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ABSTRACT

The thesis explores the questions of (1) Why teachers do not choose to enter, or at least enter willingly the field of Special Education, and (2) Why do they leave the field of Special Education?

The study is centered on the concept of status and its salience in the recruitment and retention of Special Education teachers, using the elementary school teachers as a comparison and determinant of this status. The study deals with the Special Education system in Ontario.

The findings would indicate that Special Education teachers perceive the status of their specialty within the profession as lower than that of other teaching roles, while other professionals in the school system accurately estimate the status accorded their role within the school hierarchy.

The intrinsic rewards of Special Education outweigh the costs involved in special education for some teachers, while for others the costs are too great for them to remain within the role. Males and Females in Special Education demonstrated a difference in the degree of professional mobility aspirations. It was discovered that length of teaching experience affected attitudes toward Special Education, with the more experienced teachers indicating a less favourable attitude towards Special Education. Special Education teachers rank the status of their field more
negatively as length of teaching experience increases.

The findings have indicated that much of their misperception is a result of the attitudes displayed by the peer group of teachers during the recruitment process and continuing into the actual teaching period, resulting in the withdrawal of those who cannot cope with this perception of disapproval.
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INTRODUCTION

The thesis explores a problem with which this author is concerned within the boundaries of Special Education: the question of (1) Why do teachers not choose to enter, or at least enter willingly? and (2) Why do they leave the field of Special Education? The investigation notes the many aspects of this field which are attractive and attempts to explain why they do or do not work as such.

The more formal aspect of this thesis centres on the concept of status and its salience in the recruitment and retention of Special Education teachers, using the elementary school teacher as a comparison and determinant of this status. My study deals with the Special Education system in Ontario. Although there is evidence to suggest that the situation described in my study is universal in North American educational systems, my data was obtained from Ontario and no generalization beyond the Ontario system is implied.

Many teachers enrol in the Special Education courses offered by the Ontario Department of Education each year, and are granted certification in this area. Yet only a small percentage of these teachers actually teach in Special Education; of those who do teach in this field, many leave after short periods which range from one week to one
year. Of the teachers who elect to remain in Special Educa-
tion, the greater number will remain in the field for a long
period of time, often moving to schools which specialize in
this type of education. The author recognizes that a number
of teachers enrolled in the Department courses are there for
various reasons such as the up-grading of certificates,
leading to a higher pay category; desiring to improve their
own teaching methods by learning specialized methods which
have worked in other situations; obtaining special help for
the problems which occur in their own classrooms with disci-
pline problems and slow learners. Many teachers are also
motivated to seek specialist standing within an area for
reasons of professional status.
CHAPTER I

SPECIAL EDUCATION IN ONTARIO

The Ontario Department of Education and Special Education

As early as 1911, the Toronto Board of Education provided some classes for mentally handicapped children, under an "Act Respecting Special Classes" passed in the same year. This Act permitted elementary school authorities in any city to "make a register of all children who were backward or abnormally slow in learning, or who from physical or mental causes required special training and education." (Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, 1950:366) It also made provision for the "establishment of special classes, admission of candidates, courses of study, inspection and the apportionment of grants." (Royal Commission, 1950:366)

In 1914, the Auxiliary Classes Act, extended the "principle of the Special Classes Act of 1911 by defining requirements for admission to special classes...by setting up boards to pass on admissibility." (Royal Commission, 1950:367) Plans called for the organization of a special room for those pupils whose mental and physical handicaps retarded the progress of average and superior pupils in the same classroom. According to the Auxiliary Classes Act (1914)1 eligible pupils were "persons whose mental capacity is
incapable of development beyond that of a child of normal mentality of eight years of age." (Royal Commission, 1950:367) The practice grew in smaller schools of admitting pupils who were "defaulting in school work and were two or more years retarded in one or more subjects" (Royal Commission, 1950:367); it was later extended to include "adjustment service for pupils who were performing below their levels of ability" (Royal Commission, 1950:367). The latter not only made it possible to facilitate the pupil's return to the work of the regular classroom, but also helped to combat the stigma attached to classes where the pupils showed only "meagre academic achievement" (Royal Commission, 1950:367). Since the passing of the Act of 1914, the chronological order for classes for mentally and socially atypical children has been as follows: Vocational Schools for Senior Mentally Handicapped boys and girls, 1923; Training Institutions for Delinquent boys and girls, after 1923; Opportunity Classes, 1930; Surveys of physically and Mentally Handicapped Children in Small Schools, 1933; Class for Dull-Normal Pupils (Handicraft Schools), 1934. The summer classes for training Special Education teachers were established in 1923.

In 1920, the province had seventeen auxiliary classes; by 1946 there were 471 classes, and by 1950, there were 1700 pupils in special education with 600 full-time and 1,000 part-time teachers. (Royal Commission, 1950:377)

The classes for the children who were not solely
physically handicapped or gifted were called Opportunity Classes. These classes were designed primarily for children who needed simplified programmes and special methods of instruction.

Craft work is introduced at an early period, and is taught quite extensively, partly for the purpose of giving compensatory satisfaction in achievement, and partly for the purpose of developing the fundamental skills used in gaining a livelihood. (Royal Commission, 1950:377)

The Ontario Department of Education's latest figures on these special children, which were based on enrolment of pupils in 1948, are shown in Table I. In the category of 'number remaining' it should be noted that these children are not provided for due to parental refusal to give permission for admittance to special classes, or facilities are not available, or the children have not been officially recognized as mentally handicapped and are attempting regular grade work.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Probable Number</th>
<th>Number Provided for</th>
<th>Number Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>1:4000</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Q. less than 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>2:100</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>5,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Q. 50 - 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>4:100</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>20,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Q. 71 - 90 and the maladjusted above 90 I.Q.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Royal Commission, 1950:378
6

Group 1 includes those who have an intelligence quotient below 50 (feeble-minded) and are not capable of fending for themselves, cannot make progress in auxiliary classes, and are subject to exclusion procedure under Section 5 (1) of the Public Schools Act. (Royal Commission, 1950:379)

Group 2 includes those who have an intelligence quotient ranging between 50 and approximately 75, and are unable to make progress in the regular school grades, but under special methods of instruction are capable of being trained to become self-supporting. Persons in this group fall into two sub-groups; those whose mental limitations are genetic, and those whose limitations are the result of birth-injury, accident or disease. Children in the first sub-group are likely to develop well-integrated personalities within their limitations. Those in the second sub-group are frequently erratic in achievement and behaviour. (Royal Commission, 1950:379)

Group 3 includes those who suffer from emotional disturbances and fall into three sub-groups: (1) those who are in the early stages of insanity and need medical attention; (2) those who are in the grip of obsessions and worries caused by home or school circumstances; and (3) a very large group frequently but not necessarily in the intelligence quotient range 75-90 whose progress in school is retarded and who are frequently victims of mental blockage. This last condition may begin as a walling-out of attentions from mental areas having to do with a certain school subject in
which the pupil has failed to make normal progress. The inhibition may extend to encompass the entire school life of the pupil, who comes to 'hate' school, or in still more severe cases, result in partial or general amnesia. (Royal Commission, 1950:379) Pupils suffering from mental blockage stand as much in need of remedial personality treatment as of remedial exercises in the subject concerned.

Inclusion in the category 'markedly atypical' or in the sphere of special education of a child who is unable to approach the average standard of achievement of his age group, is a matter requiring careful consideration from the viewpoints of school economy, school efficiency, and pupil personality. Studies of intelligence indicate that for such pupils, retardation in achievement is inevitable and will become increasingly apparent as ascent is made from junior to senior classes. (Royal Commission, 1950:379) If the child begins with an I.Q. of 80, he will be two years retarded at age ten, and at least three years retarded at age thirteen, if he attempts a programme designed for the average child. For the mentally blocked (only 2% have an I.Q. in the 50 to 75 range) the retardation will be of four years and up in the average programme. (Royal Commission, 1950:380)

The Ontario Department of Education has worked on the problem of the special child for many years. The child who reaches the Special Education situation is one who is "by reason of physical, mental or social deviation . . . unable to make reasonably satisfactory progress in the work
of the regular grades of the school." (Royal Commission, 1950: 363) It also encompasses those who show "deviations in attitudes and behaviour" (Royal Commission, 1950:363). Special Education includes four major categories and many sub-categories. The major categories are:

(1) Physically Atypical . . . . Blind Deaf Hard of Hearing
(2) Mentally Atypical . . . . Gifted Slow Learning
(3) Attitudinally Atypical . . Delinquent Neurotic Personality Disorders
(4) Socially Atypical . . . . Confined Far Away Neglected

(Royal Commission, 1950:364-65).

Unfortunately, only the gifted or the physically atypical children are in any way segregated into realistic categories. The remaining children are usually lumped into one large category called Special Education, and looked upon as slow learners. The slow learner is supposed to be defined as a child of "limited mental capacity who drifts along in school with considerable failure and retardation and who may have temperamental outbreaks." (Royal Commission, 1950:365) Efforts have been made recently by some urban school boards to segregate the really emotionally disturbed from the remaining categories. However, smaller boards have been unable to allocate the space or the funds to establish separate classes and their special education classes include
varieties of atypical children. Some efforts have been made where it is possible to categorize on age. All special education classes in the province of Ontario have a class limit according to the age of the children. However classes can have as many as twenty children, which is not far removed from the normal elementary classroom size which today varies from twenty-five to thirty students per class.7

In 1950, in order that the terminology would be in conformity with usage in other provinces and countries, the Department of Education changed the name to Special Education as a substitute for Auxiliary and other names.8

Later developments in education, such as the Hall-dennis (1968) report with its recommendations for change in the Ontario school system, have recommended that special education services be discontinued,9 whereas the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, 1950, in Section 66, said that

children with intelligence quotients in the range 50-75 require special education treatment in classes distinct from those of the regular educational system. This special treatment ... must be continued under any reorganization. (Royal Commission, 1950:390)

The following section, 67, appears as a contradiction to Section 66, as it states that slow learning children should be educated with other children of the appropriate age and social group and only in extreme cases should such children be assigned to special classes and given special educational treatment. (Royal Commission, 1950:390)

One superintendent expressed concern for these
special children. He felt that the classes should be continued at all costs if these children are to survive in the educational system. However, he noted that the decision to discontinue special education services would stem from the dissatisfaction of inner city parents who feel that the children from the inner city are being placed in special education classes as a type of status punishment, and are left there without hope of returning to regular classes.

Section 68 (Royal Commission, 1950:390) further adds that special education should not be required to provide repairshops for poor schooling, nor should it condone or even encourage inefficient administration and teaching by assuming responsibility for rectifying the outcome of errors in the educational system. Special Education treatment in the sense in which the Department of Education uses it, should be made available only for markedly atypical children. Teachers, supervisors, and administrators concerned with education in the elementary schools should rectify their own errors, not transfer the results of their mistakes to the field of special education. However, it is to be noted that special education classes do attempt to rectify errors.

Miracles are expected in the year or two which the child will spend in the class trying to make up for eight years of non-achievement in the classroom. The child is expected to blossom overnight both academically and in his social attitudes. On the contrary, the added stigma of the separate class situation may be too much to bear in addition to all his other problems.
Upon entering the special class, the student loses the association of his former peer group; often he must move to another school where his status will be low because of his newness and even lower because he is 'special'. The classes are quite often of sharply contrasting socio-economic make-up, although upper socio-economic children rarely enter special education classes. The wide range of ages in many classes further frustrates a fourteen-year old who must associate daily with an eight-year old or even younger in some cases. These children can be fourteen chronologically, ten years old mentally, but often more than fourteen socially and physically because of associations with older groups.

It is discouraging to note that the Ontario Department of Education has been promoting help for so many years for the atypical child, only to fail to remove the stigma of being atypical; and that the Department has failed to educate not only the public in the correct attitude, but its own elementary school teachers who share in this stigmatizing process of the special education child.

