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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

This study attempts to examine supervisory behavior in the area of special education. The determination of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors is essential for both leadership personnel in special education and university personnel responsible for the development of adequate training programs for prospective supervisors in special education. The present study attempts to provide a framework of actual supervisory behaviors in special education which may provide guidelines for training and practical experiences.

The development of supervisory practices which contribute to the improvement of the quality of classroom instruction has been an ongoing professional goal of educators. Due to conflicting definitions and expectations of the role of the supervisor, a consensus has not been reached regarding effective supervisory practices.

Sturges et al. (1978) note that this confusion occurs because there is seldom a person within the school system whose sole responsibility is the provision of instructional improvement activities. Instructional supervision in the public schools continues to evolve
reactively from the growing complexity of social and political environments. ¹

In the area of special education, the problem of defining the role of the supervisor is exacerbated by extensive legal mandates and judicial pronouncements. The passage of Public Law 94-142, or the Education for All Handicapped Act of 1975, expanded the roles of special education leadership personnel. The complex provisions of this landmark legislation require the cooperative efforts of administrators and supervisors in both regular and special education. Although concisely outlining the responsibilities of the local education agency in the delivery of services to handicapped children, this legislation is non-specific in the assignment of these duties to special education personnel.

The diversity of state certification requirements in special education administration and/or supervision and the paucity of training programs are further evidence of an elusive professional role.

Whitworth and Hatley (1979) point out that 16 percent of the states issue special education administrative endorsement and 30 percent of the states certify special education supervisors. ²


In 1975, Forgonne and Collings documented special education certification requirements only in administration in 12 percent of the states.3

Another complicating factor has been the small number of training institutions involved in the preparation of special education administrators and supervisors. Forgonne and Collings (1975) found that twenty-three institutions throughout the nation have programs which prepare administrators and supervisors in special education.4 Stile and Pettibone (1980) found at least one special education administration and/or supervision training program in twenty-six states.5

It is clear that the passage of Public Law 94-142 has led to increased awareness of the need for leadership in the area of special education and that the individual states have responded to the 1975 mandate. However, special education programs did not commence in 1975. Public school day classes for handicapped children have been in this country since 1878.6 Evidently, a large number of current

---


4 Ibid., p. 5.


administrators and supervisors in special education, employed prior to the burgeoning efforts to train these personnel in the late 1970s, received their training on the job.

Connor (1963) cites the lack of theory in special education administration as a major impediment to the profession. Undue emphasis is placed on specific elements and a void exists in the theoretical domain which assists in decision making. 7

All of these factors, i.e., extensive legislation, diverse state certification requirements, scarcity of training programs, and the lack of a theoretical framework, have led to varied interpretations of the professional roles of the administrator and supervisor of special education.

The need for clarification of these roles has been widely recognized. Mackie and Engel (1955) conducted a nationwide study of administrators and supervisors in special education focusing on the competencies, preparation, and personal characteristics necessary for these professional roles. 8 Marro and Kohl (1972) conducted a national normative study of local administrators in special education. One of the conclusions of their research was that insufficient amounts

---


of time were devoted to supervisory functions. 9

The majority of the literature regarding special education leadership focuses on the administrator's role and is noticeably neglectful of the role of the supervisor. It is with this aspect of leadership that this study is concerned.

In developing a consensus regarding the desired behavior of supervisors in special education, some collaboration between supervisors and teachers supervised by them is necessary. As the direct recipients of supervisory services, special education teachers are in the best position to judge the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of supervisory behavior. If certain behaviors could be identified as contributing to effective supervision, this information could lead to improvement in the selection of supervisory personnel, the professional preparation of supervisors and the delineation of their professional responsibilities.

Theoretical Model

Numerous studies have been conducted outside of the field of education on the subject of employee attitudes toward their jobs. The efforts of these studies have been to identify and delineate the factors that contribute to effective or satisfying work environments as perceived by employees.

Frederick Herzberg (1959) conducted research studies on job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory maintains that workers possess two separate categories of needs which determine job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. One category of needs, the hygiene, focuses on the work environment. The other category of needs is more closely associated with the intrinsic aspects of the work itself and is called "motivator" by Herzberg.

According to the theory, if the hygienic or environmental factors are neglected, the employee is dissatisfied. If the hygienic factors are not neglected, the worker is not dissatisfied. For Herzberg, not dissatisfied and satisfied have two distinct meanings. The difference is more conceptual than semantic. In order for the worker to be satisfied or motivated, a second set of factors needs to be addressed. It is only the motivators, according to Herzberg, which contribute to job satisfaction. The relationship between the hygienic and motivational factors is as follows:

One of the purposes of the present study is to determine whether effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors in special education incorporate two separate continua of factors, similar to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of supervisory behavior of special education supervisors as perceived by special education teachers supervised by them. Specific objectives are:

1. To determine whether effective and ineffective supervisory behavior in special education incorporate mutually exclusive continua of factors, similar to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

2. To compare and contrast the supervisory roles of the building principal and the special education supervisor relative to Herzberg's factors.
3. To determine desirable personal characteristics and professional competencies for the special education supervisor as perceived by both special education teachers and supervisors.

4. To examine attitudes and professional needs of the special education supervisor as expressed by role incumbents.

5. To determine the relationship of the following variables with the teacher's perception of supervisory behavior:
   
a. Number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher  
b. Tenure status of the special education teacher  
c. Handicapping condition of the special education students  
d. Special education teacher's experience with non-handicapped students.

Methods and Procedures

The Northern Suburban Special Education District (NSSED) is a cooperative joint agreement of twenty-two school districts in the north shore area of metropolitan Chicago. These school districts have joined together to provide educational services for those children having handicapping conditions too severe to be served in their local school districts. Support services for the NSSED programs include the supervision of each special education program by an NSSED "teacher consultant," a role title defined as supervisory in function. NSSED was chosen for this study as a representative special education joint agreement with a highly developed organizational
emphasis on supervision. Ten NSSED teacher consultants were contacted for interview. All ten teacher consultants participated in an in-depth interview which focused on the attitudes toward supervision as expressed by these role incumbents.

A three-page questionnaire was sent to 112 special education teachers employed in NSSED programs. The critical incident technique, as developed by Flanagan, was utilized in the questionnaire to establish instances of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. The critical incident technique is a procedure for collecting observations of specific behaviors as they are related to the over-all performance of a defined task. Its stated purpose is to delineate those behaviors which seem critical to the success or failure of the stated task.

Each instance of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior, as reported by the teachers, was classified into one of the fourteen motivation or hygiene categories as established by Herzberg. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory was the theoretical model used for this study.

13 Ibid., p. 328.
Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to reports of effective and ineffective types of supervisory behavior as perceived by 112 special education teachers employed in programs for which NSSED is legally responsible. The teachers represent programs housed in regular school buildings. The students served by these teachers range in age from three to twenty-one and present a wide spectrum of handicapping conditions.

The Northern Suburban Special Education District was chosen for this study because of its highly developed interpretation of the supervisory role. The NSSED "teacher consultant" functions as technical consultant, supervisor, and administrative liaison. In keeping with the language of Public Law 94-142, the NSSED teacher consultant is the case manager of the handicapped student. Case management refers to the responsibility for ensuring that each handicapped child has a free and appropriate public education according to the law.

This study is limited to the special education teachers and teacher consultants employed in NSSED programs. Any attempt to apply these findings to all supervision in special education would be an error of overgeneralization. Although aspects of this study may have far reaching application, the conclusions are limited to those supported by the actual data.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature reviewed for this study is divided into three sections. The development of special education supervision and the current state of the art are discussed in the first section. The second part reviews literature pertinent to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Finally, an in-depth description of Flanagan's critical incident technique is provided.

Special Education Supervision

A recurrent theme in the literature on supervision is the role conflict experienced by the instructional supervisor. Sergiovanni (1979) notes that the necessity of living in two worlds and of speaking two languages differentiates the supervisory role from the more administrative role. ¹ Esposito, Smith, and Burbach (1975) point out that the practice of educational supervision has been impeded by the lack of a clear-cut role conceptualization. The role concept of the supervisor lacks congruence with the activities he performs. These authors suggest that the role of the supervisor be

separated according to function, i.e., helping function and administra-
tive function.  

The area of special education also suffers from an ill-defined supervisory role. Whitworth and Hatley (1979) found that the various states have numerous titles for special education leadership personnel and ascribe various job descriptions to these titles. An historical overview of special education in this country suggests that the concept of supervision was considered to be the desideratum of effective special education.

Compulsory education laws brought large numbers of handicapped students into the American public school system in the beginning of the twentieth century. The idea of establishing day classes for the handicapped was first presented, prior to attendance laws, in an address to the American Teachers Association in Detroit in 1878 by August Schenck. Other midwestern cities, Cleveland and Chicago, followed Schenck's example and established day classes within their public school systems. By 1910, special classes were quite common in the United States.

---


5 Ibid., p.10.
The concept of supervision of these special classes during the early part of this century was a rare occurrence. A document published by the U.S. Bureau of Education, advising the public schools on the organization of special classes makes no reference to supervision:

The best advice that can be given to the Superintendent of Schools who appreciates the necessity of organizing special classes and who is desirous of introducing them is to proceed with that he finds nearest to hand...the best training of these teachers must come from the actual experience. Perhaps as good a plan as any is to select a good teacher, give her a limited number of children and let her work out her own salvation, for the first year, at all events. After she has had some experience with such work, so that she knows her limitations and knows to some extent, what she needs, it would be well for her to begin to add to her professional equipment.\(^6\)

In 1905, supervision was provided through the appointment of Miss Elizabeth Farrell as inspector of ungraded classes in the New York City Public Schools.\(^7\) Miss Farrell is also credited as the instructor of one of the first classes in supervision of special classes in 1915 at Teachers College, Columbia University.\(^8\)

In a 1923 survey of forty-four cities in the United States, it was found that twenty-nine supervisors and six directors of special education were employed.\(^9\) Clearly, there was more emphasis on the

---

\(^6\) Ibid., p. 66.  
\(^7\) Ibid., p. 12.  
\(^8\) Leo E. Conner, Administration of Special Education Programs (New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press, 1961), p. 121.  
supervisory role than the administrative role in the early stages of special education.

The ill-defined role of the special education supervisor is deeply rooted in the attitudes and resultant organizational structure of supervision in the American public school system. Ayer and Barr (1928) note that the organizational plan for supervision in the majority of school systems was the extrinsic-dualistic model. In this organizational plan, the supervisor and principal work relatively independently of each other under the common direction of the superintendent. The teacher is responsible to both the supervisor and the principal. The principal has general charge of the building, including attendance, discipline, program of studies, promotions, supplies, equipment, and janitorial services. The special supervisor had general direction of the improvement of instruction.  

The extrinsic-dualistic model is based upon the concept that special supervision is external or supplementary rather than intrinsic or essential to the school organization. The truly essential elements of an efficient school organization are the teacher, principal, and superintendent.

Accordingly, supervision is esteemed to be an adventitious growth rather than an organic part of school life. Special supervision, thrifty enough during times of financial prosperity, is cut down

---

10 Ibid., p. 211.
11 It should be noted that according to these authors, special supervision refers to supervision of regular academic subjects, extension classes, and research as well as classes for handicapped students.
or eliminated during times of financial depression. The accessory position of the supervisor is apparent and is in contrast to the more fundamental positions of teacher, principal, and superintendent.  

Within this organizational model, the position of the supervisor is poorly defined and leads to many misunderstandings between teacher, principal, and supervisor. The supervisor's activities are organized upon a personal basis, varying from school to school and according to the personalities of the respective supervisors and principals, rather than the implementation of a definite role description.

Graham and Engel (1950) made some prescriptive statements concerning the job of the supervisor in special education:

The supervisor should have had teaching experience, additional courses in his area of specialization and should have at least a master's degree in education. The functions of such supervisors are both administrative and supervisory. They should develop curriculums and bulletins, prepare supply and equipment lists, authorize transfers, arrange teacher's meetings, cooperate with social agencies, evaluate pupil progress by means of tests and surveys, and carry on general supervision of the classrooms.

As a part of the U.S. Office of Education Studies, Mackie and Engel (1955) conducted a landmark nationwide survey of directors and supervisors of special education in local school systems. The purpose of this study was the collection of information on the

---

12 Ibid., p. 211.


competencies, experience, professional preparation, and personality characteristics which contribute to the success of the directors and supervisors of special education in local school systems. For this survey, facts and opinions were collected from five groups of special educators totaling 1,625 persons. The 153 directors and supervisors who participated represented 112 school systems in twenty-four states.

An analysis of percentage of time allotment spent on various functions yielded the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERCENTAGE TIME SPENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Duties</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory and Consultative Duties</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Directed Study and Research</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Services to Children</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The direct services category includes diagnostic testing and counseling services. Although Mackie and Engel's study does not supply information regarding the professional training of the special education directors, a later study by Marro and Kohl (1972) suggests that a large percentage of special education directors were trained primarily as psychologists. This may explain the rather disproportionate amount of time that directors spent in direct services to children relative to the supervisors.
Directors, as a group, spent more time than supervisors on administrative duties, public relations, and direct services to children. Supervisors spent more time than directors on supervisory duties and in-service education of teachers. A wide range of competencies was noted as requisite for the leadership position in special education. Emphasized for directors were:

- the ability to give leadership to the special education program
- the ability to select a qualified staff
- the ability to relate the special education program to the regular program
- the ability to cooperate with parent groups

Most highly valued competencies for the special education supervisor were:

- the ability to consult with teachers about teaching methods, teacher-pupil relationships, educational adjustment, special materials and equipment, and the emotional and social needs of children
- the ability to work cooperatively with parents

Special education teachers gave opinions on the ideal background and experience for directors and supervisors of special education. The majority expressed that the directors should have experience in teaching handicapped students. Professional preparation should continue beyond undergraduate level with an emphasis on orientation to all areas of exceptionality for the director and one or two areas for the supervisor.

The personality characteristics desired of special education directors and supervisors appeared to be very important to the teachers.
Free response comments from 740 teachers representing all areas of exceptionality portrayed a rather ideal person who is emotionally mature, keen-thinking, understanding, tactful, democratic, positive, idealistic, ethical, and has an honest interest in people.

The supervisory role was described in a widely quoted statement developed by the Office of the Superintendent of Instruction for the State of Illinois (1956). This document was designed to serve as a guide to local school districts in delineating the functions of the special education director. The administrative functions of the special education director included the development of a philosophy, consultation with general educators for purposes of determining policy for special programs, establishment of special programs, placement of children, scheduling staff and pupils, management of transportation, establishment of lines of communication, evaluation of personnel, purchasing of equipment and supplies, and appraisal of programs. The supervisory function of the special education director included fostering professional growth through meetings, case conferences, workshops and development projects, evaluating personnel, and serving as a resource person.

In 1966, ten years after the U.S. Office of Education Studies, the Council for Exceptional Children conducted a major study focusing on professional standards for personnel working with exceptional

---

children. Using input from approximately 700 persons, the committee prepared statements of professional preparation and competence for a wide range of specializations. Concerning the leadership roles the report concluded that, although the administrative and supervisory functions were clearly different though complementary the possibility of a useful differentiation in preparation programs at that time was doubtful. Therefore, in the statement of areas of competence, the administrative and supervisory functions were grouped together.\footnote{Wyatt (1968) conducted a study concerned with the projected needs for leadership personnel in special education nationally. Wyatt found that in 1967 the majority of special education leadership personnel (32 percent) were classified as directors and 16 percent were classified as supervisors. The other 52 percent were classified as principals, coordinators, or consultants. The researcher noted that the large number of directors may be due to the small size of most programs where only one administrator is warranted. Projection of leadership needs were generated from opinions of state education agency personnel. Findings indicated that the largest projected personnel need would be in the area of supervision.}

Wyatt (1968) conducted a study concerned with the projected needs for leadership personnel in special education nationally. Wyatt found that in 1967 the majority of special education leadership personnel (32 percent) were classified as directors and 16 percent were classified as supervisors. The other 52 percent were classified as principals, coordinators, or consultants. The researcher noted that the large number of directors may be due to the small size of most programs where only one administrator is warranted. Projection of leadership needs were generated from opinions of state education agency personnel. Findings indicated that the largest projected personnel need would be in the area of supervision.


Studies that differentiate between the administrator and supervisor of special education seem to indicate that the administrator enjoys a much clearer and widely accepted role description than the supervisor. Hill (1967) compared the amount of agreement between superintendents and directors of special education in terms of their perception of major responsibility for certain administrative functions. Hill found no major disagreement between superintendents and directors of special education in their perceptions of administrative tasks and responsibilities.

Newman (1970) undertook a study to determine if special education administrators actually performed tasks which ideally they should perform. This researcher utilized Gulick and Urwick's conceptualization of seven functional areas of administrative activities including planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Newman found no significant difference between what the administrators actually performed and the tasks they ideally should perform.

