

ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY

BY

YOLANDA M. PAYNE, B.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

August 1999

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend sincere thanks and gratitude to Dr. Jane Irons for her belief in my ability and her extreme dedication to helping with this project through its completion. She is a master teacher, and I always will be grateful for all that I have learned from her, especially during the entire thesis process.

I am grateful to the professionals at Texas Woman's University, Department of Early Childhood and Special Education, who gave their time and energy to review my writing and provide assistance and suggestions. My sincere thanks are given to Dr. David Marshall for his time and effort in working on the statistical analysis involved in this project. I would like to express appreciation to Dr. Kinnison for his input and help as a committee member. Appreciation also is expressed to Dr. JoAnn Barbour for her time and effort.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to my husband, who gave financial and emotional support throughout my work on this project. Appreciation also is expressed to my three children for their encouragement and toleration of long hours while working on this project.

I want to thank Marion Smalley for her help and expertise in typing my manuscript. She gave time and encouragement in helping to complete this project. I also want to thank the principals for input and response to the survey. For these things, I am most appreciative.

ABSTRACT

Administrators' Perceptions of Special Education

Yolanda M. Payne, B.S.

Master's Thesis, August 1999

Reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and restructuring of education have made the administrator's role more important than ever. Research has shown that administrators do not have the knowledge to carry out the demands of the Act. A survey instrument was used to provide descriptive information about school administrators' perceptions of the reauthorized Act. The purpose was to conduct a statewide survey of elementary, middle, and high school principals to examine the current status of their perceptions of knowledge and responsibility for implementing special education programs on their campuses. There were 300 surveys mailed with 128 returned. Results indicated that most principals do not have special education backgrounds and little college training in this area, but believed there was a need to become better educated to appropriately implement students' Individual Education Plans. Major concerns and recommendations from administrators dealt with

staying current regarding special education laws and procedures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale	3
Statement of Problem	4
Statement of Purpose	5
Definition of Terms	5
Limitations	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
I.D.E.A.	8
Restructuring	10
Knowledge of Special Education	12
Summary	17
III. METHODOLOGY	18
Pilot Study Methodology	18
Main Study	21
IV. ANALYSIS	25
V. DISCUSSION	40
REFERENCES	44
APPENDICES	47
A. Cover Letter and Survey	48
B. Human Subjects Review Committee Approval	54

C. Graduate School Approval to Conduct
Study 56

D. Raw Data 58

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Personal Characteristics of Administrator Participants by Mode and Percent	25
2. Campus Level Characteristics of Administrator Participants by Mode and Percent	27
3. Top Five Responsibilities for Special Education as Ranked by Principals	28
4. Topic or Content Training in Implementing I.D.E.A.	28
5. Training in Preparation for Mediation and/or Hearings about Special Education Procedures	29
6. Staff Development for Special Education Procedures Provided Through District	30
7. Experience in Preparing for Participation in Mediation and/or Hearings about Special Education Procedures	32
8. Types of Special Education Placement Available on Campus	33
9. Responsibility for Special Education Funding Issues for Campus	34
10. Role of Administrator in an ARD/IEP Meeting	35
11. Procedures Used for Maintaining Confidentiality of Special Education on Campus	35
12. Special Education Support Provided on Campus	36
13. Discipline Needs of a Special Education Student When Sent to Administrator	37

Table

Page

14. Discipline Alternatives District Utilizes for Special Education Students	38
--	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Currently, several special education issues have emerged as critical factors for regular administrators: state and federal regulations specifically the 1997 reauthorization of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (I.D.E.A.), special education training, and specific knowledge of lack of the implications of special education court cases. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) (1997a) has notified school district administrators of the amendments to I.D.E.A., stating that the school districts must implement the new requirements immediately. The reauthorization includes consent requirements; Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs); evaluations; required Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) members; procedural safeguards; children in private schools; and discipline issues. The demand for restructuring the education system, including special education programming and I.D.E.A. reauthorization, has made principals even more involved and responsible in all aspects of special education (Podemski, Marsh, Smith, & Price, 1995; TEA, 1997a).

Hirth and Watt (1993) found that principals had insufficient knowledge to ensure that mistakes in provision of special education programming did not occur. There are court cases emphasizing that the administrator is the person most responsible for seeing that all aspects of I.D.E.A. are implemented. *John and Kathryn G. v. Board of Education of Mt. Vernon* sued, claiming the school district failed to identify their student's disabilities and failed to provide Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) under I.D.E.A. (Turnbull, 1994). In *Oberti v. Board of the Borough of Clemention School District*, the court ruled that school districts have an affirmative obligation to consider placing students with disabilities in general education classes (Osborne & Dimattia, 1994). With *Esteban R. v. Three Rivers ISD* the court held the district liable for denial of FAPE when the teachers and administrators indicated their unfamiliarity with the procedures or responsibility for Special Education referrals and lack of knowledge regarding eligibility criteria (Gallegos, 1998).

It is imperative that principals be kept current regarding legal issues and trends related to special education because of legal implications (Quigney, 1996). There are many aspects of special education that school administrators must know if they are to appropriately implement I.D.E.A. (Podemski et al., 1995). There appears to

be a need to clarify principals' perceptions of special education rules/mandates and procedures concerned with reauthorization of I.D.E.A.

Rationale

Three factors have contributed to the rapid alteration of special education: (a) an increased number of special education students, (b) a dramatic increase in the number of special education students with more severe disabilities on regular education campuses, and (c) changing expectations of students, professionals, and parents in terms of outcomes for students with disabilities has dramatically increased (Cardinal, 1991). Due to these factors, I.D.E.A., and school restructuring, it is imperative that principals become familiar with the requirements of legal tenets to ensure appropriate implementation of legislation and litigation (Quigney, 1996). The lack of informed administrator involvement can result in legal entanglements that could be avoided if appropriate information is available and proper procedures are followed (Anderson & Decker, 1993). Typically, principals have training and experience with administration of school buildings and supervision of instruction, but the majority of principals need to know more about special education law (Goor, Schwenn, & Boyer, 1997; Podemski et al., 1995). Knowledge of special education

law is essential to ensure appropriate education for students with disabilities and to reduce a school district's liability for potential litigation (Valesky & Hirth, 1992). Most states have no definitive requirement for administrators to take special education classes or special education law classes, and only three states require a special education law course for principals, instructional supervisors, and superintendents (Hirth & Watt, 1993). There appears to be a need to discover to what extent, if any, principals have knowledge of special education, especially if this knowledge could avert possible legal problems.

Statement of Problem

Reauthorization of I.D.E.A. and restructuring of education have made the role of the administrator more important than ever before. A principal's knowledge of special education laws and policies is imperative if legal problems are to be limited and students with disabilities are to receive FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE). There is a need to examine elementary, middle, and high school principals' perceptions of special education law and policies, and their responsibility for implementation of special education programs on their respective campuses.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research was twofold: (a) to develop a survey instrument and validate it through a field study; and (b) to conduct a statewide survey of principals at elementary, middle, and high school levels to examine the current status of principals' perceptions of their knowledge of special education and their responsibility for implementation of special education programs on their respective campuses.

Definition of Terms

In this study, the following definitions were used for these terms:

Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) Meeting-- committee that makes decisions concerning the eligibility and educational program of students referred for consideration for special education services. Specific guidelines are available in the I.D.E.A. amendments of 1997, Parts A and B (TEA, 1997b).

Individualized Educational Plan (IEP)--developed by ARD committee for each student, IEP must include a statement of the student's present competencies taken from assessment data, short- and long-term goals for the year, and any related services. Specific participants and guidelines are

listed in the I.D.E.A. amendments of 1997, Parts A and B (TEA, 1997b).

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)--special education and related services that (a) are provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge; (b) meet the standards of state educational agency; (c) include appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the state involved; and (d) are provided in conformity with the individualized education program required under section 614(d) (TEA,1997b).

