Dissertations

Spring 5-2014

Relationship Between Leadership Styles of High School Teachers, Principals, and Assistant Principals and Their Attitudes Toward School Wide Positive Behavior and Support Implementation

Geneva Cosweller Lampton-Holmes
University of Southern Mississippi

Recommended Citation

The University of Southern Mississippi

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF HIGH SCHOOL

TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND

THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL WIDE POSITIVE

BEHAVIOR AND SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

by

Geneva Cosweler Lampton-Holmes

Abstract of a Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May 2014

The University of Southern Mississippi

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF HIGH SCHOOL

TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND

THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL WIDE POSITIVE

BEHAVIOR AND SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

by

Geneva Cosweler Lampton-Holmes

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of The University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Thelma J. Roberson_____
Director

James T. Johnson_____

David Lee_____

Sharon Rouse_____

Maureen A. Ryan_____
Dean of the Graduate School

May 2014

ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES OF HIGH SCHOOL

TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND

THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL WIDE POSITIVE

BEHAVIOR AND SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

by Geneva Cosweler Lampton-Holmes

May 2014

The purpose of this study was to determine if seventh through twelfth grade educators' attitudes towards School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) are affected based on their gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, leadership style, and knowledge of SWPBS.

Through an online survey, an analysis of the leadership style and knowledge of SWPBS of Mississippi teachers and administrators was conducted. Other variables included the school discipline policy and participants' gender and years of experience. The study found that knowledge of SWPBS and school discipline policy had a significant impact on the educators' attitudes towards SWPBS. Leadership style, gender, and years of experience did not have a significant impact on the educators' attitudes towards SWPBS. All five variables predicted 58.6% of the change in the educators' attitudes.

According to Scott, Park, Swain-Bradway, and Landers (2007), SWPBS creates a safe, productive learning environment. This is done through interventions designed to improve behavior and consistent feedback. Individualized instruction is designed for students that continue to demonstrate inappropriate behavior (Scott et al., 2007).

DEDICATION

The writer would like to dedicate this dissertation to her personal support staff. My grandmother, the late Jessie Mae Lampton, who taught me about the importance of an education she was never able to receive herself. My mother and father, Edna Rose Wilson and the late Johnny Wilson, Sr., who showed me that anything can be accomplished with hard work and perseverance. A special thanks to my family, children Joshua, Jamae, Jaree, and Derrell, daughter-in-law Shenequa, grandsons Jayden and Jeremiah, sister Amy, brother-in-law Alvin Jefferson, brother Johnny Jr., sister-in-law Tameaka, and nephews Johnny, Joneil, Isiah, Grant, and Jeremiah, who were patient and understanding throughout the entire doctoral process. Also, I would like to thank my mentor, Cynthia J. Magee, for teaching me the importance of applying the knowledge I obtained. A special thanks to my friends and colleagues, Earnestine Dillon, Janice Pittman, Laurie Capps, Braseye Graves, J. Bradley Brumfield, and Shree Montgomery, for their support. Finally, a special thanks to my best friend; he provided support through all my endeavors and encouragement when needed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to thank the dissertation chair, Dr. Thelma Roberson, and the other committee members, Dr. James T. Johnson, Dr. David Lee, and Dr. Sharon Rouse, for all the advice and support they provided. I would especially like to thank all the Educational Leadership professors and office staff for answering my never-ending questions while remaining patient and understanding. A special thanks to Ms. Ruth Jones, who was patient and helpful every time I called with endless questions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

           Background
           Research Question
           Definition of Terms
           Delimitations
           Assumptions
           Justification
           Summary

           Introduction
           School-Wide Positive Behavior Support General Introduction
           Leadership General Introduction
           Leadership Styles
           SWPBS Case Studies
           Leadership Case Studies
           Summary

           Introduction
           Overview
           Instrumentation
           Participants
           Research Design
           Procedures
           Data Analysis
           Summary

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides basic information about School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) and how it has evolved. It also contains information about the current study on the influence of gender, years of experience, knowledge of SWPBS, and leadership style on the participants' attitudes toward SWPBS. The chapter will also introduce important terminology associated with the current study.

Background

According to Pedota (2007), both new and veteran teachers have left the profession because of discipline problems. Mississippi code (37-11-18.1, 37-11-54) requires schools to implement some type of student positive behavior intervention and support system (PBIS) that addresses the behavior of all students. According to the Mississippi Department of Education (2010), this program has a similar structure as the response to intervention (RTI) framework, a three-tier model designed to address the academic needs of students.

According to Crimmins and Farrell (2006), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1997 recommended addressing inappropriate behavior with positive behavior support (PBS) and functional behavioral assessment (FBA). Teachers develop individual intervention plans for students with special needs whose behavior is detrimental to their academic and social growth. The reauthorization of IDEA in 2004 allowed for a school-wide intervention system and allowed for the expenditure of special education funds to provide training for SWPBS (Crimmins & Farrell, 2006).

SWPBS is an operational framework designed to facilitate student improvement both academically and behaviorally by utilizing instructional and behavioral interventions (Sugai, 2009). SWPBS teaches all students appropriate behavior, resulting in a decrease in inappropriate behavior (Horner & Sugai, 2000). Teachers design interventions to prevent inappropriate behavior through a three-tier model (Office of Special Education Programs, OSEP, n.d.; Simonsen, Sugai, & Negron, 2008).

Positive behavior support (PBS) evolved from applied behavior analysis (ABA), the normalization/inclusion movement, and person-centered values (Carr et al., 2002). PBS is rooted in behavioral theory (Sugai, 2007). Without ABA research, PBS could not have developed. ABA provided PBS with the conceptual framework for changing behavior as well as several assessments and intervention strategies (Carr et al., 2002). ABA is mainly concerned with the impact the environment has on human behavior and also recognizes the biological impacts on behavior (Association for Behavioral Analysis International, 2009).

According to the Department of Education (2006), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) legislation supported the normalization/inclusion movement. Section § 300.114(a)(2)(ii) of this legislation required schools to educate students with disabilities in the regular classroom with necessary supplemental aids and services. Section 300.101(c) also required that students with disabilities must have a free and appropriate public education available to them (Department of Education, 2006).

Carr et al. (2002) stated person-centered values are focused on an individual with a disability. In the past, school programs placed individuals with disabilities in services

already provided. Using the person-centered values approach, services were designed to meet the individual's specific needs (Carr et al., 2002).

According to Graham (2000), behaviorism has three guiding principles:

1. Psychology is the science of behavior. Psychology is not the science of mind.

2. Behavior can be described and explained without making reference to mental events or to internal psychological processes. The sources of behavior are external (in the environment), not internal (in the mind).

3. In the course of theory development in psychology, if, somehow, mental terms or concepts are deployed in describing or explaining behavior, then either (a) these terms or concepts should be eliminated and replaced by behavioral terms or (b) they can and should be translated or paraphrased into behavioral concepts. (Graham, 2000, p. 2)

Graham (2000) addressed three types of behaviorism. Methodological Behaviorism theorizes that psychology should focus on behavior, not on the mental state of humans and animals. Psychological Behaviorism attempts to explain human and animal behavior through responses, external stimuli, learning histories, and reinforcement. This theory can be traced back to classical associationism, which links intellectual behavior with associative learning. Analytical or logical behaviorism focuses on the mental terms and conditions and their meanings. This theory derived from logical positivism focuses on understanding and verifying scientific statements through experimental conditions or observations (Graham, 2000).

According to Pugsley (2011), the behaviorist theory focuses on the individual's response to stimuli. Focusing on the response to the stimuli leads to the teacher being

able to select the teaching method and to control the learning process or the stimuli so that the desired response from the student will be achieved. The teacher can utilize a reward system to achieve the desired behavioral response. When students demonstrate the desired behavior, the teacher has complete control over what, how, and when it is learned (Pugsley, 2011).

Dwyer, Osher, and Wager published a study in 1998 called *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe School,* which was sponsored by the Department of Education. This publication includes interventions to prevent inappropriate behavior. These interventions included teaching students appropriate behavioral responses and providing individualized interventions for students exhibiting inappropriate behavior. The publication also called for school-wide strategies to increase the effectiveness of individualized interventions. The report suggested that rules be broad with clear expectations that promote positive behavior and that immediately addressed inappropriate behavior. The publication recommended the combining of negative consequences for inappropriate behavior and positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior. The report also provided information on creating a school-wide written plan to prevent and, when necessary, to respond to disruptive behavior. The study recommended a team to monitor the plan (Dwyer et al., 1998).

Sugai et al. (2000) implied PBS is a combination of behavioral science, interventions, values, and system perspective. According to the behavioral sciences, human behavior is learned; therefore, it can be changed (Sugai et al., 2000). According to Sugai (2009), to gain a good understanding of SWPBS, it is important to know what it is and what it is not. SWPBS is an operational framework designed to improve student

behavior and academic achievement through interventions and instructional and behavioral practices. It is not an actual curriculum or intervention but a guiding framework (Sugai, 2009).

SWPBS has four elements and six guiding principles. The elements are as follows:

1. Data for decision making

2. Measurable outcomes supported and evaluated by data

3. Practices with evidence that these outcomes are achievable

4. Systems that efficiently and effective support implementation of these practices. (Sugai, 2009, p. 1)

The guiding principles are as follows:

1. Develop a continuum of scientifically based behavior and academic interventions and supports.

2. Use data to make decisions and solve problems.

3. Arrange the environment to prevent the development and occurrence of problem behavior.

4. Teach and encourage prosocial skills and behaviors.

5. Implement evidence-based behavioral practices with fidelity and accountability.

6. Screen universally and monitor student performance & progress continuously. (Sugai, 2009, p. 1)

According to Lewis and Sugai (1999), Simonsen et al. (2008), and Sugai (2009), SWPBS can be implemented through a three-tier process. The first tier assists all

students. SWPBS should be used consistently by all school faculty and staff and is designed to be implemented throughout the entire school environment, including classroom and non-classroom settings. Students who exhibit continuous problem behaviors move into the second tier, which provides more specialized strategies that are applied in small group settings. For less than 10% of the student population, who are still nonresponsive, tier three provides highly specialized individual interventions (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai, 2009).

According to Lewis and Sugai (1999) and Simonsen et al. (2008), Tier One is the foundation of the three-tier process and is designed to improve school outcomes for all students. For this to be accomplished, school officials first identify goals. The school improvement plan identifies priority areas SWPBS has listed as an initiative. School officials review data on office referrals, state test scores, and special education referrals in order to determine priority areas. Desirable measurable outcomes are set and monitored to determine if the interventions are successful once problems have been identified (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Simonsen et al., 2008).

According to Handler et al. (2007), Lewis and Sugai (1999), Simonsen et al. (2008), and Sugai and Horner (2002), the next step for officials is to develop a school-wide system. The school-wide system is developed by establishing a team consisting of administrators, teachers, special services providers, and community members. Leadership teams are important to the implementation and ongoing evaluation of SWPBS. These team members should be viewed as respected leaders by their colleagues. They should have excellent communication skills and extensive classroom management skills and education knowledge. They need adequate time to attend at least one meeting per month

to analyze data (Handler et al., 2007; Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2002).

