

379  
N81d  
No. 4027

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF NINE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS  
PROVIDING INCLUSION FOR THE DIFFERENTLY ABLED

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
University of North Texas in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Cloyd L. Hastings, B.S. in Ed., M.S.L.S.

Denton, Texas

December 1994

379  
N81d  
No. 4027

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF NINE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS  
PROVIDING INCLUSION FOR THE DIFFERENTLY ABLED

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
University of North Texas in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Cloyd L. Hastings, B.S. in Ed., M.S.L.S.

Denton, Texas

December 1994

Hastings, Cloyd L., A Qualitative Study of Nine Elementary Principals Providing Inclusion for the Differently Abled. Doctor of Education (Educational Administration), December, 1994, 225 pp., references, 97 titles.

This is a qualitative description of the decision making processes that nine elementary principals use in determining campus level services for the differently abled and of how their administrative styles and values impact those decisions. Both the literature on leadership and on special education inclusion are reviewed. This review creates the framework in which the research questions are examined and structures the reporting of the findings. The defining attributes of leadership styles in conjunction with the defining attributes of inclusion are the heart of this study.

Audiotaped interviews with each principal provide the data related to questions of leadership style, decision making, philosophy and autonomy. Separate site visits in which teachers from both regular and special education are queried as to the actual practices on their respective campuses and to their reactions to program changes involving the differently abled students. The combination of data gathered from the principal interviews, from the site

visitations and the use of triangulation of data provide the basis for the findings.

The principals are characterized as transformational leaders, transactional leaders or as managers. Managers resist change, and the practices on their campuses are only as inclusive as the district's policies demand. While transactional leaders more readily implement inclusive practices on their campuses, it is the transformational leaders who implement from explicit value structures congruent with the values implicit in inclusion, and who are pioneering and clearing the path for fully integrated schools.

Four principals meet criteria to be defined as transformational, two are transactional, two are managers, and one's inexperience negates categorization. The criteria are based upon the linkage between the definitions of the labels, the interrelationship between what the principals said in the interviews and what was observed during actual instruction, and the use of triangulation.

All the schools are expanding opportunities for the differently abled, and three of the schools are clearly on the cutting edge of inclusive practices.

Copyright by  
Cloyd L. Hastings  
1994

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My love, gratitude and appreciation is extended to my family. To Jim and Karen for their support from afar. To Kate for too many missed outings, movies, games and good times together. To my parents for raising me in a home with positive values and a respect for education and for all the sacrifices they have made over the years to provide me with opportunities to grow. To my loving wife, Dianne, for supporting me, and at times pushing me, but always believing in me and for giving me the space to complete the task.

I wish to thank those professional educators who participated in this study without whose gift of time there would be no study.

I wish to thank the Departments of History and Philosophy at Eastern Illinois University for providing me with the training, insights and confidence necessary to continue my education.

I especially wish to thank Dr. Judy Adkison for her faith in me; to Dr. Forrest Rollins for his friendship, guidance and strength; and most especially Dr. Gary Anderson for his patience and his endless encouragement to stay the course.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem	
Research Questions	
Definitions of Terms	
Procedures	
A Qualitative Research Design	
Selection of Setting	
Selection of Subjects	
Data Collection	
The Role of Values	
Limitations	
Nonexperimental Research	
The Researcher	
Chapter Summary	
Overview of the Other Chapters	
II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	37
Introduction	
The Principal As Change Agent	
Change as a Process	
Organizational Climate for Change	
Strategies for Change	
Managers and Leaders	
Leadership	
Transformative Leadership	
Values	
Paradigm Shift	
Values in Educational Leadership	
Conclusion	
Inclusionary Special Education	
Historical Overview	
PL 94-142	
IDEA and ADA	
Prejudices	
The Spectrum of Inclusive Practices	
Conclusion	

III.	A QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS . . . . .	103
	Introduction	
	The Directors of Special Education	
	The Principals	
	Summary	
IV.	FINDINGS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE RESEARCH DESIGN . . . . .	161
	Introduction	
	Paradigm Shifts	
	Findings	
	Overview	
	General Data Summary by Categorical Labels	
	Specific Data Synthesis by Categories	
	Summary	
V.	FINDINGS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE RESEARCH DESIGN . . . . .	188
	Introduction	
	Additional Findings	
	School Finance	
	Instruction	
	Summary Statement of Findings	
	Areas Needing Further Research	
	Concluding Thoughts	
APPENDIX A . . . . .		205
APPENDIX B . . . . .		208
APPENDIX C . . . . .		211
REFERENCES . . . . .		213



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Access to appropriate educational opportunities, settings, and resources for all students is a continuing challenge for school administrators in Texas and the nation as a whole. Quality and equity are issues embedded in school financing, special population services, desegregation efforts, curriculum reform, and every other aspect of school administration. The interrelationship of all these issues is clearly evident in the development of policies and procedures for students labeled as "differently abled".

A full generation of students has been educated under the protective umbrella of the landmark Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975), PL 94-142. This law extends the right to a free public education to all children regardless of disability, and defines as segregative an appropriate public education that is not in a least restrictive environment. The issues of quality and equity of educational opportunity for the differently abled students are clearly established as state and national concerns with the passage of PL 94-142, but the varying interpretations of least restrictive environment, of segregative practices, and of identification procedures, leaves these issues unresolved in the 1990s.

The new wave of reform is calling for a total restructuring of education. The mainstreaming attempts and programs which grew forth from PL 94-142 are being declared by some to be ineffective, inappropriate, and unacceptable. Least restrictive environment is viewed by many advocates for change as a continuation of a philosophy which holds that standardization of performance outcomes is more important than diversification of performance production (Skrtic, 1987). The position of such advocates is centered in the perception that the organizational theory which guides the educational establishment has remained basically unchanged in this century. Thus all students who do not readily fall within standardized expectations are excluded from full participation within the main framework of the system.

The antithesis of exclusion is inclusion. Inclusion is the term adopted by many advocates for reform of special education who call for the elimination of labeling and categorizing of students for the purposes of sorting and separating. Those who hold this belief are calling for an organizational restructuring of education with a philosophic assumption base which will include all children from theory through daily implementation.

Within this flurry of change stand principals who must daily define the roles which they wish to play out upon the stages of their specific campuses. Relative autonomy has

always existed for principals. The uniqueness and the importance of this autonomy in relationship to special education reform is embedded in the expectations for their roles within Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) committee decisions. Principals are in positions of leadership and influence which allow them to set the tempo and tone for reform on their campuses through the implied and explicit powers assigned them within special education procedures.

The principal's authority rests in the ability to influence rather than in any absolute authority. The parents, faculty members, and administrative support staff, look to the principal for guidance, knowledge, and strategies. Hopefully, the principal acts upon the issues of quality and equity for all children based upon beliefs of what is best for individual students, for the individual schools, and for the individual community.

National and state laws, district administrative guidelines, career ambitions, advocacy groups, and educational philosophies can not be ignored as factors influencing principals. The resolution of conflict by individual principals among and between these various value structures is at the heart of this study. The authority of principals within ARD committees is limited more by their powers of persuasion than by the individual vote they cast. Principals are expected to provide leadership and direction to these committees because of their general knowledge of

educational practices and because of their position as chief executives. This in no way diminishes the role of other members on the committees. It does speak to the intent of federal and state guidelines that govern ARDs that school administrators are to commit resources and to provide opportunities for the recommendations of the committees to be realized.

Principals in the 1990s are faced with educational decision making in an environment of heated emotionalism, legal interpretative battles, philosophic mismatched constructs, and personal bias matrixes as complex and difficult as those made a generation ago in racial desegregation cases. It is a premise of this paper that individual principals have, and will continue to have, more direct influence and impact upon the mindscape of inclusion education than individual principals had in racial desegregation decision making. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that this paper examines the decision making behavior of individual principals as they attempt to provide opportunities for all students within their care to maximize individual learning opportunities.

#### The Problem

This study describes the decision making processes selected elementary principals use in determining campus level services for the differently abled and describes how

their administrative styles and value systems impact those decisions.

#### Research Questions

1. What are the specific practices for serving the differently abled students within each school administrated by the principals selected for this study?
2. To what extent do the principals indicate they have autonomy to chose and to implement these specific practices?
3. Does administrative style effect the type and degree of services offered to differently abled students served by the principals in this study?
4. How does inclusion fit within the principals' professional value system, particularly in relationship to:
  - a) philosophic purposes of education;
  - b) beliefs about human potentialities; and
  - c) definitions of quality and equity related to accessing educational opportunities?

#### Definitions of Terms

Adaptive Instruction--modifies the learning environment to accommodate the unique learning characteristics and needs of individual students, and it provides direct or focused interventions to improve each student's capabilities to successfully acquire subject matter knowledge and higher-

order reasoning and problem-solving skills, to work independently and cooperatively with peers, and to meet the overall intellectual and social demands of schooling (Wang 1989a).

Adhocracy--is an open-ended organizational system which has no standard programs and is organized to provide novel solutions to each unique problem as it arises (Skrtic 1987).

Children with Disabilities--children with mental retardation, hearing impairments including deafness, speech or language impairments, visual impairments including blindness, serious emotional disturbance, orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities. (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1990).

Children with Specific Learning Disabilities--children who have a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which disorder may manifest itself in imperfect disorders include such conditions perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Such term does not include children who have learning problems which are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of mental retardation, of emotional disturbance, or of environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1990).

Comprehensive Local School (CLS)--the local school is one that a student would attend if he or she were neither attending private school nor requiring special education services. The local school is comprehensive to the extent that it can meet the educational service needs of all of its prospective students, regardless of their individual characteristics and regardless of how diverse, extensive, or costly their special service requirements (Sailor 1989). Also used in this paper with unified system and merger as interchangeable.

Content Mastery--a specific application of the "resource" setting for facilitating students identified as meeting eligibility for special education services. The distinguishing characteristic of this model is that students leave the regular classroom to receive assistance from a trained special education professional as they need the assistance. This service, therefore, is not a scheduled delivery of assistance requiring a student to leave the regular education environment on a consistent basis. No subject is directly taught by the special education teacher. The student remains in the regular education classroom to receive the direct instruction from the regular classroom teacher. During independent activity times the student may select, or the teacher may select for the student, to go the content mastery center (CMC) to receive modified reteaching, read from highlighted textbooks, listen to texts on tape,

take a modified test or any number of services delineated by the student's IEP. Because of the flexibility of this model, the amount of time spent in the CMC will vary, and the student may not need to attend each day (Texas Education Agency 1989; Waldron 1992).

Differently Abled--a currently accepted term to describe individuals who have more traditionally been labeled as disabled, or handicapped. Handicapped is a term that evolved from individuals with limitations begging with a cap in their hand; thus a rather negative term to continue to use. Disabled implies to some people "less abled" while differently abled more clearly describes potentialities rather than limitations. Handicapped and disabled will be used when the source cited has done so. Differently abled will be used whenever it is possible by this researcher.

Dual System--a dichotomous educational system that supports separate pupils, teachers, supervisory staff, and funding system (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989b).

Inclusion--a system of education in which all students attend their neighborhood schools, attend classes with their same age peers and are provided with the supports necessary for them to benefit from their educational experiences (Burkhour 1990).

Individualized Education Program (IEP)--a written statement for each child with a disability developed in any meeting by a representative of the local educational agency



or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities, the teacher, the parents or guardian of such child, and whenever appropriate, such child, which statement shall include: a) a statement of the present levels of educational performance of such child; b) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives; c) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular educational programs; d) a statement of the needed transition services for students beginning no later than age 16 and annually thereafter (and, when determined appropriate for the individual, beginning at age 14 or younger), including, when appropriate, a statement of the interagency responsibilities or linkages (or both) before the student leaves the school setting; e) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services; and f) appropriate objective criteria and procedures and schedules for determining on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved. In the case where a participating agency, other than the educational agency, fails to provide agreed upon services, the educational agency shall reconvene the IEP team to identify

alternative strategies to meet the transition objectives (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1990).

Innovation--is a product, such as an idea, which is deliberate, novel, and specific in regards to change which is thought to be more efficacious in accomplishing the goals of a system (Hanson 1985).

Integration--is a process whereby an ordinary school and a segregated group interact to form a new educational whole. Integration is a means and not an end in itself (Flynn & Kowlczyk-McPhee 1989).

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)--each public agency shall insure: 1) That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and 2) That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (Section 121a.550 General, PL 94-142). Each public agency shall insure that: (a) Each handicapped child's educational placement: . . . (c) Unless a handicapped child's individualized education program requires some other arrangement, the child is educated in the school which he or she would attend if not handicapped;

and (d) In selecting the least restrictive environment, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services which he or she needs. (Section 121a.552 Placements, PL 94-142).

Mainstreaming--placing students with disabilities and special education needs into the regular classroom for academic instruction (Taylor 1987).

Merger--another term for a unified system of education that emphasizes the elimination of a dual system of regular and special education (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989b).

Organizational Change--is a process of altering the behavior, structures, procedures, purposes, or output of some unit within an organization. Change is, therefore, the process of implementing an innovation in an organization (Hanson 1985).

Pull-Out Programs-- a segregated setting of direct instruction for students identified as meeting eligibility for special education services (Thousand & Villa 1989).

Regular Education--all classes, educational opportunities, and programs that are available for students not identified as disabled within a dual educational system (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989b).

Related Services-- transportation, and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services (including speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation,

including therapeutic recreation and social work services, and medical and counseling services, including rehabilitation counseling, except that such medical services shall be for diagnostic and evaluation purposes only) as may be required to assist a child with a disability to benefit from special education and includes the early identification and assessment of disabling conditions in children (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1990).

Resource Room--an instructional arrangement for providing special education instruction and related services in a school district setting for less than 50 percent of the regular school day. This arrangement also includes services provided by a special education itinerant teacher (one who provides instruction to handicapped students on more than one campus). Regardless of the percent of time the student spends in special education, this arrangement includes any supportive special education services provided in a regular education class such as that provided by helping teachers, interpreters, and special education aides working directly with handicapped students (Texas Education Agency 1989).

Segregation--refers to the practice of separating disabled students into classes, schools, and/or programs away from normally developing students (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a).

Self-Contained--this instructional arrangement provides special education instruction and related services to

eligible students who are in a pull-out program for 50 percent or more of the regular school day (Texas Education Agency 1989).

Special Education--specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents or guardians, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including: a) instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, and in other settings; and b) instruction in physical education. (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1990).

#### Procedures

##### A Qualitative Research Design

This qualitative study of principals relies upon the use of personal interviews and direct observations to gather data. This allows the researcher to probe for indepth understanding, to clarify misunderstandings, to ascertain respondent's level of knowledge, to detect ambiguity, to achieve rapport, and to make better estimates of respondents' true intentions, beliefs, and attitudes (Kerlinger 1986).

The choice of a qualitative study is in accordance with the assumptions which Vincent R. Rogers (1984) articulates. He suggests that qualitative researchers should hold specific beliefs relative to their investigation. The first is the belief that any social entity or institution is enormously complex and subtle. Another is people and

institutions must be studied holistically, and not in isolation from other forces that may influence them. Qualitative research is nonmanipulative and does not lend itself to experimental research. The basic function of the researcher is description. Knowledge of the behavior of human beings in a given social context is relatively meaningless without some understanding of the meanings those observed give to their behavior. This next belief is of fundamental importance to this dissertation. The most effective way to study a given phenomenon is through direct, on site, face to face contact with the people and events in question (Rogers 1984).

Despite its weaknesses, much nonexperimental research must be done in psychology, sociology, and education simply because many research problems do not lend themselves to experimental inquiry. . . . It can even be said that nonexperimental research is more important than experimental research. . . . that most social scientific and educational research problems do not lend themselves to experimentation, although many of them do lend themselves to controlled inquiry of the nonexperimental kind (Kerlinger 1986, p. 359).

Michael Patton (1990) examines appropriate applications of qualitative research. One such delineated application is

for studies that focus on process and evaluation. The focus of this dissertation is upon the process of change related to principals' role in implementing the specific change named inclusion.

Qualitative inquiry is highly appropriate in studying process because depicting process requires detailed description. Process is fluid and dynamic. Typically the experience of process varies for the individual participants. Their perceptions are key to process consideration (Patton 1990).

Research studies which center on process aim at understanding and illuminating the internal dynamics of how a program, organization, or relationship operates. Process evaluations look not only at formal activities and anticipated outcomes but also at informal patterns and unanticipated interactions. An inductive approach permits the outcomes to be evaluated based upon observation data and interviews rather than from the theories and expectations of the researcher's hypotheses. The nature of social processes is sufficiently complex and interdependent that it can seldom be easily represented along some set of unidimensional quantitative scales (Patton 1990).

An important component of the design of a qualitative study is the conceptual framework in which it is conducted (Miles and Huberman 1984; Krathwohl 1985; Patton 1990). A conceptual framework explains the main dimensions to be

studied and the presumed relationships among them. The framework helps one decide where and how to place special effort. A framework is a strategy for action and provides basic direction. It permits seemingly isolated tasks and activities to fit together and moves separate efforts toward a common, integrated purpose. The framework focuses and defines the study. As qualitative researchers collect data, they revise their frameworks by making them more precise, by replacing empirically feeble bins with more meaningful ones, and by redefining relationships (Miles & Huberman 1984).

Frameworks form a map. Thomas Kuhn's thesis in his 1962 book, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, concluded that all humanity, including scientists, carry out their day-to-day affairs within a framework of presuppositions about what constitutes a problem, a solution, and a method (Casti 1989).

David Krathwohl makes a point of distinguishing between "knowing" and "knowledge". Knowing is one's personal judgment that a relationship exists. Knowledge results when there is a consensus of such judgements. The task of researchers, therefore, is to create such a consensus with respect to their knowledge claims. One must build a chain of reasoning that will reduce the reader's uncertainty that the projected relationships do indeed exist (Krathwohl 1985). As a qualitative study this dissertation's chain will contain four specific links: a) subjects; b)



locations; c) interview and observation data; and d) comparisons connected to categorical labels defined within the review of the literature relevant to leadership styles and values.

One more generalized parameter needs to be examined before further addressing the specific links. The importance of a researcher's theoretical orientation directly affects the research and the methodology (Popkewitz 1984; Burgess 1985; Sherman & Webb 1988; Casti 1989; Eisner & Peshin 1990; Wiersma 1991; Borg 1993; Schratz 1993). This dissertation is influenced by a theoretical orientation described as a systems approach requiring holistic, synthetic thinking.

A system is a whole that is both greater than and different from its parts. A system cannot validly be divided into independent parts as discrete entities of inquiry because the effects of the behavior of the parts on the whole depend on what is happening to the other parts. The parts are so interconnected and interdependent that any simple cause-effect analysis distorts more than it elucidates. Changes in one part lead to changes among all parts and the system itself.

Synthetic thinking differs significantly from analytic thinking; it is required to explain system behavior. Synthesizers are more oriented to inductive reasoning than to the deductive reasoning heavily used by an analyzer.

Synthesizers study phenomena in their natural surroundings and are thus oriented to fieldwork. Out of these observations they produce an explanation of the essential nature of the phenomenon. Synthesizers are more concerned with description and explanation than prediction. In providing generalized explanations they delineate the most common causative factors from relatively rare ones (Krathwohl 1985).

Synthesizers subscribe to the norms of science and to science as a way of knowing. However, they are much more aware of the role values play in creating the potential for biasing the observations which are the foundation of their research. There is an acceptance that the behavior of groups and individuals upon the system of study are influenced by their perceptions of the system in which they are immersed and by the values each bring to this perception (Krathwohl 1985).

#### Selection of Setting

The three districts involved in this study are Dallas suburban school districts in North Texas. The districts selected for this study range in size from 18,750 A.D.A. to 33,000 A.D.A. The individual schools represented in this study vary in size and grade level configurations to include grades PK-6. Neither the real school names nor the real principal names are used, nor are the districts identified.

The three districts selected are representative of systems implementing exemplary services for the differently abled. It is largely upon the professional reputation of the directors of special education that these particular districts are selected. Six directors of special education within Texas provided input into the selection of these districts. Each of the selected districts have presented at special education conferences, state curriculum conventions, and/or national conferences on topics related to program innovations within their districts. The foci of these presentations was extending, beyond established practices, direct services to identified special education students within the regular education environment. Each of these districts have demonstrated their commitment to meeting the needs of the differently abled by significantly supplementing state and federal funds with local funds.

One of the districts has been positively cited by the Texas Education Agency for pioneering a special education program which significantly shifts the lotus of service from more restrictive pull-out settings to less restrictive settings which integrate special education staff with regular education staff. This program is referenced in nationally published professional journals and in scholarly texts.

### Selection of Subjects

There are no rules for sample size in qualitative research (Miles and Huberman 1984; Patton 1990; Borg 1993). Ambiguity is a attribute of qualitative research. Instead of methodological rules, there are purposeful strategies. Instead of statistical formulas, there are inquiry approaches. Sampling involves not only decisions about which people to observe or interview, but also about settings, events, and social processes (Miles and Huberman 1984). Qualitative research is predicated on the assumption that each individual, each culture, and each setting is unique. It important to study and appreciate this uniqueness (Borg 1993).

Data reduction is one consideration of sample size. Data reduction is the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the "raw" data collected in the field. Since qualitative research is concerned with depth of understanding, the amount of data collected from given site and/or subject tends to be voluminous. The sample size needs to grow out of the conceptual framework of the study. It depends on what one wants to know, the purpose of the inquiry, what's at stake, what will be useful, what will have credibility, and what can be done with available time and resources (Patton 1990).

The logic of purposeful sampling is quite distinct from the logic of probability sampling. The logic chain is of primary importance. Freud established his findings on a base of fewer than ten client cases while Piaget had a sampling base of two. Much of the qualitative research literature is based upon single-case studies. The conceptual framework and research questions determine the foci and boundaries of the sample size.

This dissertation's framework is holistic, systems originated, and synthesis driven. The sample size, therefore, must be larger than one. The research questions invite comparisons of kind and degree which also necessitates a sampling greater than one. Accepting the conceptual implications of triangulation, this study selected its sample from three different districts. Data triangulation uses a variety of data sources and accepts the metaphorical image of the triangle as the strongest geometric shape (Burgess 1985; Patton 1990; Wiersma 1993). Extending this logic, three principals are interviewed and observation data are collected from the three campuses to which the sample principals are assigned in each of the three districts selected. A total of nine principals and nine campuses are involved allowing for triangulation of data between districts and within districts.

### The Selection of Principals

An initial effort to randomly select principals was rejected by all districts invited to participate in this study. Originally each district was asked to provide two lists of principals. One list would furnish the pool of subjects whom the district believes to be exemplary in providing inclusive practices for the differently abled and the other list would be all other principals in the district. Two names were to be drawn from the first list and one from the second list. The superintendents in each district did not want to participate in such categorization of principals. Their position is that all principals adhere to the policies of the district. They want no part of a listing of principals.

Mindful of the fact that the district's positive reputation for meeting the needs of the differently abled is the only reason for their selection in the study, latitude was extended through the superintendents to the directors of special education in each district to provide the names of three principals who would participate in the study. Two of the superintendents delegated it directly to the director of special education and one assigned the task to the director of elementary education in consort with the director of special education.

Practical ethical assumptions supersede traditional selection criteria for this qualitative study in order to

provide the researcher with the trust and comfort of the districts and of the subjects which is so necessary to the overall integrity of the study. It is assumed that the policies and procedures which allowed the districts to be positively recognized for leadership in special education are implemented on each and every campus within the district. Nothing in the research design is to imply that any principal selected for the study is somehow more, or less, successful than any other principal within the district because of the particular practices implemented on any given campus.

The integrity of the study is best served by staying focused upon the participation of districts that are known to be implementing innovative and inclusionary practices for the differently abled. Consistent with the concepts of frameworks, purposeful sampling, and logic chains implicit in qualitative research, randomized selection of subjects is set aside.

The directors were asked by the researcher to take into consideration the concept of relativity implied in the research problem. This relativity assumes a range of principal behavior which does not necessarily imply any value judgements. Each of the directors furnished the names of three principals with whom they had discussed the study and with whom they had received a positive response to participate. No other data or statements by the directors

were provided to the researcher concerning the identified principals. The data will reveal, however, that the directors did provide for relativity and diversity in their selections.

The conclusions drawn from this investigation are reflective of the diversity intrinsic and particular to each campus and each principal in the study. The resulting "typical" case sampling technique is intended to be illustrative of behaviors of this sample only and not as definitive in terms of generalized behavior of all participants, and certainly not to all principals within the area of the survey, nor of any broader area.

### Data Collection

#### The Purpose

The purpose of observational data is to describe the setting that is observed, the activities that take place in that setting, the people who participate in those activities and the perception of meanings of what is observed. These descriptions must be accurate and thorough. Data collected for this study is fieldwork. The description of what is observed is contained in field notes which are dated and which record location site, who is present, what is the physical environment, and what activities take place. A tape recorder supplements the use of field notes during formal interviews.



### Interviews

Personal interviews with the principals selected for this study constitute a major source of data. The personal interviews with the three Directors of Special Education are of lesser importance in relationship to the general research problem, but become more important in the synthesis of the research questions. Each of the formal interviews of these twelve subjects is limited to one hour and the total variance from this goal is less than fifteen minutes.

