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Abstract
Since the end of the 1980s the Western World of education has increased its awareness towards learning-disabled students (LDS), and current legislation favours the inclusion for these students as well as for students with other special educational needs in mainstream education. Despite this worldwide commitment, there is no consensus regarding the definitions of learning disabilities (LD), and assessment instruments used for the identification of LD are varied. This lack of unanimity of procedures accompanied by over-inflated numbers of students identified as LDS has originated an in-depth study whose main focus will be managerial.

A review of the empirical literature on inclusion has indicated that leadership, culture and structures are all involved in the process. However, the aim of this study was to explore more specifically how school leadership, school structures and school culture are related to inclusive elements and whether they can predict the level of inclusion. The exploration was conducted according to perceptions of three populations: headteachers, teachers and counselors. The research was carried out in five mainstream secondary schools in Tel-Aviv, Israel.

Findings from this study matched the literature regarding the contribution of leadership, culture and structures to the process of change-making, but at the same time leadership seems to over-ride culture and structures in the context of inclusion. Findings showed that managerialism is in a transition phase from ‘old’ to ‘new’ in most schools. Yet, inclusive elements fall behind managerial elements in respect of their level of ripening. Thus, the process of inclusion was observed as slower than the process of management improvement and has not reached its full maturity yet. It has also been inferred that the level of inclusion might be predicted to some extent on the basis of school management. On the whole, it might be argued that LDS still present a burden to headteachers and they are not a top priority at schools. Despite the enhancement of the issue of LDS, the educational system does not offer at this point practical responses to these students. Therefore, this issue is still considered as a change in process. The study ends with suggestions for further research in the area.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Statement of the problem

“The first right to any disabled person is not to be disabled, never to have been disabled” (Federico Mayor Zargoza, The Secretary General of UNESCO, 1990)

Researchers agree that inclusion of students with disabilities is one of the major school reform movements of this century (Ferguson, 1995; Slavin, 1997). Initially, provision had been through a segregated school system, and later it was followed by segregated classes in regular schools. The orientation towards inclusive schooling that appeared in the late 1960s was driven by human and civil rights and by aspiration for effectiveness (Sebba and Ainscow, 1996; Mittler, 2000). It emerged at a time when scepticism and even hostility prevailed towards established patterns of special education (Reynolds, 1976).

The international commitment to inclusion was made explicit in the Salamanca World Statement on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994). It recognised the diversity of needs, but at the same time the need for accommodation within regular schools. According to this line of argument, any form of segregation is seen as a potential threat to this basic right (Mittler, 2000). Similarly, the Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education (CSIE, 1989) states that educational segregation that results from disability or learning difficulty is a contravention of human rights the same as segregation for reasons of race and gender. More recently, the UN issued that 2000 Dakar Framework for Action which expresses commitment towards Education For All (EFA) for every citizen and society.

Furthermore, the past two decades produced extensive research supporting the importance of inclusion (Hunt and Goetz, 1997). Some of these centres are: the CSIE in the UK which is committed to bring an end to segregated education; the Centre for Special Needs Education and Research (CeSNER) in the School of Education at University College Northampton in the UK, which conducts research and provides consultancy to special needs issues; the British Institute for Learning Disabilities
Indeed, the issue of inclusion is complicated. Firstly, it might be argued that some students’ basic rights would be denied unless they attend special schools or classes. This relies on the assumption introduced by Farrell (2000: 155) that “education is, after all, a means to an end, and special schools may for some children provide the most effective means towards achieving these ends”. Secondly, some researchers (e.g. Feiler and Gibson, 1999; Wilson, 2000) claim that the inclusion of all students poses a threat to the rights of mainstream peers, and highlight the issue of catering for the few at the expense of the many. Thirdly, parents’ right to choose will be ignored if a decision for the closure of special schools is made (Farrell, 2000). Finally, the orientation towards inclusion can be viewed as contradictory to the ‘grouping’ of students into ‘normal’ and ‘students with SEN’ (Special Educational Needs) (Wedell, 1995).

The abovementioned issues raise doubts as to whether socio-political inclusion and educational inclusion are part of the same process (Wilson, 1999), and whether they are influenced by the same factors. Thus, Dyson et al. (1994) maintained that if students fail to learn, it is not because they are learning failures, but rather because school has failed to release their learning potential. Gartner and Lipsky (1989) contended that most learning disabled students (LDS) do not have learning disabilities (LD) at all, but are rather victims of poor pedagogy and limited educational opportunity. It is, therefore, school failure to accommodate individual differences, that creates in students what appears to be disabilities.

Farrell (2000) argued that the human rights position on inclusion is irrelevant because it moves the debate away from the need to draw on empirical evidence in order to develop higher quality practices to all learners including those with SEN. Other researchers perceived lack of evidence (Sebba and Sachdev, 1997) as well as lack of a theoretical framework which can hinder the evaluation of inclusive practice (Blamires, 1999). More specifically, Manset and Semmel (1997) pointed out the need
of a model of wholesale inclusive programming to substitute more traditional SEN models.

There are mainly two kinds of LD: developmental - such as perceptual, cognitive, motor, memory or language disorders, and academic - which are related to reading, writing, mathematical, and spelling skills (Kirk and Gallaghar, 1983). Although LD were not considered as a handicapped category in the traditional sense, they were included within special education rubric due to the psychometric and medical model of classification which they relied upon (Center, in Ward et al., 1988). Most previous research focussed on the issue of inclusion in respect of SEN students (Clark et al., 1999; Ainscow, 1999) and only part of it included LDS in their studies (e.g. Center et al., 1989; Tomlinson, 1996). The only study in the Israeli Educational System (Avissar, 1999) on the issue of inclusion focussed on leadership and inclusion.

Research on LD in schools seems to be vital due to three main reasons. Firstly, according to a social/moral consideration, disabilities are a basic etiological element in a significant number of delinquents (Berman and Siegal, 1976; Broder et al., 1981). Secondly, LDS have also gained a worldwide recognition as learners with special needs, and currently this category is the most prevalent category entitled to special services (Ysseldyke et al., 1992). This argument is supported by the increasing numbers of LDS in mainstream education (20% between 1986-1996). However, the main reason seems to be the new circumstances created by educational reforms and legislation. Indeed, the move towards institutional autonomy has enhanced a necessity to develop clear principles and a medium-to-long-term view rather than a day-to-day survival mechanism in schools with regard to LDS. The open enrolment and Local Management of School (LMS) have empowered schools and increased their sovereignty regarding all issues including inclusion of LDS.