Howard (2007) defined leadership as "the process of communication (verbal & non-verbal) that involves coaching, motivating/inspiring, directing/guiding, and supporting/counseling others" (p. 385). He asserted that leadership is responsible for the achievement of organizational goals in a timely manner. Howard identified four leadership styles: "Type-A (Fact Based), Type-B (Creativity Based), Type-C (Feelings Based), and Type-D (Control/Power Based)" (Howard, 2007, p. 386).

The first group, according to Howard (2007), Type As, fact-based leaders, show very little emotion and set high behavior standards for themselves as well as subordinates. They possess excellent organization skills and make decisions based on data. They are researchers and think through problems to ensure accuracy. Their style may be conservative, but their appearance is usually formal (Howard, 2007).

The second group according to Howard (2007), Type Bs, creativity-based leaders, are talkers. They are willing to communicate with anyone. They even talk when they are thinking. They solve problems utilizing spontaneity, imagination, and artistic expression (Howard, 2007).

The third group Howard (2007) indicates, Type Cs, feeling-based leaders, focus on their feelings towards others and their environment, even ignoring facts that contradict their decisions. They utilize their relationships and empathy to make decisions. They are open communicators who rely on intuition rather than data. They act quickly and are flexible, seeking approval from subordinates (Howard, 2007).

And the last group Howard (2007) labels as Type Ds, control/power-based leaders, attempts to use power and control over situations and people. They focus on control, planning, and organization. They are not creative or flexible. They reward subordinates for being submissive (Howard, 2007).

Hoy and Miskel (2005) stated leadership skills can be categorized as technical, interpersonal, and cognitive. Technical skills simply relate to leaders' knowledge of their jobs. Leaders demonstrate their interpersonal skills through how well they work with others and understand the feeling of others. Cognitive skills refer to a leader's ability to think logically and analytically (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Avolio and Bass (2011) and Hoy and Miskel (2005) characterized three leadership types: Laissez-Faire, transactional, and transformational. Laissez-Faire leaders have little or no interaction with subordinates. Followers do not know the leader's views, and the leader delays or does not make decisions. Transactional leaders provide rewards in exchange for service. They identify the self-interest of followers and provide them with rewards based on these interests. Transformational leaders are proactive. They influence and inspire followers while stimulating intellect and showing consideration for the individual (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Reynolds and Warfield (2010) implied effective leadership is important for successful schools. The leaders may not only be the principal. It could be a teacher, school board member, or superintendent. Effective leaders focus on people. They have long-term goals and are not afraid to ask questions or challenge the establishment and have original ideas. The beliefs of the effective leader can be determined from their words and actions (Reynolds & Warfield, 2010).

Research Question

Are the attitudes of seventh through twelfth grade educators towards SWPBS affected based on their gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, leadership style, and knowledge of SWPBS?

Definition of Terms

Attitudes towards SWPBS – nine questions based on a 4-point Likert-type scale designed to measure attitude towards SWPBS

Behavior Support Plan – developed from data collected during a FBA and has the components of "prevention strategies, the instruction of replacement skills, new ways to respond to problem behavior, and lifestyle outcome goals" (Fox & Duda, n.d., p. 3).

Discipline Policy – policy adopted by the entire school and approved by school board identifying various student behaviors and including but not limited to rewards for appropriate behavior and consequences for inappropriate behavior for the purpose of this study.

Educators – seventh through twelfth grade Mississippi teacher assistants, teachers, assistant principals, and principals for the purpose of this study.

Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) – "process for determining the function of the child's problem behavior. . . . involves the collection of data, observations, and information to develop a clear understanding of the relationship of events and circumstances that trigger and maintain problem behavior" (Fox & Duda, n.d., p. 3).

Knowledge of SWPBS – eight questions based on a 4-point Likert-type scale designed to determine the familiarity of participants with the SWPBS process for the purpose of this study.

Laissez-faire leadership style – leadership style where leader has minimal interaction with followers (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Positive Behavior Support (PBS) – "an applied science that uses educational and systems change methods (environmental redesign) to enhance quality of life and minimize problem behavior" (Carr et al., 2002).

Response to Intervention (RTI) – "the process of gathering and examining data for use in developing, analyzing, and implementing research- or evidence-based interventions used with students in the context of intervening with, and possibly evaluating, a student who may be at risk, academically or behaviorally" (Mississippi Department of Education, 2010, p. 14).

School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) – the implementation of the three-tier process throughout the school in both the classroom and non-classroom areas (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai, 2009).

Transactional leadership style – leadership style where leader identifies followers' interests and provides rewards for services (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Transformation leadership style – leadership style where leader is proactive and works to influence and inspire followers (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Years of Experience – individual's employment time at a school for the purpose of this study.

<center>Delimitations</center>

1. Participants were seventh through twelfth grade teachers in Mississippi public schools.

2. The research design was non-experimental quantitative design.

3. Data collection occurred during a two-week window, in late August and early September 2013.

4. The variables were gender, years of experience, knowledge of SWPBS, school discipline policy, and leadership style.

Assumptions

1. All educators have some knowledge of SWPBS.

2. Email accounts are provided to all educators in Mississippi public schools.

3. Educators' email addresses are publicly available.

Justification

This study added important information to the current research on SWPBS. It surveyed the attitudes of educators towards SWPBS, which can be utilized when developing leadership teams to implement a new SWPBS program or revamping a current program. Looking at the educators' attitudes prior to the attempt to implement SWPBS will aid administrators in determining how to begin implementation. By using the questionnaire included in this study, administrators could identify educators that have a positive attitude toward SWPBS and then use them to help persuade others. The questionnaire could also be utilized to determine the knowledge of educators who need more training on SWPBS.

Summary

Pedota (2007) found that inappropriate behavior by students has affected the decision of teachers to leave the education field. The state of Mississippi requires a three-tier approach to teaching appropriate behavior. The behavioral theory (Sugai, 2007) and

Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) (Carr et al., 2002) have been the driving forces behind the development of positive behavior interventions. A school-wide approach to positive behavior is designed with three levels of interventions (Lewis & Sugai, 1999; Simonsen et al., 2008).

This chapter provided definitions to important terminology. An explanation of the variables analyzed in this study was also provided. The information learned from this study will aid in the implementation of SWPBS. The survey instrument used in this study will allow administrators to determine the attitudes of educators towards SWPBS. With this information they will be able to determine the staff members that will support SWPBS and those that will need to be convinced of the positive outcomes possible from the implementation of this process.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides information on literature related to School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) and leadership. A detailed explanation of SWPBS and research on its effective application is provided. Leadership is defined along with an explanation of leadership styles and characteristics. There is also a review of research on the effects of leadership on the educational environment.

School-Wide Positive Behavior Support General Introduction

According to Mississippi Department of Education (MDE, 2010), by 2013 all educators were expected to utilize data in determining appropriate research-based instruction and interventions based on a three-tier model for both academics and behavior. Tier One requires universal behavior screening, classroom and behavior management that includes consequences for both appropriate and inappropriate behavior, school and district level behavior support systems, parental and community involvement, universal screening of both reading and math skills, universal screening for students enrolled in Subject Area Tested Classes, differentiated instruction, research based instruction, instruction and curriculum aligned to state standards, instructional leadership and support, classroom observations, and for educators who have not met minimal instruction and behavior standards a follow-up system. At Tier One, all interventions are school-wide and a process is in place for an ongoing review of data to determine if students are meeting behavioral expectations (MDE, 2010).

According to the MDE (2010), Tier Two requires specific interventions and additional instruction for students that are not meeting behavioral and academic expectations with tier one instruction. Tier Two has twelve elements, five behavioral and seven academic. The targets of the behavioral elements are research-based behavioral interventions, school and district behavioral support systems, appropriate decision making, documentation of interventions, and parental and community involvement (MDE, 2010).

According to the MDE (2010), Tier Three provides intensive behavioral and academic interventions. At this level, students are exhibiting significant behavioral and social problems. Data gathered at Tier Two shows that students at Tier Three did not make appropriate progress and at an appropriate rate. There are fourteen Tier Three elements, six behavioral and eight academic. The targets of the behavioral elements are research-based behavioral interventions, school and district behavioral support systems, appropriate decision making, documentation of intervention, Teacher Support Teams process and outcomes, and community and parental involvement (MDE, 2010).

Sugai et al. (2000) and Sugai (2007) both state that Positive Behavior Support (PBS) is theoretically based on the behavioral theory or behaviorism, which explains human behavior with laws and principles. Sugai (2007) explains that Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA) expounds on behaviorism by applying these principles to social problems. PBS expounds on ABA by considering the social, family, and interpersonal issues of students exhibiting inappropriate behavior when applying these principles (Sugai, 2007).

According to Scott, Park, Swain-Bradway, and Landers (2007), PBS is based on the premise that behavior can be predicted and therefore can be prevented. Inappropriate behavior is prevented through various rules, routines, and even physical arrangements designed specifically to meet to the needs of that educational environment. PBS is a framework based on the following steps:

1. Predict problems or failures: who, what, when, where, and why.

2. Based on predicted problems develop rules, routines, and physical arrangements to prevent these problems and instruct students on the expected appropriate behavior.

3. Consistent implementation of these strategies with immediate feedback.

4. Collect data to determine effective and ineffective strategies and determine necessary changes to ineffective strategies. (Scott et al., 2007)

According to Sugai (2007), PBS consists of three tiers of overlapping interventions increasing in specifications. The primary or bottom tier consists of interventions to teach social behavior to all students with positive reinforcement. These interventions, on average, are effective with approximately 80% of students. The middle tier, secondary or targeted, provides specialized group interventions and is normally effective with 15% of the remaining 20% of students with inappropriate behavior. The top tier, tertiary, provides individual interventions to the remaining 5% of students still exhibiting inappropriate behavior (Sugai, 2007).

 Horner, Sugai, and Anderson (2010) state that at this primary tier, direct instruction is utilized to teach appropriate behavior. Students that exhibit appropriate behavior are recognized while there are consequences for those with inappropriate

behavior. Data is collected about inappropriate behavior and utilized by the leadership team to make decisions. All school staff and faculty members participate in the implementation of SWPBS including custodians, cafeteria workers, and bus drivers (Horner et al., 2010). At this level, strategies such as conflict resolution, anger management, handling emotions, timeliness, preparing for class, and completing homework can be taught (Walker et al., 1996). Universal classroom management practices are applied, as well as family involvement practices (Horner et al., 2010).

According to Walker et al. (1996), at Tier One interventions are focused on preventing inappropriate student behavior. All students are exposed to the same interventions in the same manner. These interventions are designed to improve the overall school environment. Since they are universal, they have the potential for developing a positive school climate while turning students-at-risk toward positive behavioral practices (Walker et al., 1996).

According to Horner et al. (2010), at Tier Two students continue to receive primary level interventions, but they also receive secondary interventions to improve behavior. Data are collected frequently so that interventions can be adjusted quickly. A team is responsible for developing secondary interventions with a coordinator to oversee these interventions (Horner et al., 2010).

According to Walker et al. (1996), at the secondary prevention level interventions are designed to provide behavior support, develop skills, and provide mentoring to at-risk students who did not respond to universal interventions. These interventions are provided in a small group setting and are designed to meet the behavioral needs of these small groups of students (Walker et al., 1996). At this level, there is an increase in structure.

The collaboration between the school and the student's family is increased, while any reward for inappropriate behavior is decreased (Horner et al., 2010).