An unstructured, or unstandardized, interview technique is used by the researcher in all formal interview environments. The research questions of this study govern an interview outline, but the content, sequence, and wording of the actual interview questions used is left to the discretion of the researcher (Kerlinger 1986). A general interview guide approach is used in which an outline of topics, or issues, is developed prior to each of the two formal interview environments; the directors and the principals.

The interview protocol. Each of the principal interviews begin with personal demographic data related to professional experience; this is followed by allowing the principal to describe the various special education programs and particular features of services offered on their specific campus; next are opportunities for the philosophic preferences of the principals to be explored; this leads to

examining relationships with the central administration and issues surrounding autonomy; the role, if any, that advocacy groups have with the principal are addressed next; the outline closes with an opportunity to discuss the role of staff development and other building staff issues. No such developed guide is used during the informal interviews with teachers and staff.

The developed interview guide simply serves as a basic checklist during the interview to make sure that all relevant topics are covered and that each participant is given an approximate opportunity to respond to the same types of questions. The interview guide presumes that there is common information which should be obtained from each person interviewed, but no set of standardized questions are written in advance (Patton 1990). The researcher uses intuition and judgement as a basis for deciding how to frame questions, or how to make observations (Borg 1993).

A basic tenet. A basic tenet of qualitative interviewing is to minimize the imposition of predetermined responses while gathering the data. Open-ended questions which permit the respondents to answer in their own terms is used as much as possible. Truly open-ended questions do not presuppose dimensions of feeling or thought. Dichotomous questions are minimized in both the formal interviews with the directors and the principals. This is attempted with the interview conversations with the teachers and staff, but

the basic nature of informality does not insure such queries parameters as easily as during a more formal environment.

#### Field Data

Observation data is gathered by "walk-throughs" of each school to allow the researcher to personally observe the education of differently abled students at each site. Permission is also given to take advantage of random opportunities for casual discussions with classroom teachers in each of the participating schools. In most cases either the principal, or a representative such as a counselor or a special education professional, escorts the researcher to facilitate the identification of the differently abled students who are included in the general education environments. Specific efforts are taken by the researcher to interview special education staff members who are directly responsible for monitoring IEP's.

An effort is made to standardize the length of campus observation time to approximately two hours. All observations achieve this goal with only one extending considerably beyond this time guideline. This was a conscience decision in order to wait for the dismissal of school at one campus in order to speak with a regular education teacher who teaches several differently abled students in the same room, and the observer did not wish to interrupt her during direct instruction time.

An effort is also made to standardize the minimum number of teachers from both regular education and special education included on each campus. All teachers of self-contained classes or pull-out programs are included from each campus. This number varies from zero to three. At least three regular education teacher's opinions are solicited per campus. As many as seven are included from two campuses. The total range of teachers involved from a campus is a low of six and a high of nine. This number does not include counselors, inclusion aides, inclusion teachers, librarians, reading specialists, special education diagnosticians, content mastery teachers or assistant principals whose input also contributed to the data of various campuses, but with whom no attempt to standardize the data from campus to campus was made. Many of these individuals hold itinerant positions which accounts for much of the variance and not all schools, nor all districts, have each of these categories of employees.

#### Data Analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research is a process of categorization, description, and synthesis. Data reduction is necessary for the description and interpretation of the phenomenon under study (Wiersma 1991). The process of data analysis occurs simultaneously with the collection of the data for no assumptions are superimposed upon the data but rather emerge from the data itself (Burgess 1985). Both

Patton (1990) and Miles and Huberman (1984) address inductive analysis. This means the patterns, themes and categories of analysis come from the data. They emanate from the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis.

Established quantitative research conventions of objectivity, reliability and validity have little relevance in qualitative studies. The past decade of qualitative research is increasingly less apologetic about its uniqueness as contrasted to quantitative research. In the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s some qualitative researchers attempted to defend their methodology by attempting to use quantitative language and reductionist practices (Popkewitz 1984; Best & Kahn 1986; Eisner & Peshkin 1990).

Others voices spoke in this same era for acceptance of the difference between the two forms of research.

In observing "process", it is difficult, if not impossible, to keep evaluations and descriptions separate. . . His choice of rubrics is made on heuristic grounds and hence constitutes a strategic decision to which the orthodox criteria of "validity" do not apply (Halpin 1957, p. 195).

New voices from the 1980s and 1990s are establishing the acceptance of qualitative research without attempting to "quantify" the data with displays, matrices and frequency

tabulations (Burgess 1985; Sherman & Webb 1986; Borg 1993; Schratz 1993).

Cross-validation of both data and conclusions is achieved in this dissertation through triangulation within and between districts and individual participants. Some generalized areas examined are reasons for adopting specific practices, the extent of change, and the range and degree of actual services provided. More specific areas considered include administrative pressures; novelty value, or challenge, associated with the changes; peer influence from other principals within the district; professional growth; reaction to special interest groups; and discovery of philosophic compatibility to inclusionary practices.

#### The Role of Values

Qualitative researchers believe that all research is value-laden. Rather than avoiding the issue of values, they make explicit their personal values and try to expose the values that are embedded in the context being studied (Borg 1993). This dissertation does indeed focus upon values. The rhetoric of inclusion education is immersed in value-laden language. The questions asked, and the responses, of the principals in this study are value-laden. Of central importance to the research design is the acceptance of relativity the meaning ascribed to the term inclusion holds from participant to participant. While it has an absolute

meaning to some purist theorists, this dissertation reveals a range of meanings to these practitioners.

#### Special Education Backgrounds

An additional observation regarding the selection of subjects is also relevant to this concept of values. Four of the nine principals selected by the districts have special education backgrounds; two from one district and one each from the other two districts. It would be a distortion of reality not to assume that these four principals have fundamental differences in their values because of this background relative to the other five principals. Whereas randomness was not a criteria for the selection of the subjects, each district was free to select individuals whom they felt represented their districts. The choices made by each district do represent diversity in terms of reflecting a range of inclusionary practices within each district and reflecting a range of principals' value structures relative to inclusion practices.

While the nature of qualitative research is descriptive and focused upon the uniqueness of individual environments, some between and within district comparative observations are made. This too is a product of a value-laden research design. The language of "seems"; "appears"; and "looks" is not intended to be evasive, but rather reflective of the nonquantitative methodology used in this study. One by-

product of qualitative research is the identification of areas for future quantitative studies.

### Limitations

#### Nonexperimental Research

Nonexperimental research has three major weaknesses: 1) the inability to manipulate independent variables, 2) the lack of power to randomize and 3) the risk of improper interpretation (Kerlinger 1986). The danger of improper and erroneous interpretations in nonexperimental research stems in part from the plausibility of many explanations of complex events (Kerlinger 1986). It is, however, because of this complexity inherent in human behavior that nonexperimental research is conducted.

#### The Researcher

In qualitative inquiry the researcher is the instrument (Patton 1990). One of the conceptual frameworks for this view of the researcher as a participant in the process is related directly to the physics within the Theory of Relativity. By theoretical construct a phenomenon being studied must consider the observer's physical relationship to an event as a determinate factor in conclusions ascribed to that event.

In their classic work, Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, Cartwright and Zander (1960) point out that the researcher is bound to exert influences of one sort or another upon the groups studied. Even when the researcher



attempts to minimize this influence during the field study, relationships are established that are bound to make a difference. For example, if the researcher interviews or asks questions, he directs attention to certain phenomena, and people are unlikely to react to these phenomena in the same manner after the investigation has concluded (Cartwright & Zander 1960).

Validity becomes, therefore, a factor of the skill, competence and rigor of the researcher doing the fieldwork. Controls for bias are largely limited to methodological considerations. Because the researcher is an instrument in any qualitative study, it is necessary to know a bit more about the researcher.

#### This Researcher

An elementary principal with both Texas mid-management and superintendent certification conducts this study. This researcher began his public education career in 1971 prior to both the 1973 Rehabilitation Act and PL 94-142. He has building level experience with students beginning their public school education at age three and extending to students exiting at age twenty-one. This mix of elementary, junior high school and high school experience is based in three states and four districts.

For the past eleven years he has served as an elementary principal within the same district. He has been a principal in buildings with a self-contained special

education class for students identified as Severely and Profoundly Handicapped (SPH), a class for identified students age three to six referred to as an Early-Childhood unit, resource rooms and content mastery centers. Over the span of eleven years he has participated in hundreds of ARD meetings, has served three years on a district special education advisory board, and has attended numerous special education workshops and conferences. He has no formal college training in special education methodologies, services, or the administration of special education programs.

#### Chapter Summary

Three primary objectives are addressed in this chapter. The first establishes the general purpose of this work. The call for more inclusive practices for the differently abled is pervasive. Inclusion is a movement born in the belief that its opposite, exclusion, is segregative, undemocratic, illegal, unjust and immoral. These are powerful, value-laden descriptors which give witness to both the frustration and the hope which advocates of inclusion present to the deliberations on how to best educate all children. Principals must make professional decisions about how their individual campuses will address student needs in this sensitive environment.

The second objective establishes the specific purpose of this dissertation. It is the intent of this paper to

examine and to describe the thoughts and practices of nine principals in relationship to the decisions they are making to educate the children for whom they are charged with that responsibility.

The third objective describes the research design. This is not a quantitative survey of principals, nor a quantitative study of variables influencing principals. It is a qualitative synthesis of nine case-studies examining specific principals within specific settings as their make specific decisions about specific program opportunities available to their specific students.

#### Overview of the Other Chapters

##### Chapter II

In Chapter II, two areas of professional literature are examined. The first focuses upon the relationships between the literature on change, leadership styles and values. The second is an examination of the history of educational opportunities and legislative actions afforded the differently abled students as well as a general overview of how some inclusion advocates view the current and future educational world.

##### Chapter III

Chapter III is a description of the case-studies themselves. A total of twenty-one site visits are reviewed in this chapter. The interviews with each of the districts' Directors of Special Education are summarized; the formal

interviews with each of the nine principals are likewise analyzed; and the additional informal staff conversations conducted on each of the nine campuses are examined.

#### Chapters IV and V

Chapter IV reports the findings of the field studies described in Chapter III and which are a direct outgrowth of the research problem and research questions. The final chapter addresses findings which are not directly related to the research design but which are germane to the field of study and are reflective of the nature of qualitative research. This chapter also draws the first four chapters together through summary, general conclusions and presentation of avenues for future research.

## CHAPTER II

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This dissertation draws from two distinct bodies of literature. The first is the research which centers on the role of the principal as a change agent, and the second is the research which focuses on inclusionary special education practices. It is essential that both bodies of literature are examined separately because of the depth of research available to both fields and because of the uniqueness of each area of study. The connection between these pursuits is self-evident in as much as the premise of this dissertation is the role of principals in implementing the specific change of special education reform called inclusion. The conclusion of this review of the literature addresses this connection whereas the bulk of the review concentrates on the separate topics of 1) principals as change agents; and 2) inclusionary special education.

#### The Principal as Change Agent

The School is a community. Not so, a school district or a school system. These are collections or aggregates of school communities in one locality. For this reason, the role of the

school principal differs from that of the other administrators of a school system (Adler 1982, p.63).

#### Change as a Process

Change is a process, not an event. Those who do not understand the complexities of change often equate change with a new program which is an event. It is essential to recognize that change is a process occurring over time (Hord 1987). Change is a process and not a destination. It never ends. Change takes time, and meaningful change takes longer than we expect or want. People learn slowly and forget easily (Belasco 1990).

Change is accomplished by individuals. It is neither ambiguous nor impersonal but rather affects people, and their role in the process is of paramount importance. Through focusing upon individuals in implementing a new program, a systematic change can become a reality. Change is a highly personal experience necessitating the comprehension by leaders that people do not behave collectively or uniformly in their acceptance or implementation of change. It is only when each individual within an organization has absorbed an improved practice that change has actually been achieved (Hord 1987).

Change involves developmental growth in which the individuals involved appear to express or to demonstrate growth in terms of their feelings and skills. These feelings and skills tend to shift with respect to a new

program, or practice, as individuals pass through an experience of increasing intensity (Hord 1987). Kelley and Conner (1979) describe the emotional cycle of change with a bell-shaped curve upon a chart with a horizontal axis of time and a vertical axis of pessimism. The five stages of the cycle are: 1) uninformed optimism [certainty]; 2) informed pessimism [doubt]; 3) hopeful realism [hope]; 4) informed optimism [confidence]; and 5) rewarding completion [satisfaction] (Kelley and Conner 1979). Krupp (1988) uses the metaphor of steps in achieving a new skill: 1) awareness; 2) awkward use; 3) feeling phony; 4) skillful deliberate use; 5) masterful--automatic use; and 6) innovative and creative use.

In addition to consideration of the cycles of change, it is important to examine degrees, or types, of change. First, a distinction needs to be made between innovation and organizational change. An innovation is a product, such as an idea, and organizational change is the process of implementing an innovation within an organization. There are three types of organizational change: 1) planned change; 2) spontaneous change; and 3) evolutionary change. Planned change is a conscious and deliberate attempt to manage events so that the outcome is redirected by design to some predetermined end. Any number of people within an organization can initiate a program of planned change, even if they are not formally charged with the responsibility of

directing the organization. Spontaneous change, on the other hand, is an alternation that emerges in a short time frame as a result of natural circumstances and random occurrences with no deliberate attempt to bring about this change. It just happens; there is no grand design. Evolutionary change refers to the long-range, cumulative consequences of major and minor alterations in the organization (Hanson 1985).

Although a position will be presented later in this dissertation that inclusionary special education practices are evolutionary, it is also the position of this work that the conscious decision of a principal to implement such practices is a planned change. From this assumption base the focus of this review of change theory will be on planned change. There are at least three basic cornerstones that are built into the foundation of a change design. First is a full understanding of the technology of an innovation. Second is a comprehensive knowledge of the environmental constraints operating within and around an organization. Third is a strategy of change (Hanson 1985). The next two sub-sections will survey environmental constraints and strategies of change. The understanding of the technology of an innovation is addressed in the second section of this review of the literature when the innovation of inclusion is examined.



### Organizational Climate for Change

No comprehensive change is possible if the climate is closed. In the classic, The Social Psychology of Organizations, Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn (1978) put forth a strong rationale for an open systems approach to understanding the workings of any human organization. Although they are both psychologists, they take aim at their own discipline by stating the dominant tradition in psychology has included the implicit assumption that individuals exist in a social vacuum. They assert that human beings are reactive, participating subjects as well as objects in any molding process. They are in touch with the complexity of human organizations and human behavior within them.

The assumption that people are tools for accomplishing a given purpose and that their work can be planned without consideration for human variability and reactivity is the central error of the machine theory of organization according to Katz and Kahn (1978). The machine theory of organizations dominated theoretical constructs for over a century. It is largely from Katz and Kahn's pioneering work on open systems in the 1960s that the concept of examining organizational climates and cultures grew.

Fred Katz is another organizational theorist pioneer from the 1960s whose postulate that autonomy is a force that binds people together shook established beliefs (Katz 1968).

As with Katz and Kahn, he recognized the complexities of human behavior and the limitless ramifications of accepting this complexity. His position that autonomy is a binding force can be viewed as a percussor to current participatory management strategies and as an opening of a door for theorists to walk through who do not ascribe to reductionism. Reductionism is the practice of attempting to account for all the properties of highly complex systems in terms of their simplest components (Leshan & Margenau 1982).

Man is by nature both complex and contradictory. Henry Mintzberg is one of the expansionists who builds upon the open systems framework. He embraces the chaotic, often contradictory, complexities of organizations to explain that this is the only way evolving human constructs can be viewed. When one overlays the fact man is in a constant state of flux, or change, then his institutions will be complex and changing.

Mintzberg (1989) argues against the convergence hypothesis, or "one best way", in organizational theory. Through his creation hypothesis, he maintains that truly great organizations transcend convergence, congruence, configuration and contradiction hypothesis. "Understanding your inner nature" is the motto of his creation hypothesis. Organizations that operate from this bias live on the edge. They invent novel approaches that solve festering problems and thus provide us with new views toward organizations

themselves. Their effectiveness depends on the two things Mintzberg consistently promotes which is a rich understanding of the world of organizations and a propensity to play with that knowledge in creative ways (Mintzberg 1989). Open systems theorists provide us with a frame of reference in which to successfully examine change, accept ambiguity, and confront the complexity of humanness.

### Culture

It is difficult to separate the concept of culture from organizational climate. Cultures guide thinking and feeling by influencing behavior. Cultures create and constrain executive behavior by generating values rather than directives (Mitchell & Tucker 1992). They create social norms and draw attention to opportunities for action.

In 1938, Chester Barnard noted that an organization was effective if its common purposes were being achieved; it was efficient if individual motives were being satisfied and the cooperation of organizational members were being elicited (Cunningham & Gephart 1973). In 1953 Cartwright and Zander maintained that group activities in organizations may be encompassed under two headings. One is goal attainment activity in which leaders initiates action; keeps member's attention on the goal; clarifies the issues; develops a procedural plan; evaluates the quality of work done; and makes expert information available. The second is behaviors oriented activity in which leaders keep interpersonal

relations pleasant; arbitrates disputes; provides encouragement; gives the minority a chance to be heard; stimulates self-direction; and increases the interdependence among members (Cunningham & Gephart 1973; Cartwright & Zander 1960).

### "Feel for the Process"

Michael Fullan (1985) holds that there are four fundamental factors that underlie successful improvement processes: 1) a feel for the improvement process on the part of leadership; 2) a guiding value system; 3) intense interaction and communication; and 4) collaborative planning and implementation. He maintains there are two reasons for referring to the concept of "feel for the process". The first is the number of factors that leaders must contend with in running and helping to improve organizations defies step-by-step, rational planning. The second is the processes of improvement are intrinsically paradoxical and subtle (Fullan 1985). Organizations are complex and the way to manage this complexity is by simplifying.

Holistic, intuitive assessments based upon experience is the link between "feel for the process" and a guiding value system. An effective leader must be master of both ideas at the highest level of abstraction and actions at the most mundane level of detail. A value-shaping manager becomes an expert implementer who has a talent for detail

while directly instilling values through deeds rather than words (Peters & Waterman 1982).

Peters and Waterman (1982) identify eight attributes of effective organizations. They are: 1) a bias for action; 2) close to the customer; 3) autonomy and entrepreneurship; 4) productivity through people; 5) hands on, value driven; 6) stick to the knitting; 7) simple form, lean staff; and 8) simultaneous loose-tight properties. These attributes speak to the values of caring, respecting, and standing for something.

In referencing Peters' and Waterman's work, Robert Muccigrosso (1987) states that the successful leader can at once dream dreams on the most inspiring scale and, out of necessity or proclivity, jump back into the trenches with the troops. For Muccigrosso dreams and detail merge. This leads him to conclude that only the leader who commands detail has the luxury of being able to dream productively (Muccigrosso 1987).

### Educators

Organizational climate is independent of most physical considerations. In more specific terms, the physical environment that exists within a school is not a critical factor to change. A school's readiness for learning and change is independent of such factors as walls, floor coverings, and heating and cooling systems. Readiness for change is dependent largely upon the nature of the school as

a social system. How people perceive their relationships with each other, how well they see themselves fitting into the scheme of things, and how they perceive the behavior of their leader are critical areas of analysis in understanding any environment for change (Glickman & Esposito 1979).

School leaders who commit to change work from a core of beliefs that stem from postulates which drive their decision making and create an organizational climate for change. One such postulate is that leaders for change are transformational in nature. They engage in a relationship with followers that inspires them to accept and accomplish values-driven goals which are beyond and above their own self-interest. Another is that leaders for change use collaborative, inclusive structures in the decision-making processes related to school improvement. Leaders for change believe that school needs and the answers to those needs are defined by the school's context is a third postulate. A fourth postulate is that leaders for change evaluate the effects of improvement efforts in terms of a variety of student outcomes (Tucker-Ladd, Merchant & Thurston 1992).

Organizational climate is really another word for the amount of interpersonal support that teachers and administrators give to each other. The single most important factor as a precondition to changing one's self as a person, changing one's classroom, and changing one's school is that of human support (Glickman & Esposito 1979).

The importance of support in bringing about systematic change hits the leader square between the eyes.

It is a sad but true statement that the vast majority of people that hold the power of operating a school, predominantly principals, are more concerned about preserving the physical elements of a school than adjusting it to human needs (Glickman & Esposito 1979, p.10).

The crucial determinant of any given innovation's success is the willingness of teachers to employ it and do so creatively and selectively in the context of the needs and abilities of their students (Hawley 1978). The only way an innovation can become established in a school is for implementers to learn it, shape it, and claim it for their own (Elmore 1978).

### Collaboration

Getting people acting and interacting represents a major attribute of effective change. Consistent communication and information sharing serves as continuous sources of support and pressure among peers. Combining a focus on action with intense interaction and information sharing tends to produce positive change (Fullan 1985).

Collaborative planning and implementation is essential because it is the glue that holds the other attributes together. Fullan (1985) refers to several studies which found that collegial decision making within the school is

strongly related to improvement. His research led him to the conclusion that principals are very influential when they voice and demonstrate commitment to an adopted innovation and follow through by seeing that ongoing assistance and interaction occur within the school.

Sometimes principals need to assist directly. In other situations they need to actively facilitate assistance through others. In still other situations principals need to respond by simply supporting the activities of teachers or other facilitators (Fullan 1985).

Effective principals in the role of change facilitator constantly survey their domain and gather information about the setting, the staff, and the students. They share responsibilities and leadership with others on their staff. Effective principals are collaborators and delegators who carefully and thoughtfully identify and utilize available human resources. Principals most effective in implementing change are team-oriented and work collegially with others (Hord 1987).

#### Strategies for Change

Chin and Benne (1969) categorize strategies into empirical-rational strategies, normative-reeducative strategies, and power-coercive strategies. Empirical-rational strategies assume that individuals, or groups, are rational, that they act when data reveal that a change is reasonable and justified, and then it can be shown that they



will gain by a change. These strategies are closely associated with classical organization theory and include such activities as demonstration projects, inservice workshops, pilot projects, visitation days, and survey data analysis (Chin & Benne 1969).

Normative-reeducative strategies assume the rationality and intelligence of people, but they also assume that motivation and action are not based on logic alone. This category of strategies deals not only with objective elements, but also with feelings and values. Change involves modifications in attitudes, values, interpersonal relationships, loyalties, and skills. Both social systems and open systems organizational theories can be associated with normative-reeducative strategies which often use T-group training, team building, consensus decision making, and feedback procedures (Chin & Benne 1969).

Power-coercive strategies emphasize political or economic sanctions as means to bring about change. These strategies may be legitimate, such as offering a promotion in exchange for meeting performance criteria. Or they may be illegitimate such as overstating the benefits of an innovation in order to obtain additional funding, or making a less-than accurate performance evaluation to coerce someone into changing. Extremely Machiavellian, there is a "change course or I will blow your ship out of the water"

quality to many of the strategies used in the power-coercive category (Chin & Benne 1969).

Clearly the normative-reeducative strategy is preferred strategy of Peters and Waterman, Fullan, Glickman and Esposito, and Muccigrosso as discussed under organizational climate. It becomes difficult to differentiate between climate and strategy when the assumption base of both is collaborative leadership. Leadership style itself, however, becomes the strategy that blends the elements of effective climate into a system which focuses upon successful implementation of goals and visions. The role of leadership is analyzed primarily in a context that views the organization as a cultural expression of its own (Muccigrosso 1987).

#### Managers and Leaders

Before examining specific issues, concerns, and traits of leadership, a clear distinction should be made between managers and leaders. Craig Hickman provides excellent parameters of distinction between the two while establishing a powerful argument for the need of both administrative styles within successful organizations. He maintains that too much of the current literature glorifies leaders at the expense of managers implying that leaders make much more of a difference in guiding organizations to competitive advantage and enduring results than do managers.

This wrongheaded notion has given too many people a distorted picture of managers as dull, impersonal, plodding, tedious, unimaginative, and stagnant souls. Of course, everyone would rather be a leader, because leaders, as we've been told, are inspiring, personable, charismatic, creative, and visionary folks (Hickman 1992, p. 3).

Hickman concludes that managers do differ from leaders, and a natural tension does arise between the typical managerial and leadership orientations. It is not that he disagrees with the distinctions authors of books on leadership made between managers and leaders because Hickman provides many of the same. However, he does disagree with such negative judgmental statements as: "Managers do things right. Leaders do the right thing (Bennis & Nanus 1985)." Hickman prefers the view that by tapping the natural tension between managerial and leadership orientations, organizations can maximize opportunities for success. Success lies not in turning the tension into conflict or in trying to make the tension go away, but in accepting and encouraging the differences so that each will genuinely value the abilities and roles of one another. Too often an adversarial schism exists in which managers stifle leaders and leaders ignore managers (Hickman 1992). Successful organizations celebrate and nurture both orientations.

Ruminating upon the differences can thus be seen in a healthy light if we view the descriptors with neutral intent. Managers tend to be more practical, reasonable, and decisive while leaders tend to more visionary, empathetic, and flexible. Managers tend to be more analytical, controlled, and orderly whereas leaders are more experimental, uncontrolled, and creative. The manager brings the thoughts of the mind to bear on daily organizational problems and leader brings the feelings of the soul to bear on those same problems (Hickman 1992).

In terms of strategy choices, the manager's mind tends to be preoccupied with strategic imperatives while the leader's soul tends to focus on values of the organization's culture. The manager seeks to overcome weaknesses, and the leader attempts to build upon strengths. In goal setting the manager generally directs attention to uniformity of practice so as to get everyone pulling in the same direction; the leader aims toward unity of purpose without regard to uniformity of practice. In staff development the manager purchases instructional curriculum or packaged courses that will teach people the right skills; the leader believes deep in his heart that people will rise to challenges and self-develop the right skills if they are inspired (Hickman 1992).