This study will examine the process of the inclusion of LDS in secondary schools with regard to management issues. This is mainly because learning deficits become more acutely evident in secondary schools where testing is a focal point, and on its face the management of the inclusion appears to be problematic. In addition, the inflatedly growing numbers of students assessed as LDS seem to call for an exploration of managerial processes involved.
But prior to furthering this discussion, it seems necessary to clarify the concept of LD as a special category of SEN.

**Definitions of LD**

One of the major problems of those who wish to make policy and plan provision for SEN is the lack of consensus among professionals, parents and policy makers about what constitutes SEN, and what level of provision is required for each category. Warnock (1982: 372) stated that “the poverty of special needs is in its definition...or rather its lack of definition”, and pointed out the difficulty “to decide whose needs are special or what special means”. Definitions of SEN have recently changed towards learning difficulties, approaches to organisation, teaching and curriculum (Booth, 1996: 88). Indeed, SEN is usually regarded as a vast umbrella which includes all kinds of physical and mental disabilities and handicaps which require some level of SEN provision.

To date, learning disabilities have remained one of the least understood disabbling condition that affect children (Lyon, 1994). Until recently the issues of definitions and classifications of LD have been ignored (Lyon et al., 1993). The complexity of defining LD derives from the fact that it is influenced by different professional viewpoints. Indeed, LD are defined differently for neuropsychological research purpose, for allocating resources for school programmes, or for the purpose of advocacy (Keogh, 1983). Further, LD fall under a vast umbrella of professionals (mainstream teachers, SEN teachers, educational psychologists, neurologists, psychological and didactic assessors), and are affected by geographical, historical and political factors (Wedell, 1993; House of Commons, 1993). The variations in the percentage of LDS across countries is illustrated in Table 1.2.

Historically, the common thread among most definitions of LD was the notion of discrepancy between aptitude (measured by IQ) and achievements (Kirk, 1963). The American Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 1994 whose classifications are adopted in Israel, defines LD as significant gaps in the level of the individual in standardised tests, as expected by his/her age, studies and IQ.
The first LD which caught professionals’ attention around the turn of the century was dyslexia (reading disability) which was defined as ‘congenital word blindness’. The prevalence rate was 1 in 1000, and 13 in 42,900 (Thomas, 1908; Schmitt, 1917-18). LD was defined then by three medical-oriented schools of thought: Hinshelwood’s (1917), Orton (1928), and Gray (1922). The second development that affected the categorisation of LDS was the introduction of the concept of ‘minimal brain damage’ after World War One, which was applied to learning by Strauss. It was contended that disturbances in perception, thinking and emotional behaviour correlate with a minimal brain damage or ‘endogenous retardation’ as opposed to mental retardation (Strauss and Lehtinen, 1947). This was supported by Cruickshank (1977) and by Kirk and Bateman (1962-3) who argued that symptomology was more important than etiology, as it sets the basis for all interventions.

Another basis for definition is etiological: whereas the 1981 National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (NJCLD) concluded that all LD are intrinsic and derive from a central nervous system dysfunction (Hammill et al., 1987), other research demonstrated that there are environmental influences on reading disabilities (Olson et al., 1989). The definitions adopted by the Israeli Ministry are based on formal definitions that were made by the 1994 NJCLD and the DSM-IV 1994 which have an operational basis.

Lately, investigators have begun to adopt an approach of identifying individuals with LD on the basis of a failure to respond to intervention (Alexander et al., 1991; Berninger and Traweek, 1991). Those who fail to make adequate progress despite intensive assistance would be diagnosed as ‘treatment nonresponders’ as opposed to those who have gained from tutoring programmes and diagnosed as ‘treatment responders’.

Hammill’s (1990:83) words encapsulate the importance of a uniform definition:

“What is important is that professionals and parents unite around one definition so that we can say with assurance: ‘this is what we mean when we say ‘learning disabilities’’.”
The Identification of LDS

Research on the classification of LD indicates little evidence that current classifications of LD are logically consistent, easily operationalised, or empirically valid (Morris, 1988).

The lack of uniformity with referene to LDS identification might lead to possible flaws in the process. Some students may be served in LD programmes despite their ability to cope in ordinary schools (Zigmond, 1993). Other students with LD have never been referred to assessments. Furthermore, assessment policies differ. In some countries such as in the UK, students are assessed longitudinally, whereas in other countries such as in Israel, students are not sent to be assessed as LDS unless the need arises. Moreover, different assessment batteries and approaches are applied in different locations and this lessens the uniform procedures of identification. Thus, researchers of clinical and empirical approach may evaluate the same child differently because their theoretical conceptualisation and operationalisation are different (Morris, 1988), or because they use different means for diagnosis. However, Morrison (1998) stated that the problem with the suitability of most standardised test instruments is that they were developed with normal populations and not with groups of greater behavioural variability.

In addition, a differential discrimination between LD and other factors of learning failures should be made prior to the didactic assessment, as there might be other factors such as family problems or low socio-economic background that could lead to learning failures. Equally important is the consideration whether the same individual might have disorders that co-occur, or whether a single disorder might have attributes of learning and psychological disabilities within the same individual.

The ethics of assessment has been scrutinised by Gartner and Lipsky (1987:372) who claim that “when test results do not produce the desired outcome, evaluators often change the yardstick”. This serious accusation implies mistrust between professionals. Clinicians have also been attacked on using a ‘shotgun’ approach, whose extensiveness is bound to find faults in every individual. On the other hand, it
is argued that extensiveness allows for the clinician to effectively differentiate among complex factors.

The two main existing approaches to assessments are the standardised and the dynamic (interactive) approaches: standardised, normative tests provide a reliable means of assessing individual differences (Anastasi, 1988), detect deficits and strengths, and may predict future school achievement (Cook and Campbell, 1979). They also allow for a comparison between previous and current levels of functioning. Dynamic assessments, on the other hand, measure the individual’s receptiveness to instruction (Feuerstein, 1979). The examiner provides instructional intervention and compares the baseline ability with the student’s performance at various points in time. The active role of the assessor allows to assess processes and observe learning as it actually takes place (Haywood and Wingenfeld, 1992).