According to Horner et al. (2010), students receiving tertiary interventions have not responded to Tier One or Tier Two interventions. Tertiary interventions are designed to meet the individual needs of each student. A Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) is performed on all students at this level. The FBA, is used, along with other data, to develop a behavior support plan for the student. While receiving these interventions, students still receive primary and secondary level interventions. At this level, there is constant monitoring to determine behavior improvement and ensure accurate implementation of interventions (Horner et al., 2010).

According to Horner et al. (2010), Simonsen et al. (2008), Sugai, Simonsen, and Horner (2008), Sugai and Horner (2009), and Sugai (2007), SWPBS is a framework based on teams and driven by data, established routines and procedures designed to encourage appropriate behavior through the teaching of behavioral expectations and prevention of inappropriate behavior.

The elements guiding SWPBS are

1. Development of measurable outcomes
2. Identify measurable practices
3. Evaluate data to determine what does and does not work
4. Establish systems to ensure successful implementation. (Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai, 2009)

The principles guiding these elements are:

1. Develop a continuum of scientifically based behavior and academic

    interventions and supports

2. Use data to make decisions and solve problems

3. Arrange the environment to prevent the development and occurrence of

    problem behavior

4. Teach and encourage prosocial skills and behaviors

5. Implement evidence-based behavioral practices with fidelity and

    accountability

6. Screen universally and monitor student performance & progress continuously.

    (Sugai, 2009, p. 1)

Sugai et al. (2000) finds that behavioral science, practical interventions, lifestyle outcomes, and a systems perspective are integrated into PBS. First, social, environmental, behavioral, and bio-behavioral factors all have an influence on human behavior. Second, a large part of the learning associated with human behavior is unintentional. Third, "human behavior is learned and can be changed" (Sugai et al., 2000).

According to Sugai et al. (2000), the knowledge provided by the behavioral sciences has allowed for the development of practical interventions. Functional Behavior Assessments are conducted and used to develop behavior support plans. From these plans, interventions that change the environment, curriculum, and even the reward system if they are factors in promoting the inappropriate behavior are emphasized. This is done through teaching, a major component of behavior change. All interventions are research based and data driven (Sugai et al., 2000).

According to Sugai et al. (2000), the goal of PBS is to improve behavior so that the overall life and learning of the student improves. For this to occur, the change in behavior must be relevant, socially significant, long lasting, and comprehensive. To meet these criteria, the interventions must be appropriate, take place in a natural setting, and should not be painful. Also, there must be an appropriate fit between the values of the students, their families, and educators (Sugai et al., 2000).

Sugai et al. (2000) go on to state that from the system perspective, the quality and durability of the supports are directly related to the amount of support provided. All practices and decisions are policy driven, and the main goal is prevention and continued used of effective practices. Teams are developed to solve problems and administrative support is evident. Multiple systems are considered so that there is a continuum of behavioral support (Sugai et al., 2000).

According to Scott et al. (2007), SWPBS improves academic performance by creating a productive and safe learning environment. Students who exhibit inappropriate behavior are given secondary interventions to improve behavior with consistent feedback. Students who still exhibit inappropriate behavior are provided specific individualized behavioral interventions (Scott et al., 2007).

According to Frey, Lingo, and Nelson (2008), SWPBS is guided by outcomes deemed important by stakeholders, positive outcomes produced by curriculum for teachers and students, and data-driven decisions. It is developed around the classroom, non-classroom, school-wide, and individual systems (Frey et al., 2008).

According to Horner et al. (2010), Sugai and Horner (2009), Simonsen et al. (2008), Sugai et al. (2008), and Sugai (2007), SWPBS is designed with three tiers of

interventions. The first tier targets all students. The second tier targets small groups of students that did not respond to the interventions provided by the first tier. The third tier provides interventions designed for individual students that did not respond to the primary or secondary tier of interventions (Horner et al., 2010; Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai, 2007; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Sugai et al., 2008).

SWPBS interventions are specific to each school but all systems have the following themes in common:

1. School-wide behavior support procedures were designed by local teams.

2. Successful schools relied on clear administrative direction and support.

3. Schools identified a small number of behavioral expectations that defined the culture of the school.

4. The behavioral expectations were taught to all students.

5. Performing to the behavioral expectations was rewarded through an ongoing recognition system.

6. Dangerous and disruptive behavior resulted in corrections. Problem behaviors were neither ignored nor rewarded.

7. Information on student performance was collected continuously and summarized for decision making by local teams. (Horner & Sugai, 2000, p. 231).

According to Simonsen et al. (2008), Handler et al. (2007), and Sugai and Horner (2002), before a school-wide system can be implemented, several factors should be considered. These factors are leadership team development, the role of staff, administrator backing, effective coaching components, and district backing. Development

of a leadership team, whether trained by outside consultants or district personnel, must be completed before SWPBS can be implemented. For the initial SWPBS plan to be received positively by school personnel, the leadership team has to be made up of individuals viewed as credible leaders by their colleagues. For example, veteran teachers with extensive education and classroom management knowledge or teachers active in the local union or professional organization are possible team members. There should be teachers from various grade levels and general and special education, various support personnel, assistants, and even community members (Handler et al., 2007; Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai & Horner, 2002). It is recommended that teams consist of eight to 10 members (Handler et al., 2007).

Handler et al. (2007) suggest that leadership teams are usually more effective if members are effective communicators and team builders. Team members have to be able to have constructive dialogue about the data collected and problems identified. This is why well respected school psychologists and counselors are also valuable team members (Handler et al., 2007).

According to Sugai and Horner (2002), the principal, a member of the leadership team, needs to be an active supporter of SWPBS and the leadership team. As members, they bring their leadership abilities, as well as decision-making authority. Leadership teams should have a clearly defined purpose, members, identified groups, measurable outcomes, and be aligned with school improvement objectives (Sugai & Horner, 2002).

The findings of Handler et al. (2007) showed that during the first year of implementation, team members spend approximately 40 to 50 hours determining the school's needs and developing a plan. They also needed approximately two hours per

month to review data to determine if changes to the plan are necessary (Handler et al., 2007).

Leadership teams are responsible for developing policy, overseeing resources, maintaining support, coaching staff to ensure consistent implementation, acting as local trainers, and evaluating implementation progress (Sugai & Horner, 2006). According to the MDE (2010), leadership teams can evaluate student behavior in several ways, including surveys of both staff and students. Survey results provide information for planning and decision making. Team members should also observe students in various parts of the school such as hallways, bathrooms, cafeterias, playgrounds, entrances, and exits at the beginning and ending of the day. Office discipline referrals may also be used to determine patterns of inappropriate behavior by students (MDE, 2010).

Handler et al. (2007) suggest that the leadership team has an impact on SWPBS implementation through decisions and practices guided by principles, understanding of effective team work, consistent team activities, and consistent SWPBS implementation through setting and attaining goals. The team acts as a guiding force behind SWPBS and constantly train on student discipline and behavior, theories on improving student behavior and school climate, as well as establishing effective systems. The availability of continuous training to team members ensures adequate knowledge to develop individual behavior plans for students and understanding of PBS principles (Handler et al., 2007).

Leadership General Introduction

Howard (2007) defined leadership as "the process of communication (verbal & non-verbal) that involves coaching, motivating/inspiring, directing/guiding, and supporting/counseling others. This results in the timely production of predetermined

organization goals" (p. 385). Northouse (2007) defined leadership as "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3). Leadership is defined as transactions between the leader and followers, implying that followers both affect and are affected. This means that everyone is capable of leadership, not just the official leader (Northouse, 2007).

According to Northouse (2007), there are three components of leadership. First is the involvement of influence in leadership. Leadership exists when followers are affected. Second is the group context. Leadership is about the influence exhibited over several individuals with the same purpose. Third, leadership involves goal attainment. The leader's purpose is to influence the group so that goals are attained (Northouse, 2007).

Northouse (2007) states power is part of leadership's influence process and is the ability to affect the actions, attitudes, or beliefs of others. Power is used by leaders to facilitate change. The two predominate types of power are position and personal power. Position power is based on the individual's job title. It is the leader's ability to influence others based on their position. Personal power is based on how others perceive an individual as being knowledgeable and likeable. Leaders are often described by their use of power (Northouse, 2007).

<div align="center">Leadership Styles</div>

Howard (2007) divided leadership into four styles: fact-based, creativity-based, feelings-based, and control/power-based. Fact-based, Type A, leaders focus on results and expect high performance from others. They thrive in situations "that require facts, logic, theories, scientific applications, analysis, quantitative, mathematical, and technical

processes to resolve" (Howard, 2007, p. 386). They set high behavioral expectations for themselves and those they work with. They seldom show emotions and always try to find the logical order to situations. Type A leaders have great organizational skills, enjoy performing research, and make decisions based on data. They desire perfection from everyone and are critical if their expectations are not met. These leaders do not react to situations but prefer to analyze the problem before attempting to resolve it. They focus on accuracy with an emphasis on the job to be completed (Howard, 2007).

Creativity-based, Type B, leaders solve problems utilizing "artistic, flexible, imaginative, spontaneous, and holistic" techniques (Howard, 2007, p. 387). They are direct and willing to communicate with others. They have a relaxed, casual style that also shows their creative side. It is common for them to talk and think at the same time (Howard, 2007).

Howard (2007) implies Type C, feelings-based, leaders solve problems based on how they feel about the situation regardless of the data which may contradict their decisions. They frequently use their relationships and emotions to make decisions. They only reference data if it confirms their decisions. These leaders utilize intuition rather than scientific inquiry. Their relaxed communication style causes others to feel relaxed talking to them. Feelings-based leaders go through the decision process quickly. They demonstrate flexibility and desire recognition from their superiors (Howard, 2007).

The control/power-based or Type D leadership style lacks creativity and uses "power and control over people, tasks, and environment" (Howard, 2007, p. 388). They reward submissive subordinates and are not flexible. Due to their fear of failure, they

don't encourage subordinates. They are not spontaneous and lack imagination (Howard, 2007).

Avolio and Bass (2011) and Northouse (2007) implied transformational leaders work to change others. "It is concerned with emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals and includes assessing followers' motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full human beings" (Northouse, 2007, p. 175). Followers are motivated to accomplish more through the use of charisma and vision. This leader is vital in facilitating change (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Northouse, 2007).

According to Avolio and Bass (2011) and Northouse (2007), transformational leadership is characterized by four factors. The first factor is charisma/idealized influence. They have a vision and a mission and are able to influence others to trust and follow them (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Northouse, 2007). According to Northouse (2007), these charismatic leaders demonstrate four types of behaviors. First, they act as role models demonstrating their values and beliefs. Second, they show followers they are competent. Third, they are able to articulate their ideological goals, which may have a moral base. Fourth, they demonstrate high expectations for followers and show they are confident that these goals will be attained (Northouse, 2007).

According to Avolio and Bass (2011), idealized influence can be broken into idealized attributes (IA) and idealized behaviors (IB). Demonstrating IA consists of instilling pride, working for group goals not individualized goals, building respect, and appearing confident. Demonstrating IB consists of explaining personal values and beliefs, exhibiting purpose, decision making based on morals and ethics, and emphasizing a mission (Avolio & Bass, 2011).

According to Avolio and Bass (2011) and Northouse (2007), the second factor is inspirational motivation. These leaders have high expectations of their followers and are able to encourage them to achieve more than they would on their own. They communicate this through encouraging words. The third factor, intellectual stimulation, describes leaders that encourage followers to be creative and develop new ways of meeting organizational goals. The fourth factor, individualized consideration, describes leaders that act as coaches and support followers by listening to them and helping them achieve their full potential (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Northouse, 2007).