Managers naturally desire stability and predictability and prefer to avoid abrupt change. The manager prefers

incremental strategic gains while the leader embraces sweeping, dramatic change. Leaders recognize that crisis can stimulate improvement. Managers attempt to duplicate the successful efforts of others while leaders blaze new trails. Managers hammer out compromises whereas leaders do not mind polarizing people so as to clarify differences. Managers plan for change, and leaders experiment with change. Managers refine existing structures while leaders promote complete revolution. Managers like control. Leaders prefer empowerment. Managers take charge. Leaders let go. Managers want good performance. Leaders want better performance. Managers are conservators and regulators who find their identity in existing systems; in contrast to leaders who are innovators and risk-takers and seek identity by altering existing systems (Hickman 1992).

Since this dissertation's focus is upon principals as change agents, the above delineation of differences between managers and leaders is important because of the earlier mentioned condemnation made by Glickman and Esposito that principals are more concerned about preserving the physical elements of a school than adjusting it to human needs (Glickman & Esposito 1979). Clearly this is a statement that implies that most principals are managers without a thread of leadership. Hickman is quick to point out that most people do not find themselves at either extreme of a management-leadership continuum, but rather possess some

combination of the two orientations with an overall preference for one or the other (Hickman 1992).

The remainder of this review of principals as change agents addresses only the leadership side of the continuum. This decision does not derive from a posture of superiority relative to leaders as opposed to managers, but from the position, which Hickman's descriptors so powerfully portray, that leaders are change agents.

Change is defined as a process. Normative-reeducative is a specific strategy of change focused upon because it fits best with the characteristics of environments in which principals who are change agents work. Leaders are change agents, therefore, principals who are change agents are leaders. Having defined leaders, it is purposeful to explore specific strategies and characteristics of the concept of leadership.

#### Leadership

The power of leadership can be defined as the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it (Bennis & Nanus 1985). To provide vision for others, a personal philosophy is paramount. Strong leaders are people who develop a personal philosophy and communicate it impellingly until it develops beyond the level of personalization to become institutionalized (Muccigrosso 1987).

Organizational systems empower using vision. People, however, can only be empowered by a vision they understand.

Understanding is enhanced by participation which produces empowerment. Empowering visions do not come engraved in stone from a mountaintop. They are shaped, crafted and developed in cooperation with those who will live it (Belasco 1990).

Effective leaders unite goals into visions and translate them into action through the empowerment of participation in the very process of vision creation.

It is not enough to find a purpose that unifies one's goals; one must also carry through and meet its challenges. The purpose must result in strivings; intent has to be translated into action (Csikszentmihalyi 1990, p. 217).

The specifics of a vision, or philosophy, in relationship to differing philosophies is less important than the experiential basis for the philosophy and the ability of the leader to communicate it (Muccigrosso 1987). Without the leader translating his vision to the followers, there is no organizational heartbeat (Bennis & Nanus 1985). "Empower your people--every day. Show your vision in action--every day. Talk about the vision's success--every day. Or else--your people will forget and your vision will be history (Belasco 1990, p.151)".

To judge the specifics of a leader's philosophy is less important than careful examination of the leader's integrity. The transformative power of our individualized

vision will more often be a function of its perceived integrity than of its orthodoxy, acceptability, or the degree of comfort it may initially evoke in others (Muccigrosso 1987). The problem with many organizations, including schools, is that they tend to be overmanaged and unled. This distinction is between effectiveness, activities of vision and judgement, and efficiency, activities of mastering routines (Bennis & Nanus 1985).

To build collaborative work culture, principals must concentrate on fostering vision-building and norms of collegiality that respect individuality. Principals are blinded by their own vision when they feel they must manipulate the teachers and the school culture to conform to it (Fullan 1992). Leaders value relationships and feelings and seek to lead through facilitation and empowerment (Bolman & Deal 1992). Organizations that do not fully comprehend why they exist will experience disharmony from internal and external pressures. The importance of the principal's role in explicitly framing school goals, purposes and mission can not be overestimated (Krug 1992). An organization's beliefs and wants are reflected in the way it uses its resources and school changes ought to be guided by and related to some system of purpose, mission, and goal (Maher, Midgley & Urdan 1992).



### Transformative Leadership

Transformative leadership theory is developed by James MacGregor Burns in his 1978 book Leadership. Transformative leadership is primarily concerned with higher-order psychological needs for esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization. Secondly it addresses moral questions of goodness, righteousness, duty, and obligation. A decade later Amitai Etzioni (1988) articulates a strong case for moral authority as a source of motivation and a basis for effective management. Etzioni maintains that what counts most to people is what they believe, how they feel, and the shared norms and cultural messages that emerge from the groups with which they identify. Morality, emotion, and social bonds are motivators far more powerful than extrinsic concerns (Sergiovanni 1990a).

According to Burns the two essentials of power are motive and resource. He further maintains motive, or purpose, is the absolutely central value inadequately recognized in most theories of power. He defines leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations--the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations--of both leaders and followers. He further maintains the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations (Burns 1978).

Leadership is thus inseparable from the needs and goals of the followers.

Predating Burns by a quarter century, Kahn and Katz (1960) presented evidence from a 1953 industrial research project which they conducted that workers in high producing groups more frequently characterized their foremen as taking a personal interest in them. They further concluded that the twin criteria of productivity and morale have many determinants in common. This suggests that the effect of supervisory behavior on motivation may be basic to understanding productivity differences (Kahn & Katz 1960).

Also before Burns's transformational leadership principles were published, S.P. Hencley maintained that leadership is determined not so much by the characteristics of individuals as by the requirements of social situations. Leadership as a form of human behavior finds issue during the conduct of human situations and is reciprocal to the behavior of others in the situation (Hencley 1973).

Transformational leaders raise both themselves and their followers to higher levels of motivation and morality. Naked power-wielders can not be leaders because they treat people as things without regard to their motives and needs (Burns 1978).

Since the motives of both the leader and the followers are so essential to understanding leadership, the interactive process becomes an ethical examination of

morality. Leaders, as differentiated from dictators, assume conflict because they accept diversity of opinions among individuals. Rather than denying conflict by assuming their's is the only opinion of import, leaders confront conflict, exploit it and ultimately embody it. Standing at the points of contact among conflict groups, they can take a variety of roles. Sometimes they can act directly for their followers; sometimes they can bargain with others; sometimes they can override certain motives of followers; and other times they can summon others into play (Burns 1978). Leaders manage conflict so as to include followers as participates in the realization of the vision held forth by the leader.

Leaders shape, alter and elevate the motives, values and goals of followers through the vital role of teaching. Teaching is a qualification of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders are concerned with end-values such as liberty, justice, equality and equity. They heighten the awareness of their followers through levels of morality by teaching them to focus on the end-values rather than the immediate daily pressures of life (Burns 1978).

Expanding upon the work of Burns who distinguishes between transactional and transformative leadership, Thomas J. Sergiovanni (1990a) writes of four sequential stages of leadership. The first stage corresponds to Burns transactional style which is labeled "Leadership by

Bartering". The leader and the led strike a bargain within which the leader gives to the led something they want in exchange for something the leader wants. The next three stages are levels of transformative leadership. The second stage is "Leadership by Building". The leader provides the climate and interpersonal support that enhances the led's opportunities for fulfillment of needs for achievement, responsibility, competence, and esteem. The third stage is "Leadership by Bonding". At this stage the leader and the led develop a set of shared values and commitments that bond them together in a common cause. The final stage is "Leadership by Banking". Here the leader "banks the fire" by institutionalizing improvement gains into the everyday life of the school (Sergiovanni 1990a).

These developmental stages of leadership provide for effective school improvement. Bartering furnishes the push needed to get things started. Building contributes the support needed to deal with uncertainty and to respond to higher levels of need fulfillment. Bonding produces the inspiration needed for performance and commitment beyond expectations. Banking provides for routine and conserving of human energy and effort needed for change. School improvement initiatives become real only when they become institutionalized as part of the everyday life of the school (Sergiovanni 1990a).

Henry J. Tosi (1982) clearly states that the critical dependent variable which researchers who examine leadership should focus on is predictability. It is the importance of organizational behaviors over long periods of time which is the basis of this conclusion. This fits with Sergiovanni's position on institutionalized patterns of behavior. Effective leaders focus upon long term, consistent, and desirable organizational goals. The challenge of leadership is to translate values and ideas into actions and programs (Sergiovanni 1990b).

#### Values

Transformational leadership takes us into the realm of values. Until recently little in the literature in educational administration focused upon moral authority, mindscapes, sacred values, cultural norms systems, the power of language in shaping reality, and theories of practice. Leadership behavior, however, can not be separated from intents and meanings (Sergiovanni 1990b; Sergiovanni 1992a). When leadership is viewed as social action, then what the leaders does is intentional and emphasizes the subjective meanings attached to situations by the leader. This requires that behavior be examined within the context of the leaders culturally defined situation and network of social relationships. To the extent that we are not only motivated by self-interests but by what we believe is right and good, by how we feel about things, and by cultural norms, then

value-driven leadership emerges as a more powerful force than bureaucratic or personal leadership (Sergiovanni 1992a).

The organizations of the future will reject the event-driven philosophy and substitute a value-driven philosophy of leadership. The core organizational values become the pull to the future, leading the organization toward a vision of excitement and energy (Patterson 1993). Values are beliefs about what is desirable and worthwhile. They are based upon our most fundamental understanding of the kind of world in which we live. Open organizations have certain core values that enable them to maintain unity and provide fulfillment for both the members and the organization itself. Planning goals, and establishing strategies for implementing the goals, must then involve synchronizing individual and organization values (Mink 1979).

The first idea to ponder about ethics is that values do not exist in the world. They are phenomenological, subjective, facts of the inner and personal experience, ultimately only within the consciousness of individual mind (Hodgkinson 1983). Changing doing without first changing thinking does not get us very far. Real change starts with our philosophies. How we conceive of reality and ourselves evolves and revolves around our beliefs (Breton & Largent 1991). It is only through understanding wholes that realities have meaning. One of Einstein's favorite maxims

is the field generates the object, not vice versa. This translates to say that whole systems give rise to specific things, not the other way around. To know the particulars, we need to know the whole from which they come (Breton & Largent 1991).

### Paradigm Shift

In every intellectual field of study, and in all decision making conditions, we use sets of assumptions, or paradigms, to organize our effort to understand our world, to set goals we pursue, to choose the means to advance our goals, and to relate to one another as we proceed as individuals or in unison. The philosopher economist, Amitai Etzioni, argues for a paradigm shift from the neoclassical individualistic paradigm to an interparadigmatic pattern combining the neoclassical with the Martin Buber, I&We collective paradigm (Etzioni 1988).

Etzioni (1988) defines the neoclassical paradigm as a utilitarian-based version of radical individualism. In this paradigm individuals seek to maximize their utility, rationally choosing the best means to serve their goals. They are the decision-making units. The idea of community is generally seen as the result of the aggregation of individual rational decisions (Etzioni 1988).

The neoclassical assumption that people render decisions rationally is replaced by the assumption that people typically select means, not just goals, first and

foremost on the basis of their values and emotions. The neoclassical assumption that the individual is the decision-making unit is changed to assume that social collectivities, such as ethnic and racial groups, peer groups at work, special issue groups, are the prime decision making units. Individual decision-making often reflects collective attributes and processes. Individual decisions do occur, but largely within the context set by various collectivities (Etzioni 1988).

At the core of the I&We paradigm is the assumption of creative tension and perpetual search for balance between two primary forces, those of the individual, and those of the community, of which they are members. This creative tension is much like the creative tension Hickman (1992) speaks of in effective organizations that learn to take advantage of the dynamic and positive interaction between leaders and managers.

If we view the community as merely an aggregation of individuals temporarily joined for their convenience, we leave out the need for commitment to serve shared needs and for involvement in the community that attends to these needs. If we see the community as the source of authority and legitimacy, and seek in the name of duty, to impose behavioral standards on individuals, including on ourselves, then we leave an insufficient basis for individual freedom and other individual rights (Etzioni 1988).



Etzioni (1988) uses the term, responsive community, to accord full status both to individuals and to their shared union. A responsive community is much more integrated than an aggregate of self-maximizing individuals. It is, however, less hierarchical and less structured than an authoritarian community.

The neoclassical decision-making model draws on one variation or another of the information-processing means-end scheme. Individuals are assumed to have ends and to set out to collect process, and interpret information about alternative means to serve those ends. Etzioni (1988) radically departs from this model and argues that the majority of choices involve little information processing, or none at all, but that they draw largely, or exclusively, on affective involvements and normative commitments.

We are far more creative without dualistic premises. Given a good system that includes everyone, creativity works by taking off limits and breaking restrictions (Breton & Largent 1991). There is more prosperity in win-win than in win-lose, and there is more prosperity in letting creativity take off limits than in imposing more. Assumptions change us. Our assumptions permeate our life and shape the character of our existence. The whole would not be what it is without each aspect. Integrated with the whole, each aspect takes on its perfect meaning (Breton & Largent 1991).

### Values in Educational Leadership

Educational administrators can establish a school environment in which education can take place ethically. An administrator is ethically naive if an assumption is made that the educational environment, the organization, the system, the institutional arrangement (the curriculum, the daily and weekly schedule, the assessment and discipline and placement and promotion policies) are value neutral. It is even worse if the assumption is that these parameters already embody a desirable ethical standards without need for deliberate reflection (Starratt 1991). School administrators do not manage just any organization; they manage educational organizations which by their very nature serve moral purposes.

Leadership mindscapes are shaped by beliefs, values and paradigms. They create the reality that drives leadership practice (Sergiovanni 1992b). When Catherine Marshall asked school leaders what guided them when they faced ethical dilemmas in their work, they never referred to a professional code of ethics or professional training. Rather they referenced religion and family background (Marshall 1992). The inner life of principals counts in determining what they believe and accomplish. This inner life is revealed by the language that they use in their practice (Sergiovanni 1992a).

Educational leaders must confront the moral issues involved when schools disproportionately benefit some groups in society and fail others. The ethics of justice and caring will facilitate school administrators in their quest for balance and fairness. Educational administrators committed to an ethic of caring are grounded in the belief that the integrity of human relationships is to be held sacred. They further maintain that the organization called a school as an organization holds the good of human beings within it as sacred (Starratt 1991).

This concept of sacred is metaphorically important to school climate, school norms and school leadership. The distinction between sacred and profane norms and their qualitative acceptance is what constitutes school cultures. The sacred is composed of essentially immutable norms while the profane is susceptible to change, with some norms more susceptible than others. The two terms define completely different orders of reality, not just opposite poles of a continuum (Rossman, Corbett & Firestone, 1988).

Sacred norms are enduring, compelling and give life its meaning. The profane norms reflect the temporary adjustments to everyday life, the transitory side of existence; they are continually being redefined. As a result, the profane can be debated, altered, planned, and imported. The sacred simply is, and is unquestionably adhered to by those in the organization. Together, both

sacred and profane norms define the existing ingrained patterns of behaving and believing within an organization such as a school (Rossman, Corbett & Firestone 1988).

The concept of school restructuring and value-driven leadership can become problematic if there is not agreement among all parties as to whether a particular change is impacting a sacred or a profane norm. If the teachers and/or the community view the restructuring to be an attempt to change a sacred norm while the administrator attempting to implement the restructuring views the change as impacting a profane norm, then tension and conflict will become inevitable. It is in the defining of the sacred and the profane which will make a value-driven principal successful in implementing change or not.

#### Conclusion

This review of principals as change agents establishes three cornerstones in the foundation of change design. First was a full understanding of the technology of an innovation. Second was a comprehensive knowledge of the environmental constraints; and the third was a strategy of change. This review has globally examined both environmental constraints and strategies of change. The next portion of this review is an examination of the technology of a specific innovation, inclusion.

### Inclusionary Special Education

It is the purpose of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 to assure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free, appropriate public education. It emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet unique needs and to assure that the rights of differently abled children, and their parents or guardians are protected. (See Appendix A for the opening text of the law). This is not the situation as evidenced by findings of Congress and/or by an historical review of the literature.

Many educational leaders, parents, schools and communities are embracing the concept of inclusion. The historical review reveals that this change called inclusion is truly an evolutionary extension of a continuum of change dating back into the nineteenth century. Some individuals within, and outside, of school organizations prefer to view inclusion education as revolutionary and therefore radical. When inclusion education is placed within its proper historical context, it is neither revolutionary nor radical. Rather it is natural and even conservative. It is conservative in that it preserves, honors, and extends the values and culture of the history from which it is born. It is not radical, therefore, because it is neither a separation from this heritage nor a departure from shared values. It remains, nonetheless, a

significant change and all the more so for those who ignore, or are ignorant, of its position in history.

### Historical Overview

The historical development of special education is relatively parallel in structure among the Western European, Canadian, and American systems. This overview, therefore, concurrently examines developments in various countries with an emphasis upon the chronology of events as important rather than locale.

As one reviews the British development of special education, for example, it is easily transferable to other settings. Throughout the nineteenth century various special schools were established for students with special needs in Britain. The first schools were for students with sensory disabilities, and then as universal elementary education spread, so did schools for students with other learning difficulties. These early developments were sporadic and locally determined without national legislation pressing for uniform quality or equity. This changed over time from educational legislation permitting special schools to requiring them. By the turn of the century the prevailing means for meeting the needs of the differently abled was through a system of separate schools (Hegarty & Pocklington 1981).

In North America it was not until 1817 that the first school for the disabled was established by Thomas Gallaudet

at the American Asylum for the Education and Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb in Connecticut. Other North American schools for the disabled soon followed such as the New England Asylum for the Education of the Blind founded in 1829 in Watertown, Massachusetts, and the Experiential School for Teaching and Training Idiotic Children founded in 1846 in Barre, Massachusetts. The first Canadian school for students designated as mentally handicapped was established in 1888 in Orillia, Ontario. Few students with disabilities were receiving an education in the nineteenth century. For the few who did, it was administrated in asylums or in institutions supported by the government or a church. While a few voices such as Samuel Howe advocated for the education of all children, it was not a view held by many (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a).

The establishment of separate systems was in accord with the understanding of the very concept of "handicap". Such individuals were viewed as defective and determined to be thus from birth to death. A child's handicap was seen as an unalterable characteristic of the child. It was not uncommon to keep an individual identified as handicapped in a juvenile status even when advanced in years (Hegarty & Pocklington 1981).

With such a conviction that the disabled were different in kind from the rest of the children, it made sense to develop separate educational systems. The British Education

Act of 1921 stated clearly that handicapped students were to be educated only in special schools or special classes (Hegarty & Pocklington 1981).

Even with the passage of compulsory attendance laws in the early 1900s on both sides of the Atlantic, many children with disabilities continued to be excluded from the public schools. Almost all children who were wheelchair-bound, not toilet trained, or considered ineducable were excluded because of the problems that schooling them would entail (Sigmon 1983). For those who were allowed to attend schools, exclusion from the regular classes was essential. Special classes came about, not for humanitarian reasons, but because such children were unwanted in the regular public school classroom (Chaves 1977).

Although far from being a charter of integration, the British Education Act of 1944 did contribute to the opening of the door for more inclusionary practices. Although special schools were to continue as the primary source of educational opportunity for students with disabilities, it did allow for the regular schools to become a part of the solution in meeting needs. Local schools were to insure under {section 8[2]} that arrangements were made for pupils who suffer from any disability of mind or body by providing, in special schools or otherwise, special educational treatment. According to {section 33[2]} school officials were to educate pupils whose disabilities were serious in separate



special schools as much as practicable, and these special schools were to be appropriate to that category of disability. However, where that was impracticable, or where the disability was not serious, the educational arrangements could be provided in any school (Hegarty & Pocklington 1981).

The 1944 Education Act offered more formal recognition to intelligence testing and differential forms of education. IQ tests were administered to predict which children would benefit from different forms of secondary education and which would benefit from special education. The 1944 Education Act led to an increase in the number of recognized categories of special education from four to eleven (Solity 1992).

During the 1950s and 1960s the movement away from asylums and residential institutions for the less than severely disabled began with special classes in public schools in the United States and Canada. Residential institutions and special schools remained, however, the norm for educating students who were blind, deaf, and physically handicapped. While the picture was improving for some groups of students with disabilities, students considered severely or profoundly developmentally handicapped were generally still denied educational services of any type, and remained hidden away in large state institutions (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a).

Contributing to the lack of social acceptance was a common perception that people with disabilities possessed criminal tendencies related to their genetic composition (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a). For all groups of identified students receiving special education the services were viewed as something that took place outside the mainstream (Solity 1992).

It was also during this time that parents of students with disabilities began to organize into support groups such as the National Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC). The United States Government started to fund education for students considered disadvantaged, low income, and/or handicapped. Congress passed the National Cooperative Educational Research Program in 1957 which provided priority funding for the study of students labeled as mentally retarded. It was re-endowed in 1958, 1961 and 1963 to prepare teachers for students with disabilities. The historic passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 did little to directly benefit students with disabilities, but it did institute the direct involvement of the federal government into funding specific programs within public education. This landmark legislation paved the way for later laws such as PL 94-142 (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a).

Congress did not prove to be the only path to reform for the advocates of children who are differently abled.

Federal court decisions in Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia in the early 1970s validated the right of all children labeled as mentally retarded to a free and appropriate education. In the 1971 case, Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the state's obligation to place each mentally retarded child in a free, public program of education was ensured. The court also stressed that a regular public school is preferable to placement in a special public school thus foreshadowing the language of least restrictive placement. The case, however, only applied to mentally retarded students. In 1972, in Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, these rights were extended to all handicapped students (Spodek, Saracho & Lee 1984). In 1973 the Rehabilitation Act, Section 504, prohibited discrimination against otherwise qualified persons in any situation in which federal funds were used including those for elementary and secondary education (Martin 1989).

#### PL 94-142

In 1975 the world of individuals who are differently abled is permanently altered. The international community as well as the United States is called to action with the passage of PL 94-142, Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This major piece of legislation continues to impact the entire educational community of the Western world. It establishes a national mandate commitment to educating all

students with special needs no matter how great or complex their needs. State education agencies must provide a "free appropriate public education" for all handicapped students between ages 3-18 (later extended to age 21). Of paramount importance is the provision requiring handicapped students be placed in the "least restrictive environment". This principle is spelled out in the law as follows:

1. That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institution or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and
2. That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. (Section 121a.550 General, Public Law 94-142.)

The basis for this law originates with the civil rights movement which resulted in the racial desegregation of public schools. In 1954 Supreme Court Chief Justice Earl Warren stated in Brown v Board of Education: "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. This inherent inequality stems from the stigma created by

purposeful segregation which generates a feeling of inferiority that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." PL 94-142 opened the door to a new civil rights movement which echoed the intent of Brown that separate is not equal (Taylor 1987).

PL 94-142 does not require all pupils to be educated in regular schools. Educational provision must be appropriate as well as being non-restrictive. If placing a pupil in a regular school or a regular classroom were to result in harmful effects to the pupil or to reduce the quality of education received, this would not be in accord with the legislation, and a segregated placement might be required.

Educating students with special needs in the regular school is not simply a question of importing special education to the ordinary school. What is required is that the school adapt its educational programs to accommodate for diversity. The school remains a single entity. What integration means is providing a highly flexible range of strategies incorporating a multitude of possibilities and not just a simple choice between regular and special classes. The conclusion that emerges is not that students should be transferred from special schools to regular schools, but that regular schools should be altered so that they can provide for a wider range of students (Hegarty & Pocklington 1981).

In 1979 the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps (TASH) adopted a resolution calling for the education of all students with severe disabilities in regular schools with their nonhandicapped peers. The National Society for Children and Adults with Autism adopted a similar resolution in the early 1980s. By this time, students considered more mildly or moderately disabled began to be integrated into regular class placements on at least a part-time basis. Many students who had not been served in the past because of the severity of their disabilities increasingly began to receive educational services in regular neighborhood schools. Although limited, involvement in regular school environments such as the cafeteria, playground, library, halls, buses, and rest rooms was introduced for the most profoundly disabled (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a).

In Britain the 1981 Education Act anticipated that approximately two percent of the school population would require special education services outside the mainstream of regular education. The Act also stated that there was a much larger group of children, approximately 18 percent of the total population, who would have special needs met within the mainstream system. The 1988 Education Reform Act is another watershed in the history of British education by further extending the expectations that students with disabilities will be educated in more inclusive

environments. At least in principle, schools are urged to recognize that all children should have access to a similar curriculum (Solity 1992).

The United States Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services in the U.S. Department of Education issued the "Regular Education Initiative" in 1986. Its purpose was to find ways to serve students classified as having mild and moderate disabilities in regular classrooms by encouraging special education and other special programs to form a partnership with regular education (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989a).

#### IDEA and ADA

In 1990 IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, was passed. It is the most comprehensive entitlement act specifically for individuals with disabilities. IDEA commits the federal government to providing funds and authorities to fully implement the extended implications of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) passed 15 years earlier. The evolution of including all children within a unified system of educational opportunities is moved to a new level of realization.