**Integration and inclusion**

Throughout the 1980s the term ‘integration’ rather than ‘inclusion’ was used. Currently, the term ‘integration’ appears to have been subsumed within the term ‘inclusion’. Tod (1999: 186) differentiates between being “*locationally integrated but not effectively included*”, a view supported by the National Association for Special Educational Needs (NASEN) and by Thomas (1997). Thomas advocates that the simple movement of SEN students into mainstream schools does not change perceptions of these students. Florian (in Tilstone et al., 1998) takes this idea a step further claiming that whereas integration is associated with the physical learning environment, inclusion is seen in terms of the quality of the learning experience which ensures that no student is denied access to educational opportunities. Similarly, Farrell (2001) suggests that ‘inclusion’ has become more accepted because it describes the extent to which a SEN student is truly integrated at school.

Furthermore, Rose (in Florian et al., 1998) contends that a failure in the process of inclusion might achieve the opposite result: “*There are many pupils with special educational needs in mainstream schools, who far from being included find themselves isolated by teaching approaches which fail to give adequate consideration*
to their individual learning needs, and thereby exclude them from a range of opportunities which would enhance their performance potential” (p. 96).

The literature appears to refer to three components of real inclusion: the first one is the acknowledgement that “their diversity of interests, abilities and attainment should be welcomed and be seen to enrich the life of the school” (Farrell, 2001: 7). The second component is “placing children with SEN in mainstream schools” (Farrell, ibid.), and the third component focusses on “support as needed by the individual” (Mittler, 1995: 105) and appropriate aids and services (Gilhool, 1989).

Despite the recent distribution of the Index for Inclusion in England and Wales which conveys the message that a “'good enough’ framework has been found” (Sommefeldt, 2001: 160), it is contended (e.g. Booth and Ainscow, 1998) that inclusion is a process. Ainscow et al. (1999: 137) maintain that “inclusion must be regarded as a never-ending process rather than a simple change of state... It means, of course, that deep changes are needed, and, inevitably, they take time”. Booth (1996) holds the view that this process implies increase in the participation of students in mainstream schools on the one hand, while on the other hand it decreases the exclusion of students from mainstream cultures and curricula.

Researchers are aware of possible discrepancies between rhetoric and implementation. Barthes (1972: 143) refer to it as “a discourse of concealment”, whereas Slee (in Ainscow, 1991) believe that inclusion is “an educational surgery which is merely cosmetic”. However, inclusion has a social meaning as well. Rice’s (in Slee, 1993) view is that “to be excluded from the mainstream of education is to be excluded from this socialisation process” (Rice, ibid.: 253). This belief is strengthened in OECD’s (1995: 15) report: “(Inclusion) maximises the interaction between disabled and non-disabled pupils”. ‘Real’ inclusion, therefore, should be a natural process which does not set apart any group of people.

The issue of inclusion can be looked at as a continuum of placements from full integration to full segregation. It might be seen that although the continuum in the United Kingdom (Figure 1.1) and in the USA (Figure 1.2) does not look exactly the
same, the division ranges from ordinary classes to special schools (based on OECD’s report).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special help in the ordinary classroom</th>
<th>Periodic withdrawal for small group help</th>
<th>Division of time: ordinary and special class</th>
<th>Part-time special school attendance</th>
<th>Full-time special school attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Figure 1.1: From segregation to integration in the UK*

Regular education
Resource room
Separate class
Separate school
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*Figure 1.2: Placement of children with SEN in the USA*

Views about inclusion pose ethical questions. They range from those who believe in totally inclusive education as a matter of right (Thomas, 1997), to those who believe that SEN means having the right to be provided with special frameworks (Fairbairn and Fairbairn, 1992). Others claim that the need for accommodation does not occur out of concern for LDS but in order “to keep the regular classroom functioning smoothly” (Doris, 1993: 98). Conversely, it is asserted that integrating LDS in mainstream education takes away money which could have been spent on ‘regular’ students.

**The aim and objectives of the study**

The aim of the study is to examine how school leadership, school culture and school structures as perceived by school staff are related to the level of inclusion of LDS in mainstream secondary education. The study will focus on management perspectives and not on the psychological, behavioural or learning deficits of LDS.
The first three objectives focus on the relationship between each of the managerial elements which are part of this study and its ‘twin’ inclusive pair. For example, the concept of ‘school credo’ will explore the values and beliefs which underpin school work in general, whereas ‘inclusive vision’ will examine the issues of vision which are specifically associated with inclusion. Thus, an in-depth enquiry will be conducted of leadership, structures and culture and at the same time of inclusive leadership, inclusive structures and inclusive culture. These two groups of managerial elements will be later combined into a complete picture of the management of school inclusion. The fourth objective seeks to identify possible relationships between leadership, culture and structures in the context of inclusion (Figure 1.3).

Figure 1.3 The relationships between management and inclusion

The context of the study

The investigation of LDS’ inclusion will be conducted in five mainstream secondary schools which are part of this research. All schools are part of Tel Aviv Municipal Department of Education. However, the research will offer a glimpse to the macro level of the Ministry as well.
Contextual data on the issue of inclusion have been collected on three levels: international, national, and local. The international level comprises an overview on policies of comprehensive schooling and inclusive provision for LDS in the UK, USA, Australia (mainly Victoria) and Israel. The national level includes a documentary analysis of curriculars issued by the Israeli Ministry of Education between the years 1996-2000, and Educational Acts relevant to the topic of inclusion. The local level offers data collected at the educational department of Tel Aviv municipality by documentary analysis. The research will be conducted in five secondary schools. Table 1.1 offers background of the five schools. Further information is provided in Appendix 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year of foundation</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Location/Feeding areas</th>
<th>Percentage of graduates with matriculation certificate (year 2000)</th>
<th>Percentage of students assessed as LDS (year 2000)</th>
<th>School focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>North-east of Tel Aviv</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>North-east of Tel Aviv</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>Vocational and academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>North of Tel Aviv (27% coming from the south)</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>North of Tel Aviv (40% of students in Senior High from the periphery)</td>
<td>73-86%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Change from vocational to academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>75% of students from south-east of Tel Aviv; 25% from the periphery</td>
<td>80% (90% in the better learning tracks)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Vocational and academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.1 Schools' background*
The following sections attempt to offer an overview of international, national and local aspects of comprehensive schooling and provision of services for LDS.

**International comparisons**

The international comparisons that are offered in this section are made among the USA, Australia, England and Israel. Although this study focusses on the management of inclusion within the context of worldwide commitment to inclusion, one should not forget the difficulties implicit within making these comparisons. Firstly, the educational system in Israel is much younger than the other countries because the state of Israel was founded in 1948. In addition, the number of students in Israel is much smaller than in the rest of the countries and this makes the comparison a lot more difficult in terms of proportions. Secondly, the educational system in Israel and in England are unified systems whereas the USA and Australia have federal governments. For example, in Australia education is a legislative responsibility of the states and territories, with the Federal Government providing financial assistance to state government, to non-government education sectors and to parent groups. Therefore, there is a considerable variation in the way inclusion is implemented in the six Australian states and the two territories. This situation is similar in the USA within the 50 states.