Avolio and Bass (2011) imply transactional leaders demonstrate constructive and corrective behavior. They set expectations and encourage others to meet these expectations (Avolio & Bass, 2011). According to Avolio and Bass (2011) and Northouse (2007), transactional leadership is characterized by two factors, contingent reward and management-by-exception. With contingent reward, an agreement is made between the leader and the followers on the goals to be accomplished and the reward for those working to accomplish these goals. Management-by-exception can be both active and passive and involves constructive criticism and feedback and reinforcement that are both negative. Leaders utilizing active management-by-exception observe the work of others for errors and provide instruction to correct these errors. Leaders utilizing passive management-by-exceptions do not intervene until after problems occur (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Northouse, 2007).

According to Avolio and Bass (2011) and Northouse (2007), Laissez-faire leadership is characterized by one factor, absence of leadership. Leaders exhibiting the

Laissez-Faire style do not provide feedback or make timely decisions. They have little or no contact with followers (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Northouse, 2007).

<div align="center">SWPBS Case Studies</div>

Bohanon et al. (2006) performed a case study of a public high school in Chicago. The population was 1,800 students consisting of 36% African American, 36% Hispanic, 16% Asian American, 8% Caucasian, 2% Native American, and 2% other. Economically, 89% of students qualified for free or reduced lunch. The study took place in three phases. Phase one began with a meeting with the school principal to provide a basic explanation of the PBS process, identification of leadership team members, and development of a process to provide information to the school staff. Phase two consisted of collecting and storing office referral data and administering the Effective Behavior Support (EBS) Survey to staff. The EBS Survey is designed to measure the PBS implementation level and to assess the priority change area, whether whole school, classroom, outside of the classroom, or individual support. Phase three consisted of presenting the data from phase one and phase two to the staff (Bohanon et al., 2006).

According to Bohanon et al. (2006), a comparison of office discipline referral (ODR) data from year two and year three showed that referrals decreased from 5,215 in year two to 4,339 in year three. Decreases were found for several behaviors from year two to year three including dress code violations from 26.63 for every 100 students to 8.39 per 100 students and serious disobedience to authority from 1.64 per 100 students to .05 per 100 students. There was also a decrease in the number of repeat referrals for students from year two to year three. The percentage of students with two to five discipline referrals decreased from 32% to 25%, while the percentage of students with six

or more discipline referrals decreased from 21% to 16%. The percentage of students with zero to one discipline referral increased from 46% to 59% (Bohanon et al., 2006).

Bohanon et al. (2012), conducted a study involving an urban high school with approximately 1,700 students and an ethnic breakdown of 72% Hispanic, 14% Caucasian, and 13% African American. Also, 90% of the students qualified for free or reduced lunch. During the 2003 – 2004 school year, Phase I of SWPBS implementation began with administrators and faculty members meeting with the research team, as well as with faculty members that had previously implemented SWPBS. Phase II began during the summer of 2005 with a meeting of the leadership team, consisting of general and special education teachers, administrators, students, and the research team to review data and determined three behavior areas to be addressed. They also set classroom and non-classroom behavior goals. Phase III began in the fall of 2005 with the implementation of SWPBS. ODRs decreased 26% from the 2005 – 2006 to 2006 – 2007 school years and 35% from 2006 – 2007 to 2007 – 2008 school years (Bohanon et al., 2012).

Turnbull et al. (2002) conducted a case study of Central Middle School in Kansas City, Kansas, which consisted of 762 sixth through eighth grade students. Inappropriate behavior is calculated per 100 students. Central reported 26.8 student-on-student violent acts that resulted in out of school suspension or expulsion compared to a district average of 9.5 and a state average of 4.9. They also reported 2.2 student-on-staff violent acts compared to a district average of 1.0 and a state average of 0.4 (Turnbull et al., 2002).

According to Turnbull et al. (2002), the implementation began by interviewing students, teachers, and administrators to determine their concerns about inappropriate behavior. Based on these interviews, the term "becoming Centralized" was developed to

explain behavioral expectations along with five universal school-wide behavioral expectations: be safe, respectful, responsible, cooperative, and ready to learn. The school's leadership team was made up of the researchers, teachers, and administrators. The leadership team then developed lesson plans to be utilized by teachers in the classroom (Turnbull et al., 2002).

According to Turnbull et al. (2002), a ticket system was developed as positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior. Students that received tickets placed them in grade level boxes in the office and the vice principal drew a name from each box every morning. The students' names and what expectation they had met to receive the ticket were announced over the intercom. Their classmates cheered as they went to the office to have their pictures taken and placed in an award case, and they were allowed to select a prize. After two years of implementing SWPBS, office discipline referrals decreased by 19%, in school suspensions decreased by 12%, and out of school suspensions for five days or less decreased by 60% (Turnbull et al., 2002).

Warren et al. (2006) performed a study on the implementation of SWPBS at a sixth through eighth grade middle school located in a Midwestern city consisting of approximately 737 students. Their ethnic makeup was 41% African American, 35% Hispanic American, and 18% European American. Economically, 80% of the students qualified for free lunch. During the first half of year one, researchers met with the school staff and developed an understanding of the school's procedures and needs, and during the second half of year one the researchers provided training on the basics of PBS and FBAs, current behavior procedures, and a comparison of current procedures to PBS procedures. The teachers and administrators worked together to develop universal school-

wide behavior expectations of being responsible, respectful, cooperative, safe, and ready to learn. They also developed lesson plans so that these expectations could be taught in the classroom (Warren et al., 2006).

According to Warren et al. (2006) the SWPBS program was implemented at the beginning of the second year utilizing a ticket system to recognize appropriate student behavior. The tickets were placed in frequent drawings for prizes. A trophy case was also set up near the cafeteria to display the pictures of the students that won the drawings. Comparing year one of the study to year two, office discipline referrals decreased by 20%, in school suspensions decreased by 5%, and out of school suspensions for five days or less decreased 57% (Warren et al., 2006).

SWPB was implemented at Abbot Middle School located in Elgin, Illinois according to a study by Cregor (2008). According to the Illinois State Board of Education eReport Card (2005), the school consisted of approximately 561 seventh and eighth grade students. The low income students made up 51.7% of the student body. The ethnic demographics were 46.2% Hispanic, 34.9% Caucasian, 14.1% African American, 3.4% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1.2% multiracial, and .2% Native American (Illinois State Board of Education, 2005).

According to Cregor (2008), after one year of implementation, in school suspensions and after school detention were cut in half, while out of school suspensions decreased from 20 to 25 to only three or four. Eighty percent of the students responded positively to the universal interventions. Fifteen percent of the students required targeted support on specific inappropriate behavior such as tardiness, while 5% had more extensive behavior issues (Cregor, 2008).

Cregor (2008) found at least 80% teacher buy-in is important to the successful implementation of SWPBS. Administrator buy-in is also important. Some common misconceptions that have to be overcome are that SWPBS only allows for positive rewards, not consequences for inappropriate behavior, and that positive rewards are only in the form of tangible gifts, not in intangible forms such as praise. SWPBS also requires a redesign of the school's discipline procedure because teachers are required to handle minor disciplinary infractions in their classrooms rather than sending the students to the administrators (Cregor, 2008).

George, White, and Schlaffer (2007) performed a study on the implementation of SWPBS. Case one involved Centennial School, a day school program for autistic and emotionally disturbed children between the ages of six and 21 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The student population was approximately 100, of which 68% were Caucasian, 13% were African American, and 11% were Hispanic American. Economically, 82% of the students qualified for free or reduced lunch. The implementation of the SWPBS program resulted in a significant decrease in inappropriate behavior, as indicated by the reduction of the need for physical restraints from 122 instances during the first 20 days of school to 0 instances during the last 20 days of school. The school also closed both secluded time out rooms (George et al., 2007).

George et al. (2007) discussed a second case, Northwest Elementary School in eastern Pennsylvania. The student population consisted of approximately 550 students in grades one through five, of which 48% were Caucasian, 47% Hispanic, 3% African American, and 1% Asian. Economically, 67% of student qualified for free or reduced lunch. Successful implementation of the program is evident by the reduction of office

referrals from 1,717 to 702 and after school detention from 845 to 85 after one year. After the second year, office referrals decreased to 619 and after school detention to 21 (George et al. 2007).

George et al. (2007) found that, although these schools have completely different student populations, a comparison of both successful SWPBS programs revealed the following similarities. First, both schools developed school-wide agreements among stakeholders. Second, both schools developed classroom interventions to be utilized by teachers prior to sending students to the office. Third, the leadership team at both schools also incorporated academic interventions into their school-wide program. Fourth, both schools developed reasons change was needed and a vision of how the schools would look after change had been implemented. Fifth, both schools had effective leadership. This was seen through administrators who were committed to the program and active in its implementation and through active members of the leadership team. Seventh, both schools provided resources for teacher training and awards for the students. Eighth, teachers at both schools worked together to provide students consistent classroom and school environments. Ninth, school psychologists, leadership team members, were leaders in developing proactive interventions. Tenth, the SWPBS procedures became part of the school's policy, with changes made yearly based on teacher feedback. These procedures were taught to all new teachers entering the schools (George et al., 2007).

Flannery, Sugai, and Anderson (2009) conducted a study of high school level SWPBS leadership teams that had implemented SWPBS for at least one year and had at least one leadership team meeting. The survey they completed was broken into five parts. They were "school demographics, staff participation and support, expectations and types

of acknowledgements, leadership team membership, and priorities for the year's action plan" (Flannery et al., 2009, p. 178). The study found that a major challenge for high schools was faculty and staff buy-in. Only 30% of participants reported 76% or more of faculty and staff members supported the implementation of SWPBS. Also, only 26% of participants reported that 76% or more of the school's staff actively participated in the SWPBS policy (Flannery et al., 2009).

Flannery et al. (2009) leadership team study also identified strategies that were essential to the successful implementation of SWPBS. The study participants stated that SWPBS implementation at every level was difficult without administrative support. The participants went on to stress that administrative support was more than an administrator being a member of the leadership team. Participants also identified training and frequent staff meeting as vital to successful SWPBS implementation (Flannery et al., 2009).

<div align="center">Leadership Case Studies</div>

Benda and Wright (2002) performed a study to determine the effect of leadership on an elementary school's disciplinary culture. They studied 30 elementary schools from northeast Pennsylvania. Their sample consisted of 680 teachers and 30 principals. The teachers completed a questionnaire on school climate, and the administrators completed a questionnaire on leadership behavior. They found a direct relationship between the flexibility of the school's leadership and its disciplinary culture. They also found that leaders with a vision that directly collaborate with teachers to provide a consistent disciplinary climate are necessary for teachers to be supportive in maintaining an education environment conducive to the academic and behavioral needs of students (Benda & Wright, 2002).

Mendel, Watson, and MacGregor (2002) conducted a study that looked at the leadership styles of administrators compared to the teachers' perceptions of school climate. They studied 39 kindergarten through fifth grade elementary schools located in southern Missouri. The participants were given a questionnaire which determined the administrator's leadership style and the school's climate. The teachers were given three leadership styles to choose from: directive, high administrator-low teacher control; non-directive, low administrator-high teacher control; and collaborative, equal administrator and teacher control. Based on the responses, the leadership styles of the school administrators were 7% directive, 33% non-directive, and 60% collaborative. The collaborative leadership style was associated with the most positive school climate with an average of 92, with nondirective averaging 81, and directive averaging 77. This average was based on their responses to 22 questions with a 5 point Likert scale (Mendel et al., 2002).