The concept of transition services for students beginning no later than age 16 and extending into post-secondary environments has a clear tie to the intent explicit in the American Disabilities Act (ADA) enacted in

July 1992. The federal government is dedicated to the belief that individuals with disabilities should be provided every opportunity to become taxpayers rather than tax spenders. IDEA will provide the educational opportunities to best insure employability, and ADA will provide the employment opportunities based upon equivalent educational/training experience.

In October 1993 a New Jersey school district decided not to appeal the Third Circuit Court of Appeals May decision in Oberti v. Clementon. The federal court ruled the district must try to educate a student with Down syndrome in a regular classroom by providing support services. President Bill Clinton's Department of Education has elected to use the Oberti case as a philosophical landmark case. The Oberti decision provides as an interpretation of the IDEA that the mainstreaming requirement prohibits a school from placing a child with disabilities outside of a regular classroom if educating the child in the regular classroom, with supplementary aids and support services, can be achieved satisfactorily. Furthermore, if placement outside of a regular classroom is necessary for the child to receive educational benefit, the school may still be violating IDEA if it has not made sufficient efforts to include the child in school programs with nondisabled children whenever possible. The new position appears to be that inclusion in the regular school



is expected, and inclusion in the regular classroom is preferred (Maroldo 1993).

The history of providing educational opportunities to all children regardless of label or specific characteristics is still being written. Western Europe, Canada and the United States have maintained a consistent and persistent movement away from segregative practices and toward inclusive practices.

#### Prejudices

In 1909 Leonard Ayers wrote a book entitled, Laggards in Our Schools. Ayers used statistics to show that American schools were filled with retarded children and that most students dropped out of school before finishing the eighth grade. He defined retarded as children who were overage for their grade regardless of how well they were doing in their work. He claimed that the extent of retardation varied from seven percent in Medford, Massachusetts, to 75 percent for "Negro" children in Memphis, Tennessee, with the average being about 33 percent nationwide (Ayers 1909).

How far have we progressed? Not as far as we might like to believe. For as silly as Ayers' 1909 findings sound to us today, we are still tied to turn-of-the-century beliefs about the effectiveness and use of IQ testing as simply an alternative to measuring the physical size of the human skull.

Craniometric arguments lost much of their luster in our century, as determinists switched their allegiance to intelligence testing--a more "direct" path to the same invalid goal of ranking groups by mental worth--and as scientists exposed the prejudiced nonsense that dominated most literature on form and size of the head (Gould 1981, p. 108).

In an average week at least 15,000 students across the country are referred for special education services. Most are given an IQ test and a standardized achievement test. Most of the students referred met eligibility guidelines and are placed joining the nearly five million students currently enrolled in special education. In effect, a second system of education has been created that serves children with diverse learning problems and disabilities (Wang, Reynolds & Walberg 1988).

#### Intelligence Testing

Ayers did more than simply report the percentages of "retarded" children in the schools. He was one of the first educators to picture the school as a factory and to apply industrial values and practices to the schools (Callahan 1962). The American fixation with statistics and efficiency began nearly a century ago and has diminished little. We can now use statistics to achieve some remarkable results. It has been estimated, for example, that more than 80 percent of all students could be classified as learning

disabled by one or more definitions now in use. In fact, 1.97 million children were categorized as learning disabled in the academic year 1988-89, 48 percent of all children identified as handicapped (Wang, Walberg & Reynolds 1992).

It is important to understand how we identify students for special education before we examine any further how to change practices. In 1904 Alfred Binet was commissioned by the minister of public education to perform a study for the specific and practical purpose of developing techniques for identifying those children whose lack of success in normal classrooms suggested the need for some form of special education. Binet's resulting scale was a hodgepodge of diverse activities. He hoped that by mixing together enough tests of different abilities he would be able to abstract a child's general potential with a single score.

By 1908 Binet decided to assign an age level to each task, defined as the youngest age at which a child of normal intelligence should be able to complete the task successfully. In 1912 W. Stern argued that mental age should be divided by the chronological age rather than subtracted from it, and thus the intelligence quotient, or IQ, was born (Gould 1981).

The IQ tests in widespread use are not true measures of anyone's intelligence. As contradictory as it may seem, they were not designed for that purpose. They were designed for the purpose of predicting achievement in traditional

academic programs. These IQ tests are good predictors of school achievement because only those items that are proven predictors of academic success are retained.

No one knows what the items are really measuring. No one knows what traditional school programs really impart, either. The most we can know is that a child who is in the average range on an IQ test is likely to be in the average range in a traditional school program, a child who is below average on the IQ test is likely to do below-average schoolwork, and a child who is above average on an IQ test is likely to do above-average schoolwork (Farnham-Diggory 1992, p. 158).

The American version of the IQ test, the Stanford-Binet test, tests only verbal skills. It does not test nonverbal or nonacademic skills, such as motor skills and mechanical ability, and reveals nothing about a student's personality, social maturity, or motivation. Children with language difficulties are penalized (Watson 1975). While the Wechsler test attempts to counterbalance the overly verbal orientation of the Stanford-Binet tests by including a performance section, it remains an IQ test with a middle class social and cultural bias. The 1972 Mills decision declared unconstitutional the practice of tracking or separating students into groups of individuals thought to be

intellectually similar on the basis of intelligence tests (Watson 1975).

L. M. Terman, who developed the Stanford-Binet scale, was a devout hereditarian who dreamed of a rational society that would allocate professions by IQ scores. Karl Pearson, who invented the technique for the standard measure of correlation, held a university chair in eugenics. Charles Spearman, father of factor analysis, stressed throughout his career, the theoretical justification for using a unilinear scale of IQ resides in factor analysis itself. He sought a single number to be used to rank people on a unilinear scale of intellectual worth. Cyril Burt, whose articles appeared in print from 1909 to 1972, wrote that intelligence is innate and that differences between social classes are largely products of heredity. He relied heavily upon Spearman's work to support this position (Gould 1981).

This scientific racism was used to limit immigration from specific nations in the early decades of this century. It is still used to support ability grouping in schools and to label students as needing special education. This is the link that binds the inclusion movement to the civil rights movement. The way some educators refer to children's "ability" is a potentially insidious form of discrimination. Although a growing number of educators may no longer support the use of intelligence tests to ascertain children's ability and learning potential, the language of the

intelligence test still abounds. This may, in the most negative instances, lead to children being quite arbitrarily identified as lacking in intelligence, or ability. The inevitable consequence is that expectations for their learning are low (Solity 1992). The use of IQ tests to identify and label students often establishes special classes as dumping grounds used by school systems that are unresponsive to the needs and demands of minority, bilingual, the culturally different and the differently abled (Watson 1975).

#### The Medical Model

Special education is problematic in its reliance upon the medical model of diagnosing the patient and prescribing a remedy to relieve the condition (Case 1992). A teacher witnesses a child struggling in the classroom; she refers the child for testing; an IQ score is correlated with a norm-referenced test score; and if there is a standard deviation variance, the child is diagnosed as needing special education services. The general prescription is intervention, as mandated by law, often for services out of the classroom. What goes undiagnosed is the instructional setting of the original classroom itself. Seldom are special education interventions targeted to improve learning in the classroom. Because the child, not the system, is defined as the problem, children remain dependent on special education (Case 1992).

Most educational plans currently designed for the differently abled students are unrelated to screening and diagnostic classification. Categorical, compensatory and remedial programs often are concerned more with administrative procedures than with the substantive goals of education (Wang 1989b). The problem in many schools is not with the instructional services themselves but with the relationship between the services and student learning. Teaching strategies identified as highly productive for both general and special education tend to be overlooked as alternative interventions for helping students with special learning needs remain in regular classrooms (Wang 1989b).

Two implementation standards in special education have become clear since the passage of PL 94-142 to some experts in the field. First, differently abled students are entitled to a free, appropriate, public education that is equal in quality to the education available to all other children. Second, special education services for these students should be carried out in regular classroom and schools, to the fullest extent possible. Implementation of this policy calls for moving special education away from educational apartheid and toward integration into the total educational system (Wang, 1989b).

In order to transition from a segregated system to a more inclusive system, two specific actions are needed. One is "bringing the children back." A sequence of step-

by-step plans for the reentry of students presently enrolled in segregated special education programs is required to allow for orderly transition. The second is "keeping the children in." This emphasizes accommodating and supporting students with special learning needs in general education settings to the maximum extent possible and bringing in special education services as needed (Wang 1989b).

### The Spectrum of Inclusive Practices

#### Mainstreaming

"Bringing the children back" is a huge task because of the historical evidence which shows that once students are identified and segregated they seldom return to regular education. According to one study of 26 large cities, less than five percent of all students labeled for special education service ever left that system completely (NASBE 1992). While mainstreaming is used by many in an effort to transition students, the results are little changed. One problem of mainstreaming is that many students receive a fragmented education and feel that they neither belong in the general education classroom nor the special education classroom. Most of the students mainstreamed into general education classrooms are never perceived as belonging to the regular classroom because most often they are there for nonacademic activities. Likewise, students mainstreamed for social purposes who are not in the regular classes during free-play times may never have the opportunity to develop



the very social skills for which they are mainstreamed (NASBE 1992).

Fully 35.2 percent of the mainstreamed students in regular secondary classrooms are expected to keep up with the class without any assistance. This is largely due to the perception of the classroom teacher that such students are "add-ons" for which she receives no assistance in planning for differentiation of instruction. The problems of mainstreaming are not limited to the regular education side of the equation. Students in self-contained special education classrooms have generally lower expectations placed upon them as do similar students in more inclusive environments. In fact, studies have shown that the "teacher-directed" instructional methods commonly employed in special classes have encouraged students to become dependent on others rather than independent problem-solvers (NABSE 1992).

"Keeping the children in" is being addressed by educators both from regular and special education backgrounds. One of the more inclusive strategies is the adaptive instruction model. The assumption underpinning adaptive instruction is that every class contains students with different interests, needs, and talents, and that whole-class instruction geared to the average student is bound to be too difficult for some learners and too easy for others (Wang 1989a).

It has a dual focus of modifying the learning environment to accommodate the unique learning characteristics and needs of individual students, and providing direct or focused interventions. Adaptive instruction applies the basic premise that students learn in different ways and at different rates, and that effective instruction involves the recognition and accommodation of the unique learning needs of individual students regardless of labels, or lack thereof. In this light it can be an alternative service delivery model for students with special needs within a general education classroom (Wang & Zollers 1990). The obvious point being that all children in the classroom are individuals with different learning rates and accommodation needs.

Some professionals committed to reform maintain that mainstreaming was devised by misguided educators to segregate classes and schools in order to placate advocates without creating problems for the system in truly adapting to the needs of the differently abled. Others view mainstreaming as an attempt to seek heterogeneity in the classroom in order for children to perceive, understand and tolerate diversity within their midst (Hegarty & Pocklington 1981).

Mainstreaming means moving identified differently abled students from their segregated status in special education classes and integrating them into regular classrooms (Watson

1975). Once placed in the regular classroom they become a part of a new whole in which all students are viewed as individuals.

### Collaborative Teams

One answer to the problems of mainstreaming without moving to a more radical inclusive model is the development of collaborative teams. Collaboration is a key to building and implementing support plans so that all children, including those who have disabilities, can participate and learn together successfully in school. Through collaboration each individual is able to contribute what he or she knows best.

Some examples of collaborative teams are: 1) collaborative consultation where a regular educator, a special educator and others meet on a regular basis to develop strategies for supporting a particular student; 2) team teaching with a regular education and special education teacher planning and teaching lessons together; 3) peer coaching in which teachers model and provide feedback about effective teaching techniques for each other--this can involve any combination of regular and special educators either together or separately; 4) the special education teacher planning and teaching a lesson to the whole class on a regular basis (Schaffner & Buswell 1991).

In collaborative teaming, team members work cooperatively to achieve a common, agreed upon goal.

Members of the team perceive themselves as positively interdependent and are expected to exhibit certain interpersonal and small-group skills. Collaborative teaming empowers the members by enfranchising them through their participation in decision-making and by owning solutions to common problem-solving situations (Thousand & Villa 1989).

### Integration

Integration is a process whereby the education offered by ordinary schools becomes more differentiated and geared to meeting a wider range of pupil needs. The effects of integration are pervasive within each school and throughout an educational system (Haegarty & Pocklington 1981). Integration is more than mainstreaming students from self-contained special education classrooms into opportunities to be with nonlabeled children only for recess, art, music, lunch and other nonacademic times. It does not mean bringing nonlabeled children into a special education class and working on a project. Integration means the process of making whole, of bringing together all children and having all children learn all that they are capable of being (Strully & Strully 1989).

The terms mainstreaming, integration and inclusion should not be viewed as identities upon an unilinear continuum, but rather as terms that describe a multidimensional matrix of opportunities. Any value

associated to a term is dependent upon the needs of the individual rather than upon absolute categorization.

#### The Inclusion Movement

(Refer to Appendix B for a full definition of what inclusion is and is not as published by the Iowa Pilot Parents Association.)

Inclusion education advances the position that all students can be integrated into the mainstream of regular education. This is to include those who have traditionally been labeled severely and profoundly handicapped (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989b). Many such advocates maintain educators should stop developing criteria for who does or does not belong in the mainstream and instead develop strategies and provide resources for increasing the capabilities of the regular education mainstream to meet the unique needs of all students.

Inclusion education advocates borrow heavily from the civil rights movement in discussing the inherent evil of inequity in a dual system of education. The tie to the civil rights movement is more than symbolic, metaphoric, or philosophic; it is also legal.

Following the passage of PL 94-142 some state officials attempted to ignore its mandates. Several Rocky Mountain area states decided not to participate in receiving the federal funds tied to the law. They simply decided not to submit an educational plan to the federal government which

would detail how they would serve the differently abled. New Mexico was one of these states. A group of parents in New Mexico went into federal district court, however, and sued New Mexico for failing to provide appropriate education for their children thereby discriminating against them under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Martin 1989).

Section 504 prohibits discrimination against otherwise qualified people in federally assisted program, including those for elementary and secondary education. The federal Office of Civil Rights developed regulations for the provisions of Section 504 which defined discrimination in elementary and secondary education so that the definition paralleled the requirements of PL 94-142. The court ruled in favor of the parents and ordered New Mexico to comply with Section 504, thus essentially forcing New Mexico to comply with PL 94-142 (Martin 1989).

Technically a subsystem of education, special education is viewed by inclusion advocates as a separate, and not equal system of education that denies students basic human rights. While such efforts as mainstreaming and integration have been attempts to reduce the sharp dichotomy between special and regular education, a dual system of education remains in effect each with its own pupils, teachers, supervisory staff, and funding system. Inclusion education suggests a merger that will incorporate all the resources

and services from both regular and special education into a single educational system.

Three major rationales are presented by inclusion advocates for the dismantling of the dual system. First, the instructional needs of students do not warrant the operation of a dual system. Second, maintaining a dual system is inefficient; and third, the dual system fosters an inappropriate and unfair attitude about the education of students classified as having disabilities (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989b).

#### The Unified Movement

The unified movement is a specific branch of the inclusion movement which also calls for the ending of a dual system of education. It is sometimes referred to as the Comprehensive Local School (CLS) model (Sailor 1989; Lipsky & Gartner 1989). The unitary model centers on the same three rationales for dismantling the dual system as the overall inclusion movement does, but focuses most of its writing on the third rationale which is the dual system fosters prejudicial views of some students. Proponents reject the bimodal division of disabled and nondisabled students, and recognize that individuals vary and that single-characteristic definitions fail to capture the complexity of people. It rejects the belief, common to all human services work that incorporates a medical model, that the problem lies in one or another treatment modality. The

unitary system, in contrast, requires adaptations in society and in education, not solely in the individual (Gartner & Lipsky 1987).

Within this concept, a unitary system would not blame the student, the family or teachers for challenges to be met in the classroom. There would no longer be a system that focuses upon limitations of the differently abled, a teacher's incapacity to teach students because of a lack of special credentials or prescribe instructional strategies and techniques according to student labels. In a unified system there will no longer be a need to approach differences in human capabilities or characteristics as disabilities on which to base categorical groupings (Gartner & Lipsky 1987).

The CLS model is classified in this paper as a unitary program in part because writers such as Sailor, Lipsky and Gartner voice the philosophy of merger. For example, Lipsky & Gartner (1989) voice the view that children with disabilities will only come to full fruition as adult human beings when they are recognized as individual who may be in need of special assistance, equipment, or modified environments as they grow. This approach contrasts with one in which children with disabilities are stereotyped as the retardate, the blind, the deaf, or any other category. Sailor also defined the term zero rejection which states



that all students, even the most severely disabled, will be included in the local school (Sailor 1989).

An important point needs to be made about CLS. It is a multiphasic model. At the elementary level it is fully unitary. At the middle school level, job training skills which reflect IEP's may require a traditional differentiated curriculum. At the high school level, inclusion means being included in the general community, not necessarily in the regular high school curriculum or even the regular environment (Sailor 1989; Lipsky & Gartner 1989). This is a distinction which some advocates of a unified system would argue does not make CLS a unitary program.

#### The Rainbow of Inclusive Practices

As school administrators look toward restructuring schools to meet the needs of all students three options appear to be available. Each of the options share three overriding assumptions: 1) policy and program changes in education will be built upon the fundamental rights of students with disabilities to a free and appropriate education designed to meet their individual educational needs; 2) changes to current policies should be controlled changes that offer an opportunity for alternative policy instruments to be tested before widescale adoption; and 3) decision making regarding changes must involve broad community input and reflect the values of the school community (McLaughlin & Warren 1992).

The three options are: 1) unified system; 2) inclusive or heterogeneous schools; and 3) separate program identity with a continuum of placements. A unified system is based upon the principle that each student represents a unique combination of abilities and educational needs and may require individual assistance at varying times during the school years in order to achieve desired outcomes. The key belief is that schools are organized around services, not programs. In a unified educational system, human and other resources are employed to provide a range of services in a range of settings to students with unequal educational needs. This option represents a major change in the way special education currently operates because it ends as inefficient and ineffective parallel program bureaucracies. All available resources are used to provide quality education to all students, regardless of their educational needs (McLaughlin & Warren 1992).

Inclusive education represents the philosophy that all students, regardless of the challenges presented by their education needs, should be educated with their same age peer in their neighborhood schools. These schools are based on the belief that those students with the most intensive educational needs should be educated in their neighborhood schools and within regular classrooms in those schools. This option does not necessarily require a major reconceptualization of special education as a program since

special education programs and services can be administered centrally and funded with minor changes. The option does require a commitment on the part of superintendents and principals to accept responsibility for educating all student in their home schools, and to redefine the roles of instructional personnel in the school building so that they work together more collaboratively (McLaughlin & Warren 1992).

The third option maintains a range of separate and specialized educational services and settings, including separate classrooms and schools, to accommodate the range of individual and unique needs of student with disabilities. The central belief is that some students with disabilities require a different curriculum and intensive instructional supports that cannot be provided with a regular comprehensive school building. This option maintains individualized educational programs and related services for students identified as having disabilities and provides those services with a continuum of specialized placements. It assumes that special education will maintain a separate identity, including separate staff within central administration who oversee and manage the specialized placements and procedures.

Culture defines disability, and this definition profoundly influences people's lives. Knowing how the culture defines disability suggests two broad strategies for

school reform. First, we can attempt to better understand and eradicate what constitutes a disability in schools. Second, a consistent effort is needed to accommodate needs (Biklen 1989).

### Conclusion

All human organizations exist to achieve purposes. These purposes are rooted in human desires and values. Each organization seeks to serve its members and its clientele by altering the world in such a way as to realize those values (Hodgkinson 1991). In this review of the literature, two distinct bodies of literature were examined. The first focused upon administrative change agents and their effectiveness in impacting organizational climate. The second focused upon the evolutionary history of providing educational services to the differently abled and the current climate of options in which administrators can make decisions related to those services. Implicit and explicit in both fields were the importance of values.

Value-driven leadership was emphasized in the first field and was demanded by most of the writers reviewed in the second field. At least on the surface, it would appear, therefore, that the nine principals who are the subjects of this dissertation and who are working within some of the finest districts in the state of Texas would have little difficulty being defined as value-driven. It would also seem reasonable to assume that they would be driven by those

values advocating inclusive practices for the differently abled.

Skrtic would caution anyone from such simplicity of thought for the problems facing the principals are neither simple nor given to organizational structures which would facilitate simplicity of problem solving. Categorical decision making flies in the face of inclusive education, and yet pigeonholing and stereotyping simplify matters greatly by allowing educators to move through their work without having to make continuous decisions at every moment (Skrtic 1987). Students whose needs fall at the margins or in the cracks between programs tend to get forced into some category because the organizational system in which principals work is not fully open-ended. In order to develop truly creative solutions to each unique need requires a problem-solving process within an organizational structure which Mintzberg calls adhocracy (Skrtic 1987).

The basic problem with PL 94-142 from an organizational perspective is that it fails to recognize school organizations as professional bureaucracies. It requires them to be adhocracies. In this application an adhocracy is a problem-solving organization in which teams of regular and special education professionals collaborate reciprocally in the interest of individual students. It further approaches implementation as if schools are machine bureaucracies. The failure to recognize schools as professional bureaucracies

is a failure to recognize that, in principle, school organizations cannot change their fundamental operations. By requiring schools to be adhocracies PL 94-142 compels school organizations to be something that they cannot be without a total reorganization (Skrtic 1987).

The call for such reorganization is being made by some, but such total reorganization has not yet been achieved in Texas in 1994. The next chapter will examine how nine leaders handle what Skrtic would have us believe to be an impossible task.

## CHAPTER III

### A QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECTS

#### Introduction

This dissertation is a qualitative description of nine elementary principals who are employed by school districts that profess to be providing inclusive practices for the differently abled students. The research problem which this description focuses upon is the decision making processes which these principals engage in as they make determinations as to how resources are allocated for the differently abled students, to what extent such identified students are placed in general education learning environments and what philosophic constructs define their decisions.

Four research questions will be implicit within the descriptions. The first is what are the specific practices for serving the differently abled students within each school? The second is to what extent do the principals indicate they have autonomy to choose and to implement these specific practices? Third, does administrative style effect the type and degree of services offered to differently abled students? Fourth, how does inclusion fit within the principals' professional value system?

No district, school or principal is cited by actual name. The three districts are simply referenced as District A; District B; and District C. The nine schools are referenced numerically 1-9 with numbers 1-3 residing in District A; numbers 4-6 in District B; and numbers 7-9 in District C. The principals are identified by combining district letter and school number; e.g. A-1; B-4; etc. Pronouns are used to refer to the principals. Seven of the nine subjects are female, therefore, in any general description of principals the feminine form of pronouns is used.

#### The Directors of Special Education

Each of the district's Directors of Special Education were interviewed prior to the campus site visits within their respective districts. Since they directly or indirectly selected the principals in this study, an overview of the interviews with these influential individuals is thus appropriate before beginning the description of the principal interviews.

#### District A

The director's office is located in the same building as the superintendent and other central office administrators. Her corner office is spacious and pleasantly appointed with traditional office furnishings. She is a friendly, gregarious professional who places one immediately at ease without losing for a moment the edge of



authority which her position within the district commands.

She is in her third year as director and considers the district's special education program to be in the midst of a major transition from traditional delivery of services to identified students in segregated environments to inclusive delivery of services within integrated environments.

During her first year as director she formed an inclusion task force which was composed of principals, parents, regular education teachers and special education teachers. This task force developed a three point initiative. Three main points are emphasized as evidence of this movement. One is that all students who are enrolled in Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs from age three to five are enrolled in their home school for kindergarten with all other five year old students from the neighborhood. Two is that all students new to the district are enrolled at the home school; and three is cluster site programs for the emotionally disturbed (ED); the mentally retarded (MR); and the severally/profoundly handicapped (SPH) are being greatly reduced in both number of locations and in number of students assigned. While she encourages the minimum use, she is not an inclusion purist because she maintains that the I.E.P. for some students will require the services and the environment of a more restricted placement which can not be established without some clustering away from home schools. "We are not willing to do what I call burn

children for the sake of a movement (Audiotape, December 2, 1993)."

She cites a thirty-three percent increase in home campus placements over a three period for identified and labeled special education students, combined with twenty-five percent of the eligible students not even being identified as evidence of the district's commitment to inclusive practices. A philosophic realignment of priorities for providing services to the differently abled is under way as she coaches principals to consider different ways to utilize personnel assigned to them to serve all students. "That's how I work with principals when I justify budget. I say we have 'x' number of teacher units assigned to your building, and they will structure, however, they think they can effectively meet the needs of students. What I do is I coach them to make sure we stay legal in our staffing decisions (Audiotape, December 2, 1993)." She adopts the concept of coaching because of her belief in individualized staff development for principals within this period of transition. She wants to be an encourager and a leader. The most critical variable in the delivery of inclusive practices in her view is the experience of the principal.

#### District B

The director's office is located on an elementary campus removed from the superintendent and other central

office administrators. Her personal office area includes an informal grouping of nontraditional office furniture made of wicker with a rocking chair, couch, side chairs and coffee table. She is friendly, soft-spoken and as reserved and relaxed as the office furnishings reflect.

The interview with this director was more conversational in its nature than was the interview with the director from district A. The expressing of her philosophy of inclusion grew as the interview moved along. Her speaking style is informal and casual. Her commitment to the inclusion movement is neither casual or informal, however. She is a dedicated zealot. Administrating in the least affluent of the three districts with a large percentage of white blue-collar neighborhoods, she is leading the community and the district in nontraditional, innovative and inclusive practices for the differently abled. She states, for example, that "excluding children in ECE and a few of our more severe ED students, there are only four, or perhaps five, students out of over 29,000 students in the district who are not in their neighborhood schools (Audiotape, December 8, 1993)." Excluding ECE and ED students there are no other cluster sites in this district.