Inclusion--a trend to serve students with disabilities in regular classrooms, to maintain or improve academics and adjustment of students with disabilities (Podemski et al., 1995, p. 4).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (I.D.E.A.)--requires school districts to educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment to the maximum extent appropriate with students without disabilities (Osborne & Dimattia, 1994, p. 6).

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)--to the maximum extent possible, handicapped children are educated with children who are not handicapped, and

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. (McNulty, Connolly, Wilson, & Brewer, 1996, pp. 158-159)

Limitations

Limitations of the research were as follows:

1. Survey research is limited to perceptions of respondents and may not reflect true conditions as they exist.
2. Cross-sectional designs are limited to group comparisons of any kind since such a design requires data collection one time only.
3. Respondents are volunteers rather than a true random selection; therefore, results may differ because those who chose to participate may have a concern to voice or differ in training and may not truly reflect the population being surveyed.
4. Survey research may have a poor return rate, usually 30% or less, and there may not be sufficient data.
5. The study only generalized to include elementary, middle, and high school administrators, since that was the population surveyed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The current emphasis on placement of students with disabilities in regular education has significant implications for principals. A review of literature will cover Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (I.D.E.A.), restructuring, and knowledge of special education which are relevant to research the administrators' perceptions of special education law and policies.

I.D.E.A.

I.D.E.A. is an important amendment that all principals should know and understand. "In 1990, the U.S. Congress amended the Education of the Handicapped Act. . . . The amendment, PL 101-476, is known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act" (Podemski et al., 1995, p. 2). I.D.E.A. does not change with respect to free appropriate public education for students with disabilities. It requires that school districts educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment, and directs states to establish procedures that assure students with disabilities are educated to the maximum extent appropriate with students

without disabilities (Osborne & Dimattia, 1994). "The 1997 amendments to I.D.E.A. contain provisions in several areas designed to promote greater flexibility while ensuring that funds continue to reach eligible students" (McLaughlin & Verstegen, 1998, pp. 373-374). One of the flexibilities for schools is in providing services to students with disabilities. This flexibility has led to two cases, one in New Mexico and the other in California, where the schools' interpretations did not coincide with what Congress intended. These cases have demonstrated the need for administrators to truly understand the reauthorized I.D.E.A. (Badger, 1998).

The 1997 amendments to I.D.E.A. contain new regulations with regard to short-term and long-term suspension. The new amendments create a balance between the rights of students with disabilities and the need of all students for well-disciplined and safe schools (Zurkowski, Kelly, & Griswold, 1998). "Changes include new protections for students with disabilities and new tools for administrators to help ensure the safety of all students" (Zurkowski et al., 1998, p. 3). The changes are not only comprehensive but complicated, which could pose potential problems for understanding and compliance for school personnel (Zurkowski et al., 1998).

Restructuring

Restructuring requires that principals know the law regarding special education and how to apply it. Since the early 1980s, demands for systemic changes in education have come from teachers, administrators, school board members, legislators, governors, the U.S. Secretary of Education, and even the President of the United States (Riley, 1992). The elements of schools' missions and goals, organization, management, curriculum, instruction, responsibilities, regulations, external involvement, and finance are included in the restructuring process (Riley, 1992). Site-based management, parental involvement, and "empowerment" movements are also part of school restructuring (Podemski et al., 1995).

The current reform movement is asking the educational system to teach all young people to be literate, both culturally and scientifically. The movement requests methodologies in schools for combining children with disabilities with non-disabled children in spite of elevated goals for the non-disabled students (Podemski et al., 1995). Reformers believe "all children can learn," meaning that all students, no matter how normal, psychotic, disabled, or oppositional should have the opportunity to sit in class alongside non-disabled students (Baines, 1997). "Inclusive

education is a fundamental belief which considers each person an important, accepted member of the school and community" (Baines, 1997, p. 495). Inclusion and mainstreaming are part of restructuring for special education, although there is debate as to the value of restructuring (Schattman & Benay, 1992). Educators have recently accepted the concept of inclusive education as the most appropriate for students with special needs. An inclusive school has been defined as:

One that educates students in the mainstream . . . providing [them] appropriate educational programs that are challenging yet geared to their capabilities and needs as well as any support and assistance they and/or their teachers may need to be successful in the mainstream. (Barnett & Monda-Amaya, 1998, p. 181)

Inclusion advocates believe that all children should participate actively in their neighborhood schools and communities; however, school environments need to be restructured to accommodate all the differing needs of all students.

The idea is that these [inclusive] schools would be restructuring so that they are supportive, nurturing communities that really meet the needs of all the children within them: rich in resources and support for both students and teachers. (Barnett & Monda-Amaya, 1998, p. 181)

A major player in the restructuring process is the principal. Principals need to have knowledge and skills in instruction, discipline, and assessment in order for

restructuring to be successful (Barnett & Monda-Amaya, 1998).

Knowledge of Special Education

I.D.E.A. and restructuring demand principals' understanding to prevent litigation that could occur. Changes in the economy and society have made programming for students in special education more important than ever before, and it has expanded the responsibilities of administrators (Podemski et al., 1995). The key predictor of a program's success is the principal's attitude toward it, the belief in the significance of the principal's involvement and taking responsibilities for the program's success (Goor et al., 1997). The principal's role is becoming more important "due to the drive to improve services to students with disabilities by their inclusion in regular education settings" (Hirth & Watt, 1993, p. 232).

It is the responsibility of the principal, as the instructional leader and manager of the total education system, to deliver educational services to students with disabilities and meet the procedural requirements of the law (Valesky & Hirth, 1992). To ensure the successful educational programming for children with disabilities, the leadership of the principal is critical (Anderson & Decker, 1993). There is a legal and moral responsibility that

principals have to ensure appropriate education for disabled students in the least restrictive environment, and must use their authority to ensure that mainstreaming is a positive experience rather than negative (Shapiro & Barton, 1993). Principals must educate their staff as to the importance of following each student's IEP, making the staff aware of their responsibilities regarding the legal consequences of not providing required accommodations (Conrad & Whitaker, 1997). Promoting collaboration between the fields of special and general education in meeting the instructional and behavioral needs of students with disabilities is another leadership role of the principal (Quigney, 1996). The principal's role is "pivotal in expanding opportunities for more inclusionary programming while ensuring that students with disabilities receive services that have been carefully planned by the placement team to meet their individual needs" (Katsiyannis, Conderman, & Franks, 1996, p. 81). The school administrators are ultimately responsible for providing the leadership for conceptualizing and monitoring inclusionary practices (Katsiyannis et al., 1996).

Hirth and Valesky (1990) stated that school administrators must be prepared to deal with the problems associated with administration of special education programming as provided in PL 94-142. Administrators not appropriately informed or who do not follow proper

procedures can become involved in legal entanglements (Anderson & Decker, 1993). Principals often feel unprepared for their roles in administration of special education and may be unaware of the extent of their responsibilities or may delegate their duties to staff (Goor et al., 1997). The knowledge of special education law has become essential to ensure an appropriate education for special education students and reduce a school district's liability for litigation (Valesky, 1992). There are two reasons that administrators must command a knowledge of special education and its law: "1) to ensure appropriate education for all students with disabilities as required by PL 94-142, and 2) to minimize losing potential lawsuits resulting from inappropriate implementation of special education legal requirements" (Valesky & Hirth, 1993, p. 403).

It is important that principals be kept current on legal issues and trends related to special education because of the continuing legal framework (Quigney, 1996). It is a necessity that principals be knowledgeable and familiar of federal and state laws that apply to special education programming because of legislation and litigation to ensure appropriate implementation. Building administrators cannot plead "ignorance of the law" as a defense for violating clearly established legal requirements and mandates. Administrators are expected to know established legal

mandates, but are not expected to anticipate interpretation of future laws. Principals are expected to be leaders in identifying students with disabilities who would benefit from special education and ensure that they receive appropriate diagnostic services. Public school administrators are to exercise reasonable judgement and be knowledgeable of the law to perform their professional duties (McCarthy, 1992).