**Selection of the Special Education Child**

What child becomes part of the special education class? We have described the child that the Department of Education categorizes as eligible. At the local level, the process is long and complicated. In the initial establishment of classes for the mentally handicapped or maladjusted, through the principals of the schools, teachers are asked to
furnish information in cooperation with the school nurse. They are asked to report on all pupils who are eighteen months or more over the age for the grade in which they are enrolled, and also report on those who are seriously retarded in reading, mathematics or spelling. From this point, a special education teacher, into whose class the child is to be admitted, will co-ordinate the material available on each child, such as the teacher's report, nurse's report, principal's report and often a social worker's report. The list is then presented to the school psychologist if there is one, or else the special education teacher must begin the process of permission and testing. Each parent is notified of the testing dates, and is usually briefly interviewed by the principal to explain why the child is to be tested. Once formal permission is granted by the parent, then the special education teacher or the psychometrist tests the child using the WISC or the Canadian Intelligence Test. If permission is refused, then the child will remain in his regular classroom until the school is ready to try for permission again.

After the testing, the one who administered the tests makes his recommendation according to the results and special problems noted during the test. Then the principal must consult the parents to obtain their permission for placement in the class. If the parent does consent, then the child must often be placed on a waiting list, as the number of spaces available is usually quite limited. Often a child will not agree to the placement, and if he is too hostile to-
ward the move, then he is not placed.

The child must usually adapt himself to the new school, new class, new classmates, new teacher and quite different teaching methods. It usually takes the first several months for a child to adjust to the new situation, as well as the adjustment he must make to the new student status which is accorded him. He is often the subject of ridicule from others in the school, with many special appellations reserved for him. If the child is capable of receiving instruction in the regular classes on a part-time basis, then he is gradually streamed into the regular classes that he can handle. Often the emotional problems connected with part-time regular classes prove to be too severe for the child to handle and he must remain in the home class until he is confident enough to venture out again. The strain that this child is under must be truly unbelievable. He must face quite a variety of new classmates in his own home room, and in the outside classes; he must face the prejudice of the classmates and teachers to whom he is assigned. Most regular classroom teachers become quite hostile to the idea of a part-time special education child. They know that this child has been a discipline problem in his former classes; they do not like the idea of an additional child, which means additional work on their part. Most of all, the regular classroom teacher cannot face the fact that he feels threatened by the very presence of this child because most teachers do not know what to do when the child does regress into unacceptable behaviour, and as a result, often make remarks which
further alienate the child, to take some rash action which they regret later.\textsuperscript{14} In most of the situations, the regular classroom teacher is afraid that he will lose face when an encounter occurs. The students see that their teacher cannot handle the special student, and as a result the special student can become a heroic figure. Of ten the student will act out due to his feelings of fear, impotency, and as a reaction to the attitude of the teacher which seems to act as a genuine catalyst. The teacher is unable to hide true feelings from these atypical children. They are able to read true emotions no matter how you try to mask them.\textsuperscript{15} They will not tolerate false politeness and shallow acceptance. They seem to prefer honesty, trust and real acceptance as a person, just as any other student would. When these traits are present in the teacher, they will work and strain to please as they have never done before. They become fiercely protective of the teacher and will go to almost any lengths to show this in their own way. When this attitude is achieved, it becomes one of the rewards which keeps the teacher in the classroom.

In the modern special education classes, the group will contain all varieties of mental and social problems. Most of the children will have a great variety of problems, which have developed throughout their years at school, and are often exacerbated by home problems. The children in these classes are usually from the lower class or from the lower middle class. It is indeed rare for a child from the higher-
income brackets to be admitted to special education classes for slow learners, as their parents cannot face this social stigma. The children from these higher-income brackets are passed on yearly under pressure from the home, and eventually are streamed into a four-year programme which is mainly vocational. The special education child will also go to a special vocational programme, usually only two years in length. He can be admitted in his fourteenth year and may complete the course at sixteen. The majority will quit school as soon as it is legally possible. Society will be unable to absorb the special child for the greater part, and this special child will continue on his treadmill of failure.

Composition of a Special Education Class

In one typical special education class for the school year 1970-71, the class consisted of two epileptic and severely brain-damaged children; one severely emotionally disturbed boy, and one emotionally-disturbed girl (only the girl was receiving treatment); two children who were unable to read or spell even the most simple words; one very slow learner with a speech defect; three slow learners with very serious reading problems; one child who performed well verbally but was unable to do written work; one slow learner with a speech defect and some emotional problems due to his defect; one slow learner who could not perform verbally, but could achieve written work at a limited level; one slow learner who was too withdrawn to function in regular classes,
and one slow learner who finally was able to return to regular classes.

The age of the pupils ranged from eleven to fifteen and a half. Only two of the pupils' families could be considered relatively free of family problems. The remaining families were deeply involved in problems of alcoholism and absentee parents. Most of the families had older children who were also problem children who had been involved with the juvenile authorities. The boys were well-known at the stores for shop-lifting. The boys (from the class) were not formally charged with these offenses. Three of these boys were involved in incidences of glue-sniffing, marijuana, and were regular drinkers. Only two became formally involved with the law at the end of the school year for a variety of charges including drinking under age, breaking and entry and car theft.

All contact with the parents had to be school-initiated and was not well received, resulting in beatings for the child by the parents. When problems of absenteeism arose, the parents usually covered for the child, so that it could not be reported as unlawful absence. This class was the rule, not the exception during my eight years of experience in special education. In these eight years of participation and observation in special education classes, I found that most of the classes that I knew of, fell into the same pattern, whether located in a small town or in the larger city.
Recruitment of Teachers and Initiation Into Special Education

Attractive factors such as extra money and smaller classes led me to enter the field of Special Education in 1960. At that time there were no such classes in existence in our school section or in neighbouring sections. Only the larger cities of Windsor and London provided such opportunities for atypical children. School boards were anxious to open these classes for several reasons, the prime purpose appearing to be the double grants allowance which were available at that time. The more important reason, that of providing education for the atypical child seemed to be considered of secondary importance. In 1960 it was considered very prestigious to have these classes on the board's listing. The rooms assigned were usually very drab and were semi-equipped for their purpose. The first referrals were made on the basis of discipline problems and repetition of grades. Each child was individually given the Canadian Intelligence Examination. Of nearly 200 referrals, approximately twenty were considered to be legally Opportunity Class material that is eighty or below intelligence quotient; with at least eighteen months retardation. The remaining referrals were discipline problems, non-achievers, or were physically handicapped—all of whom had an intelligence quotient above the legal limit.

Unlike the larger educational centres, the small cities and towns were not particularly interested in special help for the atypical child who fell into any class but that
of educable retarded or slow learner. The attitude of noninterest in other types was not an exception but was the rule.

Most parents then as now were reluctant to have their children tested for Special Education classes, let alone give approval for admittance to the classes. The stigma attached to testing for entrance was so great and considered so permanent, that any advantages were greatly outweighed. This condition too, was not a local one but was and is still quite general within the province. Now that there is a greater emphasis placed on all areas of atypical education, the stigma is lessening but is still present.

In some cases, the stigma has been applied due to the presence of one or two very atypical children who were placed in these classes due to lack of proper alternative facilities. The chaos caused by the placement of a child in Special Education, who cannot even superficially exist in the programme setting creates a stigma which becomes known and applied to other students. To illustrate, let us look at Rob a thirteen-year old boy with an intelligence quotient of approximately 60 (WISC). His I.Q. is too high for admittance to a special training school for the retarded, and so he was placed three years ago in a special education class. Rob was exhaustively tested by specialists. He was found to be retarded, epileptic, brain damaged and perceptually handicapped. In addition to these symptoms, Rob was also considered emotionally disturbed. He was a very big child, and very strong. It is virtually impossible to think
of a way in which he had not disturbed the classroom and the school situation. In addition to all of his problems, Rob is rather repulsive-looking, neglected by his parents who both work and who are seldom at home and have problems with alcoholism. They resent the fact that Rob is atypical and do not hesitate to physically impress this upon him. It is impossible to contain Rob within the classroom situation, yet legally he cannot be excluded. His reputation is widely known in the town in which he lives. When new referrals are made for other children, the parents refuse to grant permission for admittance in spite of the disadvantages which not signing will produce for their children. They will gladly grant permission when Rob is no longer part of the class. Rob's two previous teachers resigned because they could not cope with his presence.20

Nearly every Special Education class has its own variety of Rob. Teachers transfer out of Special Education to avoid a situation which is difficult to handle even for the expert.21 While such children provide the perfect excuse for leaving this specialized field, what about teachers who remain in spite of obstacles even more imposing than that of this child? What makes a teacher remain in this situation year after year? Why do teachers leave classes which fortunately do not have such an imposing obstacle? One can readily understand the teacher who leaves a situation which makes a good job virtually impossible, as no teacher wants to put himself in jeopardy when his position depends on the success
of the programme.

When a teacher decides to enter this specialized field, usually the prospective applicant will interview some of the teachers already practising in the field. Normally this will prove a deterrent, at least for the very unsure applicant, as the teacher who is honest will not paint a false picture of the situation, but must tell the person of the difficulties as well as the rewards. If the new recruit isn't of the same mind, viewing the rewards as a counterbalance to the problems, then it would be senseless to entertain such a proposal.

It is common practice within boards to have teachers volunteer in response to postings for Special Education teachers, which carry special inducements. Many boards offer to refund the cost of the Special Education departmental course when the course is successfully completed. An added attraction is often present in the form of a generous allowance for living expenses for the duration of the five-week course, although this practice is gradually being extinguished. This allowance enables the teacher to travel to various centres in Ontario for the greater part of the summer to study. Until very recently, Special Education class size was vastly different from the ordinary classroom, with the usual range from approximately four in a learning disability class to twenty in a Senior Opportunity class. The teacher had her choice of type of class, and age levels. There has never been a curriculum designed, nor specific books
assigned. The teacher is free to set her own curriculum based on the children's needs, to set her time table, book-list, and within reason choose a wide variety of teacher aids and craft supplies. The class is comparatively free of external interference or supervision. All of these factors exist, plus a yearly allowance in pay of $500 plus.22 Thus far, it is difficult to perceive any detrimental factors for the teacher in these regards. Of course these factors vary with boards and teachers' perceptions of these factors.

The first opposition in the initial phase is apparent in the colleagues' comments when the position postings are made, or your decision to consider the possibility becomes known. Most teachers are incredulous that you would even consider such a move;23 some joke as to the length of time you'll remain in the field; very few murmurs of appreciation or praise are forthcoming. Tales are recounted about other teachers who failed in the experiment, the trials and tribulations which your future students will present, and many voice their opinions about this type of class and that they handicap rather than help the child. From this initial phase, the embryo Special Education teacher will perceive the status he will hold as such a teacher, before he has a chance to prove his worth.

If a teacher can survive the initial phase, a very severe time will be when the final break is made from the peer group of his fellow teachers.24 If the move must be made to another school, then there is a double blow. Not only will the
teacher lose his contact with his familiar group, but will have to face the same drop in status when he joins the new group. Teachers do not readily welcome strangers into their groups, unless the school has experienced a great staff turn-over. Length of teaching time does not count upon entry into the new group. Teachers who have been longest on staff expect the most respect, have their choice of teaching areas, equipment etc. as seniority rights. Next in line is the teacher who will be in the senior grades. Unfortunately teachers have a scale of status based on grades and subject taught. The lower the grade one teaches, the lower the status of the children, and the lower will be the teacher's status. Teachers consider it as a status elevation to be 'promoted' to the senior grades. This status seems in part to come from the status of the pupils themselves. The Special Education teachers receive little apparent status since their children have a status rate on the minus end of the scale. He and his students are rarely included in school activities, unless there is strong pressure from the principal or from the strong personality of the teacher himself. When grade meetings are called, the special education teacher does not belong to any particular grade or even grouping, such as primary etc. Meetings called by inspectors or others for particular grades, which are recognized as social times, are closed to the special education teacher, who will attend meetings with his own specialist group, which may consist of only a dozen or less teachers. Early dismissals for sports which are also valued by teachers,
do not include the special education teacher whose children probably will not be involved in these extra-curricular activities.

The special education teacher will stand alone in his particular area. For most teachers, this situation is unbearable. The isolation, which is heightened by his own isolation within his classroom, often proves too much for continued participation.