This inclusive movement is taking place while the identified special education population is increasing and the referral rate to identify is significantly increasing. Because funding is a serious problem, she is faced with

often moving students out of self-contained, most restrictive environments back to neighborhood schools in least restrictive environments without additional personnel to assist in the transition or in the delivery of direct services. More than one hundred students have been returned to their neighborhood schools this school year without the local campuses receiving any additional personnel.

She maintains that is she is asking principals rather than forcing them or telling them to take students and to place them with other age appropriate students in regular education classrooms. While content mastery was piloted five years ago in the district as an alternative to the pull-out resource model of providing support for students labeled as learning disabled, there is still one campus that maintains the more traditional resource model. As with the director from District A, this director feels that the direct experience of the principal with students who are differently abled is the key to staff development and the key variable in implementing inclusive practices on any given campus. She expressed concern at how difficult it is to get some principals to attend any voluntary inservices on special education topics. Even when she is able to require them to attend a state conference, the variance in changed behaviors is extreme from no change to significant direct advocacy.

District C

The director's office is located in the Special Education Center, an office/campus complex housing district level special education administrators and the students assigned to the most restricted environment, generally the most severe ED students. This places the director away from the superintendent's office and other central office administrators. The office is traditional both in design and furnishings with a portion of the room with a pair of upholstered couches for less formal conversations. The director is warm and friendly and less formal than her office would portend.

She considers herself and the district to be moderates in the field of inclusive practices for the differently abled students. Her position derives from a firm belief that the I.E.P. and ARD committee should determine student placement rather than administrative policy. "My belief about special education is that we have to look at kids individually, and that we get the pertinent people involved to plan for that child's education. I believe in the ARD process as a collaborative effort where people come together to make a decision about a child. . . In terms of placement, I believe in the least restrictive environment, but I believe we are going to have to leave the placement decisions to the committee (Audiotape, February 1, 1994)." Her goals are clearly inclusive in scope and design, but

these goals are never separated from her belief in the power and process of the ARD committee.

She feels there are three roadblocks to full inclusion. One is the maintenance of a dual system, particularly in the administration of limited funds at the national, state and local levels. The second is adequate and sufficient staff development to have principals and teachers accepting of student diversity. The third is her belief that a more restrictive environment is the most appropriate environment for some students. This places her outside the purist school of inclusion. The district has a long history of inclusive practices. It was the first Texas district to pioneer content mastery over twelve years ago with all schools having moved away from the resource model for a full decade.

As with District A, District C uses cluster sites to serve students. Unlike District A, however, District C is expanding the number of cluster sites to be more inclusive rather than less inclusive. It is the director's intent to get all students either on the home campus or as close to the home campus as possible. They have decentralized the ECE program, for example, by establishing a center in each of the four junior high school quadrants of the district. These centers assist in transferring students onto their home campuses as quickly as an ARD committee determines is appropriate. They also have two support centers at each end

of the district to serve the mildly mentally retarded. These centers utilize mainstreaming practices as much as is appropriate to any individual student's I.E.P., and have as their goal returning some students to their home campuses as their mainstream experiences best prepare them.

The director believes that the principals in her district have changed a great deal over the past ten years. She believes they have an acceptance of change. This includes any and all areas of instruction and management, not simply with a particular focus upon special education. "The district hires and reinforces risk-takers (Audiotape, February 1, 1994)." She also believes the principals have a commonly held belief in doing what is best for kids. She also believes they are very well read and take advantage of staff development opportunities.

#### Conclusions

The three directors hold much in common with one another philosophically. They each believe that inclusion is an evolutionary development and that inclusion is relative to past and future practices. Each of the districts are more inclusive than five years ago. Each district is struggling with financing services for the differently abled, and the directors devote much of their time and energies in this arena.

They differ most in their comfort with pure inclusion. It appears after interviewing each for about an hour that

there is a clear continuum along which the three directors could be plotted. District B's director seems to be the most philosophically compatible with the concept of absolute inclusion of all students on every home campus. District C's director holds more to the individualism of the procedural process inherent in the ARD structure than in philosophical absolutism. District A's director falls somewhere in the middle sharing both B's idealism and C's realism. This is a short continuum since all three strongly believe in more inclusive practices and that their district's movement should be toward as much student placement on home campuses as much as possible.

As we examine the nine principals, this continuum is repeated with ranges similar to the directors. There is also a great fluctuation between the philosophies held by the director in any given district and that of principals within the same district. The directors may project the district's desired beliefs, but the principals project the district's actual practices.

### The Principals

#### Principal A-1

Principal A-1 has been a professional educator for twenty years. All eight years of his experience as a principal has been in his current assignment. He leads a school which serves 510 kindergarten through fifth grade students in an affluent upper-middle class neighborhood.



Less than one percent of the students are on the free or reduced lunch program. The campus is between fifteen and twenty years old and is well maintained with clean halls and classrooms which appear to be freshly painted. Some physical modifications have been made to the building to change it from an open-concept school to a modified open-concept school in which grade level areas are open but are closed by walls and halls from other grade levels. The school has received local, state and national recognition for academic excellence.

District A is moving away from a cluster concept in which students with specific and significant disabilities are educated on identified campuses distributed throughout the district. This strategy is employed to provide specialized personnel, equipment and modified facilities designed to meet the needs of the identified students. Campus A-1 is such a site for students with autism. This is the only campus remaining in the district which serves as a cluster site for students with autism.

This is a reduction in the number of campuses, and a significant reduction in the number of students with autism served at this campus. The principal attributes this reduction to a district change in policy. Under the new policy all home campuses receive all students as they exit clustered Early Childhood Educational Programs upon the student's fifth birthday. This policy change has brought

the district's specialized programs for students with autism down to only five students. Most of the students with autism are currently being educated at their home schools.

In the past, Campus A-1 had also been a cluster site for students labeled as severely emotionally disturbed. Within the two years this campus had nearly ten percent of its total enrollment identified as severely emotionally disturbed and/or autistic. The district has discontinued clustering students labeled as severely emotionally disturbed except for a very few who may present a physical danger to themselves or others. Because of past district practices Principal A-1 has had notable experience in administrating to the needs of specifically labeled students.

Since the campus has had a long history of serving the differently abled students, the vast majority of teachers are comfortable with mainstreaming strategies and support the principal's efforts to be appropriately inclusive of all students. The principal indicated that there was some staff resistance to mainstreaming autistic students at first, but the district supported the philosophical change by maintaining the same level of special education staff assigned to the campus that existed prior to de-clustering the emotionally disturbed students and reducing clustering for autism..

The campus has two teachers and two teacher aides to serve the five autistic students. They also work with other campuses to provide strategy assistance with students who have less severe autism and who are fully mainstreamed on home campuses. This campus is also supported with a teacher whose primary assignment is assisting students labeled as learning disabled and with a teacher who works with students labeled as at-risk; each of these professionals has a teacher aide as well. The campus also has the services of a full-time speech therapist, and a half-day physical therapist. Additionally, there is a professional who serves as the special education team leader. These seven professionals and four aides are augmented by a full-time counselor who serves all the students in the building, and special education counselors from the district offices are also available to assist in meeting student needs. One day a week a special education diagnostician is also on campus to test students referred for services and to conduct ARD meetings. Relative to the other schools in this study, this is extensive support given to a campus serving 510 students.

This team of support staff provides most of its services directly in the classrooms, often team teaching with the regular education teacher. Working harmoniously together within the classrooms, all students are provided assistance as the professionals determine to be appropriate. They teach students without worrying about whether a student

is labeled as qualifying for services. Certainly the special education teachers are aware of the identified students to be served, and they do expend most of their energies with these students, but part of the inclusive philosophy under which they work is to provide assistance to any learner seeking and/or needing assistance.

The principal explained that his philosophy of serving the differently abled is deeply rooted in his academic background as a social studies teacher. "I have a global idea about teaching students more than what the subject is about; but giving them the human development behind events, giving them the connection so they can take it as their own. . . All kids can learn is more than a belief from research. It reshapes your thinking. . . I believe all kids can learn more than facts (Audiotape, January 11, 1994)."

He believes everybody is somebody of worth; and it is his belief that he personally can, and should, make a positive difference in the life of every student who walks through the front doors of his school. He maintains that what has always been successful for him is to focus upon the individual child. This principal develops his administrative practices in concert with, and within the context of, his overall belief structures.

When queried about what autonomy he has in making campus level decisions regarding inclusion. His immediate response was that the central administration provides him

the freedom to be challenged. He believes he has always held a philosophical base which is in alignment with the conceptual basis of inclusion. Through the leadership of the district's director of special education, an intellectual environment has been created in which he has been invited to examine his own beliefs and to find the connections for himself. He admitted that he needed to adjust some of his practices, but that there is a philosophic match with the central administrators who simply support him once he was able to refocus his thoughts about how to deliver services to students.

His transformational leadership style creates an organizational climate for change, it is clearly evident throughout the building that teachers are going about their professional duties relaxed, confident and focused upon instruction. We observed a student who has autism in a first grade classroom as an example of full inclusion. The student was academically performing along with his peers and appeared to be socially accepted by them without reservations. This particular observation had a special education teacher co-teaching with the regular education teacher. They were both involved in direct instruction and both were providing individualized guided assistance to a variety of students.

We also observed a fifth grader who has Down syndrome as another fully included child. This student has been

fully included since first grade providing further evidence that this principal and his staff are not novices to the concept of inclusion. While we were in the fifth grade room, a teacher aide was monitoring the students' work.

As the class instruction changed to science, a team of teachers entered the room. One teacher provided a brief mini-lesson and then the class divided into cooperative groups with four adults assisting. This heterogeneously grouped class of fourth and fifth graders had students identified as severely learning disabled, one student with Down syndrome, another student with an unspecified disorder, several students identified as gifted and talented, and several other students without labels. This outside observer could not identify a professional regular education teacher from a professional special education teacher from a special education aide. The teaching team moved among the students providing guidance, monitoring progress, providing clarifications of directions and information and praising good work.

While the staff had prior notice that an outside observer was going to be in the building on that given day, no schedule of movement through the building was prior established, and the observer, rather than the principal, determined the length of observation in any given setting. In other words, this fourth/fifth grade science class did not know the observer would be in their room for the lesson

observed. As a seasoned observer of student/teacher interaction during instruction, the observer could also determine that what was occurring was not rehearsed nor unusual for this group of students. The quickness and orderliness with which they moved into groups following the mini-lesson and the comfort that they displayed with all members of the adult team were reflective of many prior experiences with these individuals and with this style of instruction. This integrated experience was part of their norm.

No statistically driven questionnaire, nor any well structured interview could have provided the type of evidence that this principal and this building practice what they say they do as both the first and fourth/fifth grade experiences revealed. This building is well within the refinement stage of change. It is so ingrained throughout the building it is difficult to reference it as innovative except in comparison to the world outside of this particular school.

#### Principal A-2

Principal A-2 has been a professional educator for twenty-one years. All four years of her experience as a principal has been in her current assignment. The campus serves 620 students from age three through fifth grader in a building that appears to be ten to fifteen years old. The immediate neighborhood is a moderately affluent middle class

community with some areas of the attendance zone decisively wealthy upper income. Less than one percent of the students qualify for the free or reduced lunch program. In addition to serving the immediate neighborhood many students are bused from housing areas which do not yet have sufficient population to support their own neighborhood schools. The entry hallway has been uniquely decorated with store front facades providing a lively and welcoming feeling tone to the campus.

This school serves as a cluster site for one population which will remain clustered, Early Childhood Education (ECE), and another population which is being phased out for clustering, the severely mentally retarded. Currently there are still four students on the campus receiving services as students labeled as severely mentally retarded (MR). None of these students reside within the attendance boundaries of this campus. They are served by a teacher and an aide. The aide is sometimes used to assist regular education teachers as some of the labeled MR students are mainstreamed.

The ECE program serves twenty-one students divided into two half-day programs. In the morning seven of the students with the most severe disabilities are educated. In the afternoon fourteen students with less severe disabilities are educated. Only two of the students in these classes reside within the attendance boundaries of the school. A professional teacher, a teacher's aide, and a speech



therapist are assigned to the ECE program. The program is only for students aged three and four since all five year students are returned to their home campuses to have their IEP's developed and administered by that campus's ARD committee. Most receive instruction in regular kindergarten classrooms on their home campuses, but some may be placed in more restrictive environments at cluster sites.

Parent training is provided by asking the parents to volunteer in the ECE classroom. All of the non-working mothers do volunteer. They account for about 50% of all the mothers. In addition to volunteering the district provides an extensive program of parenting skills for these parents on videotape.

Other students identified as qualifying for special education who are otherwise mainstreamed into regular classes such as students labeled as learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded or attention-deficit are served by four professionals, including a full-time speech therapist, and two teacher aides. Some of these students receive direct instruction in a pull-out resource room for as much as 50% of the total day. For some then, they are mainstreamed only for physical education, music, art, library, recess and lunch. There are three students who have Down syndrome and four students who are either severely learning disabled or mentally retarded who are thus served.

Two of the students who have Down syndrome are in the fourth grade and have been together at this school for six years. This campus was once a cluster site for students who have Down syndrome. One of the fourth grade students does not live in the attendance zone, but has been allowed to remain at the campus as per his parents' request. The teacher who works with these two students reports that they have a strong social experience at the school and are included in private as well as school sponsored parties. Academically, however, they are mainstreamed less and less with each year because of the increasing gap between their functional level of instruction and that of the other students who are their age appropriate peers. The teacher admits she is of the old school of thought about how to best serve these children and has a real personal and professional problem in giving up "ownership" of them. She clearly cares a great deal for these students, but does not trust that it is in their best interest to be "left alone" in a regular classroom. One of the students does not, in fact, ever go to a classroom without either the teacher or an aide.

The principal's philosophy of serving the differently abled students is neither specific nor grounded within a holistic philosophy of education. "Inclusion in my view. . . is mainstreaming. They are two words for the same thing (Audiotape, January 27, 1994)." This principal's decisions

are driven by adhesion to law, guidelines and central office dictums. She has a general agreement with inclusion education, but reserves full philosophic acceptance because of what she describes as concerns of reality. "I am on the inclusion task force. . . [the director of special education] truly believes in her position. I respect her highly, sometimes that is not how it really works (Audiotape, January 27, 1994)." Principal A-2 does not believe it is the best or right solution for all children and has some preference for continuing the cluster concept with the more severe students. Both sensitive and compassionate toward children and their needs, she does frame her statements about individual children around generalized beliefs about providing services to them as much as she frames her statements around administrative procedural language.

She feels as though she has little autonomy in making decisions about how she and her staff can best serve children since the central administration is forcing inclusion in a top-down fashion. She does not feel that the central office has provided enough staff to implement inclusive practices. She views inclusion as idealistic and believes the central administration has taken a hard-line on forcing schools to be inclusive. Her concern, however, is that the central administration "will not go to the mat with us if we have parental problems with inclusion (Audiotape,

January 27, 1994)." In regard to parental demands for more inclusion, she states she has had some negative experiences with parents coming to ARD meetings with outside advocates who made her feel defensive. She also admits that their presence did force her to study more, especially special education law.

While the principal may not feel as though she has much autonomy, her personal beliefs about inclusion are clearly evident throughout her building. The organizational climate of the building in relationship to inclusion, with the notable exception of the ECE program, is guarded, pensive and lacking in consistency. Certainly there is evidence of identified students being served in regular education classrooms, but there is more evidence of students being educated in pull-out programs both within and outside the regular education classroom. The amount of direct instruction provided in resource room environments is significant, and the amount of instruction provided in the back of the regular classroom is also significant.

The principal strongly stated that more staff development is needed in the area of inclusive education for both her regular and special education staff. This campus is just beginning to experience the pains of initial change. Change, in relationship to inclusion, is frightening and uncertain for both the principal and her staff.

Principal A-3

Principal A-3 has been a professional educator for twenty-one years. She is enjoying her second year as a principal. The campus she is leading serves 515 students ranging from the students who are three years old in the ECE program to fifth graders. Most of the students live in the immediate neighborhood. The neighborhood is moderately affluent middle income with some creek-lined homes which are definitely more affluent, but still within middle class incomes. Less than one percent of the students qualify for the free or reduced lunch program. The building is ten to fifteen years old and is of a modified open design with the library serving as the physical hub from which classroom areas radiate.

As with the other two schools selected from District A, this school has experienced being a cluster site. Last year was the end of the school's role as a cluster site for students who are labeled as severely emotionally disturbed and/or mildly mentally retarded and/or severely learning disabled. Most of the students served by the cluster concept happened to live in the neighborhood so this site is their home school; therefore, the campus is very close to working in an atmosphere of natural proportionality. Two students from the old cluster who do not live within the attendance boundaries of the school continue to attend at this time. All of these children are now placed in regular

education classrooms with age appropriate peers. The school is a cluster site for ECE students for the first time.

To assist with the children from the old cluster program for students labeled as severely emotionally disturbed and/or mildly mentally retarded and/or severely learning disabled, the central administration has continued much of the staffing as when the campus served these students in that more restrictive environment. The school did lose a professional position whose expertise was in behavior management. This leaves three professional teachers, including a full-time speech therapist, and two aides funded with special education money to serve students in the K-5 classrooms. The ECE has two professionals, one of whom is a speech therapist. There is also an aide. As district policy requires, all qualifying students upon their fifth birthday return to their home campuses for an ARD meeting. Principal A-3 shared that some parents prefer to transfer their children who are five year old to private educational institutions which offer full day services.

This is an inclusive school environment for K-5 students. There is no use of pull-out programs for identified special education students for either resource room services or content mastery (CM) services. All CM styled services are delivered directly in the classroom. The principal credits the ease of transitioning to full inclusion to the strong professional relationships which the

special education staff has nurtured with the regular education staff over the many years of being a cluster site. The prior principal was also credited for much of the success since she too had a belief in inclusive practices and worked to have a unified staff rather than two staffs under one roof. Principal A-3 had been a teacher in the building under that principal so she has a real sense of what took place before her.

Principal A-3 was separated from the campus for a year and a half as she performed the duties of a teacher appraiser at the district level. The philosophic continuity between the two principals, however, remains an influential component of the total picture of this campus's successes.

The two principals have been able to hire many former special education teachers and place them in regular education assignments. According to the principal, one of the most pivotal positions for the success of their program is the school counselor who is a former special education teacher. The counselor told this observer that there was a strong sense of continuity between the two principals, but that the current principal approached inclusion with even more "gusto" than the previous principal.

When Principal A-3 was asked how she developed her current belief structure, she did not hesitate to reference her teaching background in another state in a highly diverse community with heterogeneously grouped students. From her

first nine years in the profession to present day, she has experienced holistic, heterogeneous educational environments. Inclusion education in her words was a natural evolution of experiences which began with a belief that one teaches the students assigned to you with the best strategies and methodologies without questioning whether a student belongs in your class or not.

She relies heavily upon a Campus Assessment Team to assist teachers in buying into the concept that every student is their student. This team consists of the building's reading specialist, the counselor, the principal, the special education teacher and a teacher representative from each grade level. Parents are also invited to become a part of the assessment team. Together they develop the particulars of how a student's IEP is going to be met.

As to the question of what role the central administration plays in the decision making process at this campus, the principal simply stated that the role was "supportive but not formative". This principal has a clearly defined philosophy of education which does not differentiate between regular education students and special education students. ". . . all of us have beliefs inside and philosophically maybe on the outside you can grey something over, but it has to be really in there to be workable (Audiotape, January 28, 1994)." The organizational climate in this building is consistently uniform and is



directly impacted by the pervasiveness of special education trained teachers at every level. The building does not feel the need for a behavior management specialist, for example, because the counselor serves so well as a crisis intervention specialist for students labeled as emotionally disturbed. From top to bottom this building has a clear direction and clear understanding of a commonly held vision of educating all students.

#### Principal B-4

Principal B-4 has been a professional educator for sixteen years. She is braving her first year as a principal. She did serve as an assistant principal for four years in another building within the district. The campus serves 535 students in a building that is over thirty years old with several portable buildings which are intended to be a temporary solution to the overcrowding of the permanent structure. The neighborhood is a mix of small older middle class homes with some new areas with somewhat larger middle class homes. Over 40% of the students benefit from the free or reduced lunch program. The building has been well maintained. While there are undeniably obvious shortcomings of being an older building, there are also some real strengths such as large classrooms with lots of windows.

This campus was once the special education campus for the district. There remains a strong presence of this legacy since there are still two ECE programs, a self-

contained classroom for students labeled as severely emotionally disturbed (ED), and the district's adaptive communication specialist offices on campus. This is, however, the first year for the ED program on this campus. All the students in this class are bused in from outside the neighborhood, and all are boys. The ECE classrooms are staffed with one teacher and one aide each. There are actually three half-day programs; two morning and one afternoon. Once again most of these students are bused in from outside the neighborhood.

Special education staffing for the K-6 program consists of a content mastery teacher and aide; an inclusion specialist who works with two aides. One of the inclusion aides is assigned full-time to one specific student with multiple limitations. The inclusion teacher works primarily with three students including a blind student, a sixth grader with Down syndrome, and the student with multiple limitations. All three students are fully included in regular classrooms. In addition to working with these students and directing the efforts of the aides, the inclusion teacher facilitates inclusionary efforts throughout the building by advising and assisting any regular education teacher who is having difficulty accepting and/or modifying for students with learning disabilities. In this role she works closely with the content mastery teacher.

Unlike District A, District B does not provide each elementary building with a full-time school counselor. The campus shares the services of a counselor half-time with another building. While technically not a part of the special education staffing profile, this does impact the overall effectiveness of the school's ability to serve both the direct needs of the differently abled, but also the indirect needs of the faculty and parents who daily provide care and education for these students often under stressful conditions. One role that a school counselor plays is assisting in the establishment of positive morale among staff members. More importantly a counselor is often able to provide enough time to individual students to reduce referrals to special education. This lack of a full time counselor at each campus is a significant difference from both District A and District C and is a direct reflection of the discrepancy in school funding which is largely based upon local property values.

In respect to the Principal B-4's philosophy of inclusion, she taught first grade for ten years but is a certified special education teacher. This training greatly impacted her own classroom as she modified to meet diverse student needs and compels her to be an articulate spokesperson for inclusionary education. "I don't know how research based my feeling about inclusion is, but I believe in my heart that kids belong in their neighborhood schools

(Audiotape, January 24, 1994)." She feels that the regular education classroom should be the classroom for all students with the only exception being for those who may be a physical harm to themselves or others. Her relationships with the central administration are philosophically strong except in establishing agreement as to sufficient staffing level for implementing the shared vision. She feels the central administration only looks at numbers when making staffing decisions and wishes they would look more to individualized needs by campus and by student. She does feel that she has sufficient autonomy to make changes and to be supported for making changes.

This is a unique organizational climate in which to observe, and certainly in which to work. This first year female principal is following a male principal who had been principal in this building for twenty-six years. Every day she walks in the door it is a change. She is consistently articulate about her belief in a collaborative team approach to decision making. ". . . we work as a team. I have always believed that you can do so much more for the kids when you bring all of the resources to teach and be the best we can be (Audiotape, January 24, 1994)." Her rhetoric is that of a vision driven leader, but her actions are driven more by first-year managerial necessities.

It is premature to categorize her administrative style. Although both her rhetoric and the rhetoric of the staff,

clearly indicate that she will be a transformational leader. Once she organizes and establishes administrative practices that become habituated by both she and her staff, the attributes of her manager style will quickly fade.

To further complicate the picture the district has simultaneously dealt her both inclusionary staff and program support and given her a new self-contained program. While this observer walked around the building with the inclusion teacher, visual and vocal support for the principal was in ample evidence. The inclusion teacher is particularly supportive of her. There is a pervasive pride throughout the building and most of the staff appears committed to making inclusion work. Acceptance of change and implementation of change is relative and within this relativity this building is moving through the early stages of optimism, that is evidenced by a relaxed and eager staff.

#### Principal B-5

Principal B-5 has been a professional educator for twenty-eight years. She has been a principal for thirteen years in two buildings within this district. This is her third year at this campus. The campus serves 550 K-6 students in a building which is over thirty years old. The school is located in an older lower-middle class neighborhood with high mobility and over 50 percent free or reduced lunch participation. The school serves only the immediate neighborhood and has no students bused in for

special programs. The building is well maintained and has bright and inviting colors throughout. The classrooms are large and well lit with lots of outside lighting from numerous windows.

Since there are no district special education programs on this campus, the special staff is more limited than those examined to this point. There is a content mastery teacher and a resource teacher, who they describe as a partial self-contained teacher, and these two professionals share an aide. The two programs combined serve between 40-45 students. The high mobility factor makes it difficult to be more precise. The resource program is a traditional pull-out model with students in kindergarten through sixth grade arriving for direct instruction on a scheduled basis.

Although the kindergarten program for the regular education students is a half-day program, the identified special education students are given a full-day kindergarten experience through use of the resource room personnel. There is one sixth grade student who is labeled as severely mentally retarded, deaf and non-verbal who for his first eleven years of schooling was in a self-contained, most restrictive environment. The school is given no additional staff to work with this student who is mainstreamed only for music, physical education and lunch. The rest of his day is in the resource room. This is a self-contained placement without an ARD's placement into such a restricted

environment. Between this observer's first and second visit to the site, this student had moved out of the district.