Hirth and Watt (1993) surveyed principals in Tennessee about their knowledge of special education law. Findings indicated that the principals' knowledge was not sufficient to ensure that mistakes in implementation of procedural safeguards and/or the provision of educational services would not occur. "Only three states require a special education law course for principals, instructional supervisors, and superintendents" (Hirth & Watt, 1993, p. 233).

Most states have no specific requirement for administrators to take a special education survey or special education law class (Hirth & Watt, 1993). There are court cases that specify responsibilities for knowing the law and adherence to the law rests with the principal. *Reed J. v. Houston ISD* indicated that the person most responsible for seeing that IEP is implemented rests with the principal (Walsh, 1997). In *Esteban R. v. Three Rivers ISD*, the court

indicated the district's failure to provide FAPE. Testimony of various teachers and administrators demonstrated a lack of familiarity with procedures for special education referrals (Gallegos, 1998). In *Brittany C. v. Beaumont ISD*, the court concluded that Brittany was denied FAPE when the ARD committee completely failed to consider psychological assessment when the IEP was developed. School districts must pay particular attention to any assessment data, opinions of mental health professionals, teacher observations and other pertinent information when a special education student exhibits behavior problems (Evans, 1997).

In response to the trend toward greater accountability for special education, state certification requirements and university preparation programs for school administrators must ensure that the administrators are ready to face challenges posed by the educational reform. (Hirth & Valesky, 1990, p. 165)

It has been stated that administrators must command an understanding of special education in order to implement procedural requirements effectively and to provide appropriate services for students with disabilities on their home campuses (Monteith, 1998). Research has shown that,

(1) many principals lacked formal training in special education but were interested in receiving such training; (2) principals were reluctant to assume new responsibilities related to special education due to their lack of training; (3) only a third of the states required administrators to have a knowledge of special education law; and (4) over half of the school administration graduate

programs surveyed had no special education requirements. (Monteith, 1998, p. 389)

Monteith's (1998) findings indicated that principals not only need, but want training in special education, especially if the current trend of educating the majority of children with special needs through full inclusion or LRE mandate continues. "Thus administrator preparation institutions should design and implement administrator training programs that address the need for knowledge of special education" (Monteith, 1998, p. 392).

Summary

The reauthorization of I.D.E.A. and restructuring of education has redefined the role of the school administrator. It has become imperative that principals be knowledgeable in the areas of special education law and procedures in order to implement the students' IEP appropriately. Litigations can occur if the administrator is not aware or up to date with the current changes and procedures of the law in special education. Administrators are expected to be leaders in this area to ensure that students are appropriately identified, assessed and successful. Descriptive research is needed to learn what knowledge principals have of special education.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The objective of this study was to examine current administrators' perceptions of their knowledge of special education and their responsibility for implementation of special education programs on their respective campuses. This investigation contained two parts. First, an exploratory pilot study was conducted to refine the survey instrument and obtain a preliminary idea of possible outcomes of the study. Second, the main study was conducted in order to obtain data for analysis of the research problem.

Pilot Study Methodology

The purpose of the pilot study was twofold: to develop and refine a questionnaire to be used in the main study. The procedures for instrument development included identification of demographic information, the role, responsibilities and training of administrators in the area of special education, and open-ended questions to identify current trends and issues in the area of special education.

Procedures in field testing the instrument are discussed in the pilot study.

Instrument Development

Basic information which formed the basis for the survey instrument was obtained as follows. First, a review of literature was conducted to determine which questions were needed to elicit information concerning perceived preparation, role, and responsibilities of special education for administrators. In addition, survey instrument content was identified from a review of the updated I.D.E.A. and current legislation compiled from the State Board of Education.

A panel of knowledgeable professionals in the area of assessment and special education reviewed instrument questions that were developed for all of the surveys. The education faculty, in particular the Chair of the Department of Early Childhood and Special Education and special education research advisor for this project, served as expert reviewers in finalizing the development of the instruments. Open-ended questions were designed in order for survey participants to address their concerns and recommendations about implementation and policies/procedures regarding current special education programs. Data were examined to determine if revision of questions was needed.

due to lack of clarity, unclear directions or lack of information.

The instrument contains three parts: demographic information or characteristics of the participants, factors focusing upon duties and training in the area of special education, and open-ended questions to identify concerns and recommendations regarding implementation and policies/procedures with respect to current special education programs. Questions concerning demographic information were designed to identify major characteristics of administrators today (see copy of survey instrument in Appendix A).

Subjects for Pilot Study

The subjects for the pilot study were selected using the district roster of elementary, middle, and high school principals. There were 25 administrator surveys sent by mail to the selected principals with return envelopes and 18 (72%) were returned. Principals were also asked for input on ways to improve the instrument for better results.

Pilot Study Results

Construct validity for the pilot study was verified through a factor analysis of responses submitted by pilot respondents to assure that the major factors were stable. Content validity was established through a review by experts as discussed in the Instrument Development section. Based on the analysis of pilot participant responses, some changes

were made to the survey instrument. Pre-K was added to item 12 since 1 out of 18 responded to supervising pre-kindergarten. Bold type for "on my campus" and "rank in order" was added to item 13 since 4 out of 18 checked the list instead of ranking. Item 22 was listed together instead of separated to another page since 1 out of 18 started the item but did not complete on the other page. Time required to complete the survey was approximately 20 to 30 minutes, based on pilot responses.

Main Study

Methodology

Approval for conducting this research from the Human Subjects Review Committee at Texas Woman's University was obtained on July 14, 1998 (see letter in Appendix B). Human Subjects Committee approval is required to maintain compliance with federal guidelines regarding ethics with respect to human subjects. Approval was granted from the Graduate School to begin the study (see Appendix C).

Subjects

School districts were selected from each of the 20 educational service center regions to ensure that elementary, middle, and high school administrators in all regions received an opportunity to participate in the study. Participants were chosen by selecting an elementary, middle,

and high school administrator from each district in each region using the Texas Education Agency Texas Public School Campuses and Principals Including Charter Schools roster (TEA, 1998). Names and addresses for administrators were obtained the same way. Surveys were sent to 300 administrators--100 for each respective campus. The 20 educational service center regions of Texas were represented. A pre-addressed envelope was enclosed in each survey for the respondents to return the survey if they chose to participate in the study, so that participation was voluntary. The responses were returned directly to the home of the principal investigator by the respondents who chose to participate. Names or identifying data were not required on the surveys to maintain confidentiality of the respondents.

Research Design

The research design for this study was descriptive utilizing survey research methodology (Isaac & Michael, 1982), the survey instrument was designed to provide descriptive information about school administrators' perceptions of the reauthorized I.D.E.A. Survey methodology was used to systematically collect data from a sample of school administrators.

Research Questions

Research questions follow:

1. What are administrators' perceptions of their current roles and responsibilities with respect to the reauthorization of I.D.E.A.?
2. What level of special education training do administrators currently have?
3. What training is needed to enable administrators to function within their current roles and responsibilities with respect to special education programs?
4. What training do administrators have in preparation for their role in mediation and/or hearings?
5. What experience do administrators have for in mediation and/or hearings?
6. What experience have administrators had with special education discipline, suspension, and expulsion?
7. What special education staff development does the school district provide?
8. What is the administrator's role in ARD meetings?
9. What responsibility does the administrator have for implementing the IEP?
10. What knowledge and responsibility does the administrator have of special education funding issues for campus and or district budgeting?

11. What procedures are used for maintaining confidentiality of special education records and/or knowledge about students?