Even the attention which most other teachers receive from supervisors is lacking as many school boards do not employ supervisors for special education. When these supervisors are available, they often prove to be an unsympathetic sounding board for the teacher's problems. It is difficult to teach under a supervisor who is often not as highly qualified as the classroom teacher, or who does not believe in such concepts as socio-economic groupings. The teacher often turns to the supervisor as a means of contact with the system, as an aid to her problem of isolation. When these needs are not met by the person who should be understanding, then the teacher is completely isolated. It takes a very strong person to withstand all of the daily problems, plus the role strains imposed by other sources such as the teachers. In interviewing former special education teachers, one of the most frequent reasons for their withdrawal from the specialty, was either interference from the educational hierarchy, including other teachers, or lack of any communication on the part of the supervisor, or the failure of the supervisor to understand
the problem.
FOOTNOTES

1 Cf The Auxiliary Classes Act, R.S.O., 1937, Chapter 358, Sec. 2

2 Many children manage to be overlooked in the early grades for various reasons, e.g. the hardworking child who may be underachieving can manage to escape a great deal of unfavourable notice.

3 The physically atypical category also includes the speech defective, the crippled, the homebound (temporarily or permanently confined to home by disabilities arising out of accident or disease.), the hospitalized, the physiologically maladjusted.

4 This category also includes the child classed as 'defaulting'—the child of normal or superior abilities whose achievement in school is far below the level of his ability in one or more subjects. These children often receive help from a remedial teacher who may be on staff full or part-time. The child usually visits this teacher daily for specialized help, but remains enrolled in his normal grade; the subnormal— the child who will not, by sixteen years (chronologically) reach the mental age of 8 years.

5 The attitudinally atypical usually becomes part of the classes with the slow learner. This may be due to an attitude perpetuated by the child, that of being the slow learner. This type includes the delinquent, the neurotic,
and the child who has personality disorders.

6. The socially atypical child includes the confined (the delinquent in reform school, and the orphan), the far-away who resides where school cannot be reached by ordinary transportation, and the neglected, the child whose attendance or progress suffers as a result of parental neglect.

7. I recognize that in many schools the teacher-student ratio may be of different proportions. Some local boards propose a teacher-student ratio of 1:32.

8. "In order that the terminology may be in conformity with usage in other provinces and countries, we recommend that the name 'Special' be substituted for 'Auxiliary' in the Acts and regulations of the Department of Education relating to special education." (Royal Commission, 1950:382)

9. "Too often in a sincere effort to help him (the slow learner) with his problem, society has segregated him into special classes, or sent him far away from home. This practice the Committee deplores." (Hall-Dennis Report, 1968:32)

10. "Every child in Ontario has a right to stand with dignity beside everyone else in the human parade . . . If we are truly to help the child who is different, we must be preoccupied not with his handicap, or with his weakness, but with his potential and his strengths." (Hall-Dennis Report, 1968:33)
11. I have rarely seen a child from upper middle class or higher socio-economic status, be admitted to a special education class. The parents usually refuse permission due to stigmatizing effects. These children are usually tutored in an attempt to help them try to maintain the average grade level.

12. C.I.T. is an individual test administered to prospective students, as a measure of intelligence quotient. It is a fairly easy test for the non-professional psychometrist to administer.

13. Some special education teachers have each of their students on an individual time-table. Since each child is not equally retarded in all subjects, he should not be forced to take these subjects in which he is of fairly average ability, in the special classroom. When the child feels capable of handling the regular classroom situation he goes to these classes for the subjects he can handle. Regardless of how retarded the child is, he should be capable of handling at least one or two subjects outside of the special classroom. Of course this requires very special cooperation between teachers. The regular classroom teacher and the special child both have to be prepared for the change in time table. These situations are delicate. The child has to have his ego built up enough so that he can accept a possible rejection by his new group. Often the child will act out his fears, or just act up as a method of gaining the atten-
tion of his new classmates. If the regular classroom teacher cannot understand the situation, then he often rejects the child who must return to special education until ready for another chance.

14. I admit that the special education child can be a real threat to a teacher who is unaccustomed to his defenses and ways of gaining attention. The usual action by the teacher is to exclude the child from classes. It is difficult then to ask the teacher to re-accept the child because of the misinterpretation of the situation by the special child and the regular classroom students. The situation is often viewed by both groups of pupils as a 'defeat' for the regular teacher.

15. It never ceases to amaze special education teachers as to how perceptive these children are. In discussing this idea with other special education teachers, we agreed that it is difficult to mask your moods and true reactions in front of these children. When teaching emotionally disturbed children, the situation is even more difficult. I found it nearly impossible to mask feelings while teaching them; they were even more perceptive than the slow learner.

16. See footnote 12.

17. The Department of Education early recognized the fact that the children who were in the classes for pupils "who were performing below their levels of ability, and those who were educably retarded" were being stigma-
tized. "To combat the stigma attached to classes where pupils showed only meagre academic achievement . . . a new nomenclature was adopted . . . " (Royal Commission, 1950:367)

18. This particular case refers to a town which is in reality, a suburb of a larger city. It has never lost its small-town character whereby the majority of the residents are familiar with everything that happens in the town.

19. This is a fictitious name for a student I had in one of my former classes. The case however is a factual one and is not intended as a fictional representation.

20. When Rob was in the regular classroom, his teacher (female) had requested that Rob be transferred to a special class. His presence was "too bizarre" and "often dangerous to the other children." The board finally recommended that the teacher should be transferred if she was unable to "handle her class." Rob's teacher in special education (male) resigned because his numerous requests to have Rob removed were unsuccessful. The teacher could not cope with the reaction of the class to Rob's behaviour and presence.

21. Rob was finally removed from the special class to be sent to a school for the Retarded. He remained there only three days before he was excluded as a dangerous child. Rob had tried to choke several of the children. He is presently awaiting admission to the Ontario Hospital at Cedar Springs.
22. The amount of extra remuneration varies with boards. However, $500 is about the minimum extra allowance. This amount increases with the number of certificates held in Special Education.

23. Merton and Rossi (1968:62) state: "As we have seen, what is anticipatory socialization from the standpoint of the individual is construed as defection and non-conformity by the group of which he is a member. To the degree that the individual identifies himself with another group, he alienates himself from his own group."

24. Merton (1968) states that "what the individual experiences as estrangement from a group of which he is a member tends to be experienced by his associates as a repudiation of the group, and this ordinarily evokes a hostile response. As social relations between the individual and the rest of the group deteriorate, the norms of the group become less binding for him. For since he is progressively seceding from the group and being penalized by it, he is the less likely to experience rewards for adherence to the group's norms. (Merton and Rossi, 1968:63)

25. Brembeck (1966:325) states that "status in subject matter . . . is a subtle factor related to the prestige which people accord different types of subject matter. The prestige of the curricular stream influences the prestige of the teaching position. This transfer of status from the subject to the teacher is an index of
the social values in the community. The teachers of subjects that are valued are given status higher than those who teach less valued subjects. For this reason, the status attached to a subject may change from community to community, depending on the priority given to certain values.

26. Brembeck (1966:325-26) states that "Generally the prestige of the teaching position rises with the age of the students. Also, what we see reflected here in the informal social system of the school are the values of a society which honours those who work with adult affairs, with the real business of life. We expect the children in time to reach adult status; teachers who help children in that process of growing up are honoured in terms of how close the children with whom they work are to adulthood.

27. Berne (1964:14) speaks of recognition hunger ... as the complexities of compromise increase, each person becomes more and more individual in his quest for recognition.

28. Brembeck (1966:327) says that "another source of conflict among teachers is the interaction between classroom teacher and specialists ... their respective roles are apt to cause them to view matters differently."
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The present research is an exploratory study which will allow me to investigate the factors which influence the special education teacher who elects to remain within this specialized field and to compare him with the teacher who enters the field but remains for a very short period of time. My own participant observation was used as a broad base for the study, coupled with questionnaire data collected from sample populations of school professionals and interviews with teachers who left the field, and teachers who have remained within the field for at least two years.

Review of the Literature

There has been little research on the special education teacher per se. Most of the literature has been based on the teacher’s role in the classroom, the children’s roles in the classroom and the parental role. It has not been considered important to look at why the teacher as a participant in the educational social system will elect to participate or withdraw.

The literature deals with the lack of teachers for these very special children; or it deals specifically with the lack of teachers for the lower-income groups, or the minority children who are environmentally disadvantaged.
(Cordasco et al, 1970:140)

The theoretical framework which informed this study has been drawn from the literature on occupations, organizations, and measurements of job satisfaction.

The literature on job satisfaction reveals that there are numerous factors which can be employed as indicators of job satisfaction. Herzberg, Muasner, Peterson and Capwell, (1957) suggest six relatively independent factors: general satisfaction and morale, attitudes toward the company and its policies, satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job, attitudes toward the immediate supervisor, attitudes toward satisfaction of aspirations, and satisfactions with conditions of the present job. Herzberg et al (1957) identified the presence of their factors after an extensive review of the literature on job satisfaction, and they effectively summarize the work of other authors in this field. Many studies have been conducted using the SRA Employee Inventory of theorists such as Baehr, (1954,1956), Dabas (1958) and satisfaction inventories were also designed and administered by Kahn (1951) and Harrison (1961).

The literature on status and prestige is also extensive. Homans (1961) found that there is a relation between what a man gets in the way of reward and what he incurs in the way of cost. This relationship may result in status congruence, in which there is an impression made on, and the stimuli presented to other men, which may affect their future behaviour toward him and therefore the future reward he gets
from them. (1961:150) Homans also uses Exline and Ziller (1959) to demonstrate that where status congruence is lacking, interpersonal conflict is more likely to occur. It is not difficult to see that withdrawal from teaching in special education could result from such status incongruence. Homans further states that it is through periodic comparison with others that an individual eventually develops a clear idea of his status. A person frequently compares himself with others with respect to income, possessions, skills or other attributes. The people with whom a person compares himself and the degree to which he makes comparisons are determined by the person's perception of his power, and the conditions allowed for ease of comparison. Sampson (1963) states that through experience, each individual acquires a large repertoire of such expectations which provide him with a model of his social world. The more internally consistent expectations are, the less confusion and conflict he will encounter in social interactions. Therefore the individual strives to achieve this state of expectancy congruence.

**Theoretical Framework**

"Resignation from membership in a social system is usually costly to both the resignee and the organization." (Schoenherr and Greeley, 1971:1) In the educational institution, the impact of resignation is especially great because the teacher himself must be ready to fact the costs to his morale, the obvious costs to the children he has left, the
school which must re-vamp its system to care for these children, and the administration of the school board which must place this teacher elsewhere.

Schoenherr and Greeley (1971) constructed a model to explain resignations in the American Catholic Priesthood, which closely parallels the situation of the Special Education teacher. In their study, they have used the work of Barnard (1938) and Simon (1947) who placed the "decision to participate" (March and Simon, 1959:83) at the "core of their inducement-contribution theory of organizational equilibrium." (Schoenherr and Greeley, 1971:2) The key postulate of the theory states that "each participant will continue his participation in an organization only so long as the inducements offered him are as great or greater (measured in terms of his values and in terms of the alternatives open to him) than the contributions he is asked to make." (March and Simon, 1959:84)

The inducements which keep a participant in an organization can be in the form of payments made to the worker, i.e. wages, bonuses, measurable in the currency. There can also be inducements which are not as easily measured and which may be more important, such as status and prestige.

Persons are accorded status depending on the extent to which they are seen as receiving rewards or incurring costs. Esteem is one such reward, and to the extent that a person is perceived as esteemed by other persons, he is ranked high in status by the perceiver. . . In general, to the extent that a person is a recipient of things valued by our society, such as high income, he is likely to be accorded status (and prestige). (Secord and Backman, 1964:296)
March and Simon (1959) have elaborated on the Barnard–Simon theory. In discussing motivational constraints, and the decision to participate, they have enumerated a great number of hypotheses to explain basically two facts: the personal attributes of the participant and group relationships greatly influence the decisions to stay or to withdraw; secondly, the requirements of the job, the characteristics of his organization, and the environment in which the participant works also influence his decision to remain or depart.