Kincaid, Childs, Blase, and Wallace (2007) performed a study to identify the barriers and facilitators to SWPBS implementation. The participants were 70 leadership team members from 26 Florida schools that had been implementing SWPBS for at least one year. They were given a questionnaire to determine if their school was characterized as being high (HI) or low (LI) implementing. When this data was evaluated, there were 29 participants from eight schools that met the high criteria, while 41 participants from 18 schools met the low criteria. Then four HI and five LI groups of seven to nine participants were established. Participants did not know how they were grouped. The groups with the aid of a trained facilitator developed a list of barriers and a list of facilitators to SWPBS implementation in their schools. They then ranked each barrier on

the importance of overcoming it to successful SWPBS implementation based on a 7 point

scale from not at all important to very important. The barriers were also ranked on the

feasibility for the research project to impact the barrier based on a 7 point scale from very

unfeasible to very feasible. They ranked the facilitators on the strength of their impact on

SWPBS based on a 7 point scale from very weak to very strong (Kincaid et al., 2007).

According to Kincaid et al. (2007), the groups agreed on 21 important barrier

themes:

staff buy-in, use of data, inconsistent implementation, reward system,

implementation issues, time, staff and student turnover, philosophical differences,

misperceptions of PBS, district support, administrative support, staff

recognition/reward, team process/functioning, school-level/team training, parent-

community support, funding, frequent fliers, understanding behavior principles,

academic-behavior relationship, communication, and miscellaneous (Kincaid et

al., 2007, p. 178).

According to Kincaid et al. (2007), both HI and LI groups had more statements

about staff buy-in as an important barrier. The next three themes with more barrier

statements for HI groups were incorrect PBS perceptions, team training, and data, while

LI groups listed team function, communication, and rewards (Kincaid et al., 2007).

According to Kincaid et al. (2007), the groups agreed on 19 facilitator themes:

district support, PBS project support, use of data, administrative support, school-

level/team trainings, plan implementation, team membership, team

process/functioning, funding, coaching, communication, staff buy-in, positive

student outcomes, staff recognition/rewards, student buy-in, integration into

school, parent-community support, reward system, and miscellaneous. (Kincaid

et al., 2007, p. 180)

According to Kincaid et al. (2007), HI and LI groups did not have the same theme

with the most statements. HI groups had a higher frequency of communication

statements, while LI groups had a higher frequency of statements in staff buy-in,

implementation, and team membership (Kincaid et al., 2007).

<div align="center">Summary</div>

This chapter provided a review of the literature on the foundation of School-Wide

Positive Behavior Support as well as an overview of the implementation process. Specific

case studies were cited, which provide data on the successful implementation of SWPBS.

Various leadership styles were also presented with case studies outlining the importance

of leadership in the school environment.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides specifics about the design of the study, the survey instrument and how the data was analyzed. Information about the participants and the reliability and validity of the instrument are also included. The purpose of this study is to determine if seventh through twelfth grade educators' attitudes towards School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) are affected based on their gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, leadership style, and knowledge of SWPBS.

Overview

This study utilized a non-experimental quantitative design. There was not an attempt to determine cause, only to determine the influence the independent variables have on the dependent variable. The study was delivered by email to seventh through twelfth grade public school educators in Mississippi. It was a convenience sample from the aspect that the survey was sent to educators with publicly available email addresses. Once the data was collected, SPSS was utilized for data analysis to determine if gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, knowledge of SWPB, and leadership style had an impact on the attitudes of educators towards SWPBS.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument, SWPBS and Leadership Style Questionnaire (Appendix A), was divided into three sections. The first section included demographic questions providing data for the independent variables gender and years of experience. Participants were asked about their job title, years of experience, gender, and educational background.

The second section asked questions about SWPBS, providing data for the independent variables school discipline policy and knowledge of SWPBS, as well as the dependent variable attitudes towards SWPBS. The questions were based on a 4-point Likert-type scale and designed to determine if the participants had knowledge of SWPBS, their attitude about it, and if their school had an active SWPBS program. The rating scale was 1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-agree, and 4-strongly agree. The third section included questions to determine the participants' leadership styles, transformational, transactional, or Laissez-faire, which were also independent variables. These questions were also based on a 4-point Likert-type scale. The rating scale was 1-never, 2-occassionally, 3-often, and 4-always.

The independent variable, school discipline policy, was determined by questions one through eight in the second section of the survey. Knowledge of SWPBS was determined based on questions nine through 17 in the second section of the survey. Attitude towards SWPBS was determined based on questions 18 through 25 in the second section of the survey.

Leadership style was determined based on 15 4-point Likert-type items in the third section of the survey instrument. The first five questions addressed transformational leadership style. The next five questions addressed transactional leadership style. The last five questions addressed Laissez-faire leadership style.

The survey was written on a 16.5 Flesch-Kincaid grade level. To assess the validity of the questionnaire, a panel of experts examined the instrument. The panel examined both the face and content validity of the instrument. The process consisted of the panel reviewing the instrument and completing a validity questionnaire. The panel,

which consisted of the following individuals, completed the validity questionnaire in Appendix B:

1. A secondary teacher's assistant with approximately 10 years of education experience and a high school diploma.

2. Graduate student in the education department with no teaching experience.

3. A certified secondary teacher with approximately 10 years of education experience and a Master's degree in education.

4. A certified secondary teacher with approximately five years of education experience and a Bachelor's degree in education.

5. A certified secondary principal with approximately 15 years of education experience and a Master's degree in education leadership.

6. A curriculum supervisor with approximately 10 years of education experience and a PhD in curriculum and instruction.

The panel of experts determined that the language and reading level of the survey instrument was appropriate for the target audience and they would understand the answer choices provided. They also found that the second section on SWPBS addressed the independent variables intended. They neither found any questions offensive, nor did they suggest that any questions be added to the survey instrument. They did require the addition of "other certified position" under job title in the first section of the survey instrument. They found a typo in question 19 in the second section, which said "consistently be" instead of "consistently by." They also required question 15 in the third section be changed from "If I make a decision it is not done in a timely manner" to "If I

make decisions, I may not make them in a timely manner." All these changes were made to the survey instrument prior to its delivery to the pilot group.

A pilot study was conducted with the finalized instrument and the reliability of the instrument was determined. The pilot study was delivered to 21 fifth and sixth grade teachers' assistants, teachers, assistant principals, and principals and 10 were completed and returned. SPSS analysis was performed and the internal consistency of the questionnaire was determined. Table 1 shows the reliability of the pilot study compared to the full study utilizing Cronbach's alpha. Based on this analysis, the questions that measured school discipline policy, knowledge of SWPBS, attitudes towards SWPBS, and transactional leadership were considered reliable for both the pilot and full study with Cronbach's alphas greater than .70. The questions that measured transformation and laissez-faire leadership were slightly less reliable for the pilot and full study with alphas ranging from .63 to .67; however, they were greater than .30, the removal requirement.

Table 1

Reliability Comparison

Scale	Pilot	Full Study
School discipline policy	.81	.81
Knowledge of SWPBS	.78	.95
Attitudes towards SWPBS	.81	.79
Transformational leadership	.65	.66
Transactional leadership	.71	.71
Laissez-faire leadership	.63	.67

Participants

The questionnaire was delivered to the educators utilizing Survey Monkey (see Appendix C for IRB Approval). Educators were contacted via email, which contained a link to the survey. The email was sent to 1,011 Mississippi public school educators across 32 school districts whose email addresses were publically available. This was the target group. The accessible group was all educators, who chose to voluntarily participate in the survey. All participants were Mississippi public school assistant teachers, teachers, assistant principals, principals, and other certified personnel. No participant was under the age of 18. It was expected that most participants would have at least a Bachelor's degree.

Because the participants' email addresses were publically available, permission from the school districts was not needed to conduct this study (see Appendix C for IRB Approval). The target participants were from 32 Mississippi public school districts. Participants were determined by the following procedure:

1. Go to the Mississippi Department of Education website (www.mde.k12.ms.us).

2. Go to MS Schools.

3. Click on MS Districts Listings.

4. Click on Mississippi School District Map.

5. Click on a southwest district to enlarge that area of the map.

6. Click on a school district.

7. Click on the link for the school district.

8. Go to the website for the district's high school(s) or middle school(s).

9. Find the list of educators and their email addresses if available.

Research Design

Education was a nominal variable with six categories. The participant's educational level categories were: high school diploma or equivalent, associate degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, specialist degree, and doctoral degree. Program of study was a nominal variable with two categories, traditional and alternate route. Grade level was also treated as a nominal variable with six options. The participants were allowed to select multiple grade levels. The grade levels were seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade. Gender was a nominal variable with two categories, male or female. Years of experience was treated as an ordinal variable with six categories. They were beginner teacher with zero to three years of experience, novice teacher with four to 10 years of experience, intermediate teacher with 11 to 15 or 16 to 20 years of experience, and veteran teacher with either 21 to 25 years of experience or 26 or more years of experience.

Procedures

The survey method was used to obtain information from various seventh through twelfth grade Mississippi educators. The questionnaire was delivered to the educators utilizing Survey Monkey. The convenience method was utilized. Following IRB approval (Appendix C), an email (Appendix D) was sent to approximately 1,000 secondary educators. This email contained a link to the questionnaire to be completed through Survey Monkey. Completing the entire questionnaire only required about 10 minutes. After selecting the Survey Monkey link, participants were redirected to an informed consent (Appendix E) which explained the research project, that participation was

voluntary, and all information provided remained confidential. After the email was delivered, there was a two-week waiting period to allow educators time to complete the survey. Since an acceptable response rate was not received, a second email (Appendix F) was sent out asking individuals that did not previously complete the survey to please do so. Survey Monkey would only allow one survey to be completed based on a computer's I. P. address. Data collection ended after another two-week waiting period. All results were downloaded from Survey Monkey into a Microsoft Xcel spreadsheet and stored on the researcher's password protected computer for one year after the study was completed. From this file, the data was reviewed, compiled, and prepared for analysis.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was utilized to begin analyzing the data. These statistics provided valuable information about the amount of data collected for each variable. Frequency charts were utilized to determine the most popular responses. Linear regression was utilized to determine if the overall model was significant. It was also utilized to determine if each individual variable had a significant relationship with the dependent variable. In other words, linear regression was utilized to determine if gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, knowledge of SWPBS, and leadership style, collectively or individually, had a significant impact on the attitudes of educators towards SWPBS. Individual variables that have a significant impact on educators' attitudes had a Standardized Coefficient significance of less than .05. The alpha, .05, was the acceptable amount of error for this study.

Analysis utilizing SPSS software was performed to determine if the independent variables, gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, knowledge of SWPBS,

and leadership style had a significant impact on the dependent variable, participant's attitude toward SWPBS. This was a correlation study or a study of the correlation between independent and dependent variables. The status variables that were asked to gain background knowledge of the participants were education, program of study, and grade level currently working with.