Conversely, the literature that focuses solely on the supervisory role in special education reveals a lack of agreement regarding

---


"real" and "ideal" task performance. Wood (1978) conducted a study to determine the actual and should-be role of the public school special education supervisor as perceived by special education supervisors, superintendents, and state board of education personnel. Wood found that all three groups differed significantly on the responses to actual and should-be roles of the supervisor. Johnson (1977) surveyed special education supervisors, speech clinicians, and special education directors regarding the real and ideal leader behavior of the supervisor. Johnson found statistically significant differences in the perceptions of supervisory behavior among all three groups. The supervisors' perception of their own ideal supervisory behavior was in closer agreement with special education directors than those of the clinicians. The supervisors' perception of their own real supervisory behavior, in contrast, was in closer agreement with those of the clinician than the directors of special education.

A major source of this elusive supervisory role in special education is the dissimilar state certification standards. In addition, college and university training programs have had minimal impact in resolving this issue. Whitworth and Hatley (1979) point out that certification standards and practices by states have a large effect on university training programs, professionals entering the field, and


ultimately, the quality of the special education program in the local district.\textsuperscript{22}

Brabandt (1969) surveyed twelve states regarding certification standards in special education administration.\textsuperscript{23} He found that only Illinois had certification or credential requirements which would promote standards for special education administration. Kern and Mayer (1970) conducted a national survey and found that only twelve of thirty-eight states responding reported any specific certification requirement for the position of director of special education.\textsuperscript{24}

In a nationwide study of local administrators of special education, Marro and Kohl (1972) found that only 32 percent of the respondents indicated that they had a credential called a "special education certificate."\textsuperscript{25} Forgonne and Collings (1975) conducted a study to determine the status of state certification and endorsement

\textsuperscript{22} Whitworth and Hatley, "Certification and Special Education Leadership Personnel: An Analysis of State Standards," p. 304.


practices for administrators and supervisors of special education. They found that nine states offered a separate credential for special education administration and twenty-three states required no certification or endorsement in either general educational administration or special education administration. Also, these researchers found that twenty-three institutions throughout the country provided training programs in special education administration.

Wisland and Vaughan (1964) undertook a research project to identify problem areas in special education administration as perceived by role incumbents for the purpose of developing better training programs in the field. The authors point out that many college courses in special education administration, at that time, were based on the personal experience, opinions, and prejudices of the instructor.

Whitworth and Hatley (1979) found that twenty-three states offered special education endorsement or certification in either administration or supervision. The researchers separated the data into administrative and supervisory categories. Noting that the requirements within each class varies from state to state, the authors found that most states appear to be fairly consistent. The requirements


for supervisory certification are more content-based, dealing with such areas as curriculum development, evaluation, and instructional techniques. The administrative requirements are oriented more toward general administrative procedures and competencies such as finance, law, and personnel administration. One of the conclusions of their study is that there is an increasing realization of the unique instructional needs of special education as illustrated by the separate certification requirements for supervisors to serve as instructional change agents. Of the eighteen states certifying special education supervisors, all but one, Montana, require special education teaching experience. Hawaii, Louisiana, and Pennsylvania require five years of special education teaching experience. 28

In 1980, Stile and Pettibone found that twenty-six states offered a separate credential for special education administration. Only seven states offered neither separate certification nor endorsement of the general administrative certificate. These authors also found at least one special education administration program in twenty-six of the states.

A study by DuFour (1978) attempted to differentiate the competencies required of special education directors and supervisors as perceived by job incumbents. The purpose of this study was to provide data to im-

prove training programs and certification standards. Dufour's findings suggest that the competencies required of the director of special education fall under the rubric of management while those of the supervisor of special education are more of a technical nature. The author recommends that the training needs be individualized according to job types and separate certification standards.29

In the development of a professional field, the establishment and acceptance of a role identity becomes a critical concern. One manifestation of role identity is the creation of professional organizations. The literature contains no reference to any organization whose membership or title is primarily oriented to the supervisor in special education. In tracing the origins of the organizations for special education administration, it can be noted that the original titles of two major organizations included the special education supervisor. Burrello (1979) documents that the original title of the Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE), which first convened in 1951, was the Council of Administrators, Supervisors, and Coordinators of Special Education in Local School Systems. The National Association of State Directors of Special Education, organized in 1938, was originally known as the Conference of State Directors and

29 Gerald Dufour, "Competencies Required of Supervisors of Special Education in Minnesota as Perceived by Directors and Supervisors and Differentiated from Those Required of Directors," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978).
Supervisors of Special Education.  

Summary

Public school special education classes have been in existence in this country for more than 100 years. Due to the highly specialized nature of this instruction, supervision has been necessary.

The role of the special education supervisor suffers from the lack of a clear-cut role description. Unlike the administrator or director of special education, there is little agreement between the expected and actual duties of the special education supervisor. One source of this confusion is an organizational model which views the special education supervisor as an ancillary position.

Other impediments to the specification of a professional role are varying state certification standards and a scarcity of training programs in administration and supervision in special education. Also, supervisors in special education lack a professional organization to assist them in identifying a common role.

Motivation-Hygiene Theory

An assumption basic to the literature on job satisfaction is that the factors leading to satisfaction and dissatisfaction are arranged on a linear continuum. This traditional view assumes that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are polar opposites and that the same factors which cause dissatisfaction can cause satisfaction if they are eliminated or

---

In reviewing industrial motivation studies, Frederick Herzberg et al. (1957) observed a difference in the primacy of factors associated with reports of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Specifically, he observed that some factors in the work situation acted as satisfiers and other factors acted as dissatisfiers. Herzberg hypothesized that the satisfiers acted as satisfiers only in their presence and that the absence of satisfiers would not result in dissatisfaction. Further, Herzberg predicted that the dissatisfiers served to dissatisfy only in their absence and that their presence would not lead to satisfaction, but rather no dissatisfaction.

Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not the obverse of each other; rather they are best viewed as two separate and parallel continua.... The opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction; the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction.

This concept of job satisfaction challenged the traditional theory of a bipolar relationship between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.


In an initial attempt to test this hypothesis, Herzberg et al. (1959) interviewed 200 accountants and engineers chosen from nine companies in the Pittsburgh area. The subjects were asked to recount an incident when they were particularly happy with their jobs and also an incident when they were particularly unhappy with their jobs. The interviewees were then asked to specify their feelings concerning these episodes. The interview format used in this study was an adaptation of the critical incident technique as described by John C. Flanagan (1954).

The technique of content analysis was utilized to classify the data. The authors state this was an "a posteriori approach which extracted the categories from the material itself". Each incident, as reported by the respondents, was classified into one of the emergent categories. Using this method of data analysis, Herzberg identified the following fourteen factors or categories:

**Achievement:** To complete a job successfully or to fail to do a job adequately

**Recognition:** To be singled out for praise or for criticism or blame

---


Work Itself: To like or dislike the actual tasks involved in getting the job done

Responsibility: To gain responsibility for own or others' work or to lack responsibility for a job

Advancement: To change status through promotion or demotion or to miss an expected promotion

Salary: To obtain a salary increase or to lose out on an expected one

Possibility of Growth: Changes in a job which could lead to further growth or which could be satisfying

Interpersonal Relations (Superiors, Peers, Subordinates): To experience satisfying or dissatisfying social interactions with one's superior, peer, or subordinate

Status: To obtain some actual sign or appurtenance of status or to lose it

Technical Supervision: To have a competent or incompetent supervisor

Company Policy and Administration: To be in a company with good policies and administrative procedures or the opposite situation

Working Conditions: To have good physical surroundings on the job or poor ones

Personal Life: To have one's personal life affected for good or ill by occurrences on the job

Job Security: Objective indications of security such as job tenure and company stability

In analyzing these incidents, it became evident, as Herzberg predicted, that the stories of job satisfaction were predominated by one group of factors. Factors which led to job satisfaction were termed motivators as they were thought to lead to increased productivity and related to psychological satisfaction inherent in the job activity itself.
Factors which led to job dissatisfaction were termed **hygienes** because they were thought to be more environmental to the work situation. The frequency of occurrence of each factor in stories of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction is illustrated in Table 1.

Based on the results of this study, the authors concluded that the motivators contributed substantially to job satisfaction but very little to dissatisfaction and the hygienes contributed substantially to job dissatisfaction but very little to job satisfaction.  

A second analysis of the data by Herzberg yielded a group of second-level factors. These factors were derived from the interviewees' perception of each reported incident:

First-level factors were to be described as situations that were antecedent to a person's attitude toward his job. Thus first-level factors always described concrete events or situations reported by the respondent. Second-level factors were to be described as the needs or drives activated by these events. The individual second-level factors would categorize the answers the respondent would give to probe questions about his reasons for feeling as he did.

The second-level factors identified were:

1. Feelings of **recognition**
2. Feelings of **achievement**
3. Feelings of **possible growth**, blocks to growth, first-level factors perceived as evidence of actual growth
4. Feelings of **responsibility**, lack of responsibility, or diminished responsibility
5. Feelings of **advancement** from change in job situation
6. Feelings of **fairness** or **unfairness**

---

37 Ibid., p. 80.
38 Ibid., pp. 26-27.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of Growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations - Subordinate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations - Superior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations - Peer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision - Technical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policy/Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Group feelings**, feelings of belonging or isolation, socio-technical or purely social

8. Feelings of interest or lack of interest in the **performance of the job**

9. Feelings of increased or decreased **status**

10. Feelings of increased or decreased **security**

11. Feelings of **pride** or inadequacy or **shame**

12. Feelings about **salary**

In reviewing Herzberg's work, Kahn (1961) states that the most important finding in this research is that satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job are caused by different factors rather than by varying amounts of the same factors. This reviewer expressed some concerns about the exclusive reliance on the subjects for descriptions of their job attitudes, however, he finds much merit in the overall work. 39

French et al. (1973) point out that Herzberg's results have been heavily criticized as being method dependent. They note that those studies which criticize Herzberg's findings have been very inconsistent in their methodologies. Further, these researchers feel that only those studies which are reasonably close to Herzberg in data collection, analysis, and interpretation can be considered relevant in criticizing the theory. 40

---


Farr (1977) praises Herzberg's use of qualitative methodology but is highly critical of the causal inferences which Herzberg associates with this method of data collection. Farr cites the sentiments of Harre and Secord (1972) who advocate the greater use of the accounts that individuals can provide of their behavior and its causes:

In order to be able to treat people as if they were human beings it must be possible to accept commentaries upon their actions as authentic, though reifiable, reports of phenomena subject to empirical criticism.

However, Farr criticized Herzberg for believing that this highly qualitative data, accepted at face value, yielded information of a causal nature relative to the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. It is for this reason that Farr believes Herzberg's work is justifiably controversial.

Dunnette and Kirchner (1965) laud the interview procedure employed by Herzberg:

...a more fundamental contribution of the study is that the job factors so identified were allowed to emerge from descriptions of actual job situations rather than being based exclusively on responses to check-lists or sets of statements developed

---


ahead of time by the investigator. The job factors derived by Herzberg's classification are more likely, therefore, to reflect things in the job environment leading to employees' approach and avoidance behaviors. As such, the factors seem to be a logical starting point for developing the measures of job motivation....

In reviewing the literature pertinent to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, King (1970) notes that various researchers have based their studies on what they "believe" to be Herzberg's two-factor theory. In his opinion, much of the controversy that developed between supporters and critics of the theory stems from the lack of an explicit statement of the theory. King delineates five distinct versions of the two-factor theory that have been stated or implied by various researchers:

**Theory I:** All motivators combined contribute more to job satisfaction than to job dissatisfaction

All hygienes combined contribute more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction

**Theory II:** All motivators combined contribute more to job satisfaction than do all hygienes combined

All hygienes combined contribute more to job dissatisfaction than do all motivators combined

**Theory III:** Each motivator contributes more to satisfaction than to dissatisfaction

Each hygiene contributes more to dissatisfaction than to satisfaction

---


Theory IV: In addition to Theory III,

Each principal motivator contributes more to satisfaction than does any hygiene

Each principal hygiene contributes more to dissatisfaction than does any motivator

Theory V: Only motivators determine satisfaction

Only hygienes determine dissatisfaction

King's assessment of the situation is that Herzberg's theory encompasses Theories I, II, and III as stated above. However, there is some question as to whether Herzberg intended Theories IV and V. 46

In analyzing studies critical of the motivation-hygiene theory, Whitsett and Winslow (1967) found misinterpretation of the motivation-hygiene theory, misinterpretation of results, and methodological weaknesses to be prevalent. 47

Following the publication of Motivation to Work in 1959, numerous studies were conducted which rendered varying degrees of support to the original theory. Herzberg (1965) replicated the motivation-hygiene study with 139 lower level supervisors representing a wide range of industry in Finland. Herzberg substituted a questionnaire for the interview but maintained the critical incident technique. Analysis of the data was the same as the original study and the results confirmed the two-factor theory of job attitudes as

46 Ibid., p. 29.

expressed by the motivation-hygiene theory. 48

Sergiovanni (1967) replicated Herzberg's methodology, with some modification, with seventy-one teachers in Monroe County, New York. Sergiovanni utilized the critical incident interview technique and the content analysis as outlined in Herzberg's Motivation to Work. Results of this study indicated that the factors of achievement, recognition, and responsibility contributed predominantly to teacher job satisfaction. Interpersonal relations, supervision, school policy and administration, and personal life were factors which contributed predominantly to job dissatisfaction for these teachers. The remaining factors appeared to contribute to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The author concluded that the results of this study tend to support the universality of Herzberg's findings. 49

A dual theory of job satisfaction was supported in a study by Friedlander (1965). The relationship between the importance of seventy-three environmental factors to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction was the focus of this study. Subjects were 1,973 government employees. The results indicated that work process and work content tended to elicit positive motivation while work context


and community tended to elicit negative motivation. 50

With some modification in design, Schwartz, Jenusaitis, and Stark (1963) studied job motivational factors for 111 male supervisors in public utility companies. These researchers used written questionnaires rather than personal interviews and restricted the coding process to the fourteen first-level factors, omitting the twelve second-level factors of Herzberg's original study. In addition, this study used the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Notwithstanding the differences in sample and methods of data gathering the results of this study were in agreement with Herzberg's findings. Job related factors were associated with positive work experiences and contextual factors were associated with negative experiences. 51

Many of the studies discussed in this chapter dispensed with the personal interview and substituted a written questionnaire using the same questions as the interview. A study by French, Metersky, Thaler, and Trexler (1973) attempted to determine whether the results obtained by using a Herzberg-type written questionnaire were significantly different from those obtained by employing Herzberg's oral interview procedure. The authors concluded that no significant differences


were found and that Herzberg's study can be replicated with a written questionnaire when certain key factors are held constant. 52

Myers (1964) published the results of a six-year research study on motivation conducted at Texas Instruments, Incorporated. 53 During the 1950s, Texas Instruments' sales grew from two million dollars to over two hundred million dollars and the number of employees grew from 1,700 to 17,000. During these growth years, Myers reports that highly motivated employees and managers found it easy to overlook problems associated with communication breakdowns and supervisory ineptness. When company growth declined in the 1960s, motivation ceased to be self-generating and became increasingly dependent upon the skill of supervision.

Texas Instruments was attracted to Herzberg's research as a possible key to the motivation problems within their company and was anxious to test its validity with their employees. Subjects for this study were 282 employees of Texas Instruments' Dallas division, representing the job categories of scientist, engineer, manufacturing supervisor, technician, and assembler. Each subject was interviewed in the same manner as the original Herzberg study. Results indicated,


in support of Herzberg's theory, that the factors in the work situation that motivate employees were clearly different from the factors that cause employee dissatisfaction. As a result of this study, Texas Instruments implemented a supervisory training program. In these sessions, the supervisors assimilated the motivation-hygiene theory and gained skills in its application to supervisory problems. 54

Willing (1979) cites Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory as a theoretical framework for administrators of adult education programs. This author advocates the provision of motivating factors as well as a conducive working environment which will enable the adult education teachers to render the best instruction to the adult student. 55

Friedlander (1964) used full-time employees enrolled in evening psychology courses as subjects for a study on job characteristics. Each of the eighty subjects completed a closed set questionnaire to determine which job characteristics served as satisfiers and which job characteristics served as dissatisfiers. Results substantiated Herzberg's finding that satisfiers and dissatisfiers were not opposite ends of a common continuum. 56

54 Ibid.


Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) conducted a study to determine the relationship of motivator and hygiene variables to job involvement. The subjects, ninety-six civil service supervisors, were given the Wernimont Job Satisfaction Scale and the Lodahl and Kejner Job Involvement Scale. Results indicated that total motivation satisfaction scores accounted for considerably more variance in overall job satisfaction than did hygiene variables. The factor of "advancement" was not significantly related to job involvement in this study. The authors note that advancement in the civil service is based largely upon seniority and performance on competitive examinations. Therefore, it seems unlikely that this variable would necessarily function as a motivator. The authors concluded that the distinction between motivation and hygiene variables introduced by Herzberg can be useful in predicting job involvement of civil service supervisors.  

Walt (1962) interviewed fifty women government employees to gather information about instances of favorable and unfavorable job occurrences. Results, which supported Herzberg's findings, indicated that for these women, favorable job occurrences were closely associated with achievement, work itself, recognition, responsibility, and interpersonal relationships. This last factor is considered as hygienic by Herzberg.  