The perceived desirability of movement is a function of both the individual's satisfaction with his present job and his perception of alternatives that do not involve leaving the organization . . . The perceived ease of leaving the organization is a function of the number of extra-organizational alternatives perceived. (March and Simon, 1959:111)

March and Simon (1959) have explained the restriction to search for another job, in their hypothesis that the "greater the habituation to a particular job or organization, the less the propensity to search for alternative work opportunities." (March and Simon, 1959:105) The teacher who remains within his field for several years has not only made his job into a habit, but the "habituation (has served) to narrow severely the range of alternatives considered." (March and Simon, 1959:105)

In addition to the factors of satisfaction, morale, productivity and commitment, there is another factor to be considered. This is of course, the factor of status. Secord and Backman (1964) see status as the worth of a person as estimated by a group or a class of persons. Only those attributes that are similarly valued by group members contribute
to status. Among the several bases for status, are the capacity of a person for rewarding those with whom he interacts, the extent to which he is seen as receiving rewards, the types of costs he incurs and his investments. Persons may be similarly ranked in terms of costs which they experience; such features of an occupation as responsibility and drudgery are both costs, but only the former contributes to high status. Another feature, which Secord and Backman associate with status is a person's investments which are an aspect of his past history or background. (Secord and Backman, 1964:491)

We regard the factors suggested by March and Simon (1959) as the intrinsic rewards involved in teaching. The perception of status, we regard as an extrinsic reward in teaching. Rosenberg (1957) in his discussion of occupational values and status, notes that men are more likely than women to place strong stress on the extrinsic rewards of work, rather than on the satisfactions inherent in the work relationship. Yet Rosenberg admits that most students will pursue a job where there will be a strong stress on the intrinsic rewards of their position. (1957:51) There is a strong and increasing tendency for students to ask "How can I expend my highest talents and abilities in my work?" rather than "What will they give me for working?" Younger people conceive of work as an "important area which could yield important satisfactions." (Rosenberg, 1957:67)

Goode (1960) formulated the concept of role strain, "the difficulty of fulfilling role obligations." (1960:483)
The individual engages in a "continuing process of selection among alternative role behaviours in which each individual seeks to reduce his role strain." (Goode, 1960:483) "The individual is likely to face a wide, distracting and sometimes conflicting array of role obligations. If he conforms fully or adequately in one direction, fulfilment would be difficult in another." (Goode, 1960:485) Role strain may result when the intrinsic rewards and the extrinsic rewards are in conflict. The rights associated with a position may not be sufficiently rewarding to motivate the participant to carry out the obligations of that position. There can also be instances of role strain when the role does not allow for the expression of his needs, does not require him to make use of his skills and abilities, or is not suited to his personality and temperament. (Secord and Backman, 1964:491) The individual can reduce his role strain somewhat "by selecting a set of roles which are singly less onerous, as mutually supportive as he can manage, and minimally conflicting." (Goode, 1960:190)

King and Ripton (1970) in a study of Ontario secondary schools, maintain that teachers "reject a longterm career perspective as 'just a teacher'." (King and Ripton, 1970:37) This is particularly noticeable in male teachers as the "orientation virtually prohibits a non-mobile conception of career." (King and Ripton, 1970:37) Most males possess a "career perspective . . . directed toward educational administration or consultation." (King and Ripton, 1970:37)
This orientation is necessitated by a reward system used by the educational bureaucracy to obtain maximum efficiency. Classroom teachers as such are not defined as 'career people', and so they anticipate . . . the fulfilment of some other role. This 'anticipatory socialization' encourages career-minded teachers to play roles which are often incongruent with those expected of the ideal teacher . . . this career variable . . . represents a powerful force. (King and Ripton, 1970:37)

King and Ripton also noted that "influence on teachers is effected through their desire for autonomy in their teaching." (1970:37) The March-Simon (1959) theory is useful here in understanding the social processes involved in a decision to resign because it recognizes the degree of autonomy of system elements and the functional reciprocity that exists between the segments of the social system as a whole. That is, the decision of a participant in a social system may be influenced by several or by all parts of that social system. (Schoenherr and Greeley, 1971:4)

Ronald Corwin (1965) in his analysis of the role of the teacher suggests that the teacher has "virtually no control over . . . matters that affect teaching." (1965:241) Corwin further found that teachers who are "highly professionally oriented are usually militant in their professionalism." (1965:263-68) These teachers want "to change the system" (Corwin, 1965:263) but in desiring this change, they must experience the most numerous and intense conflicts in the schools, as evidenced by heated discussions or major incidents. They are most dissatisfied with the system. (Corwin, 1965:263)
Smith et al (1965) point out the importance of job autonomy in that actual satisfaction ... with the job ... may be expected to be related to such job characteristics as the extent to which the individual has control over his own pace and quality of work; and it is such factors that are the basis for derived long-term interests in the job itself. (Smith et al, 1969:165)

The teacher and the child enter into a relationship which is formed for the purpose of change or influence. (Bennis et al, 1968:649) Here the teacher and the child are parties in a relationship which is to create change. The change may entail anything from acquiring new behaviour to attitude change. The main transaction between the change-agent and the change-target is information about the desired state to be achieved and feedback on how the target is doing.

Bennis (1968) goes further to state that we can expect a positive outcome, if not, then a negative one, if the teacher has not entered into or recognized this special role he plays, with the added factor that he may not even be in a relationship in which the teacher receives interpersonal feedback or reflected appraisals from the other teachers. (Bennis, 1968:649) The pressures of failure in his role and relationships would cause the teacher to withdraw to achieve a relationship in preference to the professional isolation which can result, and in which he will be denied role confirmation. (Bennis, 1968:653)

"It is usually assumed ... that role conflict reduced the teacher's satisfaction with his work and inter-
fers with his effectiveness. (Johnson, 1970:63) Johnson elaborates on his statement of the effects of role conflict, from the work of Charters (1963) who stated that role conflict is "probably disruptive, tension inducing, and, over a period of prolonged exposure, produces anxiety."

Johnson also uses Katz and Kahn (1966) who state that "emotionally, a person who experiences a high degree of role conflict has a sense of futility about his role and attempts to withdraw from his co-workers." (Johnson, 1970:63) They (Katz and Kahn) also feel that when role conflict is intense, job satisfaction will be low." (Johnson, 1970:63)

The failure to recruit and retain special education teachers in spite of extrinsic rewards such as extra salary suggests that other factors are operative in the decision of those who choose and remain in the role.

To investigate the salience of the factors suggested by the theories I have described, several hypotheses were tested, using data from questionnaires and interviews. All hypotheses are phrased in the null form.

Hypotheses

1. To test the expressed assumption of many Special Education teachers that their specialty is not highly regarded in the school system, the first null hypothesis was formulated:

   H₀: Special Education teachers will not perceive the status of their specialty within the profession as lower than that of other teaching roles.
2. In order to establish that all professionals in the school system do not underestimate the status level of their particular role, a second null hypothesis was designed:

$H_0$: Individual professionals in the school system will fail to accurately estimate the status accorded their role within the school hierarchy.

3. The importance for the original choice and the continuance in the role, of the rewards that accrue to Special Education teachers was determined by interview data. My third null hypothesis stated:

$H_0$: The rewards, i.e. extra pay, opportunities to help children unable to cope with the normal school situations, freedom to design and control learning situations, will be outweighed by the costs incurred, i.e. the loneliness, perceived lack of status, the derogation by colleagues of the role, emotional strain of dealing with discipline, for those who remain in Special Education.

In addition to the above hypotheses, preliminary investigations have generated additional null hypotheses concerning the Special Education teacher:

4. $H_0$: There will be no difference in the degree of professional mobility aspirations between males and females in Special Education.

5. $H_0$: Length of teaching experience does not affect attitudes toward Special Education.
FOOTNOTES

1. "It is well known that most individuals need recognition and a sense of belonging; the strength of this need is shown by the fact that exclusion is among the most painful of group sanction." (Presthus, 1965:157)

2. Simon (1945:xxvi) speaks of an administrative person who can make "his choices without first examining all possible behaviour alternatives and without ascertaining that these are in fact all the alternatives."

3. Rosenberg (1957:65) has data that "make it evident that specialization is an important factor in the ultimate crystallization of occupational choice. However, as they begin to take courses in their field . . . they develop a certain involvement in . . . problems and content of the field which tends to anchor their choices. The culmination of specialized courses not only enhances involvement but produces an investment in time and energy which the individual may be reluctant to discard."

4. Rosenberg's study (1957:11) shows that there is a wide range of values which they hope to satisfy in their occupations. Not money and status, but, rather, self-fulfillment, interpersonal satisfactions and security receive the greatest emphasis. 27% of his sample considered an opportunity to use their special abilities or aptitudes most important and 10% chose "permit me to be creative
and original". 10% also chose "give me an opportunity to be helpful to others." Security looms as an occupational gratification of great importance, for nearly one-quarter chose "enable me to look forward to a stable, secure future." A relatively small proportion gave top priority to money and status (10% chose "provide me with a chance to earn a good deal of money" and 2% chose "give me social status and prestige."

5. Rosenberg (1957:11) states that a chance to earn a good deal of money and give me social status and prestige is referred to as the extrinsic reward-oriented value complex. Respondents selecting these values tend to view work in instrumental terms.

6. Rosenberg (1957:13) notes that there are self-expression oriented value complexes. Respondents selecting these values tend to view work chiefly as an end in itself (a goal value) as an opportunity for expressing their talents and creative potentialities.

7. "The teacher . . . ought to want to move on to a better job, according to our widely accepted social values. If this is not a possibility he should want to improve himself in other ways—to move to more congenial schools. There is a considerable horizontal mobility as well as a vertical mobility in the teaching profession. Teachers prefer better surroundings, more teachable and brighter children, fewer problems of discipline." (Wilson, 1967: 691)
8. However, the fact that the teachers who are in special education are happy with their job and its rewards may be due to what Merton terms anticipatory socialization.

9. Merton defines anticipatory socialization as the complexity of the decision process is highlighted by the observation that not only may values influence occupational choices, but choices may influence values as well. This is likely to occur when an individual who has made an occupational choice begins to internalize the values, attitudes and behavioural patterns characteristic of actual occupational incumbents.

10. Smith et al (1969:165) write that "actual satisfaction with the activities of the job, on the other hand, may be expected to be related to such job characteristics as the extent to which the individual has control over his own pace and quality of work; and it is such factors that are the basis for derived long-term interests in the job itself."

Prechus (1965:237) writes that "logically one can argue that job satisfaction and prestige are bound up with the degree of control that one exercises over the work process." He quotes Robert Blauner: "The fact that work inherently involves a surrender of control is probably what makes the relative degree of control in work so important an aspect of job attitudes."
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND RESULTS

The Sample

A questionnaire was administered to three groups of teachers: (1) a sample of teachers employed in various fields of teaching, who were registered in a Sociology of Education course at the University of Windsor, 1971; (2) a sample of teachers who were registered in a Primary Methods course in London, Ontario, 1971; these teachers were employed in various teaching areas but they were heavily concentrated in the primary and junior elementary grades. They were chosen as a group for comparison with the group of teachers who would be employed only in Special Education at the time the questionnaire was administered; and (3) a sample of teachers who were registered in the Special Education course in St. Thomas, Ontario, 1971. All of these groups were composed of many varieties of teaching areas. For the purposes of this research, the formal questionnaire asked the respondent to indicate his present teaching position in order that the two groups, one of Special Education teachers who were presently teaching Special Education, and one of elementary teachers who were presently teaching in the elementary classroom situation could be selected. The samples were chosen for their relative ease of accessibility. Teachers are extremely difficult to sample during the school year as they
are reluctant to answer any questionnaire or to participate in any survey in which they may be identified. This seems to be consistent with their innate fears about revealing any personal attitudes about their jobs, coupled with their dislike for any extra paper work.

The Questionnaire

Using a questionnaire, interviews and participant observation, I will investigate resignation as a voluntary action that takes place in a social context and attempt to ascertain what effects the peer group, and the organizational structure have on the individual's decision to leave special education.

On the formal questionnaire, the respondents were asked to indicate their personal preference for working in each of the positions listed, by ranking the various teaching fields on a seven-point scale from 'like' to 'not like'. The purpose was to determine how closely satisfied each was in his own field of education and to measure his preference for working in special education.