Another problem is related to cross-cultural definitions. Evans et al. (1995) asserted that the concepts of LD and SEN represent two different predominant approaches: the United States strive to extend the scope of the legal definition of disability through public laws (P.L. 94-142; 99-457; 101-476) and use a range of descriptive categories one of which is LDS, whereas the United Kingdom advocates that categories of disability for educational purpose are to be abolished and replaced by the much broader term of SEN. In some countries which belong to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), SEN is synonymous to special schooling (OECD, 1995: 28). It is noteworthy that in this respect Israel is more similar to the USA because the category of LDS is treated differently than the rest of SEN categories, whereas Australia is more similar to the UK and refers to SEN as a general category.
Develo**pment of mixed ability secondary schools**

Attempts have been made to develop systems and structures to respond to a diversity of students as part of the development of comprehensive schooling (Booth et al., 1997). This concern came to be known as ‘the whole-school approach’ (Dessent, 1987) in which schools moved away from traditional and more segregated forms of provision towards mainstream solutions.

Secondary education systems pose far greater problems for integration than do primary education systems for two main reasons: they tend to be more selective in order to meet students and societies’ needs for specialisation. In addition, secondary school teachers are more concerned “with the knowledge inherent to their own individual subject specialisms, rather than as people concerned with children’s overall approaches to learning” (OECD, 1995: 27).

A key variable for integration is the age at which students specialise in learning tracks. Whereas in France, Greece, Italy, Norway, Iceland and Spain specialisation is delayed, in England some schools start it from the entry to secondary schools and this might be considered as inhibiting integration (ibid.).

The comprehensive high school, which is the dominant model in the USA today, was set by the Commission on the Reorganisation of Secondary Education (1918). It was comprehensive in the sense that it was envisaged as accommodating the needs of various students as representatives of varied populations in the USA. Indeed, whereas by the early 1920s about 30-40% of youngsters attended high schools, today the rate is well over 90% of 14-17 year olds. Following a reform between 1933-1940, matriculations were annulled and most secondary schools accredit their students with a final certificate based on the level of their performance at school.

Movement from primary to secondary education in Australia is automatic. Secondary education tends to be neighbourhood-based, featured by a comprehensive curriculum. Whereas a full secondary cycle lasts five or six years, for the majority of children the first phase which lasts three to four years also represents the conclusion of their
formal full-time education. In many cases, the student receives a certificate of attendance and performance upon the conclusion of the first phase which is based on internal records, external examination, or both. Students take their matriculation exams at the age of 18 although education is not compulsory after the age of 15. As students progress through school, they have increasing opportunities regarding breadth and depth of subject matters.

The trend towards comprehensive schooling in England is “a long and complex process, subject to much variation and many influences” (Fogelman, 1999:1). The 1944, 1988 and 1996 legislation enabled comprehensive secondary schools to introduce an element of selection in the form of the ‘11+’ examination into their intake. ‘Academic’ children were assigned to traditional, grammar schools or to technical grammar schools, and the less able were referred to secondary modern schools (The Hadow Report, Board of Education, 1926; The Spens Report, Board of Education, 1938). At the same time, dissatisfaction with the role of the ‘11+’ examination increased (Douglas, 1968) as well as awareness towards comprehensive schooling in Europe, particularly in Sweden.

The current situation in England is dependent on local politics. For example, the secondary system in Buckinghamshire is selective, but its largest town, Milton Keynes, has comprehensive schools. There are also regional differences. Whereas most secondary schools in England and Wales are comprehensive, almost all secondary schools in North Ireland select students by the ‘11+ exam’ (Booth, 1996). The most common policy of within-school grouping is mixed-ability groupings, but as students progress through the school there is increase in ability grouping.

The issue of comprehensive schools in England has always been a highly political issue, subject to intense political scrutiny by right wing parties who issued the ‘Black Papers’. At the same time left wing authorities have supported it (Cox and Dyson, 1969; Cox and Boyson, 1975). In the 1980s and 1990s the educational system in the UK was subject to restructuring: it became subject to the National Curriculum and developed school-based control over finance and management as well as parental choice. These changes emphasised individual choice, diversity of provision, excellence of outcomes and value for money. Figures indicate that whereas in 1970
47% of students left schools with no qualification, in 2000 that figure reduced to 5.4%. Furthermore, between 1989 and 1999 the percentage of 16-18 year old students in full-time education rose from 37.6 to 75.4%. Indeed, the 2000 DfEE statistics indicate that 141,387 students attend grammar schools and 108,305 attend secondary modern schools, whereas traditionally the ratio was at least one to three.

**Provision for LDS**

“There is something deeply unattractive about the spectacle of someone demanding his own rights”  
(Warnock, 1977)

Methods of allocation of SEN services vary between countries in their degrees of formality, flexibility and delegation to the local level. In addition, the nature of support and the roles and responsibilities of support services might differ too. For example, in Canada, Australia and Norway SEN service is an integrated part of ordinary school education, and does not necessarily require formal assessment. Thus, special education services are delegated to the individual schools which, in turn, can change the resources informally by school’s managing body. In other countries, such as Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States, the provision of SEN is conditional on formal multidisciplinary assessment and on decisions at regional or national level (OECD, 1995:29). In England, for instance, the provision of in-class special support assistance is a common outcome of statement procedures prescribed through an Education Act.

Table 1.2 provides data on the basis of OECD Report (ibid.: 42-45; 90-126). The empty rubrics mean that no data has been provided. It is noteworthy that most findings relate to special settings (except for Norway and Finland). This indicates that most LDS study in segregated schools. Further, most LDS study in segregated schools (40.95-66.3%), yet their total percentage in school population of SEN students varies (0.48-3.17%), as does the percentage of SEN in different countries (0.86-17.08). Finally, interpretational analysis should take into consideration the different terminology, type of provision, and location.
Table 1.2 Data gathered from OECD report (1995)

The OECD data demonstrated that although segregated special school provision continues to be the norm in several countries, most nations wish to integrate children with disabilities into mainstream settings. Yet, the key to successful inclusion lies in the modifications of practices and attitudes by policy makers as well as by schools. These attempts require an appreciable investment of human and fiscal resources.