---

Unfavorable job occurrences were associated with policy and administration and working conditions. 58

Halpern (1966) made a comparison of the relative contribution of motivator and hygienic factors to over-all job satisfaction using ninety-three males as subjects. Subjects completed a questionnaire which asked them to rate various aspects of their best-liked jobs. In support of Herzberg's theory, these researchers found that the motivation factors contributed significantly more to over-all satisfaction than did the hygiene factors. 59

Saleh and Otis (1963) explored the relationship between the sources of job satisfaction of a group of pre-retirees and their attitudes toward their mandatory retirement. The authors hypothesized that individuals who were "job oriented" would have difficulty with their coming retirement. Conversely, individuals who were more "context oriented" may look forward to their retirement. The subjects were eighty-five male, managerial-level pre-retirees ranging in age from sixty to sixty-five. The Job Attitude Scale consisting of six job-related factors and ten context-related factors paired into forced


choice format, was administered to the subjects. The authors con-
cluded that pre-retirees who stress the environmental factors as the
source of job satisfaction have more favorable attitudes toward
retirement than those who stress job-related factors.  

Groseth (1978) replicated Herzberg's research design using a
sample of administrators in the State University of Florida. Re-
sults supported Herzberg's findings with some exceptions. The most
frequently mentioned motivators were recognition, achievement, and the
work itself. The most frequently mentioned hygienes were company
policy and administration, interpersonal relations, and working condi-
tions. Interpersonal relations was mentioned nearly as often in
both satisfying and dissatisfying incidents. The researcher notes
that this may be due to the fact that administrators accomplish tasks
primarily through other persons, thus increasing the likelihood that
interpersonal relations will be a factor in all situations.  

Wernimont (1966) used both a forced-choice and a free-choice
response format in obtaining descriptions of past satisfying and
dissatisfying job situations. Subjects were fifty accountants and
eighty-two engineers from a variety of midwestern firms. The subjects
were asked to rate intrinsic and extrinsic factors as they related to

60 S. Saleh and J.L. Otis, "Sources of Job Satisfaction and Their
Effects on Attitudes Toward Retirement," Journal of Industrial

61 Rolf S. Groseth, "An Investigation of the Motivator-Hygiene
Theory of Job Satisfaction Among Selected Student Affairs Administra-
prior job experiences. Results of the "forced-choice" responses indicated that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors can be sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction but intrinsic factors were stronger in both cases. Analysis of the "free-choice" responses, alone, resulted in the subjects choosing intrinsic items much more often in describing satisfying job situations. In describing dissatisfying situations, these subjects chose extrinsic factors more readily. The author noted that the "free-choice" situation more nearly approximated Herzberg's methodology. 62

Male, middle managers in India were the subjects of the motivation-hygiene study conducted by Lahiri and Srivastva (1967). Ninety-three respondents were asked to indicate, on a continuum, the extent to which thirteen job content factors and thirteen job context factors contributed to feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job. In support of Herzberg's theory, results indicated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not the opposite poles of the same continuum. However, they found that both motivators and hygienic factors contributed to feelings of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job. Cultural differences were noted in the Indian and American emphasis on certain job factors. 63


Leon and Sepulveda (1979) surveyed 279 Peruvian civil servants ranging in age from eighteen to seventy-four on the subject of job satisfaction. Occupations represented by this sample included janitors, secretaries, accountants, administrators, lawyers, and economists. After recounting a satisfying and dissatisfying job situation, the subjects were given a questionnaire and asked to rate six variables: the work itself, responsibility, personal growth, salary, working conditions, and supervision. In describing their results, the authors structure their comments around the critical research of King (1970) cited earlier in this paper. The results of their study support Theories I, II, and III as described by King and do not support Theories IV and V as described in that same article.

Partial support for Herzberg's theory can be found in a study by Malinovsky and Barry (1965). The subjects were 117 white, male blue-collar workers employed in ground crews in a large southern state university. Each subject was given the Work Attitude Survey consisting of twenty motivator and twenty hygiene items expressed in a Likert-type five point rating scale. Twenty-eight (28) percent of the 400 correlations between motivator and hygiene items were positively and statistically significant providing some support to Herzberg's assumption that motivators and hygienes represent separate dimensions of work attitude variables. However, over-all results of this study suggest that job satisfaction among blue-collar workers was positively

Bloom and Barry (1967) designed a study to determine the applicability of Herzberg's two-factor theory to Negro blue-collar workers.\footnote{R. Bloom and J.F. Barry, "Determinants of Work Attitudes Among Negroes," \textit{Journal of Applied Psychology} 51 (1967): 291-294.} The subjects were eighty-five Negro and 117 white, male blue-collar workers employed by the Plants and Grounds department in the same southern state university used for Malinovsky and Barry's study (1965). The \textit{Work Attitude Survey} used in the Malinovsky and Barry study was also used in the present study. Factor analysis of the responses led the authors to conclude that hygienic variables are more important to the Negro blue-collar worker than the white blue-collar worker. The researchers postulated that these data may represent a stage in the maturation process of a working subclass. As Herzberg (1966) pointed out that hygienic needs must be met before motivators become operative,\footnote{Frederick Herzberg, \textit{Work and the Nature of Man} (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 71-91.} the authors conclude that Herzberg's two factor theory is less useful in considering low status workers than it had been for the accountants and engineers in Herzberg's study.

Centers and Bugental (1966) studied the importance of intrinsic and extrinsic job motivators among a selected cross section of the working population. The sample interviewed consisted of 692 adults
representing a cross section of the greater Los Angeles area. Each subject was given a listing of intrinsic and extrinsic job factors and asked to select the three most important. Results indicated that white-collar workers consistently placed a greater value on intrinsic sources of job satisfaction than did blue-collar workers. Correspondingly, blue-collar workers consistently placed a greater value on extrinsic sources of job satisfaction.\textsuperscript{67} In criticizing this study, Whitsett and Winslow (1967) state that the conclusions of these researchers are based on a misinterpretation of their data. The subjects were presented a listing of six job factors and asked, "Which of these things is most important in keeping you on your present job?" This is interpreted by Centers and Bugental to mean "more valued." Whitsett and Winslow postulate that the motivator factors are perhaps unavailable to the blue-collar workers and, therefore, play no part in keeping them on the job. This study may not demonstrate that these motivators are not valued, but rather unavailable.\textsuperscript{68}

Hammer (1970) designed a study to determine whether the factors related to job satisfaction for special education teachers and regular classroom teachers were the same. The questionnaire instrument listed


Herzberg's factors and asked respondents to rate them on a seven point Likert scale. The subjects were 152 pairs of special and regular class teachers in Iowa. Herzberg's study was not supported consistently by this study. The motivation factors of growth and advancement and the hygienic factors of supervision and job security did support the two-factor theory. However, the other factors contributed to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job.  

Ewen, Hulin, Smith, and Locke (1966) used a stratified sample of males (N=793) employed in industrial and business organizations to test Herzberg's dual factor theory. A modified version of the Job Description Index was used as the measure of job satisfaction. Two satisfiers, work itself and promotions, and one dissatisfier, pay, were the only factors used. The General Motors Faces Scale was used as the measure of over-all job satisfaction. This measure is a one-item graphic scale consisting of six faces varying from a large smile to a large frown. The authors conclude from the results that neither the Herzberg theory nor the traditional theory was supported by the data. Of eight hypotheses, three supported Herzberg's theory, four supported traditional theory, and one supported neither theory. In criticizing this study, Whitsett and Winslow (1967) question the researchers' use of the Job Description Index as a means of measuring satisfaction.

---

Herzberg's factors. In choosing this instrument, the researchers limited the study to three of Herzberg's factors, two of which have questionable relevance to the motivation-hygiene theory, specifically, salary and promotional opportunity. Pay is the most marginal of Herzberg's factors and the only hygienic factor used in this study.

Ewen (1964) conducted an exploratory study in an attempt to determine the generality of the Herzberg dual-factor theory. Responses of 1,021 insurance agents to a fifty-eight item four point attitude scale were obtained. The factors examined were manager interest in agents, company training policies, and salary, considered dissatisfiers by Herzberg. The satisfiers of the work itself, recognition, and general morale were also examined. Ewen reported that manager interest in agents and training, supposedly dissatisfiers, acted like satisfiers. Work itself was consistently a satisfier while recognition caused both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Ewen is very critical of Herzberg's study and notes the following deficiencies: 1) a narrow range of jobs investigated, 2) the use of only one measure of job attitudes, 3) the absence of reliability and validity data, and 4) the absence of a measure of over-all job satisfaction. In spite of his criticism, however, Ewen concludes that a more extensive research design is necessary in order to adequately test the Herzberg

theory. 71

Graen (1966) developed a ninety-six item questionnaire based on the content of Herzberg's dimensions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The respondents were also asked to rate the importance of each job situation to over-all job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Subjects for this study were 153 engineers employed in electronics firms in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. The author concluded that the content categories as established by Herzberg, do not constitute homogeneous groupings of job content in the correlational sense. The author suggests that Herzberg's theory be tested further utilizing objective measures of postulated dimensions. 72

Hulin and Smith (1967) used the Job Description Index and the General Motors Faces Scale in a study of 670 office personnel of an international corporation in Montreal, Quebec. The authors proposed to analyze the contributions of different variables to over-all satisfaction and dissatisfaction and to examine the differences between the presence and absence of different variables in their effects on workers' judgments of jobs. The variables were pay, work done, promotional opportunity, supervision, and co-workers. Results indicated that if the presence of a variable resulted in a job being described as good,


the absence of that same variable resulted in the job being described as bad, other things being equal. The authors note that the variable of promotion did fit the prediction of the two-factor theory. The over-all findings, the authors conclude, support the traditional theory of job satisfaction, i.e., job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are caused by the same factors.\textsuperscript{73}

In a study designed to determine the empirical and theoretical limitations of Herzberg's theory, Hinrichs and Mischkind (1967) used a rating scale and open-ended questions. The subjects were 613 male technicians in service work. They were asked to rate their level of over-all satisfaction on a scale from 0 (completely dissatisfied) to 10 (completely satisfied). Also, they were asked to list two positive and two negative influences concerning their present satisfaction with their current job. The authors predicted that:

1) motivators would be the primary cause of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction and 2) hygienes would be responsible for a lack of total satisfaction. Results of this study did not support Herzberg's theory. One significant difference between this study and others that did not support the motivation-hygiene theory is the extent to which hygiene factors were mentioned more frequently than motivators in both satisfying and dissatisfying instances.\textsuperscript{74}


In order to determine factors associated with job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction, Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel (1967) surveyed a cross section of occupational groups. Subjects included 133 store managers of a national retail chain, 89 sales clerks, 44 secretaries at the University of Minnesota, 129 engineers and research scientists, 49 machine equipment salesmen, and 92 Army reservists and night school students employed in a wide range of occupations. The researchers developed two sets of standardized statements based on Herzberg's definitions, to be used as Q-sort decks by respondents for describing previously satisfying and dissatisfying job events. Correlational matrices were developed and factor analyzed. The authors concluded that their findings failed to confirm the two-factor approach to understanding job satisfaction. They note that the factors of achievement, recognition, and responsibility seem to be uniformly more important for both satisfying and dissatisfying job events and that salary, working conditions, company policy, and security are relatively less important. These authors are highly critical of Herzberg's "story-telling method and content analysis."

This critique is somewhat surprising in view of Dunnette's earlier praise of Herzberg's interview procedure. These authors concluded that the results of their study show that the "two-factor theory should be laid to rest so as to reduce the danger of further research or
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administrative decisions being dictated by its seductive simplicity."\(^{76}\)

In reviewing studies critical of the motivation-hygiene theory, Whitsett and Winslow (1967) conclude that these studies offer little empirical evidence for doubting the validity of the theory due to their misinterpretations of the theory and misinterpretation of their own results. These authors conclude that the motivation-hygiene theory has clearly retained its utility and viability.\(^{77}\)

Summary

The studies which offer the most support for Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory utilized the critical incident technique in either an interview or questionnaire format. [Walt (1962), Schwartz et al. (1963), Myers (1964), Herzberg (1965), Sergiovanni (1967)].

The studies which utilized other types of forced-choice questionnaire or attitude surveys that did not encompass the majority of Herzberg's factors yielded mixed levels of support for Herzberg's finding (Friedlander (1964), Malinovsky and Barry (1965), Wernimont (1966), Lahiri and Srivastva (1967), Leon and Sepulveda (1979). These studies supported the basic tenet of Herzberg's theory, namely that the motivators appear more important in ratings of job satisfaction than the hygienes. The results of these studies differ in the extent


to which the individual factors contribute to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

There is some evidence to support the claim that Herzberg's theory is not as functional at lower socio-economic levels [Centers and Bugental (1966), Bloom and Barry (1967)]. However, Herzberg et al. (1957) noted this tendency in an earlier work:

The factor preferences of workers are affected similarly by employee occupational level and education. One of the most consistent findings is that intrinsic aspects of the job are more important to employees with greater education and to employees at higher occupational levels.

With the exception of Dunnette et al. (1967) the authors most critical of Herzberg's dual factor theory [Ewen et al. (1966), Hulin and Smith (1967)], used the Job Description Index dimensions as job characteristics. The six categories included in this instrument include only one factor, the work itself, which is considered to be a motivator by Herzberg. As pointed out by Whitsett and Winslow (1967) and King (1970), even these studies lend some support to Herzberg's original findings.

**Critical Incident Technique**

The critical incident technique is a procedure for collecting observations of specific behaviors as they are related to the performance of a particular task. Its stated purpose is to delineate those behaviors which seem critical to the success or failure of a
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This research method was an outgrowth of studies in the Aviation Psychology Program of the United States Army Air Forces during World War II in which the originator, John C. Flanagan, participated. The method was used to determine those behaviors which were critical to the success of failure of a variety of military activities such as pilot competence, bombing missions, and combat leadership. After the observations were completed and recorded, the behaviors were classified within an inductively determined classification system under the two major headings of "effective" and "ineffective." Interpretation of the results was determined by the practical use of the data for which each study was intended.

Between 1944 and 1954, Flanagan and his collaborators developed and utilized the critical incident technique. At the close of World War II, some of the psychologists who had participated in the U.S.A.A.F. Aviation Psychology Program established the American Institute for Research, a non-profit scientific and educational organization. Flanagan and others at the Institute further systematized the technique by conducting studies for the Navy and for industry.

---

80 Ibid., p. 329.
81 Ibid., p. 330.
Extensive literature is available regarding the use of the critical incident technique. Although findings in diverse areas may have little relevance to the present study, valuable insight can be gained as to the validity and feasibility of this research method.

The Association of American Medical Colleges (1968) used the critical incident technique to develop a comprehensive classification of the activities of physicians which were judged, by competent specialists, to be causally related to either beneficial or detrimental patient care. The purpose of this classification was to facilitate the subsequent development of criteria and instruments for assessing the performance of physicians. Clinical faculty members of twenty medical schools in fourteen states participated in this study. These physicians were asked to describe, in detail, three effective and three ineffective incidents of physician performance. The 12,886 descriptions of critical physician performance generated an inductive classification system. The authors felt the results of this study were most useful in the planning and evaluation of pre- and post-medical degree programs, including continuing education programs.

The critical incident technique was used in a study conducted in a Los Angeles community program in 1968 for serious male delinquents which sought to determine staff-inmate collaboration. Ninety-nine

boys and five staff members were interviewed to explore the facets of crisis behavior. Incidents included violations of the law as well as conflicts between the inmates and the community. The purpose of the study was to determine the amount of staff-inmate collaboration utilized to resolve these crises. Results of the study indicated that inmates and staff willingly shared information regarding problem behavior. Furthermore, the emergent "culture" of the program was increasingly effective as a social control mechanism. 83

More pertinent to the present study is the research conducted in the area of education, specifically focusing upon the supervisory role. Cheesebrough (1971) used the critical incident technique to study the effectiveness of the college supervisor in the student teaching program. He collected data from student teachers and cooperating teachers at three institutions. Some of the conclusions drawn from the reported critical incidents were that: 1) the respondents desired specific technical assistance for the improvement of teaching style, classroom control, and pupil-teacher relationships; 2) the college supervisor is expected to exhibit positive personal characteristics; 3) the college supervisor is expected to assume an active role in developing and maintaining good interpersonal relationships among

the student teaching participants. 84

Kruger (1977) collected critical incidents from special education student teachers affiliated with six colleges in Pennsylvania. The reported incidents illustrated both helpful and deleterious supervisory behaviors of their college supervisors. The three major categories drawn from the data were: 1) the helping capacity of the supervisor, 2) the professional manner and conduct of the supervisor, 3) the rating capacity of the supervisor. As a result of this study, the researchers recommended increased numbers of observational visits to the classroom and increased supervisor involvement in the construction of daily lesson plans. In addition, the findings indicated a need for a more considerate and courteous manner of entering the classroom for observation. 85

Sellers (1972) used the critical incident technique to study the nature and source of critical job satisfiers and dissatisfiers affecting classroom teachers, grades one through twelve, in the public schools of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. The five satisfiers most frequently reported by this group of teachers were: 1) recognition for teacher achievement, 2) student achievement, 3) affection, 4) teacher

84 Dean Cheesebrough, "Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of the College Supervisor as Perceived by Elementary Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers," (Ph.D. dissertation, Miami University, 1971).

achievement, and 5) recognition for student achievement. The reported sources of these satisfiers, in decreasing order of importance, were students, parents, administration, and former students. The three dissatisfiers most frequently reported were perceived denigration, organizational impingements, and a sense of disappointment. The sources of these dissatisfiers, in order of importance, were administration, parents, and peers. The author notes that the school administration was the source of approximately six times as many dissatisfying incidents as satisfying incidents. 86

A study by Lee (1974) attempted to determine if differences existed in teachers and principals' perceptions of supervisory functions. Utilizing the critical incident technique in questionnaire format, the researcher also examined the variables of sex, tenure status, years of classroom teaching experience, and teaching level. Results indicated that none of these variables made a statistically significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. Lee notes that more ineffective than effective incidents were reported in the category of staff relations. This may indicate an area of needed growth. 87


The determination of supervisory behaviors which teachers of exceptional children perceive to be critical in their classroom functioning was the focus of a study conducted by DiJohnson (1970). Flanagan's critical incident technique, in questionnaire format, was used to gather the data from special education teachers in Florida. The sample included teachers of intellectually disabled, physically handicapped, and emotionally disturbed students. The relationship of background factors such as age, area of handicap taught, training, experience, and certification to the incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors was examined. The supervisory behaviors, as reported by the teachers, were classified within a modified version of Blumberg's system of categorization. Teachers reported the highest number of supervisory behaviors in the category of "establishing a wholesome climate." The need for technical assistance was also highly evidenced.