Respondents were also asked to use the same type of scale to indicate his perception of how the teaching profession as a whole regarded each of these positions. The two scores obtained provided a measure of how each teacher perceived his own specialty's status within the teaching profession, and how he thinks the profession views the status
of the special education teacher.

In the third section of the questionnaire, the respondent was asked to supply statistical information, including: (1) how long he had been teaching to see if this factor made a difference in his perception of satisfaction and status. (As March and Simon, 1959, noted in habituation as influencing the propensity to search for alternative work opportunities); (2) where the respondent's own elementary education had been received, whether it was received in urban or rural schools, in order to check for familiarity with special education as influencing perception of special education; (3) his present teaching position; (4) in what type of school, i.e. public or separate schools, and (5) the sex of the respondent. The current teaching position was asked so that each respondent could be identified as a special education teacher or otherwise. Finally the respondents were asked in which of other areas they held certificates to determine if they had been in contact with special education through the qualifying course. This supplied a check to see if they had at one time considered entering special education, or at least had contact with it in a formal manner.

The interview sample was composed of (a) ten teachers who had left the field of Special Education. These teachers had been in Special Education for periods ranging from one week to nearly two years. The sample included five males and five females; (b) six teachers who had been teaching in Special Education for three years or more. The sample
included two males and four females. The interviewees were asked: "Why did you leave Special Education?" or "Why do you remain in Special Education?" The interview was otherwise non-directed.

Results and Discussion

1. H₀: Special Education teachers will not perceive the status of their specialty within the profession as lower than that of other teaching roles.

2. H₀: Individual professionals in the school system will fail to accurately estimate the status accorded their role within the school hierarchy.

To test the validity of these hypotheses, each teaching position was compared with all other teaching positions on the professional perception variable. The results showed that all teaching areas but Special Education rate their fields as viewed favourably by the profession; that is, their particular specialty is seen as positively high in status by their professional peers and by themselves.

The teachers in Special Education rate all other specialties positively as all other teachers rate these areas. There was one minor exception: the Special Education teachers in the experience group of 6 to 10 years teaching experience range, negatively rated the professional status of the teachers of French. 64.3% of the Special Education teachers in this experience range, rated the French teacher
as negative or low in professional status. This isolated instance is not sufficient evidence to support the null hypothesis.

The results also indicate that the Special Education teachers are the only teachers who perceive their specialty as possessing negative status in their peers' opinion. The Special Education teachers rated their professional perception of their field as follows: (Breakdown is by length of teaching time.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of teaching experience</th>
<th>Professional Perception Rating</th>
<th>N=75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5 years</td>
<td>55% high; 45% low</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>47% high; 53% low</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>44.5% high; 55.5% low</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years +</td>
<td>29% high; 71% low</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only beginning special education teachers perceive their professional status correctly. While all other groups of teachers rated Special Education as comparatively positive in status, if we look at the ratings on Special Education status by the comparison group of elementary teachers, we
find that the Special Education teachers are incorrectly perceiving their status within the profession.

TABLE 3
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL PERCEPTION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION: BY LENGTH OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of teaching experience</th>
<th>Professional perception rating</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 5 years</td>
<td>67.4% high; 32.6% low</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>70.7% high; 29.3% low</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>50% high; 50% low</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years +</td>
<td>93.3% high; 6.7% low</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings would indicate that the hypotheses are not supported, so that (1) special education teachers do perceive the status of their specialty within the profession as lower than that of other teaching roles; and (2) individual professionals in the school system do accurately estimate the status accorded their role within the school hierarchy.

3. H₀: The rewards i.e. extra pay, opportunities to help children unable to cope with the normal school situations, freedom to design and control learning situations, will be outweighed by the costs incurred, i.e. the loneliness, perceived lack of status, the derogation by colleagues of
the role, emotional strain of dealing with discipline, for those who remain in Special Education.

An analysis of the interview data indicates that there are rewards and costs involved in Special Education.

A summary of the rewards lists as follows:
(a) freedom to design and control his own timetable, choose texts, etc.
(b) the chance to help children unable to cope with ordinary school situations,
(c) extra pay,
(d) autonomy,
(e) smaller classes,
(f) aid to mobility,
(g) outlet for creativity,
(h) freedom from censure if children do not succeed as quickly as expected.

A summary of the costs lists as follows:
(a) lack of peer group feeling with other teachers,
(b) lack of recognition by other teachers in form of praise, etc.,
(c) negative reactions perceived from peers during recruitment stage, and persisting during actual follow-up work in Special Education,
(d) too much supervision perceived as interference during initial Special Education teaching period,
(e) unable to cope mentally with the situation, as manifested
by need for tranquilizers and other medications,
(f) lack of adequate facilities for teaching, i.e. not given
the best facilities for amount of space needed,
(g) lack of emotional support from peers, and educational
hierarchy.

While the interview data of teachers who continue
in Special Education role reveals the rewards of Special
Education, so do the interviews with teachers who left
Special Education; while these interviews with both groups
indicate the costs involved also. A reading of the inter-
view data (see Appendix A) clearly indicates when rewards
outweigh costs involved, and the reverse situation. Those
for whom the costs easily outweighed the rewards, left
Special Education; those who remain in Special Education
mention the costs involved but emphasize the positive holding
power of the rewards.

The evidence does not support the null hypothesis.
Therefore we can state that the rewards are important in the
original choice of Special Education and for the continuance
in the role; furthermore for those Special Education teachers
who do elect to stay, the rewards outweigh the costs and may
be viewed as important for the retention of Special Education
teachers.

4. H₀: There will be no difference in the degree of
professional mobility aspirations between males and females
in Special Education.

In an examination of the data on self choice by the
Special Education teachers, I noticed a striking difference in the responses on a breakdown using the sex variable, and ratings on liking for administrative positions and other high status positions of secondary school and senior elementary. Holding sex constant I compared the teachers' perception of special education as a self-choice against their perception of administrative positions as a self choice. (Self choice refers to choosing a position for yourself.)

**TABLE 4**

**SELF CHOICE RATING OF FEMALE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE OF PRINCIPAL: BY THEIR RATING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Principal</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2 (3.9%)</td>
<td>19 (36.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: On all tables, none of the special education teachers perceived their choice of Special Education as low.)
TABLE 5

SELF CHOICE RATING OF FEMALE SPECIAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE OF VICE-PRINCIPAL:
BY THEIR RATING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Vice-Principal</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3.9%)</td>
<td>19 (36.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 demonstrates that females who ranked special education high as a self choice, rank the administrative position of principal much lower as a self choice. Even those who ranked special education medium as a self choice, rank principalship low as a self choice. (There were no teachers who ranked special education low as a self choice.)

Table 5 again demonstrates that females who rank special education high as a self choice, rank the administrative positions, here, that of vice-principal fairly low as a self choice.
TABLE 6

SELF CHOICE RATING OF FEMALE SPECIAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS OF HIGHER STATUS TEACHING POSITION
(SECONDARY SCHOOL): BY THEIR RATING OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Secondary School</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (9.6%)</td>
<td>15 (28.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 demonstrates that females who ranked special education high as a self choice rank the status position of secondary school teaching lower as a self choice. In the medium rankings, the direction remains lower but not as consistently as in the high preference category.
TABLE 7

SELF CHOICE RATING OF FEMALE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS OF HIGHER STATUS TEACHING POSITION (ELEMENTARY SENIOR): BY THEIR RATING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Elementary Sr.</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7 (13.2%)</td>
<td>18 (34.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table demonstrates that in a relatively high status position, that of elementary senior, which is an available position for women to obtain, the females ranked special education high as a self choice, follow the same pattern as in previous tables and rank elementary senior low as a self choice. The pattern for the medium rating is one of the same pattern of inconsistency as was demonstrated on the previous table, (Table 7) for perception of secondary school as a self choice.
On all of the following tables, none of the male special education teachers perceived their choice of Special Education (as a self choice) as low.

### TABLE 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Principal</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6 (42.9%)</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The males who ranked special education high as a self choice, also rank the position of principal high as a self choice. This is also true for the two males who had ranked special education medium as a self choice.
TABLE 9

SELF CHOICE RATING OF MALE SPECIAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE OF VICE-PRINCIPAL:
BY THEIR RATING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Vice-Principal</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64.3%)</td>
<td>(21.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males who ranked special education high as a self choice, also rated the position of vice principal high as a self choice. This was also true for males who ranked special education medium as a self choice.
TABLE 10

SELF CHOICE RATING OF MALE SPECIAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS OF HIGHER STATUS TEACHING POSITION
(SECONDARY SCHOOL); BY THEIR RATING OF SPECIAL
EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Secondary School</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>9 (64.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males who ranked special education high as a self choice, also rated secondary school as a fairly high self choice. It is not as high as the administrative positions for self choice, as these secondary school positions are more readily available for males if they so desire them, and as such are not as valuable as indicators of mobility aspirations.
TABLE II

SELF CHOICE RATING OF MALE SPECIAL EDUCATION
TEACHERS OF HIGHER STATUS TEACHING POSITION
(ELEMENTARY SENIOR): BY THEIR RATING OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Perception of Role of Elementary Sr.</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.0%) (50.0%) (---)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males who are high in their perception of special education as a self choice are high in their perception of elementary senior (Grades 7 & 8) as a self choice. This may be due to the fact that there is a high probability that these males were in elementary senior teaching positions before entering special education.

On the tables, the percentages indicate that the attractiveness of administration and other teaching fields of high status, is low for women, but is the opposite for men. The tables would appear to indicate that mobility aspirations for women are low, while relatively high for men.
This is shown quite clearly if one looks at the percentages of males rating high in perception of special education for self choice and high in perception of administrative positions for self choice. In turn, these administrative choices are even higher than their choice of secondary school categories.

The attractiveness of other fields for those who indicated high on special education and high on administrative positions as self choices would be an indication that the males are prepared to go into other areas of education. Those who ranked special education high and administrative positions as low are not using special education as a mobility factor, as one would deduce from the forementioned cases. In the education field, a male is expected to have experience in many teaching fields before he can assume the responsibilities of a principalship. Thus, spending a year or two in special education would enhance his chances for obtaining an administrative post and would partially explain the attractiveness of special education for the males. The first question on the questionnaire is tapping the attractiveness of the position. In special education, there is no real difference between males and females on their perception of the attractiveness on special education when rating it as a self choice.

Table 12 which follows demonstrates no outstanding differences between males and females on rating of special education as a self choice as an indicator of the attractiveness of special education.
TABLE 12

RATINGS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
BY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS:
BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data of the preceding tables require overwhelmingly the rejection of the null hypothesis and would support a hypothesis that there is a difference in the degree of professional mobility aspirations between males and females in Special Education.

5. $H_0$: Length of teaching experience does not affect attitudes toward special education.

When we examine the scores on self perception of special education by special education teachers, we see that they have a high evaluation of the area, but when we look at their perception of the professional evaluation of special education, they see it as low. There is a disjunction between
the self evaluation of the role and the professional evaluation of this role. When we examine the reaction of the elementary teachers to special education, we see the reverse situation, in that they do not at any time perceive special education as highly personally satisfying but appraise it as high in professional status. However the longer that the teachers have been in the educational system, the lower the rating they give special education. Of elementary teachers who have been teaching up to five years, only 32% find this area of special education to be low in status. In the six to ten years category, 34% find this area to be low in status. In the category eleven to fifteen years of teaching, the percentage rises to 50% and drops slightly to 43% for the teachers who have been teaching more than sixteen years. The perception of status of Special Education then shows a loss of status as the number of years of experience rises to sixteen years of teaching.

As noted previously (in the first two hypotheses) the special education teachers demonstrate a pattern in which the beginning teachers rate the status of special education as comparatively higher, that is only 45% of the teachers rate the status of special education as low; for the teachers who have been teaching six to ten years, 53% rate the status as low; for the teachers who have been teaching eleven to fifteen years, 55.5% rate the status as low; the lowest rating came from special education teachers who had been teaching sixteen years or more, in that 71% rated special
education as low in professional status. It would appear that if you're in the Special Education field for a relatively short period of time, you have a different perception of the field and rank it higher than will the more experienced teacher.