12. What type of special education support is provided on the campus?

13. What types of special education placements are available on the campus?

Sample

Names for the main study were selected randomly by region number to obtain a cross-section of respondents from all of the 20 regions in the state and were chosen from the Texas Public School Campuses and Principals Including Charter Schools 1998 roster. A total of 300 names was chosen--100 names for each respective campus. The roster was used to obtain names in the 20 regions in the state for the individual surveys sent by mail to the principals. A pre-addressed envelope was enclosed in each survey for the respondents to return the survey if they chose to participate in the study, so that participation was voluntary. The responses were sent directly to the home of the principal investigator by the individuals who chose to participate. Names or identifying data were not required on the surveys to maintain confidentiality of the respondents.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Information was analyzed from the elementary, middle, and high school administrators' survey instruments. Demographic information characterizing the administrator participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Personal Characteristics of Administrator Participants by Mode and Percent (N = 128)

Characteristic	Mode	Percent
Gender	Male	69.5
Ethnicity	Caucasian	85.9
Age range (in years)	46-55	52.3
Years of experience teaching Special Education	none	80.3
Clock hours of training in Special Education	7-12	26.8
College credits in area of Special Education	none	54.3
Education level	Master's	99.2
Certification obtained	Mid-management	98.4

There were 300 surveys sent to administrators--100 for each respective campus--across the 20 educational service center regions in Texas. The administrators returned 128 surveys, yielding a 43% return. All of the 20 educational service center regional areas were represented, so that a statewide representation was inferred.

Personal characteristics of the sample suggest that the participating administrator were male and Caucasian, with the most frequent age ranging from 46 to 55 years. Over 80% of the administrator respondents have no experience teaching special education, and over 54% do not have any college credits of coursework in the area of special education. Data suggest that more than 26% of the administrator respondents have had 7 to 12 clock hours of training in special education over the past 2 years. The educational level of the sample indicated that over 99% have a master's degree and more than 98% have a mid-management certification.

Demographic information characterizing the district background of the administrator respondents using frequency tables and descriptive statistics is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Campus Level Characteristics of Administrator Participants
by Mode and Percent (N = 128)

Characteristic	Mode	Percentage
District size	1-2,000	52.0
Job description	Building principal	92.8
Years as administrator	> 15	26.6
Grade levels supervised	7th to 9th	60.0

Characteristics of local campus respondents suggest that 52% of the administrator respondents are from a small district size of no more than 2,000 students. The respondents were building principals with over 26% having more than 15 years of administrative experience. Of the sample, 60% were secondary administrators who supervise seventh to ninth graders.

There were 128 surveys returned in the study and 111 respondents ranked their primary responsibilities for special education on their campus. Table 3 shows the top five rankings.

Table 3

Top Five Campus Responsibilities for Special Education as Ranked by Principals

-
1. Attend ARD meetings as administrator.
 2. Evaluate special education personnel.
 3. Hire special education teachers.
 4. Conference/assist parents of students with special needs.
 - *5a. Discipline.
 - *5b. Arrange substitutes for special education teachers.
-

* Indicates a tie in the rank ordering of responsibilities.

In special education training the respondents indicated that about 74% had training in implementing I.D.E.A. at their campuses. Only 67 out of 128 respondents listed topics that were addressed with the top two responses listed in Table 4.

Table 4

Topic or Content Training in Implementing I.D.E.A.

Topic/Content	Percentage of Respondents
Federal/state mandates	44.8
Legal and compliance issues	43.3

Federal/state mandates also included I.D.E.A. and CAP (correction action plan) with legal and compliance issues addressing the December visit as noted by some of the administrator respondents. Both areas were addressed on over 40% of the campuses. Table 5 addresses the replies from the respondents for training in preparation and/or hearings about special education procedures.

In the area of training in preparation for mediation and/or hearings about special education procedures the respondents indicated that more than 41% are prepared by their districts through professional development and almost one-fourth received no training in preparation for mediation and hearings.

Table 5

Training in Preparation for Mediation and/or Hearings about Special Education Procedures

Training	Percentage of Respondents
None	24.8
District prepares administrators through professional development	41.6
Special education department takes care of mediations and hearings	28.8

Administrator respondents listed more than five areas on their surveys regarding staff development for special education procedures through their districts. Table 6 shows the top three areas of staff development.

Table 6

Staff Development for Special Education Procedures Provided Through District

Staff Development	Percentage of Respondents
Child-centered process	35.1
Legal issues/I.D.E.A.	35.1
Instruction-modifications/ curriculum/TAAS	25.8

There were 97 out of 128 surveys in which the respondents listed staff development activities. The sample indicated that the child-centered process, which includes ARDs, IEPs, timelines, parents' rights, and procedures were discussed at staff development equally as much as legal issues/I.D.E.A., with Instruction-Modifications/Curriculum/TAAS the next issue addressed. More than three-fourths of the administrators who responded to the survey (88.3%) felt that a course in special education administration should be required for all school administrators.

There were 103 respondents out of 128 who listed more than four areas for training needed to understand the administrator's role and responsibility with respect to special education programs. The top area for training was Special Education Legal Issues, with 57.3% indicating that area. Of the administrators, 93% responded that they have access to a copy of the current State Board of Education Rules for Special Education.

Table 7 indicates the current level of experience an administrator has in preparation for participation in mediation and/or hearings about special education procedures. The sample indicated that about 35% of the administrator respondents have participated in mediations/hearings regarding special education. There were 77% of the administrator respondents who have experience in special education discipline, suspension, and expulsion, and specified that they deal with it on a daily basis.

Table 7

Experience in Preparing for Participation in Mediation
and/or Hearings about Special Education Procedures

Experience	Percentage of Respondents
None	32.3
Participated in mediations/hearings regarding Special Education	35.4
District prepares administrators through professional development	33.9

Table 8 shows the types of special education placements available on the respondents' campuses. As specified by the sample, almost 84% of the administrator respondents indicated that mainstreamed classes for P.E., music, recess, and lunch are available on their campus. About 73% of the campuses provide self-contained classes for students with severe needs. Inclusion for all students in all classes is available on about 50% of the campuses. More than 55% of the campuses provide inclusion for all students in all classes except pull-out classes for math, reading, and language arts. More than 50% of the campuses mainstream for lunch, P.E., and music, with about 40% of the campuses mainstreaming for recess. A continuum of services for all students is available on more than 65% of the campuses.

Table 8

Types of Special Education Placement Available on Campus

Special Education Placements	Percentage of Respondents
Mainstreamed classes for P.E., music, recess, and lunch	83.5
Self-contained classes for students with severe needs	72.4
Inclusion for all students in all classes	48.8
Inclusion for all students in all classes except pull-out classes for math, reading, and language arts	55.9
Mainstreamed for lunch	63.8
Mainstreamed for recess	40.2
Mainstreamed for P.E.	63.0
Mainstreamed for music	53.5
Continuum of services for all students	65.4

Special education funding issues are depicted in Table 9. According to the respondents, more than 58% have district policy and procedures that deal with special education funding issues.

Table 9

Responsibility for Special Education Funding Issues for
Campus

Funding	Percentage of Respondents
None	21.3
Learned at graduate school	.8
Told verbally	13.4
District has policy and procedures	58.3

Administrator respondents specified their roles in an ARD/IEP meeting (see Table 10). The major role of the administrator in an ARD/IEP meeting, according to the sample, is seeing that the meeting runs appropriately with chairperson being next. Procedures used for maintaining confidentiality of special education records on campus is specified in Table 11.

Table 10

Role of Administrator in an ARD/IEP Meeting

Role	Percentage of Respondents
Nothing	4.7
Notetaker	3.1
Chairperson	48.8
Sees that meeting runs appropriately	51.2
Ensures IEP implemented	38.6

Table 11

Procedures used for Maintaining Confidentiality of Special Education Records on Campus

Procedures	Percentage of Respondents
None	.8
I do not know	0.0
Special Education department takes care of it	57.5
Make sure records are locked up in specific place	63.8

The majority of administrator respondents make sure that records are locked up in a specific place. Table 12

specifies the type of special education support provided on campus.