In 1996, UNSECO conducted a ‘Survey on Special Needs Laws’ and found that of the 52 countries surveyed, 27 (52%) countries had laws advocating to meet SEN in mainstream classes (CSIE, 1996). However, in the majority of the countries the extent of inclusion was conditional on school’s capacity to meet SEN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of students with LD</th>
<th>% of LDS in special schools</th>
<th>% of LDS in school population</th>
<th>% of SEN in total school population</th>
<th>% integrated into mainstream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11 934</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1987/8</td>
<td>42 110</td>
<td>43.49</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>136 422</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1990/1</td>
<td>8723</td>
<td>55.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>43 155</td>
<td>41.19</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1898/90</td>
<td>18 303</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1990/1</td>
<td>2144377</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1988/9</td>
<td>9972 (no LDS in secondary schools)</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USA

Legislation

The aim of educational laws in the USA is to secure the rights of disabled students and their parents. Indeed, the right for education is a basic right in the 14th amendment. In 1963, when the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities was formed in the US, the term LD was accepted into medical, psychological and educational lexicons. This was followed by a series of legislation initiatives: the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the 1969 Learning Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act in 1973, the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (1990), the 1991 IDEA Amendments, and the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) with respect to employment, transportation, accommodation, and telecommunication.

The 1997 IDEA in which dyslexia is the only specific LD listed, asserts that all states with a SEN policy receive money from the federal government. The IDEA focusses on five issues:

- Special budgeting for the diagnosis of SEN;
- Individualised Education Programme (IEP);
- The concept of Least Restrictive Environment which requires that schools admit all learners and initiate necessary modifications;
- Mainstream teachers training;
- Entitlement to accompanying services.

In conclusion, students' rights are legally secured by laws which protect the rights of disabled people as well as laws such as IDEA which address educational needs. At the same time, there has also been a strong advocacy of disability organisations as well as court decisions.
Vision

“The federal role in education is not to serve the system. It is to serve the children.”

(President Bush, 2001)

The major principles of legislation which concern LDS’ inclusion are: zero rejection, individualised programmes, appropriate extra provision, parental participation and shared decision making. Public schools are required to develop IEPs which must respond to the child’s individualised needs that were identified in the evaluation process. Each student’s IEP must be reviewed annually. The 1975 Act marks a shift from the clinical-oriented approach predominating between 1962 to 1975 to an educational-operational approach. This enabled schools to make decisions regarding access to resources (Burbules et al., 1982).

Implementation

OECD report (OECD, 1995: 127) indicates that in 1990-1 specific LD consisted 2,144,377 students. This number consisted 49.11% of overall number of SEN students and 3.17% of total school population.

Three studies which followed the 1969 Act in the Child Service Demonstration Centers (CSDCs) demonstrated the inadequacy of the definition of LD in operational terms (Kirk and Elkins, 1975; Mann et al., 1983; Norman and Zigmond, 1980). Since the 1970s, the number of LDS identified and catered for in public schools have soared from 1.8% in 1976-1977 (which is the first year in which national figures on the number of students with disabilities are kept), to nearly 5% in 1988-1989. The 18th Annual Report to Congress 1996 indicates that graduation rates from school are higher and more students with disabilities are going to college. The 23rd annual report to Congress on the implementation of the IDEA showed that graduation rates for disabled students of age 14 and above have climbed steadily since 1993-94 whereas the dropout rate among this population has declined. Yet, a particular concern was expressed with regard to inclusion in regular educational settings. Reports indicate that 56% of LDS were withdrawn for 40% of their time to resource room education.
Australia
Legislation
There is no legislation in Australia for inclusive education. The Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act 1992 is ambivalent in the sense that it prohibits school authorities to deny a disabled student access to school, yet if school authority can prove ‘unjustifiable hardship’ they may refuse entry of the child (Commonwealth of Australia, 1997). This hardship could be the expense of education for a disabled child, teacher stress, or the necessity to make modifications to buildings. Indeed, Forlin and Forlin (1998) argue for the development of ‘legal models’ due to the lack of legislative frameworks.

Vision
Since the mid-80s “Australia is moving towards the practice of integration for all” (Center et al., 1989: 1). While the various states and territories differ markedly in their approach to policy formulation and implementation, this general movement towards integration is uniform and is underpinned by “the recognition that children with disabilities have the right to be educated in environments which maximise the normalcy of their experiences” (ibid.: 1). The Integration Report in Victoria (1984b) demonstrated unconditional acceptance of the right of all children for mainstream education. It viewed disability as a reflection of the integration between the learner and school organisation, curriculum, pedagogy and culture. Indeed, the policies of the states and territories recognise the need to focus on students’ strengths and needs rather than weaknesses (Dempsey, 2001).

Implementation
In 1984 there were 214 disabled students enrolled in regular schools and 5,300 in specialist settings. In 1991 there were 4,987 disabled students in regular schools and 4,912 in specialist settings. In 2001, the number of disabled students in regular schools rose to 10,900 in contrast to 5,900 in specialist settings. A report by Cullen and Brown (1992) indicated an increase of 32% in the enrolment of SEN students in mainstream schools and of 46% in funding between 1984 and 1991. In addition, IEPs are mandatory and a progress review on the implementation takes place every two years.
Yet, Slee (1996) claimed that there is a discrepancy between rhetoric and practice regarding inclusion in Australian education, which might be attributed to the fact that the education system in Australia is centralised and schools are financed directly by the Ministry of Education. Lewis (1993) draws on data from Victorian schools and claims that rather than reconstructing a social policy at school a new category of ‘the integration student’ was invented. Although the Victorian state government expenditure on integration has increased from $A3 million in 1984 to $A44.2 million per year in 1992, expenditure on segregated school system has increased from $A46 million to $A97 million during the same period (Pope, 1992). Similarly, the New South Wales Department of Education is committed to a policy which favours both special and mainstream settings as alternative options for SEN students.

England

Legislation

The situation at the outset of the twenty-first century in the UK is that schools are at different points on the inclusion continuum, which ranges from formal provision to SEN students to fully inclusive classes catering for all abilities.

The education of disabled children in the UK has been influenced markedly by the Warnock Report (DES, 1978), which advocated that 20% of students might have SEN at some stage, and these needs should and can be met in mainstream schools for the vast majority (18%). Only two per cent of students who are statemented will be placed in special education. Warnock claimed that the source of the problem is not the student, but rather the result of the interaction between the strengths and weaknesses of the student and resources. Warnock also recognised that educational aims are uniform for all learners, but the degree and means to attain them differ between students. The report emphasised three stages towards integration: locational, social and functional. The report was scrutinised for offering an easy escape for schools which objected to integration.