The special education teachers indicated on the self choice question that they were nearly unanimous in their liking of special education as a career choice. In the ratings of elementary teachers on special education as a self choice, the beginning teachers rated this area on the positive side; that is 90 teachers rated special education high in preference, while 74 ranked it low. As length of teaching time increased, the rankings became negative, so that teachers with six to ten years of experience ranked special education as a self choice high in 20 cases and low in 27 cases; for teachers with eleven to fifteen years of experience, 4 ranked high while 12 ranked low. In the group with sixteen years or more experience, the high and low were even at 50% of the ratings each.

The statistics demonstrate that length of time in the educational system does lead to more negative attitudes towards the specialization as a self choice for the elementary teacher and on the professional perception of status by the special education teacher. The data also suggest that the special education teacher is misperceiving his professional status as indicated by the professional ratings of special education by the elementary teachers. It is also
possible that the halo effect is working in the case of the beginning elementary teacher who doesn't really know that much about the actual work involved in special education, and is not really sure about how the profession would evaluate it, but ranks it comparatively high anyway.
CHAPTER IV

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

In the data gathered for this thesis, only the Special Education teacher reported high or medium liking for his own field as a self choice. In only one case was Special Education as a self preference rated below 5 on the scale. The remaining categories of teachers on the self-choice question show a spread on the total scale from 1 (like very much) to 7 (do not like). That is, teachers in elementary primary, for example, rated elementary primary as a self choice, on the total range allowed on the scale, regardless of the number of respondents in that particular category.

Viewing the results of the special education teachers on this self-report item, of 75 special education teachers, 72 out of 75 of these rated special education as a self choice, with a rating of 1 or 2, indicating very high preference for the field, with only the 1 case reporting as a low preference. In comparison, the elementary teachers rated elementary fields as self choice as follows: for elementary primary positions, high in 257 cases (high is 1 or 2 rating) and low in 40 cases (low is 6 or 7 rating) from a possible N of 315; in elementary junior positions, they rated this area high in 147 cases and low in 86 cases from a possible N of 315; in elementary senior, this area was rated high in 68 cases and low in 220 cases from a possible
N of 315. Some of the latter low may be explained by the fact that a greater part of the elementary teachers in the survey were primary and junior elementary teachers. The remaining cases from each N were in the medium rating of 3, 4, or 5 ratings on the scale.

These findings would tend to indicate that Special Education teachers do rate themselves as more satisfied with choice of teaching area than do elementary teachers.

**TABLE 13**

RATINGS BY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS OF THEIR FIELD: BY THEIR OWN EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND. (RURAL OR URBAN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38 (86.4%)</td>
<td>23 (76.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>6 (13.6%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>44 (100.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Table 13 would indicate that teachers who were educated in urban schools, and are presently teaching in special education perceive special education higher
as a self choice than do special education teachers who were educated in rural schools. Both groups perceive professional status ratings almost identically (and incorrectly).

I had expected that the rural educated teachers would perceive special education as a self choice more highly than would urban educated teachers. I based this assumption on the fact that rural educated teachers would be more familiar with a classroom situation of so many levels as we find in special education. The urban teachers have probably been exposed to special education during their early education. I cannot posit a satisfactory explanation and would suggest that this would be an area for further study.

TABLE 14

RATINGS BY SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS OF THEIR FIELD: BY TYPE OF CURRENT SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT: (PUBLIC OR SEPARATE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Special Education as Self Choice</th>
<th>Public School</th>
<th>Separate School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>54 (88.5%)</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>61 (100.0%)</td>
<td>12 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15

RATINGS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS OF THEIR PROFESSIONAL PERCEPTION OF THEIR FIELD: BY TYPE OF CURRENT SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT (PUBLIC OR SEPARATE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Perception of Special Education</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Separate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(41.7%)</td>
<td>(45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.6%)</td>
<td>(36.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a comparison between teachers in Special Education in public and separate schools, we see on Table 14 that there is no major difference in the two groups' perception of special education as a self choice. There was a very minor difference in the two groups' perception of professional status.

In interviews with female special education teachers, the women tend to point out the fact that they find special education teaching attractive because it is probably the only area in which the teacher has such a high degree of autonomy.
Within a highly structured organization, women are not granted a great measure of autonomy, but in teaching special education, this desire to be autonomous is generally available. Women are usually working for men and are blocked in attempts at mobility, so they settle for specialization in the field of special education where the attractiveness of the autonomous situation can compensate for their blocked attempts at mobility.

Those men who had been in special education for a long period of time (since 1961 when the first course in special education was given in the Windsor area) saw their special education classes as attractive to them and satisfying because "we're not going to get a principalship anyway" and they like the chance to be autonomous, and particularly mentioned the time they could spend in Industrial Arts. In special education, the classes are often established with a male and a female teaching in the same school, or nearby (in country school districts) so that the boys can have the advantage of shop work, and the girls can have Home Economics. Thus, a male teacher could spend many hours per week in the shop situation. The boys really like this work and are very responsive to the teacher at this time. The teacher has tangible proofs of his accomplishments. For the male who does not have the Industrial Arts situation, there is no essentially masculine proof of this type. In addition he may be required to teach a certain amount of basically feminine subjects, such as cooking. In this way the programme is often
rather spontaneous and not structured easily enough to facilitate the maintenance of discipline. To be satisfied in his work and to see the position as attractive, the male teacher needs the facilities which will allow him to express his masculine talents and capabilities. When these facilities are not present, I found more expressions of dissatisfaction with special education and a loss of attractiveness in the area than when such facilities were available.

Men are more professionally ambitious than most women: their commitment to special education is simply a mobility commitment, but women have a commitment to the field, as mobility is practically unavailable. This fact can be demonstrated by teachers who were interviewed. In all cases, the women were more highly qualified in special education, that is they possessed more than the elementary (first) certificate in special education, and were expecting to pursue a supervisor's certificate in the near future, even though they did not have a chance to become a supervisor. The women verbalized their commitment in statements such as: "I couldn't leave this (special education) classroom and return to the other grades ever again. What would happen to these children if they had to be returned to the regular classes?" and "Here you're needed, it's your chance to do something for these kids who just can't make it any other way." and "I'd stay here even if we didn't get the extra allowance." In these ways the teachers verbalized a commitment which is difficult for other teachers to understand. Perhaps this commitment is
based on the cultural roles of women, where a woman's role is to listen to a child, to nurture him, to facilitate his attainment of goals. Man's role is to be the entrepreneur, to be mobile. The men interviewed did not appear to express a similar deep commitment. They felt that they liked special education, but that "they couldn't stand it for any number of years." When probed about commitment to special education, they expressed a commitment to the field of teaching, to a career in teaching. The men had "wanted to be a teacher" and liked special education and "the extra money and the comparative freedom" but were working on up-grading their qualifications which would mean more money and a chance to work in another area where you can "see your children learning". The men were not particularly happy about the amount of time that one must spend in what they considered a feminine role, that is, consoling the children when they were upset, and exercising the amount of patience needed when the children do not respond to the teaching methods.

The amount of commitment to teaching in general can also be demonstrated in the number of additional certificates earned from the number of additional certificates earned from the Department of Education. These courses are taken in order to up-grade qualifications and also to better the teacher's teaching methods. In the special education sample, the males had only 8 additional certificates among 22 males (the ratio would be approximately 2 additional certificates per every 5 males); among the females there were 75 additional
certificates per 53 females (the ratio would be approximately 3 additional certificates per every 2 females). In the elementary sample, the males had 28 certificates among 28 males (the ratio would be 1 certificate per every 1 male); the females had 485 certificates among 287 females (the ratio would be approximately just over 3 certificates per every 2 females). These figures support the expected differences.

There is a difference in role requirements between elementary and special education teachers. Part of the differences in role requirements is demonstrated when we speak of the autonomy factor connected with special education. Only the special education teacher is required and allowed to be so autonomous. He must be able to make decisions and be responsible for the results whether they be positive or negative. There is no principal or supervisors usually to make the decisions for him. He does not belong to a collective of teachers who will be making group decisions on curriculum and the futures of the children so that any individual is not responsible. The work and the futures of the children in special education is more highly personalized than the other types of teaching, due to the lower number of clients in the class, and the fact that each child is so different in his emotional make-up, capabilities and program needs. This is not to say that in the elementary classroom that each child is not as individualistic, but in the elementary classroom, the teacher is usually faced with the necessity to teach to the middle range, and to
larger groups of children. In special education the classroom is a therapeutic environment in that the teacher is trying to help the children to function at a normal level.

There is a restriction of information between special education and the rest of the teachers. The information concerning each child must always be held as confidential especially since so much more in depth material is available on these children. Teachers in elementary classrooms always have an exchange of information about their children, comparing his past performance with present; exchange of information is necessary when on a rotary system as the child's report is a combination of the experiences with many teachers; team teaching situations facilitate and necessitate exchange of information. The special education teacher is not involved in any of these exchanges.

To mention an improvement on the child's part while in special education would be to give negative values to other teachers' performances which is not ethically allowed. Teachers have daily meetings which are partly educational in content and partly social. The special education teacher is a single unit in the school, does not naturally have these daily group meetings and is never invited to take part in other meetings. Special education teachers verbalized their feelings about these meetings. "No one is in the staff room to talk to at noon hour, they're all out at their meetings having a great time." "I eat in my room with the children. It's better than eating alone in the staff room." The
elementary school teacher cannot understand the feeling of the special education teacher about these meetings. They feel that the teacher should be happy that he doesn't have to attend them. They do not see meetings as social situations, nor do they understand the role of isolation that the special education teacher has. They do not understand that of the basic interpersonal needs that we all have in common (Schutz, 1961:298) the special education teacher particularly has a need for inclusion. This is the need to maintain a satisfactory relation between the self and other people with respect to interaction or belongingness. (Bennis, 1968:19)

On the inclusion dimension, the special education teacher may have a strong need to include others, to bring them into his group but this expressed behaviour is relatively impossible. (Bennis, 1968:19). At the same time, the teacher has a need to want inclusion. From the interviews, this 'wanted behaviour' (Bennis, 1968:19) is relatively high for the majority of the special education teachers.

Some of the isolation of the teacher is not perceived by the elementary teachers due to the fact that the special education teacher can be characterized as extremely positive on the twelve primary response traits noted by Krech et al (1962). In the role dispositions, the role of ascendance whereby the person defends his rights, does not mind being conspicuous, is not self-reticent, is self assured and forcefully puts his self forward would certainly describe the majority of special education teachers. Perhaps much of this
is a reaction to the isolation role, but in observing these teachers within their school settings, I noted how highly visible they are within the group setting. They were assertive, self-confident, strong-willed, directive but not overly order-giving. One of the most outstanding features of their dominance role disposition is their power-orientation. Because of the amount of autonomy that the special education teacher has within the individual school, the feeling of power is also very strong. This is individual power, not being part of a group and having power. This is a difficult idea to pinpoint but the responsibility and the decision-making attributes of the special education role seems to overcome the more negative aspects of the isolation. When a teacher enters special education, perhaps these autonomy and power roles are not as visible as they would be if the teacher could remain within the system for a period of time.

Upon entry to special education there is that one year at least, of a type of direction which makes the teacher feel handicapped. Much of the direction is given by the supervisory personnel in order that the teacher will make the adjustment to his new role, and to facilitate the smooth management of the situation and the clientele. However this is interpreted by the novice special education teacher as an interference rather than an aid. (Not all teachers receive this help due to lack of supervisory personnel.) In interviews with teachers who had withdrawn from special education either during the school year or at the end of that
first year, the reactions were directed to this "interference" in their roles. One male phrased it as "they (the supervisors) won't let you do a thing on your own, they're always checking on you. Other teachers can run their own classroom but I'm not considered capable of doing the same thing." Another stated that 'if I wanted help, I'd ask for it." The relations with supervisory personnel tend to make the special education teacher feel submissive rather than dominant in his classroom. He sees other special education teachers who have been within the specialization for a short time (although comparatively long with his experience) and sees that they are more autonomous than he, or else they do not have supervisors at all. His reaction is to rebel against the supervisors, leading to a rejection of their help, and a role playing when they come. He often withdraws from special education since he cannot function within the classroom with this interference. He does not view this unsolicited help as a temporary phenomenon, but as a phenomenon which he cannot and will not handle.