Table 12

Special Education Support Provided on Campus

Support	Percentage of Respondents
None	1.6
Can ask questions and Special Education department knows answers	68.0
I do not know	.8
Special Education department takes care of everything	27.3

The sample indicated that 68% of the campuses get support and their questions answered by the Special Education department. The amount of support depended on the need of the district at various times. The Special Education department provided in-services for the administrators and special education teachers.

Administrator respondents determine the discipline needs of a special education student as reported in Table 13. According to the data from the respondents, almost 86% of the administrators look for a discipline or specific behavior management plan on a student's IEP.

Table 13

Discipline Needs of a Special Education Student When Sent to Administrator

Discipline	Percentage of respondents
District has specific policies regarding the discipline of Special Education students	27.3
School code of conduct addresses the discipline policies for all students regardless of disability	23.4
Look for discipline or specific behavior management plan on students' IEP	85.9

Table 14 ranks the discipline alternatives the administrator utilized for special education students by highest percentage of respondents. The respondents indicated that at least 96% of the campuses use in-school suspension followed by detention as a discipline alternatives for special education students. The least used discipline alternative, according to the sample, is peer mediation and family counseling (< 44%). The majority of the administrator respondents (85%) indicated that an administrator can use alternative education placement as a disciplinary option for students in special education who do not have a specific education behavior management plan.

Table 14

Discipline Alternatives District Utilizes for Special
Education Students

Discipline Alternatives	Percentage of Respondents
In-school suspension	96.1
Detention	87.5
Suspension	82.6
Time out	80.5
Access to behavior specialist or consultant	70.3
Law enforcement	69.5
Homebound instruction	56.3
Social skills training	55.5
Expulsion	50.0
Peer mediation	43.8
Family counseling	43.8

Major concerns about implementation and/or policies/procedures concerning special education programs were listed by 94 out of 128 administrator respondents. Approximately a dozen responses were recorded and the top response at 19% was keeping updated on current policies and procedures. Administrator respondents specified in 96 out of 128 surveys that the two major recommendations for regular education administrators who have responsibility for special education

on their campus are (a) know the legal obligations, and (b) keep current and get as much training as possible.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

A statewide survey was conducted with elementary, middle, and high school administrators to determine their perceptions of special education, and identify current concerns and recommendations. The response rate was 43%.

In general, administrators are male, Caucasian, with an age range of 46 to 55, who have a master's degree and mid-management certification. In general, the administrators do not have teaching experience or college credit coursework in special education; but some do have clock hour training in special education content. The majority of the administrators who responded to the survey were from small school districts with no more than 2,000 students. Respondents were secondary principals, with more than 15 years of experience as an administrator who supervise grades 7 to 9. The respondents ranked their top five responsibilities for special education programs as attending ARD meetings as an administrator, evaluating special education personnel, hiring special education teachers, conferencing/assisting parents of students with special

needs, disciplining special education students and arranging substitutes for special education teachers.

The majority of the respondents have had training in implementing I.D.E.A. with Federal/State Mandates, which includes I.D.E.A. and CAP, and legal and compliance issues, which includes December visits. Most districts provided professional development in training administrators for preparation in mediation and/or hearings about special education procedures.

There were three top ranked staff development sessions for special education procedures that the district provides. The staff development sessions listed were the child-centered process, which includes ARDs, IEPs, timelines, parents' rights and procedures; legal issues including I.D.E.A.; and instruction/modifications/curriculum/ TAAS issues.

The majority of the administrators responding felt that a course in special education administration should be required for all school administrators. Special education legal issues was identified as the training required to understand the administrator's role and responsibility with respect to special education programs. All the administrators also had access to the State Board of Education rules for Special Education.

Most of the administrator respondents have participated in mediation/hearings regarding special education, and have experience dealing with special education discipline, suspension, and expulsion on a daily basis. The majority of respondents were secondary principals.

The most utilized special education placements on campuses were mainstreamed classes for P.E., music, recess, and lunch; and self-contained classes for students with severe needs. The least available placements are inclusion for all students in all classes and mainstreaming for recess. The districts provided administrators with policy and procedures to deal with special education funding issues.

The major role of the administrator in an ARD/IEP meeting is seeing that the meeting runs appropriately. The administrators make sure that records are locked up for confidentiality purposes. In general, special education departments provided support and answered administrators' questions about special education.

According to the respondents, a discipline or specific behavior management plan on a student's IEP is used when a special education student is sent to the administrator for discipline reasons. The major discipline alternative the districts utilized for special education students is in-school suspension with peer mediation and family counseling

the least utilized. The majority of the administrators indicated that an AEP can be used as a disciplinary option for students in special education who do not have a specific education behavior management plan.

The major concern administrators expressed about implementation and/or policies/procedures concerning special education programs was keeping updated on current policies and procedures. The two major recommendations for regular education administrators who have responsibility for special education on their campuses are knowing the legal obligations and getting as much training as possible.

The results of the statewide survey indicated that most administrators do not have any special education background. Some have training in special education which was usually provided by the district. The administrators have indicated that there is need for special education administration courses to be required for all school administrators. Major recommendation for school administrators indicates a need to keep current with laws and procedures of special education.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R. J., & Decker, R. H. (1993, February). The principals' role in special education programming. NASSP Bulletin, 1-6.
- Badger, B. (1998 1999). The new IDEA hits a few bumps. American Teacher, 83(4), 18.
- Baines, L. (1997, March). Future schlock using fabricated data and politically correct platitudes in the name of education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 495-496.
- Barnett, C., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (1998). Principal's knowledge of and attitudes toward inclusion. Remedial and Special Education 19(3), 181-192.
- Cardinal, D. (1991, May). How to stay current with special education issues. NASSP Bulletin, 71-77.
- Conrad, M., & Whitaker, T. (1997). Inclusion and the law: A principal's proactive approach. The Clearing House, 70(4), 207-210.
- Evans, K. (1997). Hearing officer lacks authority to reopen cheerleader tryouts. This Just In . . . Developments in Special Education Law, 90, 1-2.
- Gallegos, E. M. (1998, April). Conference on Special Education Law: The relationship between IDEA and the regular educators: Ten rules for the teacher, principal, and counselor. Presented at 12th Annual TCASE--Legal Digest Symposium, Dallas, TX.
- Goor, M. B., Schwenn, J. O., & Boyer, L. (1997). Preparing principals for leadership in special education. Intervention in School and Clinic, 32(3), 133-141.
- Hirth, M. A., & Valesky, T. (1990). Survey of universities: Special education knowledge requirements in school administrator preparation programs. Planning and Changing, 21(3), 165-172.

Hirth, M. A., & Watt, L. D. (1993). A transformation process explored: Special education leadership skills and knowledge for principals. Planning and Changing, 24(3/4), 232-239.

Issac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1982). Handbook in research and evaluation (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: EDITS.

Katsiyannis, A., Conderman, G., & Franks, D. (1996, March). Students with disabilities: Inclusionary programming and the school principal. NASSP Bulletin, 81-86.

Matthews, N. C. (1998, March). Conference on special education law: Practical application of the disciplinary rules under the reauthorized IDEA. Presented at 12th Annual TCASE--Legal Digest Symposium, Dallas, TX.

McCarthy, M. M. (1992). The principals' blue book on special education part 1: Administrators and the law governing students with disabilities. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Department of School Administration, Department of Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 358 642)

McLaughlin, M. J., & Verstegen, D. A. (1998). Increasing regulatory flexibility of special education programs: Problems and promising strategies. Exceptional Children 64(3), 371-384.

McNulty, B. A., Connolly, T. R., Wilson, P. G., & Brewer, R. D. (1996). LRE Policy: The leadership challenge. Remedial and Special Education, 17(3), 158-167.

Monteith, D. S. (1998). Special education administration training for rural minority school leaders: A funded proposal. Orangeburg, SC: South Carolina State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417 918)

Osborne, A. G., Jr., & Dimattia, P. (1994). The IDEA's least restrictive environment mandate: Legal implications. Exceptional Children, 61(1), 6-14.