The 1981 Education Act introduced the procedures for statements, whereby LEAs became responsible for the identification of students with SEN. The Act removed the ‘medical’ labels and replaced them by ‘educational’ descriptors in an attempt to de-stigmatise SEN students and place them on the continuum of mainstream
education. However, the Act introduced an ambivalent picture of the duty to integrate (Fairbairn and Fairbairn, 1992) including an excessive leeway to LEAs by stating provisos which enabled them to effectively ignore this duty. In reality, the Act did nothing to enhance SEN provision.

The 1981 Act still forms the basis of all special needs legislation, especially on the identification and assessment of students with SEN. However, the 1993 Education Act is also considered to be an important milestone because it was the first legislation to make schools of all kinds responsible for meeting SEN. It related to more specific realms of of the Special Education Act: roles and responsibilities, co-ordination arrangements, accessibility, resource allocation, evaluation, staff training and outside support, links with other schools, and access to curriculum. In addition, schools had to make annual reports to parents regarding school policy and its implementation.

Another contribution of the Act was the Appeals and Special Educational Tribunal.

Further new legislations were initiated in 1988 as a result of two reforms: the shift to LMS and the introduction of a uniform national curriculum. Examples for new legislations are the Green Paper (DfEE, 1997), the Programme of Action (DfEE, 1998) and a whole series of circulars on various SEN issues. In particular, the Salamanca Statement (UNSECO, 1994) had a major impact on current thinking (Farrell, 2001).

The Code of Practice that was issued after the 1993 Act (DfE, 1994g) was designed to correct the deficiencies of the 1981 Act (Loxley and Bines, 1995) by offering provision for the 18% of students identified by Warnock (1978) as having SEN without statements (Peter, 1994). The Code provided guidance to the LEAs, schools and other agencies about how to fulfill their duties, and differentiated between learning difficulties and learning disabilities. It highlighted management issues such as the SEN coordinator role (SENCO). The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 (SENDA 2001) offers amendments to the 1996 Education Act by removing two of the conditions on mainstream inclusion for these students. The new Code of Practice which came into force in 2001 places more emphasis on school’s responsibility to provide curricular responses and IEPs to SEN students. It maintains that the early stages of assessing and meeting SEN should be based within the school
setting, whereas the final procedures which involve statutory requirements are to be shared between school and the LEA.

**Policy**
Trends which started in the 1980s and 1990s towards high achievements and competitions between schools (Housden, 1993) arose concerns with regard to vulnerable populations. Simkins (1994) pointed out that the Conservative Government was concerned with the three Es: Efficiency, Economy and Effectiveness, but ignored the fourth E – that of Equity. The new Labour Government, however, expressed commitment to equal opportunities and to educational and social inclusion. It supported the Salamanca Statement in the Green Paper (DfEE, 1997) and its Action Programme (DfEE, 1998). This document outlines an intention to move more students from segregated to mainstream schools although some points remain ambiguous.

The government’s policy of tackling social exclusion can be seen through the establishment of the Social Exclusion Unit, the Sure Start (SS) and Early Excellence Centre (EEC) programmes, and the extension of the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) to schools and further education which was reinforced by the Human Rights Act 2000. Farrell (2000: 154) asserts that “inclusion in a more general sense is now seen as a ‘good thing’ and exclusion as ‘a bad thing’”. This policy was further supported by the ‘Index for Inclusion’ (Booth et al., 2000) which was sent to all schools in England and Wales in May 2000 in an attempt to explain the social model as opposed to the medical model towards inclusion.

**Implementation**
Findings indicate a steady reduction in the numbers of students attending special schools (2% of SEN students according to DfEE, 2001) but this may be accounted for by a reduction in the numbers of students with sensory and physical difficulties (Farrell, 2000). There has been a steady increase in the number of students excluded from schools (Parsons and Hawlett, 1996) and in the numbers of students put forward for statutory assessments (DfEE, 1999). This caused pressures on LEAs and school budget and raised questions with regard to the most effective means of resourcing
special needs. Moreover, the commitment to parental choice implies the need to maintain both inclusive and segregated systems with the budgetary implications.

Lunt and Norwich (1999) argue that the persistence in the definition of SEN as a group within the context of ‘excellence for all’ identifies inclusion with additional resources. Consequently, the number of assessed students increased because this ensured school access to more resources, although it equally posed an ethical problem regarding ‘perverse incentives’ for statements. Yet, despite the enhanced legislation, 25% of all SEN students were being educated in mainstream classes in 1990, whereas 63% were being educated in special schools and 12% in special classes. Kirp (1982) contrasts the legislative approach in England and the USA and asserts that the former was under the control of educational professionals, whereas the latter was guided by an emphasis on rights in legislation.

The Israeli experience

Development of mixed ability secondary schools
The secondary education has been influenced by two main Acts: the 1949 Act which established compulsory education for ages six to fourteen, and the 1953 Act which established education by the State. The Israeli system of secondary education offers the following types of schools: grammar schools which are matriculation-oriented; vocational and technical schools; the Yeshiva, which is an orthodox matriculation-oriented school that focuses on Jewish subjects. The matriculation grading system is based on exams as well as on teachers’ evaluation of students’ performance. Less able students may take the final governmental examinations which grant them with a secondary school diploma even if they have not taken the matriculations.

The 1960s introduced a new trend of ‘Education for All’, allowing each individual an opportunity to materialise his/her skills. The 1975 EA extended compulsory education to the age of 16, and free tuition was granted until the 12th grade. Consequently, vocational trends were offered in grammar schools, and comprehensive schools currently offer varied secondary curricular ‘menus’. Some mainstream secondary schools offer special classes for LDS and low-achievers which provide a more flexible curriculum and support to individuals, and help them graduate within existing
National Curriculum. Indeed, data indicate that more students attend secondary schools and are able to graduate from them (245,000 students in 1990 and 331,000 in 2002).

In a report that was issued in July 2002 by the Tel Aviv Municipality two tendencies can be observed: an increase in the number of secondary schools with LMS (six in 2002, 14 in 2002); a change in school policy towards a policy of ‘non-exclusion’ as regards weak students, as a result of which more students are now able to graduate from the same six-year school where they started their studies (58% of graduates in 1998 as opposed to 62% in 2002).

**Provision for LDS**

A survey conducted in 1999 in 300 Senior High Schools revealed that out of 132,748 students from all sectors 14,189 students were identified and assessed as LDS, a number which totals to 10.6% of student population. Data analysis indicated a great diversity among schools in the percentage of students assessed as LDS, as well as in assessment batteries and specific test accommodations.