In relating the supervisory behaviors to the variables studied, the factors of age, experience, area taught, and certification status appeared to significant. A greater number of younger teachers reported ineffective supervisory behaviors in the relationship category, while a greater number of older teachers reported supervisors as ineffective resource people. Teachers with the least experience appear to find ineffective supervisory behaviors in the category of "information giving" as a serious problem, as do teachers of the intellectually disabled. Both certified and non-certified teachers appeared concerned, to a significant degree, about "ineffective climate"
created by the supervisor. When supervisory behaviors were studied in terms of the official role designations of the supervisor, little difference was noted by the teachers in the functioning of the special education supervisor and the regular education supervisor, however, the former appeared to be more efficient in the area of "information giving."

The major finding of this study was that these special education teachers felt their supervisors needed to develop appropriate skills toward establishing favorable social-emotional climates. Furthermore, the technical knowledge of the supervisor should reflect classroom expertise specific to the education of exceptional children. 88

Corbally (1956) endorsed the use of the critical incident technique in educational research. This author cautions the researcher to limit the scope of a study utilizing this methodology and to utilize a team of trained observers if feasible. Corbally states that the technique offers an outstanding method of studying a task in terms of the behavior of those engaged in the task. Furthermore, it provides recommendations which can be utilized immediately by practitioners in the field. 89


Andersson and Nilsson (1964) conducted a study specifically designed to judge the reliability and validity of the critical incident technique. The purpose of the study was to determine the job and training requirements of selected grocery store managers in Sweden. Approximately 1,900 critical incidents, pertaining to the behavior of store managers, were collected from store employees and customers. The reliability and validity aspects examined were:

1. Comprehensiveness of data collection
2. Reliability of data collection
3. Reliability of categorization procedure
4. Validity of behavioral categories
5. Validity of behavioral sub-categories

The critical incident technique successfully withstood these tests and was, therefore, judged to be a reliable and valid method of data collection.90

A more recent assessment of the validity and reliability of the critical incident technique was completed by Ronan and Latham (1974). These researchers evaluated the critical incident technique with regard to three measures of reliability and four measures of validity. The purpose of this study was to assess the job performance of a group of pulpwood producers in the southern states. Results were

---

in agreement with Andersson and Nilsson's (1964) finding that the reliability and content validity of the critical incident technique were satisfactory. In addition, construct validity and the relevance of the critical behaviors to the success or failure of the job were also judged to be satisfactory. 91

Summary

The critical incident technique is a procedure for collecting observations of specific behaviors as they are related to the performance of a particular task. This research method was originally developed by John C. Flanagan, primarily for military use, during World War II.

The critical incident technique has been used extensively in various disciplines including education, medicine, and law enforcement, to name only a few. The results of reliability and validity studies of this technique have been positive, indicating that the critical incident technique is a reliable and valid method of data collection.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The method of research is presented in this chapter. The utilization of the critical incident technique and the application of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory are discussed. The procedures for conducting the study and the methods of data analysis are also presented.

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 112 special education teachers and ten teacher consultants employed by the Northern Suburban Special Education District (NSSED).

These special educators teach the NSSED self-contained classes housed in regular school buildings attended by non-handicapped students. The students served by these teachers range in age from three to twenty-one and represent the following areas of exceptionality: educationally mentally handicapped, developmentally delayed, hearing impaired, visually impaired, behavior disordered, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, and physically handicapped. The ten teacher consultants supervise one or more of these areas of exceptionality. This sample represents the population of the special education teachers of self-contained classes housed in regular school buildings employed by NSSED.
Collection of Data

To obtain information from the special education teachers, a questionnaire was utilized. Each of the teacher consultants participated in an in-depth interview.

Questionnaire

The research instrument was divided into three parts (see Appendix A). Each special education teacher was asked to provide:

Part 1: Demographic information including:
   Educational background
   Number of years teaching experience
   Tenure status
   Teaching experience with non-handicapped students
   Major handicapping condition of the students

Part 2: Narrative description of instances of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. In addition to describing the behaviors, the respondents were asked to indicate, on a continuum, the strength and duration of their positive or negative feelings toward their supervisor and/or job as a result of this incident.

Part 3: Listing of important personal characteristics and/or professional competencies of an effective supervisor in special education

A statement as to the purpose of the study and specific instructions for completion of Part 2 of the questionnaire were included. Effective supervisory behavior was defined as supervisory behavior
which the teacher perceived as helpful. Ineffective supervisory behavior was defined as supervisory behavior which the teacher perceived as not helpful.

Pilot Study

The questionnaire was field tested with nine special education teachers not included in the sample. These teachers submitted ample and detailed accounts of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior which indicated to the researcher that the questions and instructions were sufficiently clear. No major changes were made in the research instrument as a result of this pilot study.

As anticipated, however, some modification of Herzberg's motivation/hygiene factor classification was required in order to accommodate the categorization of the incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior as reported by these teachers. The specific changes are outlined in detail in a later section of this chapter. Sergiovanni (1967) reports a similar modification of Herzberg's classification in applying this theory to teachers.  

Interview

The ten NSSED teacher consultants participated in an in-depth interview (see Appendix B). This interview focused on the following

---

aspects of supervision:

1. Educational background
2. Professional experience within and outside of special education
3. Favorable and unfavorable aspects of the job of supervision
4. Personal characteristics and professional competencies requisite of the supervisor in special education
5. Recommendation for improving the field
6. Supervisory perception of special education teachers' needs and wants

In developing the interview schedule a combination of the interview guide and standardized open-ended interview approaches (Patton, 1980) was judged to be appropriate. This method disciplines the interviewer to focus on specific areas while allowing flexibility in probing emergent concepts. The open-endedness of the questions allows the respondents to reply in the way they choose as opposed to adjusting their responses to a pre-determined category.

Critical Incident Technique

Flanagan's critical incident technique has been demonstrated to be a useful approach in the gathering of descriptive data. The critical incident technique was selected for this study as it provides a format for collecting examples of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors from special education teachers.

---

Flanagan (1954) emphasized that the critical incident technique does not consist of a single rigid set of rules governing data collection. Rather, it should be thought of as a flexible set of principles which must be modified and adapted to meet the specific situation at hand.

Flanagan offers five guidelines for implementing the critical incident technique:

1. **Statement of General Aim:** Flanagan stresses the importance of including a brief statement of the objective of the study to the participants.

2. **Plans and Specifications for Observation:** Flanagan instructs the researcher to be very clear in the instructions to the participants as to "who" and "what" they are to observe.

3. **Collecting the Data:** A variety of methods are suggested for collection of the data. Interviews, mailed questionnaires, direct observations, and combinations of the above have proven successful.

4. **Analysis of the Data:** Behaviors obtained from the data are classified within an appropriate categorization scheme. In selecting the classification system, the principal consideration should be the use that is to be made of the data. The classification can be ascertained inductively from the data or an established classification scheme can be applied to the data.

---

5. **Interpreting and Reporting**: In interpreting the results, the researcher needs to avoid faulty generalization while simultaneously emphasizing the value of this qualitative data.

**Motivation-Hygiene Theory**

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory was selected as the classification system for the supervisory behaviors on the basis of its compatibility with the nature and purpose of the investigation. This theory delineates factors associated with employees' reports of satisfying and dissatisfying experiences on the job. The following is a general description of each factor as outlined by Herzberg et al. in their original study.⁴ The specific behavioral delineations used in the analysis of their data can be found in Appendix C. As these categories were originally developed in the area of industry, some modifications were necessary in order to apply this classification scheme to special education teachers and supervisors. Specifically, six first-level factors and one second-level factor were expanded.

**First-Level Factors**

Descriptions of concrete events or situations reported by the respondents. Objective element of the situation in which the respondent finds a source for his good or bad feelings about the job.

**Recognition**: Some act of notice, praise or blame is involved. Major criterion was an act of recognition. Also includes negative recognition, i.e., criticism or blame. (For present study, also includes incidents of supervisor supporting teacher.)

---

Achievement: Stories involving some specifically mentioned success, e.g., successful completion of a job, solutions to problems, vindication, seeing the results of one's work. (For present study, also includes mention of a parent conference where a problem resolution was indicated.)

Advancement: Actual change in the status or position of the person within the company (school).

Responsibility: Person reported that he/she derived satisfaction from being given responsibility for his/her own work or for the work of others or being given new responsibility. Also includes stories in which there was a loss of satisfaction stemming from a lack of responsibility. (For present study, also includes reported incidents of supervisor failing to assume appropriate responsibility or assuming more responsibility than is appropriate or desired. Also includes supervisor's failure to follow through on stated plans or promises. Stories of teacher assuming more responsibility than appropriate or desired are also included in this category.)

Work Itself: Respondent mentioned the actual doing of the job or the tasks of the job as a source of good or bad feelings.

Salary: Sequences of events in which compensation plays a role.

Possibility of Growth: Respondent reported changes in his/her situation involving objective evidence that the possibilities for his/her growth were now increased or decreased. Also includes situations where respondent is able to learn new skills in order to grow professionally.

Interpersonal Relations: Stories which emphasized the characteristics of the interaction between two persons. Mention of friendly or unfriendly relations or a willingness or lack of willingness to listen to suggestions. (For present study, also includes incidents where an issue of confidentiality was involved as well as instances of positive or negative communication. The presence or absence of "diplomacy" by the supervisor or parent conferences where the resolution to a problem was not indicated would be included in this category. Stories of the supervisor contradicting or reinforcing the teacher in the presence of students were also included.)
Technical Supervision: Technical competence or incompetence of the supervisor would be classified in this category. (For present study, also includes placement of students, classroom observation by supervisor, professional evaluations, and assistance in the technical aspects of teaching handicapped children, i.e., lesson planning, individualized education plans, curriculum assistance, and methods of behavioral management of the students.)

Company Policy and Administration: Some over-all aspect of the company (school) is involved. Instances where lines of communication or personnel policies, inadequate organization or management are involved are placed in this category. (For present study, also includes the scheduling of classes and school-related activities.)

Working Conditions: Stories in which the physical conditions of work, the amount of work or the facilities available for doing the work were mentioned.

Factors in Personal Life: Stories in this category noted that some aspect of the job affected personal life in such a way that the effect was a factor in the respondent's feelings about his job.

Status: Respondent mentioned some sign or appurtenance of status as being a factor in his feelings about his job.

Job Security: Objective signs of presence or absence of job security, e.g., tenure or company stability.

Second-Level Factors

Factors derived from the respondent's perceptions of each reported incident. Second-level factors provide categories for the respondent's answers to probe questions about his reasons for feeling as he did about the incident.

Recognition: Feeling of recognition or failure to obtain recognition.
Achievement: Feeling of achievement or failure.

Advancement: Feeling of advancement or demotion derived from changes in job situation.

Responsibility: Feeling of responsibility, lack of responsibility, or diminished responsibility.

Work Itself: Feeling of interest or lack of interest in the performance of the job.

Possible Growth: Feeling of possible growth or block to growth or first-level factor perceived as evidence of growth.

Group Feeling: Feeling of belonging or isolation, socio-technical or purely social.

Status: Feeling of increased or decreased status.

Security: Feeling of increased or decreased security. (For present study, also includes feeling of "security" stemming from appropriate intervention of supervisor with parent or mainstream teacher and also the converse.)

Salary: Feelings about salary as source of improvement of well-being.

Pride/Shame: Feeling of pride, inadequacy, shame, or guilt.

Fairness/Unfairness: First-level factor perceived as fair or unfair.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated in this study:

1. Is there a relationship between type of supervision (effective/ineffective) and Herzberg's factors?

2. Is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role (special education supervisor or principal) and type of supervision?
3. Within type of supervisory behavior (effective), is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and Herzberg's factors?

4. Within type of supervisory behavior (ineffective), is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and Herzberg's factors?

5. Is the perception of effective supervisory behavior related to the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher?

6. Is the perception of ineffective supervisory behavior related to the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher?

7. Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the tenure status of the respondents and Herzberg's factors?

8. Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the tenure status of the respondents and Herzberg's factors?

9. Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the handicapping condition of the students and Herzberg's factors?

10. Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the handicapping condition of the students and Herzberg's factors?
11. After experiencing an effective supervisory incident which resulted in a positive attitude, how long did the teacher maintain that positive attitude toward his/her supervisor and/or job?

12. After experiencing an ineffective supervisory incident which resulted in a negative attitude, how long did the teacher maintain that negative attitude toward his/her supervisor and/or job?

13. How is the "duration of attitude" factor related to the motivation and hygiene factors?

14. After experiencing an ineffective supervisory incident, how strong is the feeling of the teacher?

15. After experiencing an effective supervisory incident, how strong is the feeling of the teacher?

16. How does the "intensity of feeling" factor compare principals with special education supervisors?

17. How is the "intensity of feeling" factor related to the motivation and hygiene factors?

18. Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and Herzberg's factors?

19. Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and Herzberg's factors?

**Procedures**

A questionnaire, self-addressed stamped envelope, and cover letter (see Appendix D) were sent to the teachers at their school
addresses. Each questionnaire was coded to assist in the follow-up mailing. Two weeks later, a second questionnaire, self-addressed stamped envelope, and cover letter (see Appendix E) were sent to the teachers who had not responded to the initial request. Four weeks later, the researcher contacted twenty teachers by phone, selected on a random basis, to thank them for their participation in the study and to urge them to return the questionnaire if they had not done so already.

Seventy-six (76) of the 112 questionnaires, or 68 percent, were returned to the researcher. There were four parts to the questionnaire:

1. Demographic information
2. Incident of effective supervisory behavior
3. Incident of ineffective supervisory behavior
4. Open-ended listing of professional competencies and/or personality characteristics

Table 2 indicates how each questionnaire was handled by the respondents.

Each of the ten teacher consultants was contacted by phone and asked if they would participate in an in-depth interview for this study. The researcher met with the teacher consultants, individually, at their offices. All interviews were tape recorded with the interviewee's permission.

**Analysis of Data**

Upon receipt of the questionnaires and completion of the interviews, the task of coding and analyzing the data was undertaken. For purposes of analysis, the data were divided into three sections:
## TABLE 2
TREATMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Completed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic information</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended listing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Completed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic information</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended listing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Completed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended listing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Returned Blank Questionnaire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Did Not Return Questionnaire</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) the critical incidents and demographic information, (2) listing of characteristics and competencies, and (3) interviews with teacher consultants.

Critical Incidents

A frequency tabulation was recorded of the responses to the demographic questions. These frequencies were used later in the analysis of eight of the research questions.

The next step was to code the narrative stories of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior into the modified motivation/hygiene factors. Referring to the narrative portion of Part 2 of the questionnaire (Appendix A), the respondents were asked to:

1. describe an effective and ineffective supervisory behavior in detail and,

2. indicate why they felt this incident was effective or ineffective.

Each response was reviewed separately by the researcher. As a result of the reading of the first question, the incident was coded for one or more first-level factors. As a result of the reading of the second question, the incident was coded for one or more second-level factors. In the final stage of coding, each incident was assigned to either the motivation or hygiene category based upon the predominating factors. Two judges assisted the researcher in coding the data. If two of the three coders agreed to assign an incident into a category, it was coded in that way.
A frequency tabulation was recorded of the responses to Questions Number 5 and Number 6 of the questionnaire. These questions asked the respondents to estimate the duration and strength of their feelings about these incidents.

To assess the significance of relationships between data, the chi square statistic was utilized. Popham (1975) describes the chi square test as one of the most serviceable analyses used by statisticians. This technique can be employed to contrast two or more groups with respect to nominal classification data. The chi square test can be used to test whether significant differences exist between an observed number falling into each category and an expected number for that same category.