Podemski, R. S., Marsh, G. E., Smith, T. E. C., & Price, B. J. (1995). Comprehensive administration of special education (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Quigney, T. (1996). Revisiting the role of the building principal in the supervision of special education. Planning and Changing, 27(3/4), 209-227.

Riley, S. M. (1992). Restructuring schools: Effects on the role of the principal. Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association Journal, 16, 6-7.

Sattler, J. M. (1992). Assessment of children (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Author.

Schattman, R., & Benay, J. (1992, February). Inclusive practices transform special education into the 1990s. The School Administrator, 8-12.

Shapiro, A., & Barton, E. (1993). Disabilities are not handicaps. Principal, 72(4), 54-55.

Texas Education Agency. (1997a). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Amendments of 1997 (TEA SPED 97-01). Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1997b). Public Law 105-17 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Amendments of 1997, Parts A and B. Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1998). Texas public school campuses and principals including charter schools. Austin, TX: Author.

Turnbull, H. R., III. (1994). Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities. Denver, CO: Love.

Valesky, T. C., & Hirth, M. A. (1992). Survey of the states: Special education knowledge requirements for school administrators. Exceptional Children, 58(6), 399-406.

Walsh, J. (1997). Failure to modify as per IEP leads to reimbursement. This Just In . . . Developments in Special Education Law, 85, 1-2.

Zurkowski, J. K., Kelly, P. S., & Griswold, D. E. (1998). Discipline and IDEA 1997: Instituting a New Balance. Intervention in School and Clinic, 34(1), 3-9.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Cover Letter and Survey

Texas Woman's University
Denton / Dallas / Houston
Department of Early Childhood
and Special Education
P.O. Box 23029
Denton, TX 76204-1029
Phone: 940 / 898-2271

Principal Investigator: Yolanda Payne - 972 / 881-2176 (phone)
Chairperson Research Committee: Dr. Jane Irons - 940 / 898-2275 (phone)

Dear Administrator:

I am currently working on a Masters degree at Texas Woman's University in the area of Special Education. In order to collect data for my thesis I need your assistance with completion of a questionnaire which will take approximately 10-20 minutes of your time.

The purpose of my study is to examine the current status of school administrators' perceptions of their responsibility for implementation of special education programs on their respective campuses. The reauthorization of IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) includes many issues that have changed since the implementation of IDEA. Because you are on the front lines everyday making decisions regarding implementation of special education programs, it is important that I get your input. The results of this study should contribute much needed information on what is occurring in schools today in the way of special education training for administrators and what principals perceive is their responsibility for implementing special education programs.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to comply with this request, simply do not return the survey. Return of the survey will be interpreted as informed consent. At no time will you need to identify yourself or your district by name and there is no way your personal information will be known. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this research at 972 / 881-2176, or you may contact my committee chair, Dr. Jane Irons, at 940 / 898-2275.

If you choose to participate please answer each question carefully, based on your own knowledge. It is not necessary to ask for "expert" advice. I am interested in knowing what perception administrators have and what they do on a daily basis concerning responsibilities for implementation of special education programs. If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please contact me at the address below and one will be provided. Completion of this study is projected for the winter of 1998. As soon as you complete the survey, please return it in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope. Thank-you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
DENTON / DALLAS / HOUSTON
DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD AND SPECIAL EDUCATION
College of Education and Human Ecology
P.O. Box 23029, Denton, TX 76204-1029

Title: Responsibility for Special Education Survey
School Administrator

This questionnaire focuses upon school administrator's perceptions of their role with respect to special education procedures and program implementation. Please complete the following survey and return to the principal investigator in the enclosed stamped return addressed envelope.

Please answer the following questions by placing an X in the box in front of the response that you feel best applies.

Respondent Background

1. Gender:

Female Male

2. Ethnicity:

Caucasian African American Other
 Native American Hispanic

3. Age range of individual completing this form:

25-30 36-45 Over 55
 31-35 46-55

4. What experience do you have in teaching special education?

none 1-3 years
 4-6 years + 6 years

5. During the past 2 years, how many clock hours of training have you had in special education?

1-6 hours 7-12 hours 13-18 hours
 19-24 hours > 25 hours

6. How many college credits of coursework have you had in the area of special education:

none 3 credits 6 credits
 9 credits 12 + credits

7. Education Level:

Masters doctorate
 Other (explain) _____

8. Check each Certification you have obtained:

Teaching, Secondary Level Supervisor
 Teaching, Elementary Level Mid-Management
 Special Education, any area Superintendent
 Other (please clarify) _____

District Background:

9. District size by ADA:

- 1 to 2,000 7,001 to 30,000
 2,001 to 7,000 over 30,000

10. Job Description:

- Building Principal Other administrator (explain) _____
 Assistant Principal

11. How many years have you worked as an administrator?

- < 1 6-10 > 15
 1-5 11-15

12. Which grade levels do you Supervise? (check all that apply)

- pre-K 1 - 3 4 - 6 7 - 9 10 - 12

13. My primary responsibility for special education on my campus includes: (**Rank in order** with 1 most frequent to least frequent)

- attend ARD meetings as administrator
 discipline (explain) _____
 hire special education teachers
 attend mediations or hearings
 supervise special education funds
 evaluate special education personnel
 conference/assist parents of students with special needs
 attend Individual Transition meetings
 arrange TAAS remediation for special education students
 arrange substitutes for special education teachers
 provide/arrange staff development for special education
 Other (explain) _____

Special Education Training:

14. Have you had training in implementing IDEA at your campus within the past year?

- yes no

If yes, what was the topic or content?

15. What training have you had in preparation for mediation and/or hearings about special education procedures?

- none the district I work in prepares administrators through professional development
 the special education department takes care of mediations and hearings
 other (please clarify) _____

16. What staff development regarding procedures for special education does your school district provide?

17. In your opinion, should a course in special education administration be required for all school administrators?

yes no

18. What training do you think is needed to understand your current role and responsibility with respect to special education programs?

19. Do you have access to a copy of the current State Board of Education Rules for Special Education?

yes no

Administration Experience in Special Education:

20. What experience do you have to prepare for participation in mediation and/or hearings about special education procedures?

none I have participated in mediations and hearings regarding special education
 the district I work in prepares administrators through professional development
 other (please clarify) _____

21. What experience have you had with special education discipline, suspension, and expulsion?

none I deal with special education discipline on a daily basis
 other (explain) _____

22. What types of special education placements are available on the campus? (check all that apply)

none
 mainstreamed classes for p.e., music, recess, and lunch
 self-contained classes for students with severe needs
 inclusion for all students for all classes
 inclusion for all students for all classes except pull-out classes for math, reading, and language arts
 mainstreamed for lunch
 mainstreamed for recess
 mainstreamed for p.e.
 mainstreamed for music
 continuum of services for all students
 other (please specify) _____

23. What is your responsibility in special education funding issues for your campus?

none what I have learned at graduate school
 what I have been told verbally the district has policy and procedures
 other (explain) _____

24. What is your role in an ARD/IEP meeting?

nothing notetaker chairperson
 sees that the meeting runs appropriately ensures IEP implemented
 other (explain) _____

25. What procedures are used for maintaining confidentiality of special education records on your campus?

none I do not know the special education department takes care of it
 I make sure the records are locked up in a specific place
 other (explain) _____

26. What type of special education support is provided on the campus?

- none I can ask a question and the special education department knows the answer
 I do not know the special education department takes care of everything
 other (explain) _____

27. If you know the student sent to you for discipline reasons is a special education student, how do you determine what discipline you will use?