The policy of management of LD in Israel will now be overviewed with reference to the relevant Acts and the General Manager’s Circulars that were issued from 1996 onwards.

**Legislation**

The Special Education Act 1988 (section 7b) states that “*when a placement committee deals with the placement of an exceptional child, it will prioritise a familiar mainstream institution to a special school*”. However, a student’s placement is dependent upon a rigorous examination of his/her individual needs and a consideration of the most suitable institution for him/her. The Act enhances mainstream school staff responsibility for SEN students and encourages cooperation between special and mainstream education. It advocates the use of special needs services such as ‘remedial’ teaching and para-medical services. What underpins this Act is the necessity to recognise diversities among people and learn to accept the ‘different’ as an integral part of society.
Circulars regarding the implementation of the Act were issued from 1992-3 onwards. Brandes and Nesher (1996) pointed out tensions regarding the rhetoric and implementation, whereas Shulman and Hed (1990) focussed on organisational/physical integration as opposed to social/interpersonal integration.

Two long-term integration programmes which aimed to achieve full implementation of the 1988 Act were initiated in 1989 and 1994 and were specified in the General Manager Circular 1999 (49c) ‘Integration Programmes in Mainstream Education regarding SEN students in mainstream and special classes’. It views the concept of integration as one of the greatest challenges of the Israeli educational system whose aim should be to address the special needs of students who cannot adapt socially or academically to mainstream schools (except for severe disabilities). It is noteworthy that LDS appear under Category B in the priority list in the circular regarding the provision of SEN services.

On November 13th 2003 the Committee of Education and Culture of the Israeli Knesset approved the 2003 Act of the Rights of LDS in Mainstream Education. This Act focusses on the standardisation of procedures of identification and assessment of LDS, and on decisions regarding educational interventions and test accommodations. LDS, who make 15-20% of students’ population, will be assessed twice during their learning career. In addition, a committee of 19 professionals whose main job will be to consult and supervise the implementation of this Act will be established.

Another Act concerning the Integration of SEN Students in Mainstream Education was approved by the Knesset Committee on November 12th. It focusses on the allocation of extra support, IEPs prepared by homeroom teachers in partnership with SEN teachers, and monitoring the process at the end of every school year.

**Vision**

The 1996 Circular calls for “continuous heart recruiting and a change in attitudes” (p.19). It maintains that most LDS should study in regular classes and only a small number of students needs special frameworks. The 1996 Circular encourages “the creation of supportive school climate which enables the system to function as remediating rather than categorising” (p.9). The basis for the 1997 Margalit
Committe was the social recognition that every student has rights for equal opportunities to materialise his/her learning potential. The 1998 Circular emphasises the need for a differential discrimination. It claims that LDS should be taught new strategies for coping with LD throughout their life cycle. In addition, it states clearly that the purpose of assessments is first and foremost intervention and treatment and not test accommodations.

The common feature in the different papers on the issue of integration is the importance of the headteacher in leading the process of inclusion at school. However, Avissar (1999) argues that the headteacher’s role with regard to inclusion in Israel is mainly ensuring the uniform decisions imposed by the Ministry rather than leading a change.

**Policy**

The Israeli policy towards inclusion clearly sees LDS as a distinct category among other SEN categories. Yet, it is not clearly-cut. For example, the 1996 Circular states that students of upper grades that have never been assessed before are not entitled to any special test accommodations. Contrarily, the 1997 Margalit Committee advocates their entitlement for test accommodations on the grounds that “LD can be identified throughout life circle” (p.17). The 1998 Circular advocates the implementation of this decision, whereas the 1999 Circular excludes upper graders claiming they were assessed for the sake of matriculations.

It is also noteworthy that the phenomenon of over-placement in special schools is still continuing and Avissar’s (1999) interpretation is partly the additional resources allocated for SEN and partly the system’s hopelessness regarding the problems SEN students face in mainstream education.

**Special concerns**

The Margalit Committee expresses concerns regarding several issues:

- The low availability to LD identification services among certain populations, such as the Arab sector or Haredi (fanatic religious) Jews;
• The disruption in the continuum of services from Junior to Senior High Schools;
• The lack of standardisation, uniformity and validity in assessment tools which might mislead members of pedagogic committees;
• The increase in the number of students applying for test accommodations following assessments (5.8% of all students in 1995, 8.4% in 1996 and 11.4% in 1997);
• The fact that most assessments are conducted in private frameworks.

Recommendations
In the 1996 circular it is suggested that in-service training system be developed in every school within five years, which includes the development of assessment skills among teachers and SENCO. The 1997 Margalit Committee advised that training should be designed according to subject area and methodology of specialist teachers. It has also been recommended that MATIYA centres (regional centres which provide inter-disciplinary services for LDS) be set, in order to provide assessment and multi-professional services. These ‘remedial’ learning centres will work in full cooperation with schools.

The 1998 Circular advocates that assessments will be valid from Junior High School until five years from graduation date (as opposed to five years of validity in former circulars). In addition, a specific committee for LD matters will operate in every school and discuss accommodations on the basis of assessment findings as well as the level of student’s functioning at school. School’s pedagogic committee will also be empowered to match the content of the report to test accommodations. The 2000 Circular reconfirms the need for a SENCO in every school.

The Circulars differ in the extent and variety of test accommodations. For example, the 1996 Circular suggests seven types of test accommodations, the 1998 suggests ten, whereas the 2000 Circular suggests eleven. The 2000 Circular offers detailed accommodations for every specific LD.
Assessment procedures

The 1996 Circular seems to be inconsistent in respect of authorised assessors of LD. It asserts that differential discrimination will be conducted by an educational psychologist. Basic academic skills, on the other hand, will be assessed in a complementary didactic assessment only if individually-designed interventions have borne no results. At the same time it is maintained that pedagogic committees should rely on “an educational psychologist, a specialised didactic teacher or a specialist doctor” (p.15, 4) while granting test accommodations. In another section (3a) it entitles psychologists or doctors to assess, with no clear statement what specialist doctors are included in this definition.

The 1999 Circular confirms the entitlement of school’s pedagogic committee to state its opinion on test accommodations relying on “a valid psychological assessment” (p.1, section 1.2). The 2000 Circular further accredits the pedagogic committee on the basis of its daily acquaintance with the students, and acknowledges it as the fully authorised body for deciding on test accommodations. The main change is that the committee is now empowered to advise on the type of assessment and assessors according to the following baseline:

- Didactic assessments will be suggested when LD are assumed to be primary and no other factors need to be negated.
- Psychological assessment will be advised when other factors, such as behavioural or emotional are involved.
- Multi-domained assessments will be suggested when specific accommodations need to be approved, such as oral tests or reduced materials.
- Other assessments might be suggested in some cases, such as neurological, and occupational.