The special education teacher is also high on social initiative in that he will organize social events which forcefully bring him into the group, that is, he will initiate group activities which will by necessity include him. He makes suggestions at meetings he does attend and often takes over the leadership of the group. However these chances to show social initiative are relatively few. The special education teacher is high on the role disposition of indepen-
dence. He prefers to do his own planning, to work things out in his own way, does not seek support or advice, and becomes emotionally self-sufficient within his own setting. For women teachers, these opportunities to be dominant, socially initiative and independent are primary reasons for remaining within the special education. Since mobility is not usually a viable goal, the teacher settles for a second choice of autonomy with its accompanying independence, freedom and facility for dominance which is not a major consideration in the elementary teacher's role.

The special education teacher accepts the child. There is no alternative for the child within the school system. The special teacher has learned to accept this fact, but even more important to build upon it. That is, he is the last hope of the child. With his disposition of sympathy, the special education teacher makes acceptance and sympathy work together to aid the child in his pursuit of goals. The teacher's role is unique. He evolves a hypothesis about the child, but does not limit himself to a smaller range of perceptual stimuli emanating from the child as Sarason (1966: 100) believes the elementary teacher does. The special teacher does not become an "unwitting participant in the self-fulfilling prophecy with this child." (Sarason, 1966:110) Rather he responds to this child in ways that attempt to guarantee that the child will eventually behave in a manner consistent with the teacher's original hypothesis. This is not to say that every special teacher will transform himself
and his children into the ideal classroom situation. Rather the teacher will try to build on whatever positive foundations the child has and will help the child recognize and evaluate his own negative aspects. The child has been a victim of the "hypothesis of mental retardation." (Sarason, 1966:110) Sarason explains this as the regular classroom teacher's decision based on any number of variables (many of which may be incorrect) that the child is slow, backward, or retarded. The teacher then will "often begin to perceive and respond to that child in a manner very different from his characteristic way of responding to other children in her class." (Sarason, 1966:110) The special teacher is not faced with this disadvantage. All of the children in his class are of the same basic type, in that they are all failures of the educational system, and usually present behaviour problems. The individualistic approach is the only way that he can approach this problem. To react in the same way that the other teachers and peers have in the past would be the creation of a situation which would make the classroom unbearable, not only for the teacher but for the child. The foregoing is not meant as a tirade against the elementary school teacher. Often overcrowded classrooms prohibit the amount of time available for an individualistic approach.

Perhaps the most outstanding fact to emerge from this study, in my opinion, is that the special education teachers misperceive their status. As the data has shown, the special education teacher perceived the professional rating
of his status as much lower than the actual rating as demonstrated by the elementary teachers' sample. The interview data also indicated that the special education teacher finds it difficult to handle his apparent low status. Coleman (1960) asserts that a realistic assessment of one's assets and liabilities, achievements and failures, limitations, and potentialities seems essential both for effective functioning on a day to day basis, and for fullest development of self. (in Smith, 1965:99)

The special education teacher who places a great value on high status as a reward for his job does not seem to be able to remain in special education under the pressure of his misperception of his status. Smith (1965:99) found that although one should never accept uncritically the evaluations of other people, it is generally true that those who are perceiving themselves quite differently from the way that other people perceive them have an inaccurate self-image. Such inaccuracy in self-evaluation may lead to a good deal of dissonance in interpersonal and social relationships.

The special education teachers who feel that they are low in status as indicated by reactions from other teachers cannot withstand the pressures which the job intrinsically contains. However as Smith (1965) says, "self-ratings may frequently be influenced by the individual's moral and social values and the resultant portrait may be in error." The young teacher is doubly aware of his lack of confidence and ability if he is 'failing' in Special Education. All of the teachers who were in the interview sample of teachers who had withdrawn from Special Education had entered this special
area within their first five years of teaching experience. Yet this group was the only group to more correctly perceive their status as rated by the profession. As the special education teachers gained in total teaching experience their misperception of status increased. Stouffer and Merton hypothesized that in such a case if the "individual's awareness of a more fortunate group is increased, he should feel more deprived than before, less satisfied with his own status-rank." The fact that the more experienced special education teacher can withstand the misperceived lower status may be due to the fact that he is further in the "process of becoming a mature, self-actualized, fully-functioning person ... such gains in self-acceptance are accompanied by a decline of feelings of insecurity, anxiety and discontent." (Smith, 1965:99) These more experienced teachers are able to remain in special education, reinforced by the positive aspects of intrinsic rewards. For those teachers who are involved in conflict and tension, due to feelings of self-dissatisfaction and dissatisfaction with the profession, Smith (1965) offers some suggestions. He states that the young teacher who finds himself dissatisfied with his role should remember that "only self-dissatisfaction can motivate one toward a different behavioural pattern." (1965:104) Furthermore, "be happy that you have some pangs of anxiety and malcontent; without them you would be no different a person (nor would your profession be a different one) than you are today." (Smith, 1965:104)
Summary

In summarizing the data presented in Chapters III and IV, we can abstract a profile of the Special Education teacher. He is highly satisfied with special education as a career choice; however this is more positive in the case of the female who is probably involved in special education for the personal satisfaction inherent in the work, while the male is more often using special education as a mobility factor in his quest for an administrative position. The Special Education teachers can articulate numerous rewards and costs which they realize are involved in teaching special education. For some reason, it appears to make a positive difference in satisfaction with special education if you were educated in urban rather than rural schools, although this fact cannot be explained at present.

The special education teacher more closely approximates the true professional. He is autonomous, can structure his own environment and his work is highly personalized. The special education teacher is usually highly visible in the school in spite of his isolation, as he is often assertive, self-confident and is in his dominant role disposition rather power-oriented, due to the amount of autonomy most special education teachers have. The special education teacher enjoys attention from the educational hierarchy because of the isolated role, but rejects all signs of interference in his classroom role. Consultants in their non-evaluative function
are more welcome than the supervisor. Those teachers who remain in special education tend to more negatively view their professional status as reflected by the teacher peer group, but view the rewards inherent in special education as able to overcome the cost structure of which status is an integral part.

Implications for Future Study

The area which I have examined in this thesis proved to be extremely interesting. The special education teacher alone provides a wealth of areas for future study; when seen in the context of his classroom, his peer group, his place and role in the educational hierarchy, the possibilities for future study appear limitless.

Possible topics for study could include a comparison of actual autonomy between principals and special education teachers; investigation into the misperception of professional status by special education teachers; a comparison between teachers in a system which does not have supervisors and consultants and those in a system that does, as to the amount of isolation the teacher feels he has.

It has been rather facetiously suggested that when special education teachers remain in this area, they become paranoid. This observation was based on the evidence presented as to the amount of misperception that special education teachers have about their professional status when compared with length of teaching experience.
Today, special education teachers are not as difficult to recruit, but according to one superintendent of a large school board, the problem of retention of high calibre special education teachers still exists. The ease of recruitment is due mainly to the surplus of teachers who will teach in special education to facilitate obtaining a regular elementary classroom position once they are under permanent contract. Negative factors once so important in the recruitment process have lost some of their power in the case of the embryo teacher as a result, but still operate in the recruitment process of the more experienced teacher. Further study could perhaps reveal the total range of factors in recruitment and retention and focus on ways and means of eliminating, or at least reducing their effects.

The retention of high calibre teachers could be facilitated by a programme which would remove the teacher from his isolation and involve him in the peer group. I would suggest a programme which would not only involve the child but also the special education teacher in both programmes of the elementary school, that is, the special education teacher would teach part time in the regular programme and part time in special education. This involvement would help to moderate the costs enumerated in special education.
FOOTNOTES

1. I am indebted to Mr. Terrence H. White for permission to use ideas derived from his concepts from his unpublished doctoral dissertation. Mr. White has summarized autonomy as the amount of discretion or choice a worker has in his work role over (a) the organization, (b) pace, and (c) execution of his work. It would be interesting to attempt to apply Mr. White's organizational model to the teaching profession.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS WHO LEFT SPECIAL EDUCATION

Subject 1. Male

At least I lasted a year. You have to give me credit for that. I really like special education and I'd go back in a minute if I could be free to run my own room the way I think it should be. I felt badly about leaving but when I got back into my old group (elementary teachers) they made me feel pretty good. You know the old 'welcome back to the fold' routine. They really think that the only place to be is in their group. I like to be on my own. I thought that in special education I'd be able to run my own show--set up my time table etc. I got to do that in a way. I was pretty free, but at the same time I couldn't really get the feeling that I was my own boss. The director was always on my back. If he knew something about teaching I wouldn't mind. The principal was greally great to me, but she's not the one who guarantees your job, and that's what counts. It's good to be back in the regular grades--lots of people to help you out--borrow materials and all that. I remember when I wanted to borrow things for my slow kids. They (the elementary teachers) always said that it would be too hard for my class and was I too lazy to do my own work--I was getting paid all that extra money for working with those kids. I only wanted to borrow a copy. You'd think they had copyrights on their
things. Now they'll offer to share ideas when I haven't even asked. I don't know how you stay in special education for a long time. Don't those teachers miss being part of the stream?

Subject 2. Male

I felt as if I were really going to be a great teacher when I made the decision to go into special education. I thought that this was my big chance to do my part—you know, to do something really worthwhile for kids who would really need me (not like the pupils in the accelerated grades who hardly ever need you.) When I told the other teachers what I was going to do, they really couldn't believe that I wasn't kidding them. After they finished with their (derogatory) remarks, I felt as if I were really out of my mind to get into special education. Every time one of the guys saw me, he'd make faces or act really retarded. I was wondering if I was being committed to the O.H. or exchanging teaching jobs. I was losing my whole perspective. But I'd said I'd teach it so I gave it a chance. You know I lasted just the two weeks. I thought that going to a new school would make a difference. Those teachers just ignored me or made (derogatory) rude remarks about wasting a teacher and all that money on those kids. It was just too much. That's why I asked for a transfer back to a regular grade.

I did give it another chance though. That was when I went to ___. I didn't care this time what the teachers
said. I was angry because I had let them make me feel the way I did before. I really liked the students at ___. Nobody put you down because you were teaching the slower kids. (Why did you leave then?) Look, when an organization can't get itself together and start putting into practice what they preach, then it's time to get out. ___ and that other guy that was in charge were always on my back. They don't even teach but they tell you how to run your classroom. That's why my wife quit there too. (His wife was an elementary teacher who had also switched to special education.) If you didn't have the principal interfering or one of the others (staff teachers who were not qualified special education teachers) about your methods etc, then it was the social work staff or cottage staff. Nobody looked at the results of my work or how the kids were improving--they were only interested in directing and enforcing the ideas of education that they had.

Subject 3. Female

I really liked the way the special ed. teacher always seemed to be so happy. Her experiences with the kids looked so much more rewarding than the ones we (the elementary teachers) were having. I liked the idea that the board would pay me to take the course out of town and then that paper (Elementary Special Education certificate) would be worth an extra $500 every year. What a surprise when you get in that classroom. I did last until Christmas though. The kids weren't
all that bad. But you'd think that the supervisor would have given me a boost once in a while. You know you don't get too much from the teachers. They praise each other; I know it's hard to find something for them to praise in special education with their feelings about the room, but they could at least say thanks for taking the kid off their hands. They didn't want them (the children in special education) and are really glad to get rid of them. They forget that though when the kid's finally gone. I would like to have seen their faces after I left. I'm happier in my work now because I'm not alone any more. I really feel part of a group and I always have others in my position to check on for support.

Subject 4. Male

I just stayed the one year in special education. No way I'd go back as long as they keep running the system the way they are now. I'm really a good teacher. I like the Opportunity kids and I do a good job. But they don't let you do what you're really able to do. Some of the special education teachers have a really fantastic time in their rooms. They make up their own programme, and choose their own books. It's really great to run your own show. You can't do that in the usual classroom.