- the district has specific policies regarding the discipline of special education students
 school code of conduct addresses the discipline policies for all students regardless of disability
 I look for a discipline or specific behavior management plan on the student's IEP
 other (explain) _____

28. Check all discipline alternatives your district utilizes for special education students:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> suspension | <input type="checkbox"/> law enforcement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> in-school suspension | <input type="checkbox"/> detention |
| <input type="checkbox"/> time out | <input type="checkbox"/> access to behavior specialist or consultant |
| <input type="checkbox"/> expulsion | <input type="checkbox"/> homebound instruction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> social skills training | <input type="checkbox"/> family counseling |
| <input type="checkbox"/> peer mediation | <input type="checkbox"/> others not listed (please list) _____ |

29. Can you use an AEP as a disciplinary option for students in special education who do not have a specific special education behavior management plan?

- yes no

30. As an administrator, list your major concerns about implementation and/or policies/procedures concerning current special education programs.

31. What recommendations can you make for regular education administrators who have responsibility for special education on their campus.

"I understand that the return of my completed questionnaire constitutes my informed consent to act as a subject in this research."

Appendix B

Human Subjects Review Committee Approval

[REDACTED]

TEXAS WOMAN'S
UNIVERSITY

DENTON/DALLAS/HOUSTON

HUMAN SUBJECTS
REVIEW COMMITTEE
P.O. Box 425619
Denton, TX 76204-5619
Phone: 940/898-3377
Fax: 940/898-3416

July 14, 1998

Ms. Yolanda Payne
4012 Bosque Dr.
Plano, TX 75074

Dear Ms. Payne: [REDACTED]

Your study entitled "Administrators' Perceptions of Special Education" has been reviewed by a committee of the Human Subjects Review Committee and appears to meet our requirements in regard to protection of individuals' rights.

Be reminded that both the University and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations typically require that agency approval letters and signatures indicating informed consent be obtained from all human subjects in your study. **These consent forms and agency approval letters are to be filed with the Human Subjects Review Committee at the completion of the study. However, because you do not utilize a signed consent form for your study, the filing of signatures of subjects with the Human Subjects Review Committee is not required.**

Your study was determined to be exempt from further TWU HSRC review. However, another review by the Committee is required if your project changes. If you have any questions, please feel free to call the Human Subjects Review Committee at the phone number listed above.

Sincerely, [REDACTED]

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

Appendix C

Graduate School Approval to Conduct Study

████████████████████

TEXAS WOMAN'S
UNIVERSITY
DENTON/DALLAS/HOUSTON

January 26, 1999

████████████████████

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
P.O. Box 425649
Denton, TX 76204-5649
Phone: 940/898-3400
Fax: 940/898-3412

Ms. Yolanda Payne
4012 Bosque Dr.
Plano, Tx 75074

Dear Ms. Payne:

Thank you for providing the materials necessary for the final approval of your *Thesis* prospectus in the Graduate School. I am pleased to approve the prospectus entitled "Administrators' Perceptions of Special Education", and I look forward to seeing the results of your study.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Dissertation/Theses signature page is here.

To protect individuals we have covered their signatures.

Appendix D

Raw Data

11-Mar-99 SPSS Release 6.1 for DEC Alpha OpenVMS

15:34:21 SPSS Open VMS Development SYS on TWUAl::

VMS V6.2

For VMS V6.2

SPSS Open VMS Development SYS

SPSS ID 0

```

1 0 set width=80/length=none
2 0
3 data list file='yp.txt' free/
4
5 id, gender, ethnic, age, seexp, setrn, secol, edlma, edldr, edloth,
6 certsec, certelem, certse, certsupv, certmm, certsupi, certoth,
7 distsize, jobdesc, yrsadm, pretok, oneto3, fourto6, sevento9, tentol
8 2,
9 i13p1 to i13p11,
10
11 id2, idea, feds, legal, trnmedn, trnmedd, trnmeds,
12 stafdccp, stafdleg, stafdins,
13 serequ, progselg, sboeaccs, expmedn, expmedp, expmedd,
14 sedisc, spplc1 to spplc9,
15 sefundn, sefundd, sefundv, sefundd, ieprolen, ieproles,
16 ieprolec, ieproleo, ieprolei, confidn, confidk, confidse,
17 confidrl, sesuppn, sesuppd, sesuppk, sesuppda,
18 discd, discc, discp,
19
20
21 id3, disalt1 to disalt11, aepopt, curpol, nolegob, keepcur
22
23 missing values all(0)
24
25 frequencies var=gender to i13p11, idea to discp, disalt1 to keepcur
26

```

There are 51,206,560 bytes of memory available.

Memory allows a total of 23,853 values accumulated across all variables.
There may be up to 5,964 value labels for each variable.

11-Mar-99 SPSS Release 6.1 for DEC Alpha OpenVMS

15:34:25 SPSS Open VMS Development SYS on TWUAl::

VMS V6.2

GENDER

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	39	30.5	30.5	30.5
	2.00	89	69.5	69.5	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

ETHNIC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	110	85.9	85.9	85.9
	2.00	5	3.9	3.9	89.8
	4.00	12	9.4	9.4	99.2
	5.00	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

AGE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	1	.8	.8	.8
	2.00	5	3.9	3.9	4.7
	3.00	40	31.3	31.3	35.9
	4.00	67	52.3	52.3	88.3
	5.00	15	11.7	11.7	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

SEEXP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	102	79.7	80.3	80.3
	2.00	6	4.7	4.7	85.0
	3.00	3	2.3	2.4	87.4
	4.00	16	12.5	12.6	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SETRN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	30	23.4	24.4	24.4
	2.00	33	25.8	26.8	51.2
	3.00	25	19.5	20.3	71.5
	4.00	14	10.9	11.4	82.9
	5.00	21	16.4	17.1	100.0
	.00	5	3.9	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 123 Missing cases 5

SECOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	69	53.9	54.3	54.3
	2.00	22	17.2	17.3	71.7
	3.00	12	9.4	9.4	81.1
	4.00	6	4.7	4.7	85.8
	5.00	17	13.3	13.4	99.2
	6.00	1	.8	.8	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

EDLMA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	127	99.2	99.2	99.2
	2.00	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

EDLDR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	8	6.3	6.3	6.3
	2.00	120	93.8	93.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

EDLOTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	11	8.6	8.6	8.6
	2.00	117	91.4	91.4	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTSEC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	97	75.8	75.8	75.8
	2.00	31	24.2	24.2	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTELEM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	49	38.3	38.3	38.3
	2.00	79	61.7	61.7	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTSE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	15	11.7	11.7	11.7
	2.00	113	88.3	88.3	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTSUPV

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	22	17.2	17.2	17.2
	2.00	106	82.8	82.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTMM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	126	98.4	98.4	98.4
	2.00	2	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTSUPI

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	40	31.3	31.3	31.3
	2.00	88	68.8	68.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

CERTOTH

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	22	17.2	17.2	17.2
	2.00	106	82.8	82.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISTSIZE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	64	50.0	52.0	52.0
	2.00	31	24.2	25.2	77.2
	3.00	18	14.1	14.6	91.9
	4.00	10	7.8	8.1	100.0
	.00	5	3.9	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 123 Missing cases 5

JOBDESC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	116	90.6	92.8	92.8
	2.00	9	7.0	7.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

YRSADM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	7	5.5	5.6	5.6
	2.00	32	25.0	25.8	31.5
	3.00	30	23.4	24.2	55.6
	4.00	22	17.2	17.7	73.4
	5.00	33	25.8	26.6	100.0
	.00	4	3.1	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 124 Missing cases 4

PRETOK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	36	28.1	28.8	28.8
	2.00	89	69.5	71.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

ONETO3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	38	29.7	30.4	30.4
	2.00	87	68.0	69.6	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

FOURTO6

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	57	44.5	45.6	45.6
	2.00	68	53.1	54.4	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

SEVENTO9

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	75	58.6	60.0	60.0
	2.00	50	39.1	40.0	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

TENTO12

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	48	37.5	38.4	38.4
	2.00	77	60.2	61.6	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