As a prelude to examining the principal's philosophy of inclusion, the first note taken was a very subjective observation. This principal is genuinely tender-hearted. While certainly a subjective note, it was based upon the physical evidence that she teared while describing specific students and again when she described how she thought the central administration viewed her commitment to serving children with differing needs. In her prior principalship she administered several special education programs. She was among the first to mainstream students in the district and was hired as a consultant by other districts to inservice staffs about how to prepare themselves for receiving special education students into their regular education classroom. In other words, her self-assessment is as an innovative advocate for children with special education labels, especially those labeled as learning disabled.

Her change cycle was completed, however, and she is now resistant to new change because it threatens her established beliefs. Inclusion is not evolutionary to her; the word she uses to describe inclusion is "extremism". With great compassion in her voice she asked rhetorically, "when do we sacrifice the child for the program? (Audiotape, January 11, 1994)." She maintains we need to balance the needs of the

individual and the needs of the other students. She considers the central administration's response to inclusion to be too often a dump and run approach in which a student is placed on his home campus without sufficient support to make it a productive experience for the individual or the school as a whole.

This feeling was evident throughout the building as this observer talked to the assistant principal, the special education staff, and classroom teachers. One classroom teacher was particularly upset and was a mirror image of the principal's emotionalism and frustration with forced inclusion. This teacher's self-assessment is one of compassion and love for children and her profession of teaching. She is distraught over the lack of support she is given to handle having a child in her room with severe emotionally needs with frequent disruptive and inappropriate behaviors and serious learning difficulties. She laments not being given any specific training to address his needs and minimum direct assistance except for the times he is pulled out of her room to receive services for special education personnel. She stated, "Inclusion is something done to a teacher (Fieldnotes, February 22, 1994)." She too teared as she expressed frustration because she had always thought herself to be a good teacher with a good heart. She does not dislike the student included in her room; she feels as though she is failing to meet his needs, however. She



feels the stress of attempting to serve this child is causing her to fail to meet the needs of the other children in her room.

Even the content mastery teacher appears to be confused about her role. Her center is more like another resource room than a traditional CM center. Several students are scheduled into the center daily to receive direct instruction; i.e. resource services. Many other students do, however, come to the center as it was designed and this leads to time management problems. The teacher has to determine how to best serve the scheduled and the unscheduled students when the aide is with the resource teacher, and she is alone with conflicting demands placed upon her.

The principal has been in the building for three years and has yet to establish a clear picture for her staff as to how to she wishes to address the needs of the differently abled. She is neither leading through vision, nor is managing by guidelines or procedures because she disagrees with them. The frustration in the building is acute as evidenced by conversations with individual teachers. The principal's frustration with the central administration's view of her commitment to the differently abled and of the needs of her particular campus has allowed her administrative style to become situational and random. Without the confidence of belief in her own philosophy or in

the philosophy of the district, this principal is drifting from one situational crisis in attempting to serve students with special needs to another. Her staff reflects this by attempting to patch together a program of services from an old paradigm of pull-out approaches to the newer inclusionary paradigm. The manner in which the content mastery concept is implemented on this campus is direct evidence of this lack of direction.

#### Principal B-6

Principal B-6 has been a professional educator for thirteen years. She is serving in her second year as a principal. She had been an assistant principal for three years in the district at another school. The campus facilitates 635 students in a grades kindergarten through fifth grade. This neighborhood school is located in an established community of older, lower to middle income single family homes. Approximately 40% of the students benefit from either the free or reduced lunch program. The physical facility is approximately forty years old and is in need of maintenance. Built on the California styled concept of classrooms exiting directly into covered outdoor walkways instead of interior hallways and constructed on property that required multiple-tiered construction, the campus has serious accessibility limitations for the physically less abled. Students requiring wheelchair assistance, for example, need in some cases to go from one end of the campus

to the other end to access a ramp in order to attend music or physical education classes while classmates can quickly exit the classroom and walk down a few steps to these facilities. Several portable buildings also provide classroom space for this weather exposed campus. The principal stated that the district is seriously considering razing the entire building and building a new school on this same site.

The special education program and staff at this campus are in the midst of a major transformation. In the previous year there was a self-contained program for students with multiple identified disabilities which was staffed with one teacher and one aide. This year all students who were in the self-contained class and who reside in the school's attendance zone are placed in regular education classrooms and provided in-the-room services. There are eleven such students with one in each grade level except for second grade which has three former self-contained students and fourth grade which has four such identified students. Two other students who were in the self-contained class and who do not reside in the attendance zone were returned to their home campuses. The former self-contained teacher and aide are now described as inclusion personnel and assist the regular education teachers.

The campus also has a content mastery program with a teacher and an aide who help over fifty students identified

as learning disabled. A speech therapist is on campus four days a week. As with all elementary schools in this district, they have a counselor on a half-time basis to provide services to all 635 students and all staff members. Again in accordance with staffing patterns consistent throughout the district, this school only has the services of a registered nurse on a half-time basis.

The decision to discontinue educating students identified as severely disabled in a self-contained classroom was made by the principal with the support of a core of regular education teachers, the campus special education staff, and the central administration. The principal is a former special education teacher who is an ardent believer in inclusion education. "It was the belief that I had that those students needed to be with their peers. . . There is more to education than teaching a twelve year old the ABC's. Mom and Dad are saying, 'I want him to have a friend come up to him at the grocery store. I want him treated like other kids are treated.' That has always bothered me--how long we work on ABC's and when do we draw the line and say there is something more. That has always been in the back of my mind, and when I started hearing about inclusion, I just knew in my heart that there could be more growth, not only academically, and especially language wise, but emotionally and socially for those students. And then looking at the big picture; when they get out of

school, how are other people going to treat them. What networks are they going to have. We have to start that now (Audiotape, January 25, 1994)."

She had been the assistant principal at campus B-4 which had been the special education campus for the district. She was allowed to bring with her the special education teacher who taught the self-contained class and is now the inclusion teacher. This individual is an important component to the principal's plan to move the school toward inclusive practices. They share a vision of inclusion and have established both a professional and personal relationship. Bringing this colleague with her to this campus is a specific example of her administrative style as she attempts to bring about change. She has a vision which leads to a plan which leads to shared envisioning with staff members who are receptive to the plan.

The special education teacher brought from the former campus is the principal's seed, and one person she did not have to convert. During her first year was able to identify teachers who were receptive to the inclusion vision she was building through staff development, staff meetings and informal conversations with staff.

The principal made a few grade-level assignment changes for the second year and was thus able to have in place a teacher in each grade who was prepared to educate students who had been in the self-contained class. While this strat-

egy worked well for those grades which received only one student from the old program, it was a weak strategy for the two grades which received multiple students because they were placed in the same room. The principal is disappointed in this decision because "it is not representative of the real world. It lacks natural proportionality (Audiotape, January 25, 1994)." To make the situation as workable as possible she reduced the class sizes in the rooms which received multiple students from the old program.

In the fourth grade room, for example, there are four students from the former self-contained class, but only ten other students for a total class size of 14. Having thirty percent of a class with children who are labeled as severely disabled, certainly is not proportional to a natural distribution. As one observes this class it is immediately obvious that it is a "special" class. Unlike other classrooms observed in this study where the proportionality was natural to the total school, one could easily identify the less abled students, and most importantly, one could identify changed teacher behavior as she provided direct instruction. The teacher did a remarkable job of accepting student behaviors and responses and made numerous on the spot modifications to accommodate students' needs. This regular education trained teacher handled this class as well as any special education trained teacher would have. Unfortunately the impression that a self-contained class was

merely merged with a regular education class, is a true reflection of reality. This lack of natural proportionality is not the kind of inclusion the principal envisions for the future.

The principal stated she would not recommend doing what she did, and regrets placing all the identified students with one teacher. It is representative, however, of a clearly defined plan to bring about change by allowing successes to create new converts and thus generating further success stories. The strategy is a sound one practiced by many in various professional fields. It is working for this principal perhaps better than she realizes because it is difficult to remain objective in transitional stages of change. No where did this observer speak with anyone in the building who did not support the efforts of the principal to change the climate of the school. Rather than viewing the second and fourth grade experiences as not working, the general tone of conversations centered on how well inclusion works in the rooms with only one student labeled as severe. There appeared to be an acceptance among most teachers who were interviewed that when more teachers are given the opportunity to teach a class with an identified severely differently abled student, the problems experienced this year in second and fourth grade will disappear. This principal has achieved her overall goal of creating a climate of acceptance and change.

Principal C-7

Principal C-7 has been a professional educator for twenty-seven years. She has been an elementary principal for eighteen years with eight years in another state and ten years in her current district. This is her fifth year in this building. The school is located in a neighborhood of relatively new middle class homes. Approximately ten percent of the 810 pre-kindergarten through sixth grade students are bused to the site to participate in an English As a Second Language (ESL) program for students who live in the northern portion of the district. Only about nine percent of the students attending the school benefit from the free or reduced breakfast and lunch programs. The building itself is only five years old and is built to comfortably educate 1000 students so there is ample room throughout this well equipped facility.

The special education program at this campus has four main components. One is content mastery which provides services for the students labeled as learning disabled; the second is speech therapy; the third is two self-contained classes for students who are labeled as severely emotionally disturbed (ED); and the fourth is two support centers which provide services for students labeled as severely multiply disabled, including students who are mentally retarded or deaf/blind.



The CM center has a professional and an aide, and this is one of the few elementary schools in District C to have a full-time speech therapist. Each of the two self-contained classes for students labeled as ED has a teacher and an aide; one class is for primary aged students and other is for intermediate aged students. Most of the students in these classes are bused in from outside the school's attendance zone. There is a total of fifteen students between both classes. Each of the support centers is also staffed with a teacher and an aide. These classes are also divided according to age groupings with one class for primary and the other class for intermediate students. As with all elementary schools in District C, there is a full-time counselor.

Mainstreaming strategies are pervasive enough for some of the students who are assigned to either a self-contained ED class or to a support center that for them these programs are more like a resource environment than a self-contained environment. Some students, for example, are assigned to a regular education class for all but one period a day. In both the support centers and the ED classes this period focuses upon social skills. All students classified as enrolled in a self-contained class are assigned to a regular education homeroom where they begin the day with those classmates in a silent reading period. They also go with these same students from homeroom for lunch and for music,

art and physical education. There are two exceptions from the primary support center whose physical limitations do not currently make these opportunities available to them. In addition to mainstreaming students out of the self-contained rooms, the building also brings many regular education students into the self-contained rooms for sharing and extension of their own learning.

This principal manages the special education programs on her campus while lacking an articulated philosophy of her own. She is loyal to the district and becomes an enthusiastic follower/convert to other's professional visions. For example, she was the principal of the building that served as the pilot for the district's then innovative content mastery program. The decision had been made by the central administration to start the program on this particular campus prior to this principal being hired. Her first reaction to the idea was negative. Her previous experiences as a principal had been with resource services, and she felt that the lack of structured delivery of instruction on a scheduled basis would not be efficient or effective use of time and personnel. "They had to prove to me that it would work. It wasn't that hard to prove. I just hadn't see anything like it before. . .I didn't want to shift the paradigm, but I did. I believe wholeheartedly in it now (Audiotape, February 21, 1994)."

She explained she did so in part because of the dynamic persistence of the central administrator who developed the program and because she views herself as a risk-taker. She enjoys trying new things. Through practices she is a change agent; in theory she is a traditionalist.

On the question of autonomy she was quick to state that she has always felt that she had choices about whether to accept programs or changes in programs. She confessed that her primary motivation in accepting central office suggestions for change is to be accommodating--to be a team player. Once she accepts the program or change she takes full ownership of it as it becomes now a part of her new norm and is defensive and reluctant to suggestions that she either give them to another campus or that it is time to change again. She needs to be persuaded anew with each innovation, but then takes it on as her own once persuaded. It is, therefore, not a clean assessment to state that she does not lead from vision. What is clean is to state that she does not have an overriding educational philosophy from which innovations are derived or into which innovations must fit.

Her strong management style is best reflected by her quickness to express frustration over personnel issues related to implementing mainstreaming strategies. Her strongest statements related to the fact that the central administration, personnel, did not take into consideration

the regular education program when including students caused the twenty-two to one ratio to be exceeded. Between transitioning ESL students into regular education rooms, and mainstreaming special education students into some of the same rooms regular education teachers often exceed the state mandated limits on class sizes for most, and in some cases, the entire day.

Her administrative style has successfully brought a staff together in supporting the programs in place. There is enthusiasm and pride throughout the building from both special education staff and regular education staff. It is note worthy that there is a wide range of beliefs among the staff, particularly within the special education staff, as to where to go from here. There is not a shared vision for the future delivery of special education services, but that may be reflective of the principal's lack of vision. While lacking a vision, the principal is highly supportive of each of her professional staff members and easily accepts that there is diversity of views on the subject of the degree to which we need to include students. What is also evident is that the principal's style of acceptance is generally adopted by her staff so that they can agree to disagree and remain cohesive team members.

#### Principal C-8

Principal C-8 has been a professional educator for twenty-one years. He has been an elementary principal for

seventeen years with twelve of those years in District C. This is his sixth year as principal of this campus. The school is located in an older section of the district with a mix of older lower-middle, and middle class single family homes and a sizeable apartment community. Many of the students are bused from an apartment community outside of the immediate neighborhood. They are, however, part of the attendance zone and are not bused in for special programs. Over forty percent of the 500 pre-kindergarten through fifth grade students benefit from the free or reduced breakfast and lunch programs. The building itself is between thirty-five and forty years old, but has been renovated several times and is reflective of consistent attention to maintenance needs. A new library built within the past five years greets one upon entering the instructional hall inside the entryway from which one can easily access the office.

This campus has the fewest special education staff members of the entire study. They have a content mastery teacher and an aide, and they have a speech therapist on campus three days a week. They also have a crisis intervention specialist on a half-time basis who works with identified emotionally disturbed students who are fully included in regular education classes. This professional conducts both in-the-room behavior modification strategies and pull-out direct instruction in social skills. She works with eight identified students but also provides

consultation assistance to teachers for another twenty plus students. The principal believes that through her work with the teachers there has been a significant reduction in referrals for direct special education services for students who might qualify as severely emotionally disturbed.

As recently as two years ago there were four self-contained special education classrooms at this facility. For much of the last twenty years this campus had a strong self-contained presence. Two years ago there were three classes for students labeled as severely learning disabled or mentally retarded; and there was one class for the severely emotionally disturbed. The central administration elected to either return the students to their home campuses or to move them to a new elementary building (Principal C-9's) depending upon the students' IEP, the acceptance of the home campus and/or to simply move them closer to where they resided. Only two of the students in the four classes were from this campus's attendance zone. The school's ARD committee decided to educate them on the home campus rather than move them to a new site. The principal wished to point out that he did not request that any change be made. He expressed some remorse that they moved the teachers as well. He would like to have been able to reassign some of the four teachers to regular education classrooms rather than lose them.

On the whole issue of autonomy, Principal C-8 feels it does not truly exist in District C. He feels he had no say in the decisions made to remove the programs from his campus. He further notes that the central administration has so pressured diagnosticians to push for inclusion that not one student from his campus in the last three years has been placed in a self-contained program, even when the campus had the self-contained programs on site. He feels that through administrative staff development inside and outside the district, as well as through the monthly principal's meeting, the message of inclusion is being drilled into their thinking. He perceives this movement as a reaction to parent and outside advocacy groups. He defines inclusion as a socially driven and focused movement which does not adequately address the academic needs of the identified students. Furthermore, he considers the central administration in the Special Education Department to be negatively judgmental whenever he or any of his teachers suggest a self-contained placement for a student.

This principal articulates in a soft tone of voice a consistent expression of frustration with the central administration and with inclusion. "What we are in danger of is not doing what is best for kids. The IEP concept can be done at the home school, but is it going to be as effective as if the IEP is done in a self-contained classroom? We are talking about five to eight students with

a teacher and an aide as opposed to twenty-two students and a teacher with content mastery assistance. . . We are going to meet IEP's less effectively in our environments than in self-contained rooms (Audiotape, February 25, 1994)." He maintains an advocacy for mainstreaming strategies at a reasonable and appropriate rate for the individual student. Expecting students and teachers to be successful with students identified as severely disabled is not realistic in his view.

The feeling tone of the teachers with whom this observer spoke mirrored the principal's tone of frustration. A kindergarten teacher referenced her positive feeling for the old self-contained programs by stating their loss was "a real injustice (Fieldnotes, March 24, 1994)." She feels society is facing an ever increasing number of students who come to school with physical, mental and behavioral problems, and we are responding by providing a social experience that does not focus upon education's primary role as developers of academic skills.

Another teacher was demonstratively vocal about her perception that the school was experiencing a significant increase in the number of students with very low IQ's. Her statement of concern rose to a plea for understanding as she expressed her frustration with her perception that teachers were expected to teach these students with inferior



intelligence in heterogeneous classrooms with little to no assistance.

A third teacher complained about the increasing number of students with low IQ's. She maintains she has one student who is socially accepted because the student has been in the school since kindergarten, but the child can not academically progress without one to one assistance which is not being provided.

A fourth teacher complained about the emotionally disturbed students in her room who are so internally conflicted that they are organizational nightmares for her and for themselves. She too expressed concern that while they may be making social growth, these students need self-contained assistance for academic assistance, for skill development in such areas as organization of personal materials, and for skills in dealing with anger and other emotional pressures.

These four teachers were interviewed separately; and two have rooms at the opposite ends of the building from the other two. This staff and the overall learning climate does not have the sense of chaos observed in Principal B-5's building, but the frustration and anger with the system is just as high. All teachers expressed fondness for the principal, but many teachers were seeking transfers to other buildings to escape from the frustrations they felt working at this campus. They place the blame for these frustrations

on changes in society and on the school system as a whole, and not on the principal.

#### Principal C-9

Principal C-9 has been a professional educator for thirty-one years. She has been a principal for nine years all in District C, and this is her second year at this campus. The school is two years old and is located in a rapidly developing neighborhood of new middle income homes. The school also serves an apartment community and several students are bused to the site to receive special education services. Nearly 25% of the 500 kindergarten through sixth grade students benefit from the free or reduced breakfast and lunch programs. As a new building designed to support nearly twice the current student population, there is ample room everywhere and the facility is very well equipped.

In addition to a content mastery teacher and aide to assist students with learning disabilities and services of a half-time speech therapist, three teachers and three aides work in special education support centers. Much like the centers in Principal C-7's building, these centers address the needs of students with a variety of labels including Down syndrome, mentally retarded, other health impaired and severely emotionally disturbed.

This principal is a former special education teacher who taught in both self-contained and resource classroom environments. She later became a reading specialist and was

the elementary language arts curriculum coordinator before becoming an elementary principal. She pointed out this background because it motivated her in her early years as a principal to concentrate upon reading issues and to rather deny her previous experience in special education. One important issue continued to unite her experiences philosophically and that was a belief that grouping children by ability for instruction is inappropriate, unhealthy and indefensible in light of numerous research reports.

After five years of being a principal at her first campus, a couple of special education teachers came to her with an idea. They wanted to try more inclusive practices for the students in their more restrictive self-contained classes. The students involved were primarily identified as mentally retarded and/or with severe learning disabilities. They wanted to use the model program which the principal had implemented for the students in the bilingual program. All bilingual students were assigned to a regular education homeroom from which they were then "pulled-out" for bilingual instruction, but otherwise attended all physical education, art, music, assemblies, parties, recesses, and lunch with their homeroom classmates.

In other words, the principal had established a mainstream concept for the students assigned to the bilingual program. The special education teachers on the campus saw this type of environment inviting for their

students. Thus, for this principal, significant movement toward more inclusive practices for students labeled as needing special education was from the bottom up rather than from the central office down.

When this principal moved into her new building she was able to bring some of her staff from the her previous campus. While the support centers at this campus serve students with the same labels as those described under Principal C-7, the service delivery is quite different. There is also significant variance between the centers on this campus. The primary center is highly inclusive with consistent team teaching implemented between the regular education teacher, the special education teacher and the speech therapist. This campus structures some of its regular education classes in mixed-aged classrooms. It is the classroom with a mix of first and second graders that the students from the support center are included with for much of their direct instruction. The teacher of this primary unit has a kindergarten styled centers approach to instruction utilizing mini-direct teach opportunities with a lot of concrete applications in learning centers placed around the room. The special education teacher and aide provide direct assistance in monitoring, providing corrective feedback, and praising students as does the regular education teacher during these application times.

Both teachers provide whole-class direct teaching as appropriate and as planned.

The situation is somewhat different in the classroom with second and third grade students mixed. While the special education teacher does some planning and some team teaching with the regular education teacher, it is far less frequent. The special education teacher expressed real reservation about "her" students' abilities to benefit academically by intensive inclusion within the regular education classroom. The gap in abilities is central to her concerns as she feels the students assigned to her need more direct pull-out instruction. What she attempts to do to is to be flexible and individual-need driven. Some of the students assigned to her are pulled out more than others for direct instruction.

The support center for the older elementary students is structured more like the support centers on the campus described under Principal C-7 than like the primary unit on this campus. This teacher is in her first year in the district and in the state of Texas. She reports that the social acceptance of the students assigned to her by the regular education students is quite low. They do attend music, art, physical education and library-time with regular education students in the morning and some direct teach opportunities during the morning. After lunch, however, the

support center is conducted much as a resource program with the students self-contained for direct instruction.

Principal C-9 has developed the programs used on her campus through site-based decision making. The central special education office has been highly supportive of the efforts made and encourages further exploration of inclusive practices. This principal believes what they are doing is a reflection of an evolutionary movement in educational reform. For the past seven years as principal she has scheduled teacher planning time so that the special education teacher would have the same planning time as the grade/age equivalent regular education teachers have. During this same time she also made sure that the physical classrooms were not segregated but rather were placed in grade/age equivalent relationship to regular education rooms.

Through staff development, staff meetings and grade-level meetings the principal is continuing to share and to develop with her staff the vision of inclusive practices. She defines inclusion in universal terms incorporating every child, not simply those identified as differently abled. "Inclusion is number one, every child that walks in the door has a right to be here. As much a right as anybody and that includes the regular ed. kid, the average Joe kid, as well as the child with disabilities. Once you get in here you have a right to as much of this school as you can benefit

from. And not to feel separate and apart, that this is a program only for you and not for somebody else (Audiotape, March 3, 1994)."

While there is clear diversity of opinions and practices on this campus, there is also a shared optimism and a shared belief that more inclusive practices are better than fewer inclusive practices. This staff is actively questioning their practices in an healthy environment of transitional change in which critical judgements are largely suspended, or at least accepted in a healthy mutually respectful environment of trust. The leadership style of this principal is allowing growth to take place on an individual basis and at individualized rates.

#### Summary

This chapter has provided the qualitative description of the three special education directors and the nine principals who were interviewed for this study. In addition to reporting data collected during the interviews, information collected by direct observation and through discussions with teachers and other staff members on each of the nine campuses was also described in this chapter.

Four specific areas were described in relationship to each of the nine campuses involved in the study. The first was a description of actual practices being implemented on each campus. The second was to characterize the principal's decisions related to these practices within a context of

personal beliefs and within the context of how these practices and beliefs matched those of the district's director of special education. The third area depicted the principal's administrative style in correlation with the feeling tone of the campus as a whole as the practices were being implemented upon the separate campuses. The fourth field related to the holistic observation of how the particular practices reflected general philosophical beliefs held by the principals.

In the next chapter generalized conclusions about what these three districts and nine principals hold in common and in difference will be summarized. The descriptions set forth in this chapter will be the basis upon which the next chapter's findings will be grounded.



## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE RESEARCH DESIGN

#### Introduction

Socrates did not assume that ideas such as freedom and justice could be quantified. He was interested in investigating qualities that are essential and universal. Ideas apply to us all equally, not because we are all the same but because ideas tell us about what's basic. Our philosophical choices affect everything else. Philosophies orchestrate that which is within our power to influence and those whom we are capable of impacting. They guide how we manage that which is ours to change. In the end, they define who we are.

#### Paradigm Shifts

Edward Clark, in his article "The Search for a New Educational Paradigm" credits Thomas Kuhn for introducing the concept of "paradigm shift" in his 1962 book The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. However, Andrew J. Halpin wrote Chapter V, "A Paradigm for Research on Administrator Behavior", in the 1957 book by Roald Campbell and Russell Gregg entitled, Administrative Behavior in Education. Halpin defines a paradigm as a model which provides the basis for a systematic classification and

critique of existent and ongoing research. His writing stresses the distinction between studying administrator behavior and administrative behavior. He called for a shifting away from the exclusive examination of administrative behavior in exchange for studying what administrators actually do.

The primary purpose is to identify the relationships that exist between the behavior of the administrator and changes in the Organization's Achievement [sic]. No matter how successful one may be in defining the relationships in other parts of the paradigm, until he pins down this particular relationship he will have missed the fundamental research issue (Halpin 1957, p.189).

The purpose of this dissertation is to do exactly what Halpin suggests by studying what a group of principals actually do.

The paradigm of study is the behavior patterns of nine elementary principals. The shift is examining within a qualitative design the degree and scope of the change which inclusion education challenges these principals to explore. The degree of change represented by this reform is an individual issue linked to personal historical background, philosophic constructs, and administrative style. The scope of the change is also an individual issue since the extent to which a principal commits herself, the staff, and the

community to inclusion education is specific to each location.