Really the supervisors were trying to be helpful, I guess, because that was my first year in special ed. If I could have run my class in my own way I would really have enjoyed the year. But no way! When I was in Grade 6 (as a
there were always supervisors and consultants hanging around—the Inspector keeps visiting. Your program always has to be at the same point as everyone else in the whole city that's teaching that grade. The teachers even interfere. If they had told me one more time how terrible my kids were and how much money was being wasted on them, I would have punched them. These kids are great and they're finally getting the breaks that no other teacher let them have. There's something special even in the slowest kid and the feeling that a child has gained even a couple of mental months is an achievement that really means something. Maybe when the system changes I'll go back to special education but it doesn't look like there's much chance of that happening. Maybe when I get more seniority in teaching I'll stand a better chance of getting out of special education all I know there is to get and I'll be able to give in return all I know I can give.

Subject 5. Female.

When I decided to go to __ it was kind of a chance for me to prove what a really good teacher I was. When I was interviewed the director told me I would enjoy working with the girls. The classes were really ungraded and I could set up my own programme and work at my own speed. There were only six girls in the class and sometimes only one or two when they're sick. It sounded really great because you know how I am about running my own show!

It was really great the first week or so. The kids
were great but they were a little noisy. My room was right next to the principal's office. The walls were concrete blocks so they really carried the noise. I got so tired of the pounding on the wall. Whenever she thought we were a little too noisy, she'd bang something on the wall. Well that wasn't too bad, but when she'd come into my classroom and interfere with the lesson, that was a little too much.

On top of it all, when I'd tell my friends and other teachers where I was working, I'd get a reaction that made me feel that I had really scraped the bottom of the barrel in teaching "those girls". They thought that the girls were really on the lower rungs of the ladder and that made me a poor teacher just because I was teaching them. I found myself reacting so badly to the whole situation that I wasn't really doing a good job. It's good to be back with the regular kids although I miss the girls and the work is really not too exciting or fulfilling here.

Subject 6. Male

I was really excited to get my job in special education. I thought it would be a real change--besides I've always wanted to be a real wheel in administration, but you know that they're tough when you apply for a V.P. (vice-principalship). They expect you to have had experience in every area before you can direct a school. Anyway, they were going to open this class and it would just have about 5 students--they'd be slower learners but mainly emotionally
disturbed. You get more money—all kinds of materials. I got to set up my own room and my own timetable. I was to have first and final say about the whole thing.

Then when I got in there things were a little strange and I was really confused. I asked for help from the psych guy and from the woman that was our Supervisor for special ed. You know what she's like—I was really trying to do a good job and she kept handling me like I didn't know what I was going to do at the next minute. I can't work in a job where someone is keeping tabs on me as if I should be certified as not competent. I really couldn't make it even until Christmas. I really liked those boys but I was on so many tranquilizers that I couldn't really function in my own class. When someone has to help you keep control over your own students then it's time to get out.

Subject 7. Female

I took the course when it was offered in Windsor because I thought that this would be a really challenging area to be in. One of my sisters is a retarded child and I've always enjoyed working with her. The course really kind of turned me off—you know, they made jokes of all the problems you'd have in the classroom. I really wondered what it would be like and why they felt they had to continually joke about it. I was really apprehensive by time the course ended and I had the feeling that I wasn't going to like special education. I didn't want to be a spoilsport and quit before I even
had a chance to get into the teaching.

When I got to school a couple of days before the term started, I couldn't believe the mess that things were in. The class lists weren't complete—there were few supplies. I think they gave me the worse room in the whole place. The teachers with all the seniority get their choice of the best rooms.

I really tried to do a good job, but I just couldn't stand the way things were piling up. Everyone just expected too much from me. I quit at the end of the opening week of school. I thought I'd better while I was still able. I was lucky that I could get moved to another school.

Subject 8. Female

The work looked so easy when others were teaching. I thought I'd try it for the extra money—there were fewer students as compared with my own class. I liked the way everyone thought that you were so fantastic because you could control the class.

Then when I got in there, there were so many levels that I had to teach at. No one was there to help me, just to criticize me—why wasn't the class running as smoothly as the year before. The other teachers kept telling me how crazy I was to leave my nice safe classroom and go in with those kids. The kids were O.K. It took us a while to adjust to each other. After all, they had had the same teacher for four years. I just seemed to be a failure in all areas. I couldn't
take it any longer. I was determined to stick out the year because I knew how the kids would feel if they had to be returned after being away for so many years. I'll never go back into special education again.

Subject 9. Female
Subject 10. Male

The next two subjects were both fired from their jobs as special education teachers because they were not capable of handling an autonomous position. They constantly asked for help and emotional support from the other teachers who were either unable or unwilling to give it. The principal received so many complaints from the staff re: the demands of these two special education teachers.

The female respondent felt that the teachers were 'against her'. "If people had cooperated a little more, I would have been able to get along." When asked why she waited nearly two school years to get out of the job, the respondent was unable to see that perhaps special education just wasn't her field. "I enjoyed the freedom of the classroom. The girls were always so nice. But it seemed like the other teachers were always putting me down. Nobody talked to me when I went into the lounge, except when they wanted to criticize my girls or the noise from my room."

The male respondent also felt that he wasn't getting the cooperation from the teaching staff. "They didn't like my methods but I found that they were quite successful."
The children enjoyed working and I think they learned a lot. The staff was probably jealous of the freedom I allowed the children. Doesn't the new thinking say that a classroom doesn't have to be quiet?

It should be noted that the respondents were not originally from Ontario. The female was from India and the male was Jamaican. Both felt that much of the bias noted in the staff's relations with them came from feelings of prejudice. There were other teachers on staff from first generation ethnic backgrounds who did not feel that the staff had any feelings of prejudice.

INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS WHO STAYED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Subject 1. Female

I really enjoy special education. It's the only way to teach. When I was in the (regular) grades I ran my classroom but really I was just one of a group, because I was expected to be at a certain page at a certain time--like in the Spelling. Here I set up the program, choose the texts, operate a very flexible timetable. If you hit a day where the students just can't work, you switch over to a completely different programme and then the day's really interesting. You really have to be flexible when you get those days.

Some people ask how I stand the kids, but you know they're special, and you really become attached to them. For
a woman at least, it's like having a big family. They act up and you try to change their behaviour. I like the discussion groups and the fact aht I can take the time to talk to the students whenever they need it or ask for it. No one really bothers me. We don't have any supervisors or consultants. The principal gives me lots of support, even though the teachers don't. If they ever decide to take away the extra pay I'll stay here anyway. There's no amount of money that can make up for what I personally get out of this class.

Subject 2. Male

I could go on forever about why I stay in special education. I like the money, the freedom, being my own boss, the relatively small number of students, all of these things. It's really great not to have to do what everybody else is doing this week and this period. I wanted to be a principal once, and so I tried different kinds of classes, to get the experience I needed. I still keep hoping that I'll get the chance to be one yet. But I really enjoy special education and it's a great place to be in the meantime.

I teach shop to the boys from both classes while teaches home economics to the girls. The boys enjoy the shop so much that there's never any discipline problem. The kids know better than to act up here because they are penalized by losing a shop period if the behaviour was really disruptive.

It's really hard to put into words without sounding
conceited, but I really think that I'm making a contribution to society. They (the students) sat around the classrooms for years until I finally got them. It's really great to see a 15 year old boy learn to read. I've never found anything in teaching to equal how I feel when some big guy has even a small success.

Subject 3. Female

Sometimes I think I stay in special education just to prove to the other teachers that I can make it-- and that I'm strong enough to fight all the pressures, whether it's the kids, the teachers or the principal that are on my back. I nearly gave up before I even started teaching here because I couldn't stand the teasing from the other teachers. They really think I should be committed for working with these kids. Maybe it's not a very good reason, but I stay because I know I can help these kids. That's one of the things that the other teachers can't stand. They couldn't do anything with the kids and so they just let them sit there getting further and further behind. I'm really determined to show them what the student (and myself too, I guess) can do when the team applies the effort. The only way I can really become part of the teachers' group is to joke about the really funny things that happen during the day. Somehow I feel better about my problems when I look at them from a humorous angle but I'd like the chance to talk seriously to the other teachers about what we could do as a team to help the kids who really
should never end up in special education if we really cared.

Subject 4. Male

I actually began teaching in special education. I had just arrived in this country and needed to earn enough money to go to Teachers' College. That was the only teaching job I could get. Once I finished Teachers' College, I went right back. After facing the large classes during practice teaching, I wanted the smaller class. You can get through all of your marking a lot faster when you have only 10 of each paper to mark. I find that my evenings are usually free and so I have time to socialize and wear off any frustrations that are stored during the day. I miss not seeing the rapid achievement levels that you get in the regular grades but here in special education, a gain of a few mental months or even when a girl learns to divide or something small like that, I get such a charge out of it, and yet I have the freedom that if for some reason a pupil doesn't succeed, nobody blames me. It's odd to think that I got into this work for the money and was especially glad to get the extra pay for working in this kind of teaching. I get along well with the principal. I get almost anything I want for my class. I'll never get ahead in my career if I stay in this work, but right now the satisfaction in my job is worth more than taking on some administrative headaches.
Subject 5. Female

I can make this really short. I like the work, the pupils, the extra pay—all of these things. There are so many positive sides to special education that it's really hard to say just one is more important than the rest.

I like Wednesdays because we have cooking on that day and the children behave so well on that day and the day before that, I can get through the rest of the week just knowing that these days are coming.

I'm going to go on for my Supervisor's certificate. I'll probably never get to be one but I'm really becoming a specialist in my field. I see a lot of things wrong with special education—you know, things I'd really like to change—not that they're really wrong, just that they need to be changed or improved upon.

Subject 6. Female

You really want me to give you one reason why I stay in special education? If so, I'd just answer special education itself. When I made the move (in spite of a lot of flack) it didn't take long for me to see that I was really in my field at last. I had considered leaving teaching because I didn't find it to be too exciting—anyone could have programmed the kids to be at a certain page on this or that day. Some teaching I know is quite exciting—maybe the open concept—but I just felt that I had really made a mistake by getting into teaching. I needed the money though so I thought I'd
spend my last year in special education—might just as well go out with a bang. That was seven years ago and I'm still here. My kids are really great. I feel so needed here and I feel as if I've become a better person. When one of these kids gives me something he's made in crafts, I get really choked. The gift is probably really terrible to someone else, but it holds trust and affection and everything that boy or girl can't say to me but is showing me. Ask me again in a few years—maybe I can be more specific then, but I'd still be in special education—you can count on that.
APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Would you please indicate on the following scales how much you would like to work in the positions listed. Place a check mark between the colons toward the 'like' or 'not like' poles so that your check mark indicates as closely as possible your reaction to the particular position. IF for example, you would like very much to teach Art, you would place a check in the following manner:


A more neutral preference would be indicated by a check near the centre position; a position you would not choose would be indicated by a check toward the 'not like' pole.

1. Librarian
2. Vice Principal
3. Music
4. Elementary Primary
5. Guidance
6. Principal
7. Elementary Junior
8. Special Education
9. Art
10. Elementary Senior
11. French
12. Secondary School
14. Commercial
15. Technical
Now please use the scales below in the same way to indicate how you think the teaching profession as a whole regards each of these positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Not Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Librarian</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vice Principal</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Music</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elementary Primary</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Guidance</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Principal</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Elementary Junior</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Special Education</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Art</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Elementary Senior</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. French</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Secondary School</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Health &amp; Phys. Ed.</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Commercial</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Technical</td>
<td>like___</td>
<td>not like</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To facilitate analysis, would you please supply the following information.

1. How long have you been teaching? (Check one)
   ____ 0 - 5 years
   ____ 6 - 10 years
   ____ 11 - 15 years
   ____ 16 years or more

2. Did you attend elementary schools in
   ____ an urban area
   ____ a rural area
   ____ a suburban area

3. Where are you presently teaching? (as of June 1971)
   ____ in Public schools
   ____ in Separate schools

4. Your sex?
   ____ Male
   ____ Female

5. In what position are you currently teaching? (e.g. Librarian)
   My position is ___________________
6. In which of the following areas do you hold certificates, in addition to your Elementary Teaching Certificate?

___ Librarian
___ Music
___ Guidance
___ Special Education
___ Art
___ Health and Physical Education
___ Commercial
___ Primary Methods
___ Technical
___ Others (Please specify)  ____________________

_________________
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