Summary

This study was quantitative in design. Survey methodology was employed to conduct the study through the use of a questionnaire that consisted of three sections: demographics, SWPBS, and leadership. The instrument was examined by a panel to determine validity and reliability. The participants included seventh through twelfth grade educators in public schools in the state of Mississippi. SPSS software was utilized to analyze the data received from the completed questionnaires.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter provides a synopsis of the data collected. Several tables are included to provide detailed information of the data. Detailed information from each question is also included. The data are simply reported no conclusions are drawn.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was delivered via an email with a link to the survey in Survey Monkey. A total of 1,011 emails were sent; of those 22 were returned undeliverable. Nine hundred eighty nine surveys were delivered successfully. A total of 244 educators responded to the survey resulting in a response rate of 24.67%.

Descriptive Data

The first section of the instrument asked the respondent for demographic information including gender, educational level, educational program, job title, years of experience, and the grade level(s) he/she served. Tables 2 and 3 provide a frequency distribution of these data. There were 244 educators who participated in the study, which consisted of 78.7% female and 21.3% male. The majority of the educators, or 57.4%, had obtained a Master's degree, while 36.1% possessed a Bachelor's degree. There were no individuals with an associate degree. The majority of the participants, 179 (73.4%), were trained through traditional college education programs, compared to 64 (26.2%) that were trained through an alternate route program. The majority of the participants, 200 (82%), were teachers; there were only two paraprofessionals or non-certified participants and two who did not select their job title. The educators' years of experience were spread

across all the categories. Beginning educators made up the smallest number of

participants (8.6%); novice educators with four to 10 years of experience made up the

largest number of participants (33.2%). The veteran category was composed of 15.2%

with 21 to 25 years of experience and 9.8% with over 26 years of experience.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Demographic Variables

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Female	192	78.7
Male	52	21.3
Degree		
Associate	0	0.0
Bachelor	88	36.1
Masters	140	57.4
Specialist	12	4.9
Doctorate	3	1.2
No Response	1	.4
Program of Study		
Alternate Route	64	26.2
Traditional	179	73.4
No Response	1	.4

Table 2 (continued).

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Job Title		
Paraprofessional	2	.8
Teacher	200	82.0
Assistant Principal	9	3.7
Principal	10	4.1
Other Certified	21	8.6
No Response	2	.8
Years of Experience		
0 – 3	21	8.6
4 – 10	81	33.2
11 – 15	44	18.0
16 – 20	37	15.2
21 – 25	37	15.2
26 or More	24	9.8

Table 3 provides a distribution of the grade level or levels the participants served. This was a multiple response question because many seventh through twelfth grade educators work with more than one grade level. The majority of the participants worked with 10th, 11th, and 12th grade or 55.7%, 57.4%, and 53.2%, respectively. There were

fewer participants working with seventh and eighth grade, 32.1% and 31.6%,

respectively; 49.4% worked with ninth grade.

Table 3

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Grade Level Responses

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Grade Level		
7	76	32.1
8	75	31.6
9	117	49.4
10	132	55.7
11	136	57.4
12	126	53.2

Table 4 shows the statistics for the first eight questions in the School-Wide

Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) section of the questionnaire, which addressed the

participant's school discipline policy. The first question had a mean of 3.02, which shows

that overall participants agreed that interventions were being provided. The standard

deviation of .674 shows that there were responses that disagreed as well as strongly

agreed. The fifth question asked if students were verbally commended for appropriate

behavior; the mean of 3.11 shows that the majority of participants agreed that students

were being commended for appropriate behavior. The sixth question asked whether clear

behavioral expectations were being taught to students; the mean of 3.13 shows that the

majority of participants agreed that students were being taught clear behavioral

expectations. The eighth item stated that there are only consequences for inappropriate

behavior in the participant's school discipline policy; the mean of 2.45 shows that the

responses were split between disagree and agree. This item had the smallest mean in the

school discipline policy section. The overall mean of this section was 2.90.

Table 4

School Discipline Policy Statistics (N = 219)

Question	Mean	Std. Dev.
Interventions for inappropriate behavior	3.02	.67
Incentive program for appropriate behavior	2.73	.85
Broad behavior rules are taught	2.96	.70
Student taught to take responsibility for actions	2.94	.71
Appropriate student behavior verbally commended	3.11	.58
Clear behavioral expectations taught	3.13	.65
System in place to review student behavior	2.86	.72
Only consequences for negative behavior	2.45	.82
School Discipline Policy	2.90	.47

Note. Scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

Nine questions addressed the participant's knowledge of SWPBS. Table 5

provides the statistical information associated with these questions. The majority of these

questions had a mean closer to 2.0, showing that participants as a whole disagreed with

the questions. Question nine asked whether they had been trained; the mean of 2.18

shows that overall participants had not been trained on SWPBS. The standard deviation

of .826 shows that there were some participants that agreed or had been trained, but there

were also individuals that strongly disagreed and had not been trained. Question 12 asked

if all faculty and staff at the participant's school were trained; the mean of 2.08 shows

that participants disagreed, or the entire faculty and staff had not been trained. Question

17 asked if they were able to utilize the three-tier process to improve student behavior;

the mean of 2.25 shows that participants disagreed, or they could not effectively utilize

SWPBS to improve student behavior. The combined mean of all knowledge-based

SWPBS questions was 2.38, which shows that participants did not have extensive

knowledge of SWPBS or the three-tier behavior intervention process.

Table 5

Knowledge of School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Statistics (N = 219)

Question	Mean	Std. Dev.
I have been trained on SWPBS	2.18	.83
I have read about SWPBS program	2.34	.87
I know what SWPBS program entails	2.32	.84
School trained all faculty and staff on SWPBS	2.08	.75
I understand the behavior intervention process	2.83	.67
I have basic knowledge of SWPBS Tier One	2.48	.82
I have basic knowledge of SWPBS Tier Two	2.41	.81
I have basic knowledge of SWPBS Tier Three	2.36	.82
I effectively utilize SWPBS to improve behavior	2.25	.73
Knowledge of SWPBS	2.38	.69

Note. Scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

Table 6 shows the statistical information from eight questions related to participants' attitudes toward SWPBS. The mean of these questions varied from participants disagreeing to agreeing. The mean for question 18 was 2.49, indicating that participants disagreed with the statement that SWPBS was effective in decreasing inappropriate student behavior. Question 19 asked whether participants would recommend SWPBS for the grade level they were currently working with; the mean of 2.56 shows that participants were split between disagreeing and agreeing on

recommending SWPBS for seventh through twelfth grade students. Question 20 had a

mean of 2.32, indicating that participants disagreed with the statement that their school

discipline policy was consistently applied by all faculty members. Question 22 had a

mean of 3.16, which shows that participants agreed with the statement that the

administrators at their schools support the discipline policy. Question 23 had a mean of

3.00, which shows that participants agreed with the statement that the majority of the

faculty and staff at their schools supported the discipline policy. The overall mean of 2.65

shows that participants were split between disagreeing and agreeing on the SWPBS

attitude questions.

Table 6

Attitude towards School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Statistics (N = 219)

Question	Mean	Std. Dev.
SWPBS effectively decreases inappropriate behavior	2.49	.74
SWPBS recommended for grade level working with	2.56	.75
Discipline policy applied consistently	2.32	.73
Policy effectively decreases inappropriate behavior	2.71	.63
Policy has support of administration	3.16	.61
Policy has support of majority of faculty and staff	3.00	.59
Policy does not decrease inappropriate behavior	2.75	.69
SWPBS in place at my school	2.64	.84
Attitude toward SWPBS	2.65	.44

Note. Scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree

The leadership questions asked participants the frequency with which they displayed a specific leadership characteristic. The responses to the transformational leadership style questions are summarized in Table 7. There were only four questions associated with transformational leadership analyzed. The third leadership question was a repeat of SWPBS question number three. This error was made by the researcher in preparing the questionnaire for the pilot study. Leadership Question 1 asked the frequency with which the participants tried to change others; the mean of 2.86 shows that participants tried to change others often. Leadership Question 4 had 212 responses; the mean of 3.44 shows that participants often demonstrated their values and beliefs. The overall mean of 3.21 shows that participants often showed transformational leadership characteristics.

Table 7

Transformational Leadership Style Statistics (N = 219)

Question	Mean	Std. Deviation
I work to change others	2.86	.77
I utilize charisma and vision to motivate others	3.10	.73
I demonstrate my values and beliefs	3.44	.63
I listen and help others achieve potential	3.40	.59
Transformational Leadership Style	3.21	.49

Note. Scale 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = often, 4 = always

The responses to the five transactional leadership style questions are summarized in Table 8. Leadership Question 6 had a mean of 3.45 which shows that participants often set expectations for others and expected them to be met. Leadership Question 9 had a mean of 2.85 which indicates that participants were split between both occasionally or often observing others' work for errors and providing them instructions to correct the errors. The overall mean of 3.14 shows that participants often demonstrated transactional leadership characteristics.

Table 8

Transactional Leadership Style Statistics (N = 219)

Question	Mean	Std. Deviation
I set expectations and expect others to meet them	3.45	.62
I establish reward for expectations met by others	2.92	.76
I provide constructive criticism and feedback	3.32	.66
I observe others' errors and provide corrections	2.85	.87
I don't intervene after problem occurs	3.30	.72
Transactional Leadership Style	3.14	.54

Note. Scale 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = often, 4 = always

Table 9 provides the responses to five questions that determined if the participants had a Laissez-faire leadership style. Leadership Question 12 had a mean of 1.39, which shows that participants disagreed with this question; they did not try to avoid contact with others. The mean for Leadership Question 13 was 1.39, which shows that participants

disagreed with this question; they believed in providing feedback on others' work. The

mean for Leadership Question 14 was 1.99, which shows that participants agreed with

this question; they allowed others to make their own decisions. The overall mean for

Laissez-faire leadership style was 1.47, indicating that participants disagreed with these

leadership style questions and did not have a Laissez-faire leadership style.

Table 9

Laissez-Faire Leadership Style Statistics (N = 219)

Question	Mean	Std. Deviation
I avoid situations requiring decisions	1.44	.60
I avoid contact with others	1.39	.60
I don't believe in providing others feedback	1.39	.62
I allow others to make their own decisions	1.99	.63
I may not make decisions in timely manner	1.65	.69
Laissez-Faire Leadership Style	1.47	.44

Note. Scale 1 = never, 2 = occasionally, 3 = often, 4 = always

When looking at all three leadership styles, the participants, overall, related to the

transformational leadership style with a mean of 3.21. Transactional leadership was a

close second with a mean of 3.14. Laissez-faire had a mean of 1.47, which shows that

overall participants said that they never or only occasionally displayed characteristics of

this leadership style.

Statistical Data

The purpose of this study was to determine if seventh through twelfth grade educators' attitudes towards SWPBS were affected based on their gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, leadership style, and knowledge of SWPBS. A regression analysis was performed on the data utilizing the predictors of gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, leadership style, and SWPBS knowledge. The results were $F(11,201) = 25.814, p<.001, R^2 = .586$. Yes, there was a significant relationship between educators' attitudes toward SWPBS and gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, leadership style, and knowledge of SWPBS. The model predicts 58.6% of the change in their attitudes towards SWPBS. The model also shows that the participants' knowledge of SWPBS and their satisfaction with their current discipline policies had the only significant relationship with their attitudes toward SWPBS (see Table 10).