Given the assumption that the inclusion movement is evolutionary, whatever changes a school is implementing which increases the mainstreaming of identified students can be, and is in this dissertation, viewed as inclusionary. The ultimate paradigm shift is the abandonment of a dual system and the instituting of a unitary system.

This chapter examines whether a given principal is viewed as a leader or a manager. If she is perceived as a leader, then it is assumed by the definition of leadership used in this study that she is also a change agent. This chapter establishes the linkage between the principals who are change agents and their implementation of the specific change called inclusion education. This linkage centers on the second portion of the research problem which is how these selected principals' administrative styles and value systems impact the decisions they make for the differently abled. The research questions related to autonomy, administrative style and how the principals' professional value systems philosophically fit the concept of inclusion are also addressed in this chapter.

#### Findings

#### Overview

A stated assumption of this study is that the districts selected are representative of systems implementing

exemplary services for the differently abled. It is an additional assumption that these practices are in a state of continuous evolution, and thus constitute some degree of change with variable rates and in variable stages.

Therefore, all nine of the principals in this study are faced with implementing change in the delivery of services to the differently abled students assigned to their campus relative to services offered two or more years ago. There is, however, wide variance in leadership styles, effectiveness, use of change strategies, and values among the nine. Summary statements related to each of these variables are made and then extended explanations follow each conclusion reached.

#### Categorical Synthesis of Data

Throughout this dissertation the premises of statistical analysis have been called into question. The single most consistently queried postulate is the belief that categorical conclusions about individual human behavior can be made readily if the sample size is sufficiently large and the analytical use of factorial techniques are precisely and adequately formulated and utilized. It is the very concept of categorizing individual behaviors which leads to labels which in turns leads to collective assumptions which closes the mind to individual differences and needs and from which prejudicial practices arise that this paper has

assailed. In this chapter the incarnate shortcomings of such systematic processing of data appear to be used.

Organizing Thought. The sole defense of such seemingly paradoxical decision making is to clarify the dichotomous use of categorical labeling. To cluster like items, characteristics, traits, or other similarities into groupings is a fundamental way in which the human mind is able to store and then retrieve data. To deny categorical usage would be imprudent. The pitfalls alluded to in this dissertation to classifying individuals has not been to repudiate that categorical labels such as autism, Down syndrome, or emotionally disturbed do not exist within the general population.

The danger addressed has been in making categorical educational decisions for individual students who may fit into one or more groupings of disability. The theme has been to customize as much as possible the educational opportunities of every individual student regardless of labels.

This point is critical to emphasize at this junction because this chapter categorizes and labels the nine principals in a variety of ways. This is not to be taken as any more hypocritical than to agree that certain characteristics of behavior can be categorized as constituting behavior of an individual who has autism, for example. It is not, therefore, the label, but what is done

to, or with, an individual once the label has been assigned that is cause for caution.

Practices v. Labels. The use of labels for these nine principals is for the purpose of assisting in the assessment of the various factors which can influence the decision making of individual principals in determining how they implement inclusionary practices. As part of a qualitative study, this chapter is intended to be descriptive.

Judgements as to which category an individual principal may be placed are based entirely upon the data received through the individual interviews and the field work conducted on each campus. The focus of the study remains upon actual practices and not upon labels. Categories and labels are used only to take advantage of the natural techniques used by the human brain to make sense of the world.

Triangulation. As described in Chapter I, the concept of triangulation is used in qualitative research to strengthen data collection methodology so as to fortify the conclusions which derive from the data. Consistent with the logic and rhetoric of qualitative research, triangulation is not an effort to provide quantifiable, analytical, scientific, or factorial data. It is a metaphor. The allegorical implication of a triangle as the strongest geometric shape is the root of triangulation. Through the process of examining data as it connects to other data, rather than as isolated fragments, the researcher is able to

make rational statements about how the data contributes to the formation of an holistic conclusion.

Using the methodology of triangulation, the language of between and within data analysis is a deliberate borrowing of factorial terminology because it is commonly understood language within the research community, and because there does indeed exist correlational logic of between and within comparisons. Caution is again called for because no matrix of between and within comparisons exists, nor is any intended to be implied. In point of fact, each of the nine principals is viewed as unique.

Relativity, much as in the case with the concept of categorization, is a process of data reduction methodology which the human brain uses to make sense of the world. The relativity produced by the between and within comparisons used to categorize these nine principals has the validity of metaphorical logic, but not the validity demanded in the use of statistical factor analysis. The continuum which these nine principals can be placed upon while examining any given categorization is clearly not the same continuum that one thousand, or even one hundred, randomly selected principals would be placed upon.

It is more than a matter of time and resources which would disallow a qualitative study of one thousand principals. The only way in which the human mind would be able to handle the quantity of data collected would be to

use quantitative methodologies. The critical point for the purpose of understanding the use of triangulation of data for this study is that the judgements which are made derived from the individual data, but were not determined until after all the data was compiled.

#### General Data Summary by Categorical Labels

(See Appendix C for a summary chart of the categorical conclusions which this section will describe in narrative form.)

#### Leaders v. Managers

Based upon the data collected in the field studies, it is the judgment of this researcher that four of the nine principals meet sufficient criteria to be defined as transformational leaders; two are defined as transactional leaders; two are defined as managers; and one principal's inexperience does not yet justify categorizing her leadership style. The inexperienced principal, B-4, does demonstrate sufficient evidence of leadership to place her into the category of leader rather than manager when the criteria are focused upon change dynamics. However, the first year stress of establishing managerial procedures demands so much of her energy that much of the interview centered upon issues of time management, allocation of resources, and other administrative functions that it seems more prudent to not classify her as either transformational, transactional, or managerial at this time.



### Change Agents

Seven of the nine can be depicted as effective change agents, including B-4, relative to the challenges implicit in performing the role of change facilitator on their individual campuses as the innovation inclusion is unfolding. Only principals B-5 and C-8 are not identified as change agents. These two principals are effective managers attempting to comply with district dictum while preferring to maintain the status quo.

### Leadership Strategies

None of the principals used power-coercive strategies directly with their staffs, but four of the nine reacted to the central administration as victims of power-coercive strategies. Six of the nine exhibited preference for normative-reeducative strategies, and the field study of their staffs supported this preference. Three of the principals showed through both interview and field study a preference for empirical-rational strategies.

### Values

It is important to differentiate between the general human characteristic of making decisions from a base of individual values and the specific characteristic of transformative leaders who are deliberate about making decisions from a set of articulated values. All nine principals do, in fact, make daily decisions based upon individual values. For purposes of data analysis pertinent

to this study, categorical consideration of values is reserved to those identified as transformational leaders. The values of the transformational leaders are critical not only to their decision making but also to their leadership style. Of the four principals identified as transformative one works from the neoclassical paradigm and three operate from the I&We, collaborative, paradigm. In relationship to the innovation examined in this study, three of the four transformative leaders view inclusionary practices as a sacred norm while the other leader views it as a profane norm. The less experienced principal will be described with those who operate from the I&We paradigm and ascribe to inclusion as a sacred norm.

#### Specific Data Synthesis by Categories

##### Leadership Style

The specific classifying of the principals as transformational, transactional and managerial is based solely upon the data collected from the direct interviews with the principals and from the conversations and observations made during the follow-up visits to each campus. No direct, nor implied, nor inferred data collected during the interviews with the districts' directors of special education is used in making these determinations. There are no categorical assumptions made about the three districts based upon the classification of the leadership styles of the principals involved in this study. Nor are

there any categorical assumptions made about the principals based upon any prior knowledge of the districts themselves. This study is a descriptive examination of nine individual principals selected by central office administrators from each district. The only district generalization made by this study is that each district represents progressive practices for the differently abled.

The four principals classified as transformational leaders are A-1; A-3; B-6; and C-9. The two principals categorized as transactional leaders are A-2 and C-7. The two principals coded as managers are B-5 and C-8. Principal B-4 is the inexperienced principal not classified by leadership style.

The criteria used to reach these conclusions are found in the linkage between the definitions of the labels, the interrelationship between what the principals said in the interviews and what was observed in the building during actual instruction, and the within and between triangulation of behaviors of the principals. This latter component is thus a factor of relativity which emerged as the researcher observed behavior both within each district and the relative relationship of such behaviors between the principals of different districts.

It is fairly easy to determine through an isolated interview whether an individual principal has a proclivity toward being classified as a transformational leader or as a

manager. To determine whether an individual has a transactional leadership dominance as opposed to either a transformational leadership or a manager dominance is considerably more difficult. It is tempting to simplify the categories into a dichotomous, leaders and managers. Transactional leaders viewed in this simplicity would be classified as managers because transactional leaders lack the vision of transformative leaders and possess the manager's preference for incremental strategic gains; replication of successful efforts; compromise; and refinement of existing structures.

It is not simple, however. Transactional leaders are indeed leaders as opposed to managers. While they may not "own" a vision, they are loyal followers of the leaders above them, and they will administer the vision held by their superiors. Using the language of Sergiovanni (1990a), their leadership style is leadership by bartering. They negotiate an agreement with their followers to go in a given direction in exchange for something the followers want, for example, the freedom to self-determine the degree of compliance with the change the leader is requesting.

Transactional leaders are committed change agents. It is what motivates them to change that separates them from transformative leaders; but it is their real commitment to change which separates them from the managers who resist change.

For example, Principal C-7 is classified as a transactional leader. She is very clear in both her rhetoric and in her actions that she is a change agent. She enjoys her image as a risk-taker, but she has little philosophical framework from which to articulate change. She reacts positively to the ideas presented to her by her superiors when they call for change. She wants to be the first to raise her hand and to charge forward for the good of the team. There is an inherent danger for some transactional leaders, such as Principal C-7, to swing with the winds of change and to move just as quickly to undo an innovation if the decision from above is to abandon the change. Nonetheless, she is willingly, and with some enthusiasm, leading her staff toward inclusive practices.

The best way to meaningfully determine her label as transactional is to view her in contrast with another principal who is clearly a transformational leader, such as Principal C-9 and with a principal who is clearly a manager, such as Principal C-8. Principal C-9 leads from an internalized vision of progressive change and Principal C-8 resists change and administers programs as required. Principal C-7 can be thus placed in the transactional category both through direct synthesis of the data from the field study at her campus and through relativity established from within district triangulation.

Another example of within district triangulation is contrasting principals in relationship to the sense of autonomy from which they make decisions. Principals C-7 and C-8 speak of their dependence on the central office in making their administrative decisions related to inclusion while Principal C-9 chose to highlight the role of the teachers in influencing her administrative decisions. In this comparison the characteristic of transformative leaders to prefer collaborative processes is made evident.

Principal C-7 can be validated further as a transactional leader when compared to Principal A-2 who is the other principal labeled as a transactional leader. Their leadership styles bear out similarities not only in their rhetoric, but also in the feeling tones of their buildings and from the direct conversations with their staff members. This is a use of between district triangulation for analysis.

By definitions established in Chapter II, transactional leaders have a focus upon tasks and bureaucratic processes; whereas transformational leaders focus upon higher-order psychological needs and democratic processes. Principal C-7's confession that it is her desire to be accommodating to the central office as her primary motivation for accepting change is representative of the language used to assign the label transactional. In contrast, Principal A-1's statements about his belief that everybody is somebody

of worth and that it is his mission to make a difference are examples of the rhetoric which qualified him as a transformational leader.

Principal B-5's campus provides an example of how the relationship between the principal's interview and the building's field study confirms the label of transactional leadership. The principal referenced inclusion as extremism and one of her teachers reflected this view with the statement, "Inclusion is something done to the teacher." Whereas Principal A-3's campus is clearly transformational as evidenced through the role of the counselor and the use of the Campus Assessment Team. The staff on this campus is as involved in the defining and delivery of services as is the principal. This collaborative environment is again a distinguishing characteristic of a transformational leadership style.

Between district triangulation was used, in part, in supporting the labels for Principals B-6 and C-9. They are the solitary principals labeled as transformational in their respective districts and comparing their decision making styles and teacher involvements was helpful and became particularly confirming when additionally compared with principals A-1 and A-3 whose styles were also established as transformational.

This form of logic is used throughout this chapter. No further direct reference to triangulation is used, but it is

consistently at play in each judgement and conclusion made. It is important to not encumber every finding with extensive descriptions of the methodology used to establish the finding. As Patton (1990) explains the researcher is the instrument in qualitative inquiry. The findings of this chapter are consistent with the logic and methodologies explained in Chapter I.

#### Change Agents

In defining seven of the nine principals as effective change agents, the critical attribute was the level of positivism or negativism felt and expressed for the concept of inclusion during both the principal interview and during the campus field study. Once again there is a degree of variance among the seven, but there is clearly a delineation between the positivism of the seven compared to the negativism of the other two.

While frustration with the implementation of change is a defining characteristic of the change cycle, pervasive openly negative emotionalism and hostile, harsh and angry language is indicative of a closed system. Principals B-5 and C-8 are not effective change agents in providing inclusive services for the differently abled. Both feel this is a movement forced upon them and their campuses. Neither have a philosophical vision of an ideal program for serving such students other than to continue past practices.



Both have faculties which are stressed, lacking in direction and exhibit traits of being victimized.

It is important to emphasize this is a localized observation. The staffs of both of these campuses are loyal to the principals. They are comfortable with the principals' leadership in general. Both by their own rhetoric and that of their teachers these two principals work collegially with others and are team-oriented. This is not simply defensive language for these two principals. It is language which speaks well of their ability to lead in other areas. After all one can not be a leader unless people are following. These two principals have loyal staffs following them daily down many paths. One such path happens to be resisting the innovation called inclusion.

With respect to inclusion, the other seven principals comply with Hord's (1987) critical attributes of effective change agents. These principals are constantly surveying their domain and gathering information about the setting, the staff, and the students. They share responsibilities and leadership with others and are collaborators and delegators. Whether transactional or transformative in style, there is tangible movement toward the goal of implementing more inclusive practices on their campuses.

#### Change Strategies

The relationship between the central office and the building principals is at no time more evident in its impact

that in the arena of change strategies as defined by Chin and Benne (1969) in Chapter II. Power-coercive strategies emphasize political or economic sanctions as means to bring about change. None of the nine principals use these strategies, but clearly Principals B-5 and C-8 feel that these strategies are being used with them from the central office. Principal B-5 feels that inclusion is a dump and run program administered by the central administration in which there is little to no funding at the local campus level to support inclusionary practices mandated by the central office. Principal C-8 perceives this movement as the central administration's response to parental pressures. Less obvious is Principal C-7. She too, however, comes under the category of feeling power-coercive strategies coming from the top because she admits that most of what she has done in inclusion is to accommodate the central administration. Certainly the central office has used more carrots than stick with this principal, but the apparent result is still compliance for reward or punishment.

Principal A-2 is just as articulate in her statements about inclusion being a top-down mandated program as either Principals B-5 or C-8. She differs from these principals, however, in stating she has a fundamental philosophical agreement with the director of special education. She is similar to the Principals B-5 and C-8 in that she considers the central office to be overly idealist and hard-line in

interpreting what are the best strategies for meeting students needs. She does not feel adequate support in funding or in staffing. She is specific in her criticism of the central administration in terming inclusion as a district philosophy when the secondary principals and schools are not practicing inclusion and are not being required to so. "District philosophy should be district philosophy, but there is no real inclusion at the secondary level. . . It is an elementary philosophy, not a district philosophy (Audio tape, January 27, 1994)." This is another example of her perceiving the district level administration as the power brokers and the ones who determine of change. As with Principal C-7, Principal A-2 is political enough to make sure that inclusion is implemented, as directed, on her campus.

Three of these four principals appear to use empirical-reeducative strategies to bring about change on their campuses. Their efforts are rational and justified by their views of reality which are defined by the central administration. The fourth principal, C-8, has a preference for normative-reeducative strategies based upon his own statements and the leadership style shared by his teachers. It is difficult to clearly place him in either category since to be truly normative-reeducative one addresses values to bring about change, and he does not accept the values of the change. On the other hand, he does lead through

motivation and does directly attempt to modify by addressing attitudes, interpersonal relationships, and loyalties. His teachers report he uses team building and consensus decision making models. It is somewhat unclear from the record, however, whether this is in a general sense and perhaps disassociated with this particular innovation, or whether collaboration is used in an haphazard fashion.

The other five principals more clearly utilize normative-reeducative strategies. Principals A-1; A-3; B-6; and C-9 have clearly defined statements of belief regarding the individual worth of each student and in the role of the school in serving each child assigned to it. More importantly each of these four principals have collaborative teams of teachers working with one another while the principal pursues the development of a commonly held vision of how to best deliver services to all students.

Principal B-4 has been left out of much of this summary data because it is her first year as a principal. No negative interpretations should be drawn from these omissions. It is simply difficult to assess her behaviors in categorical terms since she has had little more than one semester to influence change. Through the discussions with her staff members she is establishing trust and is presenting a vision for inclusive practices. The weight of administrative decision making in which each decision is unique and potentially precedent setting for her pressuring

her in such a way as to limit her time in being more collaborative. She does have a core of strong supporters who give testimony to the potential for a favorable preference and use of normative-reeducative strategies.

### Values

Any judgements related to a paradigm shift needs to be absolutely suspended for this is not about right or wrong, or better and best. It is simply about describing frames of reference. Four principals have been described as transformational leaders with Principal B-4, the first year principal, showing evidence of being a transformational leader. By definition each of these five principals function from value structures which exist within a decision making paradigm that foreshadows, permeates and concludes all administrative dicta and all interpersonal relationships.

Principal A-1 is a transformational leader who appears to make decisions from the neoclassical paradigm. Etzioni (1988) described this as an utilitarian-based process of thought in which individuals seek to maximize their utility by rationally choosing the best means to serve their goals. The evidence for concluding that principal A-1 has a preference for this paradigm is found in his statement that some of his practices needed to be realigned following a challenge from the central administration for him to self-examine his philosophy in relationship to serving the

differently abled. This is revealing in that it places emphasis upon his particular and individualistic need for self-examination in order to best lead the campus toward the desired goals. This principal has a strong sense of his individualistic philosophy and vision and attempts to reveal and to share it with others. To this end he is highly successful as evidenced by the national, state and local recognitions his campus has received. Within the context of this study it is evidenced by the smooth operations and interdependent relationships of the staff. The manner in which he decided to be the personal escort through his building is also representative of his individualistically driven paradigm of values sharing.

Principals A-3, B-4, B-6, and C-9 are more attuned to the I&We collective paradigm. At the core of this paradigm is the attempt to balance the individual and the community views as equally important. This paradigm operates from an assumption referred to as the responsive community. The responsive community is much more than an integrated aggregate of self-maximizing individuals. It is more holistic and presumes the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The four principals who appear to work from this paradigm have a common linkage in that they were all trained as special education teachers prior to becoming principals. What is immediately suspect is the question as to whether they function from a different administrative paradigm, or

more particularly do they act from a different experience paradigm?

The answer to this question will not be fully given by this study. What is in evidence is the data that shows these four principals to be focused upon a vision for the delivery of services for the differently abled which encompasses a communal philosophy of interdependence and interpersonal relationship building which does attempt to balance the individual needs of the one with the collective needs of the many within the classroom.

All five of the principals categorized as transformational hold sacred values. As defined in Chapter II these sacred values are absolute, unconditional and fundamentally defining to the organization. Two such values are in evidence with these principals and on their campuses. One is the belief in the importance of the individual. The manifestation of this belief which is pertinent to this study is their preference not to make categorical decisions. This desire is limited, however, by the greater system in which they operate their schools. They work toward having the needs of each individual student be the determining factors as to the extent to which support services are made available. It is sacred because it preconditions every decision made for every student, not just the students identified as differently abled. The other belief is in democratic equality of opportunity.

As an extension of their belief in the importance of the individual, these principals view education as a fundamental right to be made available to all children and to made as equal as individual differences will allow. Least restrictive environment for these principals is not simply a legal mandate. It is a principle of acceptance.

These principals accept on a personal belief level the responsibility to administer their campuses in a way that provides maximum educational opportunities available to each and every student placed in their charge. This fundamental premise forces more restrictive environments to become exceptional conditions derived only after least restrictive opportunities failed to meet the unique needs of given individuals considered as individuals and not as members of a particular category of individuals. All individuals, regardless of abilities or disabilities, are a part of a generalized whole. If they become separated from this whole, it is based solely upon individualized need. For these principals the only categorical label of importance to them is the child's membership in their school.

#### Summary

Chapter III addresses the first portion of the research problem which is to describe the decision making processes of selected elementary principals in determining campus level services for the differently abled. Chapter IV addresses the second portion of the problem which is how



these selected principals' administrative styles and value systems impact the decisions they make for the differently abled. The research questions related to autonomy, administrative style and how the principals' professional value systems philosophically fit the concept of inclusion are also addressed in this chapter.

It is a conclusion of this study that the principals who are described as transformational leaders are the administrators committed to making inclusive practices an integrated part of their schools' cultures. Although all the principals in the study are implementing inclusive practices on their campuses, those principals described as either transactional or as managers are not deliberate in their efforts to provide for internalization of acceptance.

This conclusion derives from the difference in the emphasis the transformational leaders place on the role of values in their decision making. They have all voiced in definitive language their beliefs in the universality of educational opportunities and have spoken to the need to share this value structure within their spheres of influence. Furthermore, the transformational leaders have stated that they accept the social development of children to be at least as important as the academic development of children in reference to defining what constitutes educational opportunities. This becomes the bedrock upon

which they build their structure of beliefs related to the development of acceptance.

All human decision making involves implicit value constructs. The transformational leaders formulate decisions with both implicit and explicit value constructs. In relationship to the focal point of an innovation such as inclusion, all of their decisions are framed around the impact those decisions will have upon the holistic implementation of the innovation. Transactional leaders and managers, on the other hand, make situational decisions framed around issues that are generally divorced from any innovation. At times their decisions may be based upon tangential issues related to a given innovation, or have an accidental alignment to a given innovation, but the focal point of their decision making is found in a value matrix disassociated with innovations. This value matrix can include loyalty to a superior, collegial acceptance, maintenance of the status quo, staff harmony, or any number or mix of values.

No polarized judgements are attached to these conclusions. They address motivation, mindscapes and thought constructs, but not rightness or wrongness, or good or bad. Schools exist within larger organizations. The school system itself, the community as a whole and the state bureaucracy. Hickman's position that healthy organizations need a balance created by the dynamic tension of the

interactions between leaders and managers neutralizes the potential for judgmental labeling.

Chapter V will explore findings that are not directly related to either the research problem or the research questions. Suggestions for further research and general conclusions will also be delineated.

## CHAPTER V

### FINDINGS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE RESEARCH DESIGN

#### Introduction

In the first four chapters focus on the development of the research design, reviewing the literature relevant to the design, describing the actual research, and reporting the findings that are a direct outgrowth of the design itself. This chapter is both a departure from the research design and an extension of the design. It is a departure in the sense that the contents of this chapter do not directly address the research problem, nor do they provide direct answers to the research questions. It is an extension in the sense that what is presented is consistent with qualitative research designs.

Unlike a quantitative study which sets out to prove, or disprove, an hypothesis, a qualitative study has no stated hypothesis. There are assumptions inherent in the research design, but taken as a whole the design is intended as an open-ended description of observations. The importance and the function of the researcher as an instrument of a qualitative study is emphasized throughout this work. The combination of an open-ended inquiry approach and the reliance upon the researcher as the primary instrument of

investigation creates an intellectual environment in which unanticipated events, data and findings can be discovered during the field studies.

This chapter will examine two such unanticipated findings which grew out of the field studies. The field studies are guided by the research problem and research questions, but are not controlled by the research design. Since they are conducted after the development of the research design, the field studies in qualitative studies often produce findings that are not taken into consideration within the formal statement of the problem or in the questions.

#### Additional Findings

##### School Finance

The three Dallas area suburban districts have more in common than not. An important difference, however, is the relative property wealth of the districts. Two of the districts are fund-balanced districts who must send directly to the state millions of dollars collected through the local property tax levies. The third district is a property poor district which receives additional direct financial aide from the state. This has some importance to the principals in relationship to feeling the autonomy to make decisions which impact funding issues such as personnel. There is a clear distinction among the three districts in terms of providing financial support for special education personnel.

According to assessed property values per student, District C is the wealthiest, District A is next, and District B is the least affluent. District A, however, has made the strongest financial commitment to special education funding of the three districts as evidenced by their level of staffing.

The financial finding which is most pertinent to this study is that 100% of the principals stated at sometime during their interview that they feel they could do a better job of serving the needs of the differently abled students on their campuses if they had sufficient personnel and funding. The variance in support from District A to District B in financial support is impressive, and yet the principals in District A were just as impassioned in their calling for more financial assistance as any principal in District B. It is interesting that Principals A-2 and B-5 who shared other common characteristics where the two principals who were most persistent in their frustration over funding issues. If Principal B-5 had the support enjoyed by Principal A-2, she would likely think herself supported by the central office beyond belief.

What is important in this observation is that the principals tend to view inclusion as a financial quagmire requiring endless sums of money and countless personnel specialists to fully implement. While it is true that the differently abled require supportive services which some

other students do not, it is suggested by some advocates for merger that this is more a function of attempting to maintain a dual system than it is of requiring bottomless pockets. As a nation we spend millions of educational dollars testing, labeling and sorting children.