I13P1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	122	95.3	97.6	97.6
	2.00	3	2.3	2.4	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	110	85.9	88.0	88.0
	2.00	15	11.7	12.0	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	113	88.3	90.4	90.4
	2.00	12	9.4	9.6	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	83	64.8	66.4	66.4
	2.00	42	32.8	33.6	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P5

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	86	67.2	68.8	68.8
	2.00	39	30.5	31.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P6

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	119	93.0	95.2	95.2
	2.00	6	4.7	4.8	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P7

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	111	86.7	88.8	88.8
	2.00	14	10.9	11.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P8

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	77	60.2	61.6	61.6
	2.00	48	37.5	38.4	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P9

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	99	77.3	79.2	79.2
	2.00	26	20.3	20.8	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

I13P10

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	96	75.0	76.8	76.8
	2.00	29	22.7	23.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	125	Missing cases	3		

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	102	79.7	81.6	81.6
	2.00	23	18.0	18.4	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

IDEA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	92	71.9	73.6	73.6
	2.00	33	25.8	26.4	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

FEDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	30	23.4	44.8	44.8
	2.00	37	28.9	55.2	100.0
	.00	61	47.7	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 67 Missing cases 61

LEGAL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	29	22.7	43.3	43.3
	2.00	38	29.7	56.7	100.0
	.00	61	47.7	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 67 Missing cases 61

TRNMEDN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	31	24.2	24.8	24.8
	2.00	94	73.4	75.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

TRNMEDD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	52	40.6	41.6	41.6
	2.00	73	57.0	58.4	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

TRNMEDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	36	28.1	28.8	28.8
	2.00	89	69.5	71.2	100.0
	.00	3	2.3	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 125 Missing cases 3

STAFDCCP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	34	26.6	35.1	35.1
	2.00	63	49.2	64.9	100.0
	.00	31	24.2	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 97 Missing cases 31

STAFDLEG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	34	26.6	35.1	35.1
	2.00	63	49.2	64.9	100.0
	.00	31	24.2	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 97 Missing cases 31

STAFDINS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	25	19.5	25.8	25.8
	2.00	72	56.3	74.2	100.0
	.00	31	24.2	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 97 Missing cases 31

SEREQU

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	113	88.3	89.7	89.7
	2.00	13	10.2	10.3	100.0
	.00	2	1.6	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	126	Missing cases	2		

PROGSELG

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	59	46.1	57.3	57.3
	2.00	44	34.4	42.7	100.0
	.00	25	19.5	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	103	Missing cases	25		

SBOEACCS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	117	91.4	92.9	92.9
	2.00	9	7.0	7.1	100.0
	.00	2	1.6	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	126	Missing cases	2		

EXPMEDN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	41	32.0	32.3	32.3
	2.00	86	67.2	67.7	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	127	Missing cases	1		

EXPMEDP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	45	35.2	35.4	35.4
	2.00	82	64.1	64.6	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	127	Missing cases	1		

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	43	33.6	33.9	33.9
	2.00	84	65.6	66.1	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

 SEDISC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
	2.00	97	75.8	77.0	78.6
	3.00	27	21.1	21.4	100.0
	.00	2	1.6	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 126 Missing cases 2

 SPPLC1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	106	82.8	83.5	83.5
	2.00	21	16.4	16.5	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

 SPPLC2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	92	71.9	72.4	72.4
	2.00	35	27.3	27.6	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

 SPPLC3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	62	48.4	48.8	48.8
	2.00	65	50.8	51.2	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SPPLC4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	71	55.5	55.9	55.9
	2.00	56	43.8	44.1	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SPPLC5

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	81	63.3	63.8	63.8
	2.00	46	35.9	36.2	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SPPLC6

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	51	39.8	40.2	40.2
	2.00	76	59.4	59.8	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SPPLC7

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	80	62.5	63.0	63.0
	2.00	47	36.7	37.0	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SPPLC8

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	68	53.1	53.5	53.5
	2.00	59	46.1	46.5	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SPPLC9

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	83	64.8	65.4	65.4
	2.00	44	34.4	34.6	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SEFUNDN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	27	21.1	21.3	21.3
	2.00	100	78.1	78.7	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SEFUNDS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	1	.8	.8	.8
	2.00	126	98.4	99.2	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SEFUNDV

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	17	13.3	13.4	13.4
	2.00	110	85.9	86.6	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SEFUNDD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	74	57.8	58.3	58.3
	2.00	53	41.4	41.7	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

IEPROLEN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	6	4.7	4.7	4.7
	2.00	121	94.5	95.3	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

IEPROLES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	4	3.1	3.1	3.1
	2.00	123	96.1	96.9	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

IEPROLEC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	62	48.4	48.8	48.8
	2.00	65	50.8	51.2	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

IEPROLEO

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	65	50.8	51.2	51.2
	2.00	62	48.4	48.8	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

IEPROLEI

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	49	38.3	38.6	38.6
	2.00	78	60.9	61.4	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

CONFIDN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	1	.8	.8	.8
	2.00	126	98.4	99.2	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

CONFIDK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2.00	127	99.2	100.0	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

CONFIDSE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	73	57.0	57.5	57.5
	2.00	54	42.2	42.5	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

CONFIDRL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	81	63.3	63.8	63.8
	2.00	46	35.9	36.2	100.0
	.00	1	.8	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 1

SESUPPN

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
	2.00	126	98.4	98.4	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

SESUPPD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	87	68.0	68.0	68.0
	2.00	41	32.0	32.0	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

SESUPPK

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	1	.8	.8	.8
	2.00	127	99.2	99.2	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

SESUPPDA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	35	27.3	27.3	27.3
	2.00	93	72.7	72.7	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

DISCD

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	35	27.3	27.3	27.3
	2.00	93	72.7	72.7	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

DISCC

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	30	23.4	23.4	23.4
	2.00	98	76.6	76.6	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

DISCP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	110	85.9	85.9	85.9
	2.00	18	14.1	14.1	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT1

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	106	82.8	82.8	82.8
	2.00	22	17.2	17.2	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT2

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	123	96.1	96.1	96.1
	2.00	5	3.9	3.9	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT3

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	103	80.5	80.5	80.5
	2.00	25	19.5	19.5	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT4

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	64	50.0	50.0	50.0
	2.00	64	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT5

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	71	55.5	55.5	55.5
	2.00	57	44.5	44.5	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT6

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	56	43.8	43.8	43.8
	2.00	72	56.3	56.3	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT7

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	89	69.5	69.5	69.5
	2.00	39	30.5	30.5	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT8

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	112	87.5	87.5	87.5
	2.00	16	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT9

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	90	70.3	70.3	70.3
	2.00	38	29.7	29.7	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 0

DISALT10

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	72	56.3	56.3	56.3
	2.00	56	43.8	43.8	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

DISALT11

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	56	43.8	43.8	43.8
	2.00	72	56.3	56.3	100.0
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	128	Missing cases	0		

AEPOPT

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	103	80.5	85.1	85.1
	2.00	18	14.1	14.9	100.0
	.00	7	5.5	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	121	Missing cases	7		

CURPOL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	18	14.1	19.1	19.1
	2.00	76	59.4	80.9	100.0
	.00	34	26.6	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	94	Missing cases	34		

NOLEGOB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	49	38.3	51.0	51.0
	2.00	47	36.7	49.0	100.0
	.00	32	25.0	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	96	Missing cases	32		

KEEPCUR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1.00	21	16.4	21.9	21.9
	2.00	75	58.6	78.1	100.0
	.00	32	25.0	Missing	
	Total	128	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	96	Missing cases	32		

11-Mar-99 SPSS Release 6.1 for DEC Alpha OpenVMS

15:35:13 SPSS Open VMS Development SYS on TWUA1::

VMS V6.2

Preceding task required 1.25 seconds CPU time; 49.50 seconds elapsed.

27 finish

27 command lines read.
 0 errors detected.
 0 warnings issued.
 2 seconds CPU time.
 53 seconds elapsed time.
 End of job.