Table 10

The Influence of Independent Variables on Dependent Variable of Attitude

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	
	B	Beta	Sig.
Constant	.599		.014
Gender	-.014	-.014	.769
Experience 0-3	-.076	-.049	.428
Experience 4-10	.023	.025	.762
Experience 11-15	.026	.023	.757
Experience 16-20	.017	.014	.844
Experience 21-25	-.001	-.001	.989
Experience 26 or more	-.074	-.046	.425
School Policy	.513	.547	.000
Knowledge	.241	.370	.000
Transformational	.000	.000	.995
Transactional	.005	.007	.902
Laissez-Faire	-.012	-.012	.808

Summary

This chapter provided tables and a brief explanation of the data collected. The tables provided both descriptive and statistical data. There was also a synopsis of each table. The model predicted 58.6% of the change in attitude towards SWPBS. The only variables with a significant impact on the educators' attitudes were school discipline policy and knowledge of SWPBS.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study was designed to measure whether seventh through twelfth grade educators' attitudes toward School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS) were affected by gender, years of experience, leadership style, knowledge of SWPBS, and school discipline policy. This chapter will provide an explanation of the data collected and its impact on future research.

Conclusions and Discussion

The overall determination of this study was that collectively gender, years of experience, leadership style, SWPBS knowledge, and school discipline policy were able to predict the majority of the change in the attitudes of seventh through twelfth grade educators towards SWPBS. With approximately 219 participants, or a 25% response rate, there was enough participation to determine whether each independent variable had a significant influence on the dependent variable. Looking at the independent variable gender, even though the majority of participants were female, there were approximately 50 males to determine gender's significance. The years of experience was spread from first year educators to those with over 26 years of experience. There were at least 20 participants in each category to determine the significance of experience.

Of the five areas focused on in the study, only two had a significant impact on educators' attitudes. Those two areas were knowledge of SWPBS and school discipline policy. In other words, the more educators know about SWPBS and the positive impact the process has had in other schools, the more their attitude changes towards SWPBS.

Also, a school discipline policy that aligns with SWPBS changes the attitude of educators towards SWPBS. The significance of these two areas was consistent with previous studies. Flannery et al. (2009) found that training, SWPBS policies, and a discipline system including major and minor offenses aided SWPBS implementation.

The study by Flannery et al. (2009) also found that inexperienced staff, previous school discipline attitudes and beliefs, as well as a lack of teaching experience were all factors that hindered SWPBS implementation. The current study did not find that years of experience, overall, had a significant influence on the educators' attitudes toward SWPBS implementation. Also, when looking at the various experience categories, this study found that educators with zero to three years of experience and educators with 26 or more years of experience were both insignificant at .428 and .425, respectively. The difference in these findings could be credited to the 2009 study measuring how teaching experience influenced implementation, while the current study measured how experience influenced the educators' attitudes towards SWPBS.

SWPBS question 18 responses were evenly split between participants that agreed and disagreed that SWPBS was effective in decreasing inappropriate student behavior. SWPBS question 19 was also evenly split between participants that agreed and disagreed on recommending SWPBS for the grade level they were working with. This means the data were inconclusive in determining the positive impact participants have observed SWPBS to have at grade levels seven through twelve.

The leadership styles measured by the survey instrument did not have a significant impact on educators' attitudes, which was also contradictory to the literature, especially for transactional leadership. According to Northouse (2007) and Avolio and

Bass (2011) transactional leadership is about setting expectations and providing rewards when these expectations are met. Leaders with this leadership style also observe others and provide them with information to correct errors (Avolio & Bass, 2011; Northouse, 2007). This leadership style aligns with the basic definition of the SWPBS three tier process. According to Sugai (2007), Sugai et al. (2008), and others, Tier One provides the behavioral expectations for all students and rewards are given for appropriate student behavior. Tiers Two and Three are designed to correct inappropriate student behavior that has been observed (Horner et al., 2010; Simonsen et al., 2008; Sugai, 2007; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Sugai et al., 2008).

<div style="text-align:center">Limitations</div>

One limitation is that the survey did not ask participants for school size. Larger schools imply more distance between faculty members, which could lead to difficulty for participants to determine how consistently rules are being applied by other faculty members. The leadership results are also a limitation. The data show that none of the leadership styles that were examined in the study had a significant effect on the educators' attitudes toward SWPBS. Another limitation is that it remains unknown if the participant was a member of a SWPBS leadership team. Being a member of the team would add to their knowledge of SWPBS and provide information of its effectiveness. The sample size is also a limitation. The responses of 244 educators are being generalized to the entire population of educators.

Another limitation is that the leadership styles were not significant. This could be due to the transformation and Laissez-faire leadership style questions being unreliable. These questions were unreliable in both the pilot study and the final study (see Table 1).

The leadership style questions were designed to test the leadership styles of administrators, but the survey was administered to teachers and teacher's assistants as well. This also limited the leadership variables.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Policy and Practice</div>

The current study indicates that knowledge is an important factor associated with the attitudes of educators towards SWPBS implementation. The study also found that the school's discipline policy has a significant impact on participants' attitudes toward SWPBS. Applying these findings to practice when attempting to implement SWPBS would lead to training of all faculty and staff members to influence their attitudes towards SWPBS. The findings also imply the development of a school discipline policy that aligns with SWPBS. The survey specifically asked questions about the school discipline policy that aligns with SWPBS such as interventions for inappropriate behavior and incentives for appropriate behavior, as well as the teaching of broad behavior rules and behavior expectations.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

According to Handler et al. (2007), the leadership team is important in the implementation of SWPBS. Based on their findings and the current study, future research should focus on the leadership team members. Research that could determine the variables associated with an effective leadership team would aid in future SWPBS implementation. Also, research on the team work associated with the leadership team could aid schools in developing effective teams at their schools.

Future studies should also look at seventh and eighth grade separately from high school. Depending on the setting of the seventh and eighth grades they could be similar to

an elementary school and allow SWPBS implementation to work smoothly. Question 18 in the SWPBS section of this study asked whether participants thought SWPBS was effective in decreasing inappropriate student behavior, while question 19 in that section asked whether participants would recommend SWPBS for the current grade level they were working with. The responses to these questions were rather evenly split. In other words, almost the same number of participants disagreed with these two questions as agreed with the questions. Additional research to determine if the difference was based on seventh and eighth grade compared to ninth through twelfth grade is desirable.

Future studies should compare the leadership style of leadership team members of schools that have a decline in inappropriate student behavior to those that have not had a decline in inappropriate behavior. Such studies could better determine the direct impact that leadership style has on the effective implementation of SWPBS. It is also suggested that future studies determine the leadership style of administrators in schools with and without a decrease in inappropriate behavior after SWPBS implementation to test for correlation between certain leadership styles of team members and administrators and the effectiveness of SWPBS.

Future studies should also focus more on the individual students. The case studies referenced previously showed high reduced or free lunch percentages in the school where SWPBS was implemented. Studies to show if there is a correlation between the inappropriate behavior and the students' socioeconomic status would be beneficial. Also, tying this data to high school drop-out rates would be valuable in targeting students to aid in improving graduation rates. The case studies referenced also had a diverse student population. Future studies to analyze the culture of the students compared to the culture

of the teachers and administrators would also be useful. This would add valuable data on

student behavior and culture differences or similarities of the faculty and staff. This could

aid schools in developing interventions, as well as the individuals who implement these

interventions, more effectively.

Summary

While the current study did answer some questions associated with SWPBS, it

also led to more questions. Future research is suggested to clarify these questions. Also,

caution should be taken when generalizing the data from this study.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SWPBS AND LEADERSHIP STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine if gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, knowledge of School-Wide Positive Behavior Support (SWPBS), and leadership style have an effect on the attitudes of educators toward SWPBS.
The questionnaire is divided into three sections. Section one asks for basic information about you, section two addresses SWPBS at your school, and section three addresses your leadership style. Please read each statement and answer it to the best of your ability. Please answer each statement.

I. Please answer the following questions to provide basic information about yourself.

Gender: Female   Male

Education: High School Diploma/Equivalent   Associate Degree
                                     Bachelor Masters   Specialist   Doctorate

Program of study: Traditional   Alternate Route

Job Title: Teacher   Paraprofessional   Assistant Principal
                                     Principal   Other Certified Position

Education experience in years: 0-3   4-10   11-15   16-20   21-25   26 or more

Grade Level(s) working with: 7   8   9   10   11   12

II. Use the following rating scale to respond to the comments that follow with relation to SWPBS at your school:

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree
        1   2   3   4

1. My school's discipline policy provides interventions for students with inappropriate behavior…………………………………………………………1 2 3 4
2. There is an incentive program for students that model appropriate behavior at my school…………………………………………………………..........1 2 3 4
3. Broad behavioral rules are not taught at my school…………..…….…...............1 2 3 4
4. Students at my school are taught to take responsibility for their own actions..……………………………………………………………............. 1 2 3 4
5. Students are verbally commended for appropriate behavior………….....……. 1 2 3 4
6. Students are taught clear behavioral expectations……………….…….………. 1 2 3 4
7. There is a system in place to review overall student behavior..…...………….... 1 2 3 4
8. My school's discipline policy only contains consequences for negative behavior..…….1 2 3 4
9. I have been trained on SWPBS………………..…........……..…….…………...1 2 3 4
10. I have read information about the SWPBS program……………………..…….. 1 2 3 4
11. I know what the SWPBS program entails…..……………….……………..……1 2 3 4
12. My school has provided training to all the faculty and staff on SWPB………...1 2 3 4
13. I understand the behavior intervention process………………..…………….... 1 2 3 4
14. I have basic knowledge of SWPBS tier one………...…..………………….….. 1 2 3 4
15. I have basic knowledge of SWPBS tier two…..…..……………………….…… 1 2 3 4
16. I have basic knowledge of SWPBS tier three..………...…………………….…. 1 2 3 4
17. I effectively utilize the SWPBS three tier process to improve student behavior……………….…………….……………………………..............1 2 3 4
18. I think SWPBS is effective in decreasing inappropriate student behavior………………….…………….………………………………......1 2 3 4
19. I recommend SWPBS for the grade level I currently work with………………1 2 3 4
20. The discipline policy at my school is applied consistently by all faculty members……………………………………………………………….........1 2 3 4
21. The discipline policy at my school is effective in decreasing inappropriate student behavior……………………………….…………………………......1 2 3 4
22. The discipline policy at my school has the support of the administrators………………………………………………………….........1 2 3 4
23. The discipline policy at my school has the support of the majority of the faculty and staff…………………………………….…..………….......... 1 2 3 4

24. The discipline policy at my school does not result in decreased inappropriate
behavior……………………………………………………………………………...1 2 3 4
25. There is a school-wide positive behavior system in place at my school…........ 1 2 3 4

III. The purpose of this section is to determine your leadership style: transformational, transactional, or Laissez-faire.