The best way to solve the problems associated with classifying and labeling children is to simply stop classifying and labeling students and instead approach each child as a unique individual with his or her set of physical, intellectual, and psychological characteristics (Stainback, Stainback & Bunch 1989b).

We also spend millions of dollars perpetuating the myth that only specially trained individuals should, and can, educationally deal with students who are differently abled. The historical evidence is clear that this is simply not the case for over ninety-five percent of the identified students who qualify for special education services. The principals will become more willing to focus less of their energies and concerns on funding issues as the evolutionary forces of change create the acceptance by regular education teachers necessary for full inclusion to be successful. If money were unquestionably the issue blocking inclusionary efforts, then we would not be witnessing the innovative practices daily played out upon the campuses in District B.

### Instruction

It is an assumption of this paper that the administrative behavior of the principals is the most important variable in determining the degree of successful inclusion on the campuses studied. This is not necessarily the case. The most critically important finding of this research project is not directly associated with the stated problem from the research design, nor with the stated questions from the design which guided this research.

Simultaneously examining leadership and inclusion, this work which has presented sufficient evidence to justify the conclusion that the relationship between these two fields of study are interdependent within the scope, and for the purposes, of this investigation. The degree to which a principal directs a campus toward inclusionary practices is a conditional parameter to the extent and to the success of inclusion on a given campus. What this dissertation did not set out to explore was the relationship between instruction and inclusion. It is, however, a finding of this study that the most pivotal difference between and among the campuses studied as to the extent and success of inclusionary practices for the differently abled is linked to instructional issues more than leadership issues.

The postulate that identified disabled students are inclusively incorporated into the fabric of a regular classroom simply by physically placing them in a classroom



with age appropriate peers is not true inclusion, or even true mainstreaming. It is a housing issue rather than an educational environment issue. Least restrictive environment is more than physical proximity to non-identified students. Least restrictive environment is educating an identified student in a learning environment in which natural interaction between and among fellow classmates takes place as they acquire new knowledge, explore new concepts and expand their thinking skills. If the learning environment in which the identified student is placed is instructionally weak, then least and/or most restrictive environment labels lose any relative meaning because all students are being instructed in a most restrictive environment. A most restrictive educational environment is one in which students are predominately viewed as passive receivers of instruction rather than active participates in the learning.

This is no mere subjective analysis of educational preference or bias. This is the findings of a myriad of research studies conducted in this century. No review of the literature in this field is included in this dissertation because it was not an anticipated issue of such importance until the field studies were in process. When teachers select methodologies which focus upon the learner as a receptacle to be filled, then placement of any student becomes less meaningful. Within the classroom ability

grouping, isolated styled completion of task routines such as worksheets or hours of passive listening does not include any child in the learning process. Furthermore, it does little to nothing to provide for social interaction and social development for any child. When a child with special needs is dropped into an abysses of passivity, it is of little benefit to declare the child to be just as deprived as any other child condemned to mediocrity.

#### Evidence of Mediocrity of Instruction

District B's Director of Special Education is the most insistent individual in the study on "pure" inclusion; she truly believes every student should be educated on the home campus and in age appropriate classrooms. She has the least degree of grey, the fewest examples of exceptions, and the least tolerance for principals who do not believe in inclusive practices. Two of the three principals from District B, B-4 and B-6, are described as transformational leaders who hold inclusionary practices as sacred norms.

The field study reveals that children with special needs are indeed being served in this district, on these two campuses, in regular education classrooms with age appropriate peers. However, the observed delivery of instruction is often segregative. This segregation is independent of the included special needs students. It is particular to the style of instruction given to all students.

Grouping students by teacher and/or test assessments, heavy use of independent drill and practice worksheets, and teacher centered instruction versus student directed learning is prevalent in most classrooms observed in District B. In one specific case at campus B-4, an instructional aide was sitting next to a multiple disabled students with rather severe physical limitations. The student was attempting to complete a picture association worksheet as the rest of the class was working on a phonics worksheet. This is an example of "pull-out" instruction within the classroom. The child is working with direct assistance in an isolated learning environment as in a resource room, but is physically within the regular classroom. The regular education teacher is monitoring the work of the rest of the class. In this regard all students are equally working with direct assistance in isolation. This pattern of independent seat work was observed in classroom after classroom throughout this district.

In multiple rooms reading groups were observed in which the pattern of instruction is for the teacher to meet with a small group of students for oral reading practice while the rest of the students sit at their desks doing independent worksheet assignments. Such antiquated strategies often leave students isolated from the teacher and from interaction with other students for hours each day. Whole class lecturing for periods of time of more than ten to

fifteen minutes was also observed. This style of teaching again allows for solitary, isolated, passive and often off-task learner behavior.

Within class ability grouping of students places the identified less abled students in age appropriate environments, but it does little to increase their opportunities to exchange ideas with the most abled students or to be included in the richness of a fully integrated heterogeneous classroom. This is not the forum to explore the numerous research articles denouncing the practice of ability grouping so let it be sufficient to express that as a practice it is antithetical to inclusion. Grouping students for instruction by ability was observed widely in District B and on one campus in District A.

The problem with classroom instruction that is heavily reliant upon worksheets is that, in the name of individualization of material and pace, students are again isolated from group interaction. This was nowhere more evident than on campus B-4 where the inclusion specialist proudly showed how the most severely disabled students are being included in classes. They are physically included to be certain, but the worksheets and textbooks they are using and the isolated individualized assistance of an aide helping them to complete such worksheets is evidence only of a physical inclusion. The learning expectations, the teaching strategies and the lack of academic interaction is

remembrance of the most restrictive self-contained environments.

This conclusion is not based upon an isolated instance, but was born out in classroom after classroom on all three campuses within District B. District A fared little better on campus A-2. There they proudly announced that each of their six first grade classrooms had just regrouped for math. Approximately 125 six year old students were ability grouped for math instruction into a six tier structure of differentiated instruction. It was certainly no surprise to observe the students who were "included" in the first grade to be in the lowest leveled class. Although the school would not like this assessment, it is not an exaggeration to state that student experience in this class was essentially the same as in a pull-out resource room. This campus is led by a principal identified as a transactional leader who does not hold a philosophical preference for inclusive practices.

The other two campuses in District A showed much more inclusive instructional practices such as cooperative groups, thematic instructional planning, reading and writing centers and heterogeneous grouping of students. District C was the most consistently inclusive instructional district of the three. Even on campus C-9, the instructional strategies observed are student centered, participatory and interactive. As noted earlier this campus expressed some grave reservations about special education inclusion, but

when the students are placed into a regular education environment, the instructional practices employed by the teachers made it impossible to identify the students without the assistance of the teacher.

It is a premise of this study that the administrative behaviors of principals is the most important variable in whether inclusive practices are being implemented on any given campus. While this may will be the case, it is not in the scope of this study to examine the relationship between classroom instructional practices and the principal's leadership style. What is concluded, however, is that classroom instructional practices are the most important variable in determining inclusive practices within a school. If the one ascribes to the body of research which points to the principal as the instructional leader on campuses which are described as effective, then it is a logical extension to state that the role of the principal remains of pivotal importance in the inclusion movement. The focus of examination of administrative behavior in relationship to inclusion shifts then from decision making about placement to decision making about instruction.

#### Summary Statement of Findings

When administrative behavior, in consort with observed practices, is viewed in isolation from the delivery of instruction, it has been concluded that seven of the nine campuses are making clear progress toward inclusion. When

true inclusive campuses are defined by those lead by transformational leaders who ascribe to the philosophical principles of inclusion, the number falls to five campuses. When inclusive instructional strategies are added to the defining characteristics of inclusive campuses the number drops to three; A-1, A-3, and C-9. It is arguable that the criteria used to show only one-third of the campuses to be truly inclusive is overly stringent. This remarkably poor showing derives from three districts which were selected because they had demonstratively articulated at the local, regional and state levels that they are actively pursuing inclusive practices for the differently abled. The final finding, therefore, of this dissertation is that the evolutionary movement toward inclusion has a lot of growth yet to be seen.

#### Areas Needing Further Research

The most obvious area for further research is to examine the role of the principal as an instructional leader and how that role impacts inclusionary practices. A prerequisite to meaningful and comprehensive inclusion is the establishment of teaching strategies which focus on the learner's needs. Curriculum driven instruction does not adequately meet the needs of either the most gifted students nor the less abled students. When teachers use workshop, or centers, strategies and combine consistent use of cooperative learning opportunities, and have problem solving

and thinking as the locus of their educational goals, then all students are included in a rich and stimulating environment of individualized growth and development.

Halpin's 1957 call for more studies which focus upon what administrators actually do as opposed to generalized statistical analysis of administrative behavior is just as relevant today as then. More qualitative studies of what principals and teachers do on a daily basis is needed if we are to fully understand the relationships between theories and practices. Longitudinal studies of this type are also needed to establish patterns of behavior throughout the full cycle of change in specific environments.

Based upon both the review of the literature and the observations made during the field study, it is the position of this researcher that although an individual may have a dominant administrative style, the style may be relative to particular innovations. This view necessitates that categorical labeling of administrators be conditional to given innovations. A principal that has been described in this study as transformational, could be labeled as a manager within the context of the study of a different innovation. For example, although a principal may have a proclivity toward transformational leadership styled behaviors such as collaborative involvement of staff, she may not share the organization's vision of a given innovation. A defining characteristic of transformational



leaders is that they are vision driven, and if the critical attributes of a given innovation do not fit within the belief structure of such a leader, but the innovation is found to be congruent with the overall values of the organization and is supported by the superintendent and school board, then an otherwise transformational leader may find herself implementing an innovation as a transactional leader, or even as a manager.

These same nine principals could be the subjects of a study on an innovation such as reading recovery, for example, and a transformational leader of inclusion could be viewed as a manager of reading recovery. What is important to understand about studying human behavior is that nothing is simple, static or permanent. Categorization of human behavior must always be stated in precise and specific reference to the relative relationship necessitating the establishment of the categories. For reasons of equality and equity this is as true in research papers as it is in protecting against prejudices in our daily lives.

The frame of reference from which a person assigns a label is often as critical as the actual behavior of the person being labeled in establishing the truth. For example, an individual could give a liberal response to eight of ten items on a political survey. A person who believes strongly about one of the two areas that were not marked as liberal might chose to classify the respondent as

a conservative based upon the particular rather than the whole.

This study focused upon the particular innovation of inclusion. The personal interviews and conversations with staff members focused upon inclusion. The labels assigned, therefore, are representative of these principals in this particular environment. Only further research with these same nine subjects in which other innovations are discussed and examined would the proclivities assigned in this study stand up to holistic scrutiny.

Although this dissertation built a strong case for qualitative research, there is a definite need for quantitative research in the arena of inclusive practices as well. It would certainly be helpful to have a survey of both principals' attitudes toward inclusion and of stated practices of inclusion on a large scale. Quantitative research methodologies are the only realist avenues for any large scale investigation of inclusionary practices.

#### Concluding Thoughts

A bicycle company in Japan is filling orders for individualized bikes. The champions of mass production techniques have discovered a way to customize production on a mass level. This company made the paradigm shift from product driven decision making to customer driven decision making. The company starts with what is common, and defining, about the product and then incorporates what the

customer believes is necessary to fulfill the concept of a bike (Hastings 1992). Inclusion education asks for a similar shift in thinking about the individual student first and the delivery system last. Rather than matching students to programs, ideal inclusion education matches "the single", or unified, program to meet the individual student needs.

What is organizationally called for is an adhocracy in which the educational system is open, flexible and innovative. Principals, working with teachers and local community members, need permission to take risks, to attempt novel solution to complex problems, and to fail. We live in a society of instantaneousness and immediate gratification. If we seek change, we want it perfect the first time and on time.

Principals stand upon a stage of public scrutiny and must daily play out their roles as leaders. Some choose to play to those who wish to conserve the system of the past. Some choose to play to the winds of change that are forced upon them from above. Some few choose to play to their own beliefs about what is right and of value. All have a difficult job which grows more complex, more demanding and more open to criticisms each day. Principals need support.

The call for Comprehensive Local Schools is one which will be answered sometime in the early portion of the next century. Great progress has been made in the past twenty-five years for students who are differently abled. The

immediate future holds promise that the evolution shall continue.

It is a finding of this dissertation that the nine principals in this study are committed professionals who are daily making decisions impacting the students on their campuses in ways that are congruent with their administrative styles and within their individual belief structures. The variances of practice are evident, but the common commitment to improving the lives of children is also evident.

APPENDIX A

PREFACE TO IDEA, 1990

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, 1990

The Preface

1) there are more than eight million children with disabilities in the United States today; 2) the special educational needs of such children are not being fully met; 3) more than half of the children with disabilities in the United States do not receive appropriate educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity; 4) one million of the children with disabilities in the United States are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the educational process with their peers; 5) there are many children with disabilities throughout the United States participating in regular school programs whose disabilities prevent them from having a successful educational experience because their disabilities are undetected; 6) because of the lack of adequate services within the public school system, families are often forced to find services outside the public school system, often at great distance from their residence and at their own expense; 7) developments in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instructional procedures and

methods have advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, State and local educational agencies can and will provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of children with disabilities; 8) State and local educational agencies have a responsibility to provide education for all children with disabilities, but present financial resources are inadequate to meet the special educational needs of children with disabilities; and 9) it is in the national interest that the Federal Government assist State and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of children with disabilities in order to assure equal protection of the law.

**APPENDIX B**

**EXPANDED DEFINITION OF INCLUSION**



Inclusion Is:

/All children learning in the same school with the necessary services and supports for they can be successful.

/Each child having his/her unique needs met in integrated environments.

/All children participating equally in all facets of school life.

/Encouraging friendships and social relationships between students with and without disabilities.

/Arranging for students with disabilities to receive their education and job training in regular community environments.

/A new service delivery model for special education which emphasizes collaboration between special education and regular education.

/Providing support to regular education teachers who have children with disabilities in their classrooms.

/Children learning side by side even though they have different educational goals.

/Teaching all children to understand and accept human differences.

/Providing an appropriate individualized educational program for all children.

/Taking parents' concerns seriously, and making parents meaningful participants in the team process.

Inclusion Is Not:

/Dumping children with challenging needs into regular classes without proper supports and services they need to be successful.

/Trading the quality of a child's education or the intensive support services the child needs for integration.

/Ignoring each child's unique needs.

/Sacrificing the education of typical children so that children with challenging needs can be integrated.

/All children having to learn the same thing, at the same time, in the same way.

/Doing away with or cutting back on special education services.

/Expecting regular education teachers to teach children who have challenging needs without the support they need to teach all children effectively.

/Locating special education classes in separate wings at regular schools.

/Ignoring parent's concerns.

/Maintaining separate schedules for student in special and regular education.

/Students with disabilities receiving their education job training in facilities outside of their community.

(Iowa Pilot Parents 1993).

APPENDIX C

CATEGORICAL DATA CHART

APPENDIX C

CATEGORICAL DATA SUMMARY

	A-1	A-2	A-3	B-4	B-5	B-6	C-7	C-8	C-9
STYLES:	TRANSFORMATIONAL	✓		✓		✓			✓
	TRANSACTIONAL		✓				✓		
	MANAGERS				✓			✓	
CHANGE:	AGENTS	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
	POWER-COERCIVE								
STRATEGIES:	NORMATIVE-REEDUCATIVE	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
	EMPIRICAL-RATIONAL		✓		✓		✓		
	NEOCLASSICAL	✓							
VALUES:	COLLABORATIVE			✓	✓	✓			✓

\* = conditional identification due to minimum experience

## REFERENCES

- Adler, M. J. (1982). The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Collier Books.
- Ayers, L. (1909). Laggards in our schools. New York: Putnam.
- Belasco, J. A. (1990). Teaching the elephant to dance: The manager's guide to empowering change. New York: Plume.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. (1986). Research in education (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Biklen, D. (1989). Making difference ordinary. In Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (Eds.) Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 235-248). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1992, August). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3). pp. 314-329.
- Borg, W., Gall, J.P., & Gall, M.D. (1993). Applying educational research: A practical guide (3rd. ed.). New York: Longman.

- Breton, D. & Largent, C. (1991). The soul of economies: Spiritual evolution goes to the marketplace.  
Wilmington: Idea House.
- Burgess, R.G., (ed.). (1985). Strategies of educational research: qualitative methods. London: Falmer Press.
- Burkhour, H. (1990, Third quarter). Inclusive education: What is it? Exchange. pp. 1-2.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Callahan, R.E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools.  
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.), (1960). Group dynamics: research and theory (2nd. ed.). Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.
- Case, A. D. (1992, October). The special education rescue: A case for systems thinking. Educational Leadership, 50(2), 32-34.
- Casti, J.L. (1989). Paradigms lost: Tackling the unanswered mysteries of modern science. New York: Avon.
- Chin, R. & Benne, K. (1969). General strategies for effecting changes in human systems. In Bennis, W.G., Benne, K.D., Chin, R. & Corey, K. (Eds.), The planning of change (pp. 22-45). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cunningham, L.L. & Gephart, W.J. (Eds.), (1973). Leadership: The science and the art today. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock.
- Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, secs. 1400-1461, 20 U.S.C. (1978).
- Eisner, E.W. & Peshkin, A. (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College.
- Elmore, R.F. (1978). Organizational models of social program implementation. In Mann, D. (ed.). Making change happen (pp. 185-223). New York: Teachers College.
- Etzioni, A. (1988). The moral dimension: Toward a new economics. New York: Free Press.
- Farnham-Diggory, S. (1992). The learning-disabled child. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Fullan, M.G. (1985, January). Change processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 391-421.
- Fullan, M.G. (1992, February). Visions that blind. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 19-20.

- Flynn, M.G. & Kowalczyk-McPhee, B. (1989). A school system in transition. In Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (Eds.). Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 29-42). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Gartner, A. & Lipsky, D. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review, 57(4), 367-395.
- Glickman, C.D. & Esposito, J.P. (1979). Leadership guide for elementary school improvement: Procedures for assessment and change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gould, S.J. (1981). The mismeasure of man. New York: Norton.
- Halpin, A.J. (1957). A paradigm for research on administrator behavior. In Campbell, R.F. & Gregg, R.T. (Eds.). Administrative behavior in education (pp. 155-200). New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Hanson, E. M. (1985). Educational administration and organizational behavior (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hastings, C. (1992, October). Ending ability grouping is a moral imperative. Educational Leadership, 50 (2), 14.
- Hawley, W.D. (1978). Horses before carts: Developing adaptive schools and the limits of innovation. In Mann, D. (ed.). Making change happen (pp. 224-260). New York: Teachers College.



- Hegarty, S. & Pocklington, K., with Lucas, D. (1981).  
Educating pupils with special needs in the ordinary school. Windsor: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, and Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- Hencley, S.P. (1973). Situational behavioral approach to the study of educational leadership. In Cunningham, L.L. & Gephart, W.Y. (Eds.). Leadership: The science and the art today (pp.139-164). Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock.
- Hickman, C.R. (1992). Mind of a manager soul of a leader. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). Educational leadership: The moral art. Albany: State University of New York.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1993). The philosophy of leadership. New York: St. Martin's.
- Hord, S.M., Rutherford, W., Huling-Austin, L. & Hall, G. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Iowa Pilot Parents (1993, Winter). The parent perspective. Inclusion Times, 1 (2), p. 1.
- Kahn, R.L. & Katz, D. (1960). Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale. In Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. (Eds.). Group dynamics: Research and theory (2nd ed.), (pp. 554-570). Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.

- Katz, F.E. (1968). Autonomy and organization: The limits of social control. New York: Random House.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Kelley, D. & Conner, D.R. (1979). The emotional cycle of change. Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. Kansas: University Associates.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.
- Krathwohl, D.R. (1985). Social and behavioral science research: A new framework for conceptualizing, implementing, and evaluating research studies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Krug, Samuel E. (1992, August). Instructional leadership: A constructivist perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 430-443.
- Krupp, J. (1988). Dealing with change, an integral part of existence--outline. Unpublished manuscript.
- LeShan, L. & Margenau, H. (1982). Einstein's space and Van Gogh's sky: Physical reality and beyond. New York: Collier Books.
- Lipsky, D. & Gartner, A. (1989). Beyond separate education: Quality education for all. In Sailor, W. (ed.), The comprehensive local school: Regular education for all students with disabilities. Baltimore: Brookes.

- Maehr, M.L., Midgley, C., Urdan, T. (1992, August). School leader as motivator. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 410-429.
- Maroldo, R.A. (ed.), (1993, November 2). Heumann: Oberti decision is core of the ED's inclusion position. Special Educator, 9(6) pp. 85-87.
- Marshall, C. (1992, August). School administrators' values: A focus on atypicals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3), 368-386.
- Martin, E.W. (1989). Lessons from implementing PL 94-142. In Gallagher, J.J., Trohanis, P.L., & Clifford, R.M. (Eds.), Policy implementation and PL 99-457: Planning for young children with special needs (pp. 19-32). Baltimore: Brookes.
- McLaughlin, M. & Warren, S.H. (1992). Issues & options in restructuring schools and special education programs. College Park, MD: University of Maryland at College Park and Westat.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mink, O., Shultz, J.M. & Mink, B.P. (1979). Developing and managing open organizations: A model and methods for maximizing organizational potential. Austin: Learning Concepts.

- Mintzberg, H. (1968). Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations. New York: Free Press.
- Mitchell, D.E. & Tucker, S. (1992, February). Leadership as a way of thinking. Educational Leadership, 49 (5) 30-35.
- Muccigrosso, R. (1987, Fall). Organizational culture: implications for leadership. Human Development, 8, 42-45.
- National Association of State Boards of Education (1992). Winners all: A call for inclusive schools. Alexandria, VA: NASBE.
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (Memorandum of March 23, 1992).  
Mainstreaming/full inclusion, concerning an evidentiary hearing held by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California.
- Patterson, J.L. (1993). Leadership for tomorrow's schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Harper & Row.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (1984). Paradigm and ideology in educational research: The social functions of the intellectual. London: Falmer.

- Rossman, G.B., Corbett, H.D., & Firestone, W.A. (1988). Change and effectiveness in schools: A cultural perspective. Albany, New York: State University of New York.
- Sailor, W. (1989). The comprehensive local school: regular education for all students with disabilities. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Schaffner, C. B. (1991). Opening doors: strategies for including all students in regular education. Colorado Springs: PEAK Center.
- Schratz, M. (ed.), (1983). Qualitative voices in educational research. London: Falmer.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990a, May). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. Educational Leadership, 47 (8), 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990b). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992a, August). Reflections on administrative theory and practice in schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28 (3), 304-313.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992b, February). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 41-45.

- Sherman, R.R. & Webb, R.B. (Eds.), (1988). Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods. London: Falmer.
- Skrtic, T. (1987). An organizational analysis of special education reform. Counterpoint, 8, 15-19.
- Solity, J. (1992). Special education. London: Cassell.
- Spodek, B., Saracho, O.N., & Lee, R.C. (1984). Mainstreaming young children. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Bunch, G. (1989a). A rationale for the merger of regular and special education. In Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (Eds.). Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 15-28). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Stainback, W., Stainback, S. & Bunch, G. (1989b). Introduction and historical background. In Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 3-14). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Starratt, R.J. (1991, May). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27 (2), 185-202.
- Strully, J.L. & Strully, C.F. (1989). Friendships as an educational goal. In Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (Eds.). Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 59-68). Baltimore: Brookes.

- Taylor, S. (ed.), (1987). Purposeful integration . . . inherently equal. Boston: Technical Assistance for Parent Programs.
- Texas Education Agency (1989, August). State Board of Education rules for special education services (including federal regulations and state law). Austin: Division of Special Education Programs.
- Texas Education Agency (1992, January). Resource guide on site-based decision making and district and campus planning. Austin: State Advisory Committee on Site-Based Decision Making.
- Thousand, J.S. & Villa, R.A. (1989). Enhancing success in heterogeneous schools. In Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, W. (Eds.). Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 89-104). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Tosi, H.J., Jr. (1982). Toward a paradigm shift in the study of leadership. In Leadership: Beyond establishment views (pp. 47-68). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Tucker-Ladd, P., Merchant, B. & Thurston, P.W. (1992, August). School leadership: Encouraging leaders for change. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28 (3), 397-409.

- Waldron, K. (1992). Teaching students with learning disabilities: Strategies for success. San Diego: Singular.
- Wang, M.C. (1989a). Accommodating student diversity through adaptive instruction. In Stainback, S., Stainback, W., & Forest, M. (Eds.). Educating all students in the mainstreaming of regular education (pp. 183-199). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Wang, M.C. (1989b). Implementing the state of the art and integration mandates of PL 94-142. In Gallagher, J.J., Trohanis, P.L., & Clifford, R.M. (Eds.), Policy implementation and PL 94-142: Planning for young children with special needs (pp. 33-58). Baltimore: Brookes.
- Wang, M.C., Reynolds, M.C., & Walberg, H. (1988, November). Integrating the children of the second system. Phi Delta Kappan, 70 (3), 248-251.
- Wang, M.C., Walberg, H. & Reynolds, M.C. (1992, October). A scenario for better--not separate--special education. Educational Leadership, 50 (2), 35-38.
- Wang, M.C. & Zollers, N.J. (1990, January/February). Adaptive instruction: An alternative service delivery approach. Remedial and Special Education, 11 (1), 7-19.
- Watson, M. (1975). Mainstreaming: With special emphasis on the educable mentally retarded (Rev. ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.



Wiersma, W. (1991). Research methods in education: An introduction (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.