In order to determine the observed frequency, a frequency tabulation was derived for each of the variables being examined. In order to determine the expected frequency, the rows and columns of frequency cells must be sub-totaled. The proportion of row (where the individual cell is located) sub-total to over-all total is multiplied by the column sub-total. This computation is repeated to obtain the expected frequency for each cell.

The observed and expected frequencies were placed in the appropriate frequency cells for each of the research questions. The appropriate chi square test was then applied:

---

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{(|\text{Observed Frequency} - \text{Expected Frequency}| - 0.5)^2}{\text{Expected Frequency}} \]

For a 2 X 2 contingency table where there is one degree of freedom (df=1), Yates' correction for continuity must be employed (-0.5). To use this correction, a value of 0.5 is subtracted from the absolute value of the numerator contribution of each cell to the chi square formula.\(^6\)

The obtained value of chi square was then compared to the table of probability values based on the chi square distribution. If the obtained value of chi square exceeded the critical value indicated for one degree of freedom at the 0.05 level of probability, then it can be assumed that a statistically significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies for the categories in question. If the obtained value of chi square is less than the critical value indicated, then it can be assumed that no statistically significant difference exists between the observed and expected frequencies.

Characteristics and Competencies

Each of the 112 teachers was asked to list five personal characteristics and/or professional competencies of the supervisor in order of importance. Each of the five responses was placed on an individual 3 X 5 card with its accompanying ranking by the teacher (i.e.,

---

1, 2, 3, 4, or 5). The cards were sorted into five piles representing the five rankings. Within each pile, the cards were compared, as much as possible and appropriate, within the ranking pile. The results are reported as percentage frequency within each ranking.

Interviews

The standardized question format allowed the researcher to analyze the data in a systematic fashion most similar to the constant comparative method as described by Glaser. Any type of concept, motif, or idea as expressed by the teacher consultant was noted and transferred to a 3 X 5 card. Simultaneously, a process of coding the data was undertaken. Once a particular concept was identified (e.g., need for support structure), each subsequent concept was compared with the original concept for similarity of motif. If it was judged to be another example of the same concept, a check (✓) was made on that 3 X 5 card. If the new concept did not further exemplify the original concept, another 3 X 5 card was started. All of the responses to the same questions were analyzed and coded in this manner. When the cards were completed for a particular question, a second phase of delimiting the data was undertaken. This involved the combining of similar concepts. Each question with its associated response attitudes and concepts, as expressed by the teacher consultants, was compiled and presented.

---

Summary

A four-part questionnaire was mailed to 112 special education teachers. Sixty-eight (68) percent of the questionnaires were returned to the researcher. Ten teacher consultants participated in an in-depth interview.

A frequency tabulation of the responses to the demographic questions and the listing of professional competencies and personality characteristics was recorded. The narrative stories of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior were coded into the modified motivation-hygiene factors. The chi square statistic was utilized to assess the significance of relationships between data. The supervisory interviews received a qualitative analysis.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The information obtained from the questionnaires and interviews are presented and analyzed in this chapter. The material is organized into four parts:

Motivation/Hygiene Factors

An analysis of the frequency of occurrence of Herzberg’s first- and second-level motivation/hygiene factors in incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior is presented.

Research Questions

The nineteen research questions of this study are presented, followed by a statistical analysis and discussion of each question.

Characteristics/Competencies

The respondents were asked to indicate preferable personality characteristics and professional competencies of the special education supervisor. The results and analysis of these open-ended responses are presented.

Interviews

A qualitative analysis of the in-depth interviews with the teacher consultants composes the final portion of this chapter.
Motivation/Hygiene Factors

First-Level Factors

Tables 3 and 4 present the percentage frequency of occurrence of each of the motivation and hygiene factors as first-level factors, within incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. The first-level factors provide an objective description of the concrete events or situations reported by the respondents.

The first-level factors of recognition, achievement, and responsibility were the only motivation factors mentioned by the special education teachers. Although these factors were mentioned in both effective and ineffective supervisory incidents, it is clear that these motivators were coupled with incidents of effective supervisory behavior more frequently than incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. This finding is consistent with Herzberg's research which indicated that the motivators contribute substantially more to job satisfaction than job dissatisfaction.

The single exception to this trend is the factor of responsibility which appeared in 14 percent of the ineffective supervisory incidents and only 1 percent of the effective supervisory incidents. These stories described incidents when the special education supervisor failed to follow through on a stated area of responsibility or attempted to secure an inappropriate responsibility as perceived by the special education teacher. Although the difference in percentage frequency of occurrence of this factor in effective and ineffective supervisory incidents is small, this may be a subtle indication of the crux of the problem, i.e., an ill-defined supervisory role.
TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH MOTIVATION FACTOR
IN INCIDENTS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR (FIRST-LEVEL FACTORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective Supervisory Behavior</th>
<th>Effective Supervisory Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective Supervisory Behavior</td>
<td>Effective Supervisory Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of Growth</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>Possibility of Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Supervision</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Policy/Administration</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The other motivation factors of *work itself* and *advancement* were not mentioned as first-level factors by the special education teachers. As this study focused specifically upon the behavior of the supervisor, and not the teacher, the factor of the work itself would logically not be mentioned in these incidents. The concept of advancement, i.e., change of position or promotion, is oftentimes not a goal for the classroom teacher. Although a teacher's assignment, level, students or area of responsibility may change from year to year, the teacher still retains the status of a classroom teacher and, therefore, it is not surprising that *advancement* is not mentioned by these teachers.

The first-level hygiene factors of *interpersonal relations* and *technical supervision* appeared in the majority of both effective and ineffective incidents. To a great extent, these factors appeared in tandem, suggesting a close relationship between these two factors. Many of the stories related by these teachers described a situation in which the supervisor, although possessing a high degree of technical knowledge and skill, was unable to communicate this knowledge with any interpersonal agility.

Any supervisory role, by necessity and definition, involves a great deal of interaction with other persons. It is, therefore, not surprising to find an almost equal frequency of occurrence of *interpersonal relations* in incidents of both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. The factor of *technical supervision* appeared with greater frequency in incidents of effective supervisory behavior.
This is a clear indication that technical supervision is a highly valued skill for these teachers of handicapped children. To the extent that the field of special education is highly technically oriented and requires a great deal of specialized knowledge and training, the frequency of occurrence of technical supervision in these incidents is consistent with this professional area of endeavor.

The hygiene factors of school policy/administration and working conditions were mentioned in a few, mostly ineffective, supervisory incidents. These stories focused on teachers' assigned schedules and complaints pertaining to the amount of work required by the teacher.

Other hygiene factors not mentioned by these special education teachers included possibility of growth, status, salary, job security, and personal life. The previous discussion on advancement for the classroom teacher also serves to account for the absence of the factors of possibility of growth and status. Teachers are paid on a fixed salary schedule and, therefore, a supervisor would have no input regarding a teacher's salary. Similarly, job security is dependent upon the tenure status of the teacher. An administrator would have more involvement in the determination of tenure status than the supervisor. Again, as this study is focused upon supervisory behavior and not teacher behavior, factors in the teacher's personal life would not be mentioned.

In summary, the first-level hygiene factors of technical supervision and interpersonal relations contributed significantly to both effective and ineffective supervisory incidents. The motivation factors of
achievement and recognition contributed more to effective supervisory behavior than ineffective supervisory behavior. The motivation factor of responsibility and the hygiene factor of school policy/administration contributed more to ineffective supervisory incidents than effective supervisory incidents.

The following tables present the percentage frequency of occurrence of each of the motivation and hygiene factors as first-level factors within incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior.

Second-Level Factors

Tables 5 and 6 present the percentage frequency of occurrence of each of the second-level factors in incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. The second-level factors, derived from the respondents' perceptions of each reported incident, provided categories for answers to probe questions about their reasons for feeling as they did about the incidents.

Regarding the motivation factors, the pattern of frequency of occurrence is almost identical to the first-level factors, i.e., the motivation factors are more frequently mentioned in instances of effective supervisory behavior than instances of ineffective supervisory behavior. Again, the factor of responsibility is noted in more instances of ineffective supervisory behavior. One difference in the second-level factors is the appearance of the factor of the work itself which was mentioned in 10 percent of the supervisory stories. In these instances, teachers indicated that something the supervisor did, categorized as a first-level factor, e.g., interpersonal relations or
### TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH MOTIVATION FACTOR IN INCIDENTS OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR (SECOND-LEVEL FACTORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective Supervisory Behavior</th>
<th>Effective Supervisory Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>Work Itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective Supervisory Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Growth</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Feeling</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfairness</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
technical supervision, led the teacher to have an increased interest in the job or the work itself.

The hygienes as second-level factors, were more strongly associated with instances of ineffective supervisory behavior with some exception. The factors of group feeling, possible growth, and security for these teachers, contributed equally to instances of both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. In these instances, the teacher reported a situation where, due to the beneficial technical supervision or interpersonal relations or recognition shown by the supervisor, the teacher perceived professional growth or increased positive feelings among the faculty to be a result. In a few instances the teachers reported feeling more secure in themselves and in their jobs when their supervisor intervened in situations involving a particularly difficult parent or another staff member.

There was a relatively high incidence (46 percent) of supervisory behavior which the teachers perceived as unfair. These situations were most often incidents which were coded as a first-level factor of ineffective interpersonal relations. In these stories, the teachers expressed the feeling that their supervisor had acted inconsistently with different staff members or the supervisor had failed to provide the teacher with sufficient explanation of a decision that was made. It can be noted that there were no incidents which the teachers perceived as fair. Incidents which were coded as first-level effective interpersonal relations were perceived by these teachers as instances of achievement or recognition, as opposed to an example of fair supervisory behavior.
The following tables present the percentage frequency of occurrence of each of the second-level factors in incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. Table 5 presents the frequency of occurrence of the motivators and Table 6 presents the frequency of occurrence of the hygiene factors.

Research Questions

The following pages contain the presentation and analysis of the nineteen research questions of this study. Table 7 presents each research question and an indication of its statistical significance as defined by a chi square analysis.

The questions are presented separately, followed by a frequency tabulation, results of statistical analysis, and a narrative analysis of the results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Value of Chi Square</th>
<th>Significance/Level of Probability</th>
<th>Coefficient of Contingency(C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a relationship between type of supervision (effective/ineffective) and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>8.840</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role (special education supervisor or principal) and type of supervision?</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the perception of effective supervisory behavior related to the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher?</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Value of Chi Square</td>
<td>Significance/Level of Probability</td>
<td>Coefficient of Contingency(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the perception of ineffective supervisory behavior related to the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher?</td>
<td>16.080</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the tenure status of the respondents and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the tenure status of the respondents and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the handicapping condition of the students and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>8.140</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the handicapping condition of the students and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Value of Chi Square</td>
<td>Significance/Level of Probability</td>
<td>Coefficient of Contingency(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After experiencing an <strong>effective</strong> supervisory incident which resulted in a positive attitude, how long did the teacher maintain that positive attitude toward supervisor and/or job?</td>
<td>8.800</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After experiencing an <strong>ineffective</strong> supervisory incident which resulted in a negative attitude, how long did the teacher maintain that negative attitude toward supervisor and/or job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the &quot;duration of attitude&quot; factor related to the motivation and hygiene factors?</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After experiencing an <strong>ineffective</strong> supervisory incident, how strong is the feeling of the teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After experiencing an <strong>effective</strong> supervisory incident, how strong is the feeling of the teacher?</td>
<td>17.530</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Value of Chi Square</td>
<td>Significance/ Level of Probability</td>
<td>Coefficient of Contingency(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the &quot;intensity of feeling&quot; factor compare principals with special education supervisors?</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the &quot;intensity of feeling&quot; factor related to the motivation and hygiene factors?</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within effective supervisory behavior is there a relationship between teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within ineffective supervisory behavior is there a relationship between teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and Herzberg's factors?</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following key provides an explanation of the numbers appearing in the chi square 2 X 2 tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obtained Frequency</th>
<th>Expected Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(18.2) 26 37%</td>
<td>(16.2) 9 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51.1) 44 63%</td>
<td>(45.2) 53 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N 70 100%</td>
<td>Total N 62 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N 132 100%</td>
<td>Total N 132 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Is there a relationship between type of supervision (effective/ineffective) and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>(51.1)</td>
<td>(45.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 8.84 is significant at the 0.01 level of probability.

There is a relationship between Herzberg's factors and the effectiveness of special education supervision as evidenced by a statistically significant chi square value.

The motivation factors, when mentioned, were associated with incidents of effective supervisory behavior significantly more often than they were associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. Seventy-four (74) percent of the stories in which motivation factors were mentioned were incidents of effective supervisory behavior. Twenty-six (26) percent of the stories in which motivation factors were mentioned were incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. This finding is consistent with Herzberg's premise that the motivators contribute.
substantially to job satisfaction but very little to dissatisfaction.

The hygiene factors, when mentioned, were associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior slightly more often than they were associated with incidents of effective supervisory behavior. The hygiene factors were included in 63 percent of the effective supervisory incidents and 85 percent of the ineffective supervisory incidents. This finding lends some support to Herzberg's thesis that the hygienes contribute substantially to job dissatisfaction but very little to job satisfaction. Over-all, the hygiene factors were mentioned more than twice as often as the motivation factors in incidents of both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior.

The stories of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior, as related by the special education teachers, contained an overwhelming emphasis on the hygiene factors of technical supervision and interpersonal relations. Reference was made to these two factors in almost three-fourths of the stories. This finding may be an indication of the supervisory needs of teachers working with impaired children. The technical skill and emotional detachment requisite of special educators in the classroom may need to be balanced by effective supervision of technical skill areas and positive interpersonal rapport. It is important to note, however, that these stories are limited to incidents of supervisory behavior already experienced by these special education teachers and, therefore, the factors alluded to do not necessarily constitute the most desired aspects of supervisory behavior.
2. Is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and type of supervision?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(8.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>(59.5)</td>
<td>(52.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 0.311 is not statistically significant.

The respondents were asked to specify the title of the supervisor in order to determine if any relationship exists between the effectiveness of supervision and the occupational role of the supervisor. All of the supervisory titles obtained could be categorized as equivalent to a building principal or a special education supervisor. As indicated by the results of this study, there does not appear to be a relationship between the effectiveness of special education supervision and the professional role of the supervisor.

Of the 132 supervisory incidents reported, the special education supervisor was named in 113 incidents and the principal was named in nineteen (19) incidents.
Forty-seven (47) percent of the incidents involving a principal were noted as effective supervisory behavior. Fifty-three (53) percent of the incidents involving a principal were noted as ineffective supervisory behavior. The same pattern was found for the special education supervisor. Fifty-four (54) percent of the incidents involving a special education supervisor were noted as effective supervisory behavior. Forty-six (46) percent of the incidents involving a special education supervisor were noted as ineffective supervisory behavior.

The fact that the special education supervisor was named in 86 percent of the supervisory incidents clearly indicates that the special education teachers identify the specialist as the primary source of supervision. This is consistent with the previous finding that these teachers value the technical aspect of supervision. It should be noted, however, that other non-technical factors, i.e., responsibility, recognition, achievement, and interpersonal relations were cited in these supervisory incidents with the special education supervisor. It may be concluded that these special education teachers view the supervisor's role as the source of both technical consultation and professional motivation, but that no distinction between principal and special education supervisor, vis-a-vis effective or ineffective behaviors, has been discovered.
3. Within effective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>(3.12)</td>
<td>(5.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>(22.62)</td>
<td>(38.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 0.056 is not statistically significant.

4. Within ineffective supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between supervisory occupational role and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
<td>(8.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>(7.47)</td>
<td>(43.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 0.875 is not statistically significant.
As already noted in the analysis of the first research question, the motivation factors, when mentioned, were associated with incidents of effective supervisory behavior significantly more often than they were associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. The hygiene factors, when mentioned, were associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior slightly more often than they were associated with incidents of effective supervisory behavior.

There does not appear to be any relationship between this pattern and the professional role of the supervisor. Both principals and special education supervisors utilized the motivation factors more frequently in effective supervisory incidents and the hygiene factors more frequently in ineffective supervisory incidents.

It can be noted that the hygiene factors were significantly more prominent in instances of ineffective supervisory behavior for both supervisory roles. They accounted for 100 percent of the principal's ineffective supervisory behavior and 83 percent of the special education supervisor's ineffective supervisory behavior. This finding strongly supports Herzberg's thesis that the hygienes contribute substantially to job dissatisfaction.
5. Is the perception of effective supervisory behavior related to the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.62)</td>
<td>(10.73)</td>
<td>(5.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>(17.98)</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 2.44 is not statistically significant.

6. Is the perception of ineffective supervisory behavior related to the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.08)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.7)</td>
<td>(21.25)</td>
<td>(12.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 16.08 is statistically significant at the 0.001 level of probability.
There does appear to be a relationship between the perception of ineffective supervisory behavior, as related to Herzberg's factors, and the number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher as evidenced by a significant chi square value.