Use the following rating scale to respond to the comments that follow with relation to your leadership style:

Never   Occasionally   Often   Always
  1   2   3   4

1. I work to change others……………………………………..…………….........1 2 3 4
2. I utilize my charisma and vision to motivate others……...……………..…........ 1 2 3 4
3. Broad behavioral rules are not taught at my school…...…………………........1 2 3 4
4. I demonstrate my values and beliefs…………..…………………………........1 2 3 4
5. I listen to others and help them achieve their potential……...……………..…. 1 2 3 4
6. I set expectations for others and expect them to be met..……………..…….…. 1 2 3 4
7. I establish a reward for others when they meet set expectations……………….1 2 3 4
8. I believe in providing constructive criticism and feedback……………………. 1 2 3 4
9. I observe others' work for errors and provide instructions to correct the
errors…………………………………………………………………………........ 1 2 3 4
10. I do not intervene after problems occur………………………………………... 1 2 3 4
11. I try to avoid situations where I will have to make a decision..……………........1 2 3 4
12. I avoid contact with others…………………………………………………….. 1 2 3 4
13. I do not believe in providing feedback on the work of others...…………….......1 2 3 4
14. I allow others to make their own decisions…………….…………………….....1 2 3 4
15. If I make decisions, I may not make them in a timely manner….....……………1 2 3 4

APPENDIX B

VALIDITY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Does the survey contain language that can be understood by the participants? Is the reading level appropriate?

2. Does the SWPBS section address the participants' attitudes toward SWPBS?

3. Does the SWPBS section address the participants' knowledge of SWPBS?

4. Does the SWPBS section address the participants' school discipline policy?

5. Did you find any statements obtrusive or offensive?

6. Are there any statements that you would exclude from the survey?

7. Are there other statements that you would include that are not part of the SWPBS section?

8. Would the participants understand the response choices?

APPENDIX C

IRB APPROVAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001
Phone: 601.266.6820 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | www.usm.edu/irb

NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.
  Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: **13051402**
PROJECT TITLE: **Relationship Between Leadership Styles of High School Teachers, Principals, and Assistant Principals and Their Attitudes Toward School-Wide Positive Behavior Support Implementation**
PROJECT TYPE: **Dissertation**
RESEARCHER(S): **Geneva Holmes**
COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education and Psychology**
DEPARTMENT: **Education Leadership**
FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: **N/A**
IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: **Expedited Review Approval**
PERIOD OF APPROVAL: **5/28/2013 to 5/27/2014**

Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX D

FIRST EMAIL TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Teacher, Administrator, or Paraprofessional:

I am a doctoral student at The University of Southern Mississippi. You are being asked to participate in a study regarding student behavior, disciplinary procedures, and academic achievement. Your voluntary participation involves the completion of a 39 item questionnaire that should take approximately 10 minutes.

Your answers will be completely anonymous. There are no questions that will identify you, and your answers are confidential. If after beginning the questionnaire you would like to discontinue participation, you may do so without any consequences. There are no risks associated with your completion of the questionnaire.

You will be redirected to Survey Monkey by selecting the link below.
 https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8KHW9TW

 Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Teacher, Paraprofessional, or Administrator:

I am a doctoral student at the University of Southern Mississippi. You are being asked to participate in a study regarding student behavior, disciplinary procedures, and academic achievement. Your voluntary participation involves the completion of a 39 item questionnaire that should take approximately ten minutes.

Your answers will be completely anonymous. There are no questions that will identify you; and your answers are confidential. If after beginning the questionnaire you would like to discontinue participation, you may do so without any consequences. There are no risks associated with your completion of the questionnaire.

You have been redirected to Survey Monkey by the link you selected in the email. After completing the following questionnaire through Survey Monkey, submit it. When I download the completed questionnaires, I have no way to determine who submitted them. I will keep the data in an Excel file until the study is completed. At that point, all data will be destroyed by deleting it from the computer and shredding any printed copies of the data. If you would like a copy of the completed research project, please email your name and address to me at Geneva.Holmes@eagles.usm.edu.

This completed study should provide valuable information on any effects from gender, years of experience, school discipline policy, knowledge of SWPBS, and leadership style upon the attitude of educators towards SWPBS.

By selecting agree, you are consenting to participate in this study.

Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

Geneva Holmes
Geneva.Holmes@eagles.usm.edu
This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the

chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

APPENDIX F

SECOND EMAIL TO PARTICIPANTS

I sent this survey to you within the last two weeks. If you have completed the survey thank you; if you have not please do so at this time.

Dear Teacher, Administrator, or Paraprofessional:

I am a doctoral student at The University of Southern Mississippi. You are being asked to participate in a study regarding student behavior, disciplinary procedures, and academic achievement. Your voluntary participation involves the completion of a 39 item questionnaire that should take approximately 10 minutes.

Your answers will be completely anonymous. There are no questions that will identify you, and your answers are confidential. If after beginning the questionnaire you would like to discontinue participation, you may do so without any consequences. There are no risks associated with your completion of the questionnaire.

You will be redirected to Survey Monkey by selecting the link below.
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8KHW9TW

Thank you in advance for your time and participation.

REFERENCES

Association for Behavioral Analysis International. (2009). *Behavioral Analysis*. Retrieved from http://www.abainternational.org/ba.asp

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2011). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sample set. Retrieved from www.mindgarden.com

Benda, S., & Wright, R. (2002). The culture of the elementary school as a function of leadership style and disciplinary climate and culture.

Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K., Minnis-Kim, M., Anderson-Harris, S., Moroz, K., & … Pigott, T. (2006). Schoolwide application of positive behavior support in an urban high school: A case study. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *8*(3), 131-145. doi: 10.1177/10983007060080030201

Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Hicks, K., Weber, S., Their, K., Aikins, B., & … L., Irvin, L. (2012). A case example of the implementation of schoolwide positive behavior support in a high school setting using change point test analysis. *Preventing School Failure*, *56*(2), 91-103. doi: 10.1080/1045988X.2011.588973

Carr, E., Dunlap, G., Horner, R., Koegel, R., Turnbull, A., Sailor, W., & … Fox, L. (2002). Positive behavior support: Evolution of an applied science. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *4*(1), 4-16.

Cregor, M. (2008). The building blocks of positive behavior. *Teaching Tolerance*, 18-21.

Crimmins, D., & Farrell, A. (2006). Individualized behavioral supports at 15 years: It's lonely at the top. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, *31*(1) 31-45.

Department of Education. (2006, August 14). *Building the Legacy of IDEA 2004*.

Retrieved from U. S. Department of Education:

http://idea.ed.gov/download/finalregulations.pdf

Dwyer, K., Osher, D., & Warger,C. (1998). *Early warning, timely response: A guide to*

safe schools. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education.

Flannery, K., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. (2009) School-wide positive behavior support in

high school. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 11*(3), 177–185.

Fox, L., & Duda, M. (n.d.). Positive behavior support. Retrieved from

www.challengingbehavior.org/explore/pbs_docs/pbs_complete.doc

Frey, A., Lingo, A., & Nelson, M. (2008). Positive behavior support: A call for

leadership. *Children and Schools, 30*(1), 5-14.

George, M., White, G., & Schlaffer, J. (2007). Implementing school-wide behavior

change: Lessons from the field. *Psychology in the Schools*, *44*(1), 41-51. doi:

10.1002/pits.20204

Graham, G. (2000). Behaviorism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of

philosophy (Winter 2009 ed.). Retrieved from

http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/behaviorism/

Handler, M., Rey, J., & Connell, J. (2007). Practical considerations in creating school-

wide positive behavior support in public schools. *Psychology in the Schools*,

44(1), 29-39. doi: 10.1002/pits.20203

Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (2000). School-wide behavior support: An emerging initiative.

Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 2(4), 231-232.

Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., & Anderson, C. M. (2010). Examining the evidence base for

    school-wide positive behavior support. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 42*(8), 1-

    14.

Howard, W. C. (2007). Leadership: Four styles. *Education, 126(2)*, 384-391.

Hoy, W. & Miskel, C. (2005). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice

    (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Illinois State Board of Education. (2005). eReport card public site. Retrieved from

    http://webprod.isbe.net/ereportcard/publicsite/searchBySchool.aspx?searchby=sch

    oolName&language=english&year=2005&keyword=abbott%20middle&type=car

    d

Kincaid, D., Childs, K., Blase, K., & Wallace, F. (2007). Identifying barriers and

    facilitators in implementing schoolwide positive behavior support. *Journal of*

    Positive Behavior Interventions, *9*(3) 174-184. doi:

    10.1177/10983007070090030501

Lewis, T., & Sugai, G. (1999). Effective behavior support: A systems approach to

    proactive schoolwide management. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *31*(6) 1-24.

Mendel, C., Watson, R., & MacGregor, C. (2002). A study of leadership behaviors of

    elementary principals compared with school climate.

MS Code § 37-11-18.1 (2010)

MS Code § 37-11-54 (2010)

Mississippi Department of Education (MDE). (2010). Response to intervention: Best

    practices handbook. Retrieved from

http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/RtI/RtI%20Handbook/Best_Practices_Handbook_June_2010.pdf

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (n.d.). Primary prevention. *PBIS.org.* Retrieved from http://www.pbis.org/school/primary_level/default.aspx

Pedota, P. (2007). Stratgies for effective classroom management in the secondary setting. *Clearing House*, *80*(4), 163-166. doi: 10.3200/TCHS.80.4.163-168

Pugsley, L. (2011). How to…begin to get to grips with educational theory. *Education for Primary Care*, *22*(4), 266-268.

Reynolds, J., & Warfield, W. (2010). Discerning the differences between managers and leaders. *The Education Digest*, *75*(7), 61-64.

Scott, T. M., Park, K. L., Swain-Bradway, J., & Landers, E. (2007). Positive behavior support in the classroom: Facilitating behaviorally inclusive learning environments. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation and Therapy, 3*(2), 223-235.

Simonsen, B., Sugai, G., & Negron, M. (2008). Schoolwide positive behavior supports: Primary systems and practices. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40*(6)*, 32-40.

Sugai, G. (2007). Promoting behavioral competence in schools: A commentary on exemplary practices. *Psychology in the Schools*, *44*(1), 113-118. doi: 10.1002/pits.20210

Sugai, G. (2009). What is school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *PBIS.org*. Retrieved from http://www.pbis.org/school/what_is_swpbs.aspx

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2002). The evolution of discipline practices: School-wide positive behavior supports. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 24*(1-2), 23-50.

Sugai, G. & Horner, R. (2006). A promising approach for expanding and sustaining school-wide positive behavior support. *School Psychology Review, 35*(2), 245-259.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. (2009). Responsiveness-to-intervention and school-wide positive behavior supports: Integration of multi-tiered system approaches. *Exceptionality, 17*(4), 223-237. doi: 10.1080/09362830903235375

Sugai, G., Horner, R., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Lewis, T., Nelson, C. M., & … Ruef, M. (2000). Applying positive behavior support and functional behavioral assessment in schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *2*(3), 131-143.

Sugai, G., Simonsen, B., & Horner, R. H. (2008). Schoolwide positive behavior support: A continuum of positive behavior supports for all students. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40*(6), 5-59.

Turnbull, A., Edmonson, H., Griggs, P., Wickham, D., Sailor, W., Freeman, R., . . . Warren, J. (2002). A blueprint for schoolwide positive behavior support: Implementation of three components. *Exceptional Children, 68*(3), 377-402.

Walker, H. M., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., Sprague, J. R., Bricker, D., & Kaufman, M. J. (1996). Integrated aproaches to preventing antisocial behavior patterns among school-age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4*(4), 194-209.

Warren, J., Bohanon-Edmonson, H., Turnbull, A., Sailor, W., Wickham, D., Griggs, P.,

    & Beech, S. (2006). School-wide positive behavior support: Addressing behavior

    problems that impede student learning. *Educational Psychology Review, 18*(2),

    187-198. doi: 10.1007/s10648-006-9008-1