As a result of the ambiguity expressed in Circulars with regard to didactic assessors, an appeal to Court was made by the Association of Didactic Assessors. Indeed, in 1999 the Supreme Court stated clearly the entitlement of didactic assessors to assess LD, a decision which was supported by the January 2000 Circular.
Supervision procedures

The 1997 Margalit Committee decided that private assessments need to be confirmed by MATIYA Centres. It also called for a clear-cut policy regarding supervision on schools and on public assessment centres. The 2000 Circular establishes a systematic supervisory setup of the Ministry regarding the implementation of regulations concerning test accommodations in secondary schools. In case a certain school is observed as having breached regulations, the authority of its pedagogic committee will be re-evaluated. Evaluation programmes will operate in three ways:

- Detection of schools where more than 10% of students require test accommodations;
- Random supervision in schools;
- Issuing reports on LDS based on data retrieved from the Tests Unit of the Ministry;
- Supportive evaluation which aims at the enhancement of the status of LDS in the system of education.

Local Aspects: The Tel Aviv situation

The development of mixed ability secondary schools

In the 1970s, students were admitted to secondary schools on the basis of achievements and a Standard Ability Examination. Following the Open Enrolment and school competition, this attitude has changed. The Department of Education currently carries out a policy of ‘non-exclusion’ in all six-year secondary schools. Practically this means that extensive efforts are made by schools to avoid student dropout. Indeed, this has been the declared policy for some years now, but it was only implemented two years ago. If a school wishes to make a student leave, it has to be done in accordance with Tel-Aviv LEA which approves of the transfer only when all means of support have been tried out unsuccessfully. According to the Head of Pedagogic Management, dropout rates which used to be 40-50% have decreased over the past two years, although no formal statistics have been published yet.
Provision for LDS

In 1999 the municipality initiated a steering committee which established a ‘System of Support’, aiming to provide answers to ‘at-risk’ students in secondary schools. This operates in full cooperation with LMS via a Support Coordinator, whose responsibility is to identify the population of students, set support groups, and supervise the work and resource allocation within school. The Support Coordinator acts as school’s consultant and enhances ‘remedial’ training for teachers. This process functions under a system of evaluation and supervision in order to ensure the match between needs and resources.

Another way of tackling LDS problem is a system of two categories of classes in secondary schools. The first category is financed by the Ministry (MABAR and HECHVEN in Hebrew). The MABAR class is matriculation-oriented whereas HECHVEN does not aim at achieving a full Matriculation Certificate. Students’ economic situation is taken into consideration too in both cases. The second category is financed by Tel Aviv LEA (in Hebrew: BAGRUTIT) and it addresses students whose level is lower than MABAR and HECHVEN. Procedures for dropping out from these classes are similar to those described above.

These three types of classes are considered to be ‘accommodated mainstream classes’. In 1999 there were 14 and 32 classes of the first category, and 44 classes of the second. The main features of these classes are low student numbers (20 versus 40 in ‘regular’ classes), increased support, and a more flexible curriculum to meet students’ needs. This curriculum should comprise a limited number of subjects which are compulsory for the Matriculation Diploma. A high percentage of students are LDS (usually 50%). But whereas the Ministry classes make the selection by criteria of student’s ability as well as socio-economic level, the BAGRUTIT class is part of LMS, and selection is made directly by school. It is mainly meant for students who did not fit in the Ministry criteria, yet need extra help. One of the main criteria to accept students to these classes is lack of discipline problems.
In addition, Tel Aviv LEA is making attempts to initiate teachers’ training in order to increase knowledge in ‘remedial’ teaching, and to change attitudes towards inclusion of LDS and students with learning difficulties.

**Summary**

In respect of the development of comprehensive schooling, it is clear that the educational system in Israel is similar to the British system. Indeed, both systems have moved away from selection by ability at the end of primary schools (11+ exam in the UK, the SEKER in Israel) towards comprehensive schooling, a shift which took place at about the same time (the EA 1976 in England and the 1975 Compulsory Elementary and Secondary EA in Israel). In addition, whereas the matriculation exams were annulated in the USA between 1933-1940, the UK and Israel still use the GCSEs and the BAGRUT (matriculations) respectively as standard tests for academic requirements. The matriculations system is used in Australia as well.

The main conclusions from the overview of provision for LDS offered above is that on the one hand, educational policies favour inclusion although on the other hand, they are still ambiguous regarding their guidelines for implementation. Thus, discrepancies were detected in all four educational systems under investigation between the rhetoric of inclusion and the actual implementation as well as within the process of implementation. For example, whereas only 2% of SEN students in the UK attend special schools (DfEE 2001), the numbers of students put forward for statutory assessments are increasing (DfEE 1999). Similarly, the 2000 Ministry Circular in Israel advocates a supervisory setup on LDS’ inclusion, although in practice this recommendation is not implemented.

Regarding legislation, Israel is more similar to the USA in terms of special Acts for LDS alongside the recognition of the right of all SEN students to be integrated within mainstream frameworks. The first Learning Disabilities Act in the USA was made earlier than in Israel, in 1969, and was followed by a series of educational initiatives concerning all disabilities, such as the IDEA 1990 and IDEA 1997. The first Act in Israel was the 1988 Special Education Act, which was followed by the 2003 Act of the Rights of LDS in Mainstream Education, and the 2003 Act on Integration of SEN Students in Mainstream Education. The educational system in England is also
characterised by broad legislation initiatives regarding inclusion which started with the Warnock Report (DES, 1978) through other Acts such as the 1981 EA, the Code of Practice 1994 and the SENDA 2001. In Australia, however, there is no legislation for inclusive education. It might be concluded, that educational legislation in Israel regarding SEN inclusion was influenced by earlier legislation in the USA and the UK, and it is more similar to the USA due to the specific reference to LDS.

Recent legislation offers similar provision in the USA, the UK and Israel concerning IEPs for SEN students (the 1997 IDEA, the new Code of Practice 2001 and the 2003 Act on Integration of SEN students respectively).

The relationship between the process of inclusion and the managerial elements seems to be reflected in Tilstone et al. (1998) who claim that inclusion should be regarded as the processes which schools must adopt if they are to fully meet the needs of individual students. The management