In describing instances of effective supervisory behavior, teachers with less than ten years of experience indicated that both motivation and hygiene factors contributed to supervisory effectiveness almost equally. Teachers with more than ten years of experience, however, cited the hygiene factors in 80 percent of their examples of effective supervisory behavior.

In describing instances of ineffective supervisory behavior, special education teachers with zero to five years of experience and more than ten years of experience focused upon the hygiene factors more often than the motivation factors. This finding was statistically significant at the 0.001 level of probability. The factors most frequently referred to were technical supervision and interpersonal relations. Teachers with five to ten years of experience described incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior which evidenced more of a balance between the motivation and hygiene factors.

These results seem to indicate that the inexperienced special education teacher is motivated by recognition, achievement, and responsibility given by their supervisor. At the same time, these
younger teachers are highly critical of their supervisors if technical aspects of supervision and interpersonal relations are neglected. This finding supports Herzberg's premise that the factors which serve as job satisfiers and job dissatisfiers are separate and distinct.

The veteran special education teacher, on the other hand, is more strongly focused upon the hygiene factors in assessing both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. This may be an indication that these more experienced teachers are no longer seeking motivational factors from the supervisor at this stage in their career or it may indicate that they have not been exposed to the motivators.

Over-all, these results suggest that the supervisory needs of the special education teacher may change over time and, therefore, one specific supervisory style may be more appropriate than another when the years of teaching experience are taken into consideration.
7. Within **effective** supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the tenure status of the teacher and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Non-Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(17.02)</td>
<td>(7.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Non-Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(28.52)</td>
<td>(14.26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100%

Chi square value of 0.307 is not statistically significant.

8. Within **ineffective** supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the tenure status of the teacher and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Non-Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5.46)</td>
<td>(3.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygiene</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Non-Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33.15)</td>
<td>(19.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100%

Chi square value of 0.028 is not statistically significant.
The tenure status of the special education teacher does not appear to be related to the teacher's perception of supervisory behavior as outlined by Herzberg's factors. Both tenured and non-tenured teachers assessed incidents of supervisory behavior in a similar manner.

It can be noted that seven (7) of the forty-six (46) tenured respondents and one (1) of the twenty-four (24) non-tenured respondents did not complete the portion of the questionnaire which asked them to describe an instance of ineffective supervisory behavior.

In the case of the tenured teachers, this may be an indication that ineffective supervisory behavior is less noteworthy to these teachers or it may indicate a reticence to recount the specifics of ineffective supervisory incidents in writing. The non-tenured teachers, on the other hand, tended to be more verbal about incidents of both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior.
9. Within **effective** supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the handicapping condition of the students and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicapping Condition*</th>
<th>BD/ED</th>
<th>HI/VI/PH</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>EMH/DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.03)</td>
<td>(9.62)</td>
<td>(6.66)</td>
<td>(2.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11.78)</td>
<td>(16.12)</td>
<td>(11.16)</td>
<td>(4.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 8.14 is statistically significant at the 0.05 level of probability.

10. Within **ineffective** supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between the handicapping condition of the students and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicapping Condition*</th>
<th>BD/ED</th>
<th>HI/VI/PH</th>
<th>LD</th>
<th>EMH/DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>(2.24)</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.75)</td>
<td>(21.25)</td>
<td>(13.6)</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 1.81 is not statistically significant.
Handicapping Conditions

Behavior Disordered .......................... BD

Emotionally Disturbed ........................ ED

Hearing Impaired ............................. HI

Visually Impaired ............................. VI

Physically Handicapped ........................ PH

Learning Disabled ............................. LD

Educationally Mentally Handicapped ................. EMH

Developmentally Delayed ....................... DD
It appears that the handicapping condition of the students may influence the special education teacher's perception of effective supervisory behavior. The areas of exceptionality represented in this study included learning disabilities, educational mental handicap and developmental delay, behavior disorder and emotional disturbance, and the low incidence handicaps of hearing impairment, visual impairment, and physical handicap.

The special education teachers in this study, in general, referred to the same factors in their stories of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. However, the varying emphasis upon these factors suggests that, at least for these teachers, there may be a preferred supervisory style for different areas of exceptionality.

In assessing instances of effective supervisory behavior, teachers of behavior disordered and emotionally disturbed students referred to the hygiene factors in 63 percent of their stories and the motivation factors in 37 percent of their examples of effective supervision. Teachers of low incidence handicapped students stressed the hygiene factors in 81 percent of their effective stories and noted the motivation factors in only 19 percent of these incidents. Learning disabilities teachers presented the exact opposite pattern of the behavior disordered teachers in noting the motivation factors in 61 percent of their effective stories and the hygiene factors in 39 percent of their effective supervisory incidents. Teachers of
educationally mentally handicapped and developmentally delayed students tended to show more of a balance between the two types of factors in their effective supervisory incidents. These teachers referred to the motivation factors in 43 percent of these stories and the hygiene factors in 57 percent of these effective supervisory incidents.

Supervisory Behavior as Related to Area of Exceptionality

A further analysis of the teachers' assessment of effective supervisory behavior, as shown in Table 8, indicates that teachers of different areas of exceptionality stress different factors. Teachers of the low incidence handicapped stressed the factor of technical supervision (73 percent) more than their colleagues in other handicapping areas. The majority of these teachers were teachers of the hearing impaired. The priority that these teachers place on technical supervision may be in response to the pervasive effect this handicap has upon the child's total development. In many instances the teacher of the hearing impaired is required to master an entirely new communication system. Many of the aspects of this field of special education are highly technically oriented.

Teachers of learning disabled students stressed the factor of interpersonal relations in 63 percent of their stories. This emphasis is in agreement with the majority of all other teachers with the exception of the low incidence handicap teachers who stressed this factor in only 35 percent of their effective supervisory incidents. The learning disabilities teachers stressed the factor of achievement
TABLE 8
EFFECTIVE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR AS RELATED TO AREA OF EXCEPTIONALITY

Learning Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Int. Rel.</th>
<th>Tech. Sup.</th>
<th>ACH.</th>
<th>REC.</th>
<th>POL.</th>
<th>ADMN.</th>
<th>RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Frequency</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Incidence (Hearing Impaired, Visually Impaired, Physically Handicapped)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Int. Rel.</th>
<th>Tech. Sup.</th>
<th>ACH.</th>
<th>REC.</th>
<th>POL.</th>
<th>ADMN.</th>
<th>RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Frequency</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educationally Mentally Handicapped/Developmentally Delayed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Int. Rel.</th>
<th>Tech. Sup.</th>
<th>ACH.</th>
<th>REC.</th>
<th>POL.</th>
<th>ADMN.</th>
<th>RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Frequency</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavior Disorder/Emotionally Disturbed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Int. Rel.</th>
<th>Tech. Sup.</th>
<th>ACH.</th>
<th>REC.</th>
<th>POL.</th>
<th>ADMN.</th>
<th>RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Frequency</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(47 percent) more than any other group of teachers in this study. This may indicate that this group of teachers is more able to realize the results of their efforts with their students. Problems arising in parent conferences were reported to be resolved by the supervisor more frequently by this group of learning disabilities teachers.

Teachers of behavior disordered/emotionally disturbed students noted the factor of **interpersonal relations** in 70 percent of their incidents of effective supervisory behavior. As **interpersonal relations** is the foundation skill in working with these children whose handicap is socially or emotionally based, it is not surprising that these teachers would value that skill in their supervisors. This group of teachers, more than the other groups, stressed the value of open, honest, and supportive communication from their supervisor.

Teachers of educationally mentally handicapped children also stressed the factor of **interpersonal relations** in 71 percent of their stories of effective supervisory behavior. These teachers also valued supportive communication with their supervisors and the diplomacy which their supervisor exercised in parent conferences. This group noted the factor of **recognition** in 28 percent of their stories. This may indicate that these teachers need to be recognized for working with students who learn at a much slower rate than their peers.

In summary, teachers of behavior disordered/emotionally disturbed and educationally mentally handicapped students present highly similar supervisory preferences regarding effective supervisory behavior. It was noted that learning disabilities teachers, although not very
discrepant from this pattern, tended to stress the factor of **achievement** more than their colleagues in the other areas of exceptionality. The low incidence handicap teachers deviated notably from the high **interpersonal relations**, moderate **technical supervision** pattern. This group of teachers stressed the aspect of **technical supervision** in the majority of their stories and did not overemphasize the factor of **interpersonal relations**.

In assessing instances of **ineffective** supervisory behavior, special education teachers were much more unified in their judgment of which factors contributed to these ineffective incidents. All of the teachers, regardless of area of exceptionality, emphasized the hygiene factors in their examples of ineffective supervisory behavior and rarely mentioned the motivation factors in these stories.

Teachers of behavior disordered/emotionally disturbed named the hygienes in 80 percent of their ineffective supervisory incidents and the motivators in only 20 percent of these stories. Similarly, the learning disabilities teachers noted the hygienes in 81 percent of their stories and the motivators in 19 percent of their ineffective incidents. Motivators were noted in ineffective supervisory incidents in only 12 percent of the stories of the low incidence handicap teachers. These teachers noted the hygienes in 88 percent of these incidents. Finally, the teachers of the educationally mentally handicapped/developmentally delayed named the hygienes exclusively in their ineffective supervisory stories.

The factors of **technical supervision** and **interpersonal relations** were mentioned in the majority of these stories of ineffective
supervisory behavior. The primacy of these two factors is a recurrent finding in this study.

The results obtained in response to these questions indicate that these teachers all seem to agree on what constitutes ineffective supervisory behavior. What they judge to be effective supervisory behavior, however, seems to be more specifically related to their individual teaching area of exceptionality.

11. After experiencing an effective supervisory incident which resulted in a positive attitude, how long did the teacher maintain that positive attitude toward supervisor and/or job?

12. After experiencing an ineffective supervisory incident which resulted in a negative attitude, how long did the teacher maintain that negative attitude toward supervisor and/or job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Momentarily/Hours</th>
<th>Days/Weeks</th>
<th>Months/Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(13.78)</td>
<td>(50.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>(4.6)</td>
<td>(11.96)</td>
<td>(44.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 8.80 is statistically significant at the 0.02 level of probability.
Respondents were asked to indicate the duration of their positive/negative feelings toward their supervisor and/or job as a result of each supervisory incident they described. The six categories provided for response to this question were: Momentarily, hours, days, weeks, months, and years.

The results of this study indicate that the positive feelings resulting from effective supervisory behavior lasted longer than the negative feelings elicited by ineffective supervisory behavior. Sixty (60) percent of the stories which elicited attitudinal duration in the category of months/years were examples of effective supervisory behavior. Conversely, 80 percent of the stories which elicited attitudinal duration in the category of momentarily/hours were examples of ineffective supervisory behavior.

These results indicate that effective supervisory behavior has a far more lasting impact than ineffective supervisory behavior. A single instance of effective behavior may overcome many instances of ineffective behavior.

This finding lends some support to Herzberg's finding that the factors which contributed to job satisfaction had a longer duration than the factors which contributed to job dissatisfaction.
13. How is the duration of attitude factor related to the motivation and hygiene factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Momentarily/Hours</th>
<th>Days/Weeks</th>
<th>Months/Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
<td>(7.54)</td>
<td>(27.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼ 1 ▼</td>
<td>▼ 8 ▼</td>
<td>▼ 30 ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼ 10% ▼</td>
<td>▼ 31% ▼</td>
<td>▼ 31% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene</strong></td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(67.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼ 9 ▼</td>
<td>▼ 18 ▼</td>
<td>▼ 66 ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▼ 90% ▼</td>
<td>▼ 69% ▼</td>
<td>▼ 69% ▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 2.03 is not statistically significant.

There was no statistically significant relationship between the duration of attitude and the motivation and hygiene factor classification.

Consistent with previous findings in this study, the motivators, when mentioned, were coupled with a longer duration of attitude. Seventy-seven (77) percent of the stories in which motivators were noted indicated that the positive feelings associated with these incidents were in the duration category of months/years.

Over-all, the hygiene factors were mentioned more frequently in all incidents of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. A large percentage of the stories in which hygienes were mentioned were associated with negative feelings in the months/years duration category.
In the context of the duration of attitude, it can be noted that 90 percent of the stories in the shortest duration category of momentarily/hours focused exclusively upon the hygienes. In other words, when the teachers experienced feelings of short duration resultant of some supervisory incident, these feelings were focused upon the hygiene factors and not the motivators. Again, this lends some support to Herzberg's thesis that the motivators have longer duration than the hygienes.

14. After experiencing an ineffective supervisory incident, how strong is the feeling of the teacher?

15. After experiencing an effective supervisory incident, how strong is the feeling of the teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 17.53 is statistically significant at the 0.001 level of probability.
Respondents were asked to rate the intensity of their positive or negative feelings toward their supervisor and/or job as the result of each supervisory incident. On a scale of 1 to 5, a rating of "1" indicated the least intense feeling and a rating of "5" indicated the most intense feeling.

Results obtained from the special education teachers indicated the intensity of positive feelings associated with incidents of effective supervisory behavior is stronger than the intensity of negative feelings associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. Eighty-six (86) percent of the effective supervisory incidents received an intensity of positive feeling rating of "4" or "5." Forty (40) percent of the ineffective supervisory behaviors received an intensity of negative feeling rating of "1," "2," or "3."

This finding lends support to Herzberg's research on the differentiation of factors associated with job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Although Herzberg did not attempt to measure intensity of feeling of respondents in his studies, this factor provides a similar conceptual measurement. According to the results obtained from the present study, special education teachers were more satisfied with effective supervisory behavior than they were dissatisfied with ineffective supervisory behavior.
16. How does the intensity of feeling factor compare principals with special education supervisors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td>(3.31)</td>
<td>(13.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Supervisor</td>
<td>(10.27)</td>
<td>(19.68)</td>
<td>(83.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 0.518 is not statistically significant.

There was no significant relationship between the intensity of feeling factor and the professional role of the supervisor included in the incident. These teachers did not have more or less intense feelings toward their principal than their special education supervisor.

Of the supervisory incidents involving a principal, both effective and ineffective, 74 percent received an intensity of feeling rating of "4" or "5." Five (5) percent of the incidents involving a principal received a rating of "1" or "2."

Of the supervisory incidents involving a special education supervisor, both effective and ineffective, 73 percent received an intensity of feeling rating of "4" or "5." Ten (10) percent of the incidents
involving a special education supervisor received a rating of "1" or "2."

As noted earlier, special education supervisors were named in 86 percent of the supervisory incidents. Principals were named in 14 percent of these incidents. According to these teachers' responses, they do not experience any difference in intensity of feeling resultant of a supervisory behavior, solely on the basis of the occupational role of the supervisor.

17. How is the intensity of feeling factor related to the motivation and hygiene factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(5.75)</td>
<td>(24.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8% 3%</td>
<td>22% 15%</td>
<td>29% 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>(8.88)</td>
<td>(17.02)</td>
<td>(71.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92% 11%</td>
<td>78% 18%</td>
<td>71% 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 2.67 is not statistically significant.

There does not appear to be any significant relationship between the intensity of feeling and the motivation/hygiene factor classification. These teachers did not appear to have more or less intense
feelings about a supervisory incident solely on the basis of which group of factors were elicited. This finding is consistent with the previously discussed duration of attitude factor.

Again, the motivators, when mentioned, were coupled with a stronger intensity of feeling rating. Eighty-two (82) percent of the stories in which motivators were noted indicated the positive feelings associated with those incidents received an intensity rating of "4" or "5."

A large percentage of the stories in which hygienes were mentioned were associated with negative feelings having an intensity rating of "4" or "5." This finding is not surprising in view of the over-all higher frequency of occurrence of the hygiene factors.

In the context of the intensity of feeling continuum, it can be noted that 92 percent of the stories in the weakest intensity category of "1-2" focused upon the hygienes. In other words, when the teachers experienced feelings of weaker intensity resultant of some supervisory incident, these feelings were focused upon the hygienes and not the motivators.
18. Within **effective** supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Exp. With Non-H/C</th>
<th>No Prior Exp. With Non-H/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>(10.73)</td>
<td>(15.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene</strong></td>
<td>(17.98)</td>
<td>(25.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 0.157 is not statistically significant.

19. Within **ineffective** supervisory behavior, is there a relationship between teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and Herzberg's factors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Exp. With Non-H/C</th>
<th>No Prior Exp. With Non-H/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>(3.64)</td>
<td>(5.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene</strong></td>
<td>(22.1)</td>
<td>(30.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square value of 0.903 is not statistically significant.
Respondents were asked if they had prior teaching experience with non-handicapped students. This question was asked in order to determine whether exclusive teaching experience with handicapped youngsters influenced these teachers' perceptions of supervisory behavior.

Results indicated there was no significant relationship evidenced between the special education teachers' experiences with non-handicapped students and their perceptions of supervisory behavior as related to Herzberg's factors.

In reporting incidents of effective supervisory behavior, 34 percent of the respondents who indicated they had teaching experience with non-handicapped children noted the motivation factors in their stories. The other 66 percent of this group noted the hygienes in their incidents of effective supervisory behavior. Still within effective supervisory behavior, 39 percent of the respondents who indicated no prior teaching experience with non-handicapped students noted the motivation factors in their incidents of effective supervisory behavior. The other 61 percent of this group favored the hygienes in their incidents of effective supervisory behavior.

In reporting incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior, 8 percent of the respondents who indicated they had teaching experience with non-handicapped children noted the motivation factors in their stories. The other 92 percent of this group noted the hygienes in their incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. Nineteen (19) percent
of the respondents who indicated no prior teaching experience with non-handicapped students noted the motivation factors in their incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior. The other 81 percent of this group favored the hygienes in their incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior.

It would appear that prior experience with non-handicapped students has no relationship with the special education teacher's perception of supervisory behavior as related to Herzberg's factors and that exclusive teaching experience with handicapped youngsters does not influence the special education teacher's perception of supervisory behavior.

**Professional Competencies/Personality Characteristics**

In addition to describing instances of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior, the respondents were asked to indicate, in order of importance, five preferable personality characteristics and/or professional competencies of a special education supervisor. These responses represent the ideal characteristics and competencies of the special education supervisor as reported by the special education teachers participating in this study.

These open-ended responses (N = 360) were separated into the major classifications of Professional Competency or Personality Characteristic. Within the larger classification of professional competency, six sub-response categories were identified by matching identical or similar teacher responses. The classification of personality characteristics
was treated as a single category, listing the various personality characteristics mentioned by these teachers.

The classifications and response categories are shown below. Each category is followed by sample remarks which define that grouping of responses.

**Professional Competencies:**

**Support:**

- supportive of teacher's program
- supportive of teacher with parents
- supportive of teacher in staff meetings

**Background/Training/Experience:**

- knowledge of field of special education
- knowledge of field of supervision
- knowledge of child development
- appropriate educational background and training
- teaching experience in special education
- teaching experience in supervisory area of special education

**Technical Assistance Skills:**

- technical knowledge of special education
- competence/expertise
- knowledge of pertinent curricula, materials, and methodologies
- ability to give constructive criticism
- ability to evaluate teacher skill
- ability to provide assistance and advice
- specific knowledge of students in the program
appropriate placement of students
practical suggestions for teachers

Availability/Visibility:
accessibility of the supervisor
classroom observation
visibility in the program
easy to reach when needed

Leadership/Management Skills:
organizational skills
decision-making skills
follow-through
ability to delegate responsibility
responsible
take a stand on an issue
efficient
ability to solve problems
ability to order priorities
knowledge of "administrivia"

Interpersonal Communication Skills:
ability to work with people
ability to give clear directions
maintain contact with parents and teachers
effective parent communication
listening skills
tact/diplomacy
public relations skills

skills of a negotiator

act as effective liaison with school districts

**Personality Characteristics:**

The responses in this category included twenty-seven different personality characteristic mentioned by these special education teachers as desirable for the special education supervisor.

A frequency tabulation of the responses is shown in Table 9. In considering the frequency within each rating classification (1 through 5), it can be noted that support was mentioned most frequently by these teachers as the most important characteristic for a supervisor. Leadership was mentioned most frequently in the second (2) category and also in the third (3) category together with technical assistance. Leadership was again the most frequently mentioned skill in the fourth (4) category followed by technical assistance as the least important area of competence for these teachers.

By examining total frequency responses, a more comprehensive analysis of the data can be obtained. In considering the total number of responses across rating categories, i.e., regardless of the importance rating of 1 through 5, it can be noted that 69 percent of the total number of responses (N = 360) are in the classification of professional competencies and only 31 percent of the total number of responses are in the classification of personality characteristics. This finding indicates that, for these special education teachers, the professional competencies of the supervisor are more important than
TABLE 9
PREFERRED PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION SUPERVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Competency:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background/Training/Experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability/Visibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Characteristics:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine Concern/Sincere/Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm/Friendly/Personable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates highest frequency within that rating classification
TABLE 9--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Minded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Impartial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Importance Rating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Characteristics—Continued:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand Self</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discreet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the supervisor's personality characteristics.

Professional Competencies

Within the larger classification of professional competencies, these teachers did indicate certain preferences. In order to account for the priority which each teacher placed on any particular competency, a weighted score was assigned to each response. Table 10 presents the most preferred professional competencies and personality characteristics for the special education supervisor as expressed by these teachers.

The most important area of supervisory competence, over-all, was leadership receiving the highest weighted score value of 189. The special education teachers placed a high priority on the skills of leadership and management which, as defined in this study, encompass the ability to make a decision, the ability to take a stand on an issue, problem solving skills, the ability to delegate responsibility as well as organizational skills.

The second most important supervisory competence noted by these teachers was interpersonal communication receiving a weighted score value of 142. The category of interpersonal communication included the ability to work with people, listening skills, the ability to be direct and clear, and the social skills of an effective negotiator.

The areas of technical assistance, supervisory training/experience, and support received almost equal attention by these teachers, attaining weighted score values of 128, 123, and 118 respectively. Comments
TABLE 10
MOST PREFERRED PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION SUPERVISOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Total Frequency In All Categories</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Competencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background/Training/Experience</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability/Visibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69 percent of total response:</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm/Friendly/Personable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine Concern/Sincere</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 percent of total response:</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
focusing on the availability/visibility of the supervisor were noted, however, appearing less important to these teachers. This category of responses received a weighted score value of 59.

Personality Characteristics

As noted earlier, the personality characteristics of the supervisor were noted in 31 percent of the responses. No attempt was made to group these responses as the qualitative richness of the words of the respondents would be lost in this process. Also, there did not appear to be any logical classification scheme. Therefore, each response in the category of personality characteristics is listed separately. Within this larger category, five personality characteristics were mentioned in sufficient frequency to warrant comment. Honesty was the personality characteristic mentioned most frequently by these teachers, receiving a weighted score value of 51. Earlier in this chapter, in assessing the frequency of occurrence of Herzberg's second-level factors in supervisory incidents, it was noted that there was a relatively high incidence (46 percent) of supervisory behavior which these teachers perceived as unfair. These situations were most often incidents where the teacher felt the supervisor had acted inconsistently with different staff members. The relative emphasis on honesty as a desirable supervisory characteristic appears to be closely related to this perception of the teachers. Other personality characteristics receiving less but approximately equal attention by these teachers were warmth/friendliness, sensitivity, empathy, and genuine concern.
In analyzing these findings, it can be noted that the special education teachers found the professional competencies of the supervisor to be more than twice as important as the supervisor's personality characteristics. Professional competencies are learned behaviors, whereas personality characteristics are less conducive to formal training. If the most highly valued supervisory skills can be learned, then it is possible to have effective supervisors by teaching these critical skills to them. This finding, clearly, has implications for college and university supervisory training programs.

In defining ideal supervisory requisites, the leadership/management skills and the interpersonal communication skills of the supervisor took precedence over the technical assistance skills. When it is remembered that these special education teachers have undergone extensive training and have considerable technical skills, it is not surprising that they view the technical skills of the supervisor as important, however, not the most important supervisory competency. According to this group of teachers, the special education supervisor should be, primarily, an effective communicator who can make decisions and solve problems.

This finding is in contrast to the sentiments expressed by the teachers in their stories of effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. In these stories, the factors of technical supervision and interpersonal relations were overwhelmingly noted by the teachers.

One explanation for this apparent discrepancy is that the incidents of supervisory behavior recounted by these teachers were situations from their actual experience. They related incidents they
experienced with their supervisor and evaluated the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of those incidents. The open-ended preference responses, on the other hand, were not tied to the teachers' actual experiences. These responses represent these teachers' concept of an ideal supervisor, regardless of their actual experiences.

In combining the findings from both response situations, it can be noted that when provided with technical assistance and interpersonal relations, the teachers value these skills in their supervisor. However, more importantly, these teachers want leadership from their supervisor, i.e., a supervisor who will make decisions, solve problems, and follow through with their responsibilities.

It is interesting to note that one of the recurrent themes in the interviews with the teacher consultants, presented in the following section of this chapter, was the burden of enormous responsibilities with minimal authority and the absence of decision-making powers. Apparently these special education teachers and supervisors are united in their sentiments regarding the need for supervisory leadership.

**Interviews**

The NSSED teacher consultants (N = 10) participated in an in-depth interview (see Appendix B). Analysis of the demographic information yielded the following profile for this group of special education supervisors:
- On the average, the NSSED teacher consultant has ten years of teaching experience in special education, including the area of exceptionality which they supervise.

- On the average, the NSSED teacher consultant has six years of supervisory experience in the area of special education.

- Fifty (50) percent of the NSSED teacher consultants have had teaching experience with non-handicapped students.

- All of the NSSED teacher consultants have master's degrees in the area of special education and one has a doctorate.

In addition to providing demographic information, each of the teacher consultants was asked to comment on the following:

- Favorable and unfavorable aspects of the job of supervision

- Personal characteristics and professional competencies requisite of the special education supervisor

- Recommendations for improving the profession of special education supervision

- Supervisory perception of special education teachers' expectations of supervisor

The responses to each question were analyzed, compared for similarity and synthesized into summary concepts. The following pages contain each of the major questions, the emergent concepts and supporting quotes from the actual interviews. The ideas expressed are limited to the perceptions of the ten NSSED teacher consultants participating in this study.
Which aspects of your job as a special education supervisor do you like?

**Concept:** Special education supervisors enjoy the flexibility and variety which their job offers. They appear to view the opportunities for communication, problem-solving, and public relations as positive aspects of their jobs.

"...contact with people..."

"...opportunity to teach teachers."

"...figuring out the politics of the job..."

"...variety of the job..."

"...opportunity to facilitate teacher's growth."

"...problem-solving opportunities..."

"...being a support person..."

Which aspects of your job as a special education supervisor do you dislike?

**Concept:** Special education supervisors are frustrated by the lack of a clear-cut role conceptualization. The necessity of interacting with teachers, administrators, and parents, whose expectations of the supervisory role are diverse, further impedes their role identity. They experience the burden of enormous responsibilities with minimal authority.

"...interactions are always problems...same scenarios over and over again..."

"...parent pressures are tremendous..."

"...walk a thin line between teacher support tempered by administrative responsibility..."

"...expectations are intense...overwhelming..."
"...you get dumped on for everything..."
"...low visibility makes us scapegoats..."
"...necessary to spend alot of time on site building trust...interferes sometimes with other tasks..."
"...too many things to do..."
"...sandwiched between administrators and teachers..."
"...frustrating...I want to make changes and I can't."
"...feel I'm skimming the surface."
"Alot of time is spent on legal paperwork."
"...not enough in-depth time with teachers."
"We have our agenda which may not be in 'sync' with the teacher's agenda."
"...not enough time to give support..."
"...line responsibility without line authority."
"...we give and give and give."
"...when you give constantly you need to be replenished."
"...there's tremendous red tape."
"...on line person without power to make decisions..."
"...not enough time to get it all done..."
"...groveling to people who may be offended by our competence."

What personality characteristics are required of a special education supervisor?

**Concept:** The job of the special education supervisor, as viewed by role incumbents, requires a strong, secure, and flexible personality. The special education supervisor
needs to be an objective professional who has the endurance for ongoing mediating and problem solving and the maturity to experience the effects of their decisions.

"...tolerance for situations that go on and on..."

"...willingness to be a mediator and compromiser."

"...diplomatic skills..."

"...communication skills..."

"...ability not to personalize everything..."

"...thick skin..."

"...strong ego..."

"...flexibility..."

"...ability to order priorities..."

"...commitment to kids..."

"...pleasant personality..."

"...fairly secure person..."

"...able to take a firm stand..."

"...need to be democratic..."

"...can't be in control all the time..."

"...able to live with decisions that are not your own..."

"...self-confidence..."

"...some resources outside of your job that are important to you...variety of interests..."

"...ability to get along with people..."

"sense of humor, poise, sophistication..."

"...roll with the punches..."

"...ability to facilitate other people's growth without personalizing their anger and frustration..."
What professional competencies are required of a special education supervisor?

Concept: Special education supervisors express the need for technical skills and background knowledge specific to handicapping conditions as well as an overview of how a disability impacts upon the normal development of a child. In addition, these professionals view problem solving and time management skills as very necessary for their jobs.

"...knowledge of learning theory..."

"...time management skills..."

"...able to anticipate problems and head them off."

"...teaching experience in area of exceptionality."

"...ability to make tough decisions..."

"...ability to organize..."

"...ability to listen..."

"...maintain objectivity...treat all the people the same..."

"...ability to handle ten different things at the same time..."

"...ability to deal with parents..."
"...know child development and how handicap affects that development..."

"...knowledge of curriculum..."

"...know how to facilitate a proper learning environment..."

"...ability to see the whole situation as well as its parts..."

"...problem solving skills...

"...people skills...

"...knowledge of group process...

"...decision-making skills...

Concept: As former special education teachers, special education supervisors admit to the "rescue fantasy," i.e., saving the handicapped child from the impact of his handicap, as part of their professional heritage. As supervisors, however, they see the necessity of helping the teachers through this seemingly unavoidable stage of professional growth.

"...part of our nature...to need closure...hard workers...need to please and make people happy..."

"...need for support...unusual role...no one else has same kind of job..."

"...psychological need to be in this profession."

"...our need for closure...need to fix...solver of problems..."

"...we have this rescue fantasy..."

"...masochistic...we are rescuers and need to nurture and give..."

"...difficult for teachers to accept that progress is slow and limited and accept that they can't fix it...have to work through the loss of the ability to fix...we have to help them...we have to help each other..."
What do special education teachers expect from the special education supervisors?

Concept: Special education supervisors view special education teachers' expectations of them as varied, depending upon the experiences and maturity of the teacher. Some teachers ask for support, understanding, recognition, and technical supervision. Other teachers view the supervisor as the source for a quick answer to an extensive problem or as their personal psychotherapist.

"...emotional support...they're on the line..."

"...support and understanding...pressures from kids."

"...listen...you don't always have to solve the problem..."

"...back them up...hand holding..."

"...expectations are sometimes selfish...self-centered and often inappropriate..."

"...they want to reflect whether their thinking is accurate..."

"...want us to solve their problems..."

"...want to see us more in their classrooms..."

"...use us as servants..."

"...don't realize they're one of many..."

"...cookbook answers...what should they do?"

"...source for a quick answer..."

"...technical supervision..."

"...problem solver...answer man..."

"...support person...trouble shooter..."

"...sometimes view us as a therapist..."
If you could make one recommendation to improve the field of special education supervision, what would that recommendation be?

**Concept:** In making recommendations for the field of special education supervision, role incumbents see the need for more training in counseling, group dynamics, and time management skills. In addition, they strongly express the need for a professional support system in order to delay "burn-out."

"...training in group dynamics...how to work with individuals..."

"...time management skills and techniques..."

"...get together to support each other...run a group..."

"...get a support system together..."

"...some kind of therapeutic training...something to facilitate self-knowledge...you need to know yourself before you help others..."

"...need to know yourself..."

"...counseling or guidance courses...development of these skills..."

In summary, the special education supervisors interviewed for this study expressed the frustration of the lack of a clear-cut role conceptualization. Diverse expectations of the supervisory role impede these supervisors' role identities.

In order to function effectively in this role, the supervisor needs to have a strong, stable, and flexible personality coupled with requisite professional competencies. All of the supervisors participating in this study expressed the need for more training in the skills of time management and skills of interpersonal communication and group dynamics.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of supervisory behavior of special education supervisors as perceived by special education teachers supervised by them. Specific objectives were:

1. To determine whether effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors in special education incorporate mutually exclusive continua of factors similar to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory

2. To compare and contrast the supervisory roles of the building principal and the special education supervisor relative to Herzberg's factors

3. To determine desirable personality characteristics and professional competencies of the special education supervisor as perceived by both special education teachers and supervisors

4. To examine attitudes and professional needs of the special education supervisor as expressed by role incumbents

5. To determine the relationship of the following variables with the teachers' perceptions of supervisory behavior:
   - number of years of teaching experience of the special education teacher
   - tenure status of the special education teacher
   - handicapping condition of the special education student
   - special education teacher's experience with non-handicapped students
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Summary

Partial support for Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory is derived from the results of the present study. The motivation factors, when mentioned by these teachers, were more strongly associated with incidents of effective supervisory behavior than ineffective supervisory behavior. This finding is consistent with Herzberg's premise that the motivators contribute substantially to job satisfaction but very little to job dissatisfaction. Only three of Herzberg's five motivators, i.e., achievement, recognition, and responsibility, were noted by these teachers in their incidents of supervisory behavior. The factors of achievement and recognition operated as Herzberg predicted, i.e., contributing more to effective than ineffective behavior. The factor of responsibility, however, was more strongly associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior.

The hygiene factors, when mentioned, were associated with incidents of ineffective supervisory behavior only slightly more often than they were coupled with incidents of effective supervisory behavior. This finding is not consistent with Herzberg's theory that the hygienes contribute substantially more to job dissatisfaction than to job satisfaction. In the present study, the factors of technical supervision and interpersonal relations contributed substantially to incidents of both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior.

In considering the duration and intensity of attitudes held by these teachers after experiencing an incident of effective or ineffective supervisory behavior, the findings are significant. The positive feelings
resulting from effective supervisory behavior were stronger and lasted longer than the negative feelings elicited by ineffective supervisory behavior. This may be interpreted to mean that effective supervisory behaviors are associated with stronger positive teacher attitudes of longer duration than the teacher attitudes elicited by ineffective supervisory behaviors.

Results of the present study indicated that the special education teacher's perception of effective or ineffective supervisory behavior is influenced by the number of years of teaching experience and by the teaching area of exceptionality. In contrast to their less experienced colleagues, the veteran special education teacher was more strongly focused on the hygiene factors in assessing both effective and ineffective supervisory behavior. This may be an indication that these more experienced teachers are no longer seeking motivation factors from the supervisor at this stage in their careers or it may be an indication that they have not been exposed to the motivators.

It appears that the handicapping condition of the students may influence the special education teacher's perception of effective supervisory behavior. Teachers of behavior disordered/emotionally disturbed and educationally mentally handicapped students presented highly similar supervisory profiles regarding effective supervisory behavior, emphasizing the factors of interpersonal relations and technical supervision. It was noted that learning disabilities teachers, although not very discrepant from this pattern, tended to stress the factor of achievement more than their colleagues in the other areas of
exceptionality. The low incidence handicapped teachers deviated notably from the high interpersonal relations, moderate technical supervision pattern. This group of teachers stressed the aspect of technical supervision in the majority of their stories and de-emphasized the factor of interpersonal relations.

The results of the present study indicated that the special education teacher's perception of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of supervisory behavior was not significantly affected by the teacher's tenure status, the teacher's prior experience with non-handicapped students or the occupational role (title) of the supervisor.

In delineating ideal supervisory requisites, these special education teachers found the professional competencies of the supervisor to be more important than the supervisor's personality characteristics. In descending order of importance, the following supervisory competencies were noted: Leadership/management skills; interpersonal communication skills; technical assistance; professional background, training, and experience; support; and availability/visibility.

Although the personality characteristics of the supervisor were less important to these teachers than the professional competencies, the following characteristics were mentioned with the most frequency: honesty, warmth/friendliness, sensitivity, empathy, and genuine concern/sincerity.

The special education supervisors interviewed for this study expressed their frustration with the lack of a clear-cut role
conceptualization. The necessity of interacting with teachers, administrators, and parents, whose expectations of the supervisory role are diverse, impedes their role identity. According to these role incumbents, the special education supervisor, in addition to exhibiting professional competencies, must be a strong, secure, and flexible personality in order to function effectively in that role.

These supervisors cited the presence of enormous responsibilities and the absence of decision-making power as a primary source of role conflict. Along these same lines, the teachers, in noting the importance of leadership/management skills of the supervisor, cited decision-making power as one of the critical components of that competency.

Conclusions

1. In evaluating the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of supervisory behaviors which they have experienced, these special education teachers emphasized positive or negative instances of the interpersonal relations skills and technical supervision skills of the supervisor. This may be interpreted to mean that supervisors, in these teachers' experience and perception, focused upon the technical aspects of supervision and the establishment of interpersonal relations. Also, this is an indication that when presented with positive instances of interpersonal relations and technical supervision, teachers view these behaviors as effective.

2. The supervisory needs of the special education teacher may change over time and, therefore, one supervisory style may be more appropriate than another when the number of years of teaching
experience of the teacher is taken into consideration.

3. The supervisory needs of the special education teacher may be related to the area of exceptionality in which they teach. Therefore, one supervisory style may be more appropriate than another when the handicapping condition of the students is taken into consideration.

4. Special education teachers found the professional competencies of the supervisor to be more important than the supervisor's personality characteristics. Professional competencies are learned behaviors whereas personality characteristics are less conducive to formal training. If the most highly valued supervisory skills can be learned, then it is possible to train effective supervisors by teaching these critical skills to them. This finding, clearly, has implications for college and university supervisory training programs.

5. In identifying ideal supervisory requisites, special education teachers indicated that the leadership/management skills and the interpersonal communication skills of the supervisor took precedence over the technical assistance skills. Although technical assistance is highly valued, it is not the most important supervisory skill, according to these special education teachers.

6. The special education supervisors interviewed for this study expressed their frustration with the lack of a clear-cut role conceptualization. Diverse expectations of the supervisory role impede the supervisor's role identity. In order to function effectively in this role, the supervisor needs to have a strong, stable, and
flexible personality coupled with requisite professional competencies. All of the supervisors participating in this study expressed the need for more training in the skills of time management, interpersonal communication, and group dynamics. Again, this finding has implications for college and university supervisory training programs.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Action

1. When choosing a supervisory style or approach, the special education supervisor should consider the teacher's number of years of teaching experience. The veteran special education teacher may be more responsive to a supervisory emphasis upon the environmental or hygienic factors, whereas the less experienced teacher may require more supervisory attention to motivational factors.

2. In addition to technical aspects of special education supervision and the establishment of positive interpersonal relations, special education supervisors should focus on developing expertise in the area of leadership/management which includes the skills of decision-making, organizing, and problem-solving, and the abilities to delegate responsibilities and order priorities.

3. When choosing a supervisory style or approach, the special education supervisor should consider the handicapping condition of the teacher's students. Teachers in different areas of exceptionality appear to prefer varying emphasis upon the factors of technical assistance, interpersonal relations, recognition, achievement, and responsibility.
College and university training programs in special education supervision should emphasize the following skill areas in their coursework and practica: leadership/management, interpersonal communication, group dynamics, and time management.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This study focused primarily upon the special education teacher's perception of the supervisory role. As the teacher's viewpoint is only one aspect of this role, it would be appropriate to complete a similar study focusing on the administrator's perception of the special education supervisory role. In combining the teacher and administrator perceptions of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors, perhaps a more clearly defined supervisory role may emerge.

2. One of the findings of this study was that the teaching area of exceptionality may influence the special education teacher's perception of effective supervisory behavior. As the instruction of special education students is highly individualized and specific to that student's handicapping condition, the supervision of the special education teachers may also need to be highly individualized and specific to that teacher's area of exceptionality. This hypothesis should be investigated with a larger population representing more handicapping conditions in order to determine if there is a preferred supervisory profile for each area of exceptionality.

3. The professional competencies which special education teachers delineate as contributing to effective special education supervision should be investigated further. This type of information would be
most valuable to university training programs in revising coursework in that area of study.

4. A more comprehensive assessment of supervisory training needs as stated by role incumbents should be made in order to determine which area(s) of supervisory training are lacking or require more emphasis.
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INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect factual accounts of experiences which special education teachers have had with educational supervisors. These incidents will be placed in categories which will identify attitudes held by special education teachers toward educational supervision.

2. It would be most helpful if you would relate these incidents in enough detail to enable someone who was not there to understand what happened.

3. The 'supervisor' referred to in this question should be understood to mean any individual who has ever exercised supervisory influence related to your work as a special education teacher. The supervisor may be a principal, a special education supervisor or consultant or any other person designated to assist or advise you.

4. The questionnaire data will be held in strictest confidence. You have been assigned a number only as a means of checking the return of the questionnaire. The specific data will only be shared with the research committee at Loyola University.

Please answer the following questions:

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have? ______

2. Are you a tenured teacher? ______YES ______NO

3. Have you ever taught non-handicapped students? ______YES ______NO

4. What is the major handicapping condition of your students? (CIRCLE ONE)
   - Behavior Disordered
   - Learning Disabled
   - Hearing Impaired
   - Visually Impaired
   - Physically Handicapped
   - Educationally
   - Mentally Handicapped
   - Trainable Mentally Handicapped
   - Emotionally Disturbed
   - OTHER (Please specify)

5. What is your educational background?
   - Bachelor's degree MAJOR:
   - Master's degree MAJOR:
Reflect on your past and current teaching experience. Think of an incident in which your supervisor did something which you felt was especially effective. This should be an incident in which you felt you had been helped. Please describe that incident:

1. Describe the situation and state who (by title) was involved.

2. Describe exactly what the supervisor did.

3. Why do you feel this was effective behavior?

4. Overall, did you have a more positive attitude toward your supervisor or your job as a result of this incident?

   ____ YES  ________ No

5. (If YES to #4)
   In your estimation, approximately how long did you maintain this positive attitude?

   ______ Momentarily _______ a few hours _______ days
   ______ weeks _______ months _______ years

6. In your estimation, how strong was your positive attitude as a result of this incident?

   1 2 3 4 5

   Hardly noticeable  Very Strong
Reflect on your past and current teaching experience. Think of an incident in which your supervisor did something which you felt was especially ineffective. This should be an incident which failed to make you feel you had been helped.

1. Describe the situation and state who (by title) was involved.

2. Describe exactly what the supervisor did.

3. Why do you feel this was ineffective behavior?

4. Overall, did you have a more negative attitude toward your supervisor or your job as a result of this incident?

   __________ YES       __________ NO

5. (If yes to #4)
   In your estimation, approximately how long did you maintain this negative attitude?

   _______ momentarily   _______ a few hours _________ days
   _______ weeks         _______ months       _______ years

6. In your estimation, how strong was your negative attitude as a result of this incident?

   1  2  3  4  5
   Hardly Noticeable Very Strong
Cite 5 personal characteristics and/or professional competencies which you believe a special education supervisor needs to be most helpful to you and your students.

Rank them in order of importance.

(most important) 1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Thank you very much for your participation in this study.

If you would like a copy of the questionnaire results please include your name and address. I would be more than pleased to share this information with you.
SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW

1. How many years of teaching experience do you have? ... in which areas of exceptionality?

2. Do you have experience teaching non-handicapped students?

3. In which area(s) of exceptionality do you supervise? ... How Long?

4. What is your educational background?

I'd like to ask you some questions about your job as a special education supervisor. Try as much as possible to answer these questions more generically, i.e. as a special education supervisor and not necessarily as an employee of any particular agency.

5. Which aspects of your job as a special education supervisor do you like?

6. Which aspects of your job as a special education supervisor do you dislike?

7. What personality characteristics are required of a special education supervisor?

8. What professional competencies are required of a special education supervisor?

9. What do special education teachers expect from the special education supervisor?

10. If you could make one recommendation to improve the field of special education supervision, what would that be?
Analysis of Factors

1. Recognition—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Work praised—no reward.
   2. Work praised—reward given.
   3. Work noticed—no praise.
   4. Work not noticed.
   5. Good idea(s) not accepted.
   6. Inadequate work blamed or criticized—no punishment.
   7. Inadequate work blamed or criticized—punishment given.
   8. Successful work blamed or criticized—no punishment.
   9. Successful work blamed or criticized—punishment given.
   X. Credit for work taken by supervisor or other.
   Z. Idea accepted by company.

2. Achievement—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Successful completion of job, or aspect of it.
   2. The having of a good idea—a solution to a problem.
   3. Made money for the company.
   4. Vindication—demonstration of rightness to doubters or challengers.
   5. Failure in job, or aspect of it.
   6. Seeing results of work.
   7. Not seeing results of work.

3. Possibility of growth—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Growth in skills—objective evidence.
   2. Growth in status (advancement)—objective evidence.
   3. Lack of opportunity for growth—objective evidence.
THE MOTIVATION TO WORK

4. Advancement—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Received unexpected advancement.
   2. Received advancement (expected or expectation not mentioned).
   3. Failed to receive expected advancement.
   4. Demotion.

5. Salary—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Received wage increase (expected or expectation not mentioned).
   2. Received unexpected wage increase.
   3. Did not receive expected increase.
   4. Received wage increase less than expected.
   5. Amount of salary.
   6. Wages compare favorably with others doing similar or same job.
   7. Wages compare unfavorably with others doing similar or same job.

6. Interpersonal relations—supervisor—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Friendly relations with supervisor.
   2. Unfriendly relations with supervisor.
   3. Learned a great deal from supervisor.
   4. Supervisor went to bat for him with management.
   5. Supervisor did not support him with management.
   7. Supervisor dishonest.
   8. Supervisor willing to listen to suggestions.
   9. Supervisor unwilling to listen to suggestions.
  R. Supervisor gave credit for work done.
 X. Supervisor withheld credit.

7. Interpersonal relations—subordinates—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Good working relationship with subordinates.
   2. Poor working relationship with subordinates.
   3. Good personal relationship with subordinates.
   4. Poor personal relationship with subordinates.

8. Interpersonal relations—peers—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Liked people he worked with.
   2. Did not like people he worked with.
   3. Cooperation of people he worked with.
   4. Lack of cooperation on the part of his co-workers.
   5. Was part of a cohesive group.
   6. Was isolated from group.

9. Supervision—technical—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Supervisor competent.
   2. Supervisor incompetent.
   3. Supervisor tried to do everything himself.
   4. Supervisor delegated work well.
   5. Supervisor consistently critical.
   6. Supervisor showed favoritism.

10. Responsibility—first level
    0. Not mentioned.
    1. Allowed to work without supervision.
    2. Responsible (for his own efforts).
    3. Given responsibility for the work of others.
    4. Lack of responsibility.
    5. Given new responsibility—no formal advancement.

11. Company policy and administration—first level
    0. Not mentioned.
    1. Effective organization of work.
    2. Harmful or ineffective organization of work.
    3. Beneficial personnel policies.
    4. Harmful personnel policies.
    5. Agreement with company goals.
    6. Disagreement with company goals.
    7. High company status.
    8. Low company status.

12. Working conditions—first level
    0. Not mentioned.
    1. Work isolated.
    2. Work in social surroundings.
    3. Good physical surroundings.
    4. Poor physical surroundings.
    5. Good facilities.
    6. Poor facilities.
    7. Right amount of work.
    8. Too much work.
    9. Too little work.
THE MOTIVATION TO WORK

13. The work itself—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Routine.
   2. Varied.
   3. Creative (challenging).
   4. Too easy.
   5. Too difficult.
   6. Opportunity to do a whole job—all phases.

14. Factors in personal life—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Family problems.
   2. Community and other outside situations.
   3. Family needs and aspirations salarywise.

15. Status—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Signs or appurtenances of status.
   2. Having a given status.
   3. Not having a given status.

16. Job security—first level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Tenure or other objective signs of job security.
   2. Lack of objective signs of security (i.e., company instability).

17. Recognition—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors perceived as source of feelings of recognition.
   2. First-level factors perceived as source of failure to obtain recognition.
   3. First-level factors perceived as source of disapproval.

18. Achievement—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors perceived as source of achievement.
   2. First-level factors perceived as source of failure.

19. Possible growth—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors perceived as leading to possible growth.
   2. First-level factors perceived as block to growth.
   3. First-level factors perceived as evidence of actual growth.

20. Advancement—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Feelings of advancement derived from changes in job situation.
   2. Feelings of demotion derived from changes in job situation.

21. Responsibility—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors leading to feelings of responsibility.
   2. First-level factors as source of feelings of lack of responsibility or diminished responsibility.

22. Group feeling—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. Feelings of belonging—social.
   2. Feelings of isolation—social.
   3. Feelings of belonging—sociotechnical.
   5. Positive feelings toward group.
   6. Negative feelings toward group.

23. The work itself—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors leading to interest in performance of the job.
   2. First-level factors leading to lack of interest in performance of the job.

24. Status—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors as source of feelings of increased status.
   2. First-level factors as source of feelings of decreased status.

25. Security—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factors as source of feelings of security.
   2. First-level factors as source of feelings of insecurity.

26. Feelings of fairness or unfairness—second level
   0. Not mentioned.
   1. First-level factor perceived as fair.
   2. First-level factor perceived as unfair.
   3. First-level factor perceived as source of feelings of disappointment in others.
THE MOTIVATION TO WORK

27. Feelings of pride or shame
0. Not mentioned.
1. First-level factors as source of feelings of pride.
2. First-level factors as source of feelings of shame.
3. First-level factors as source of feelings of diminished pride.

28. Salary—second level
0. Not mentioned.
1. First-level factors perceived as source of ability to improve well-being.
2. First-level factors perceived as source of lack of ability to improve well-being.
3. First-level factors perceived as source of more money (need undetermined).
4. First-level factors perceived as source of lack of more money (need undetermined).
May 20, 1982

I am conducting a research study for a doctoral dissertation on the topic of special education supervision. This study is under the chairmanship of Dr. Philip Carlin, Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois.

The purpose of the study is to determine preferred supervisory practices in special education. As a special education teacher your input is urgently requested.

If you agree to participate in this project, please complete the enclosed questionnaire. Specific instructions are included as a cover sheet. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

I know this is a very busy time of the year for you and I greatly appreciate your assistance. Please return the questionnaire within one week if at all possible. I thank you, in advance, for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth A. Hebert
Doctoral Candidate
Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.

P.S. If you would like a copy of the questionnaire data please include your name and address.
June 4, 1982

A few weeks ago you received my request to complete the enclosed questionnaire on special education supervisory practices. As a special education teacher your input is, again, urgently requested for the successful completion of this study.

If you have not yet responded I would greatly appreciate your taking a few moments to do so now. Please use the enclosed envelope for your convenience.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please disregard this request.

Thank you for your cooperation especially at this very busy time of the school year.

Respectfully,

Elizabeth A. Hebert
Doctoral Candidate
Loyola University, Chicago, Il.
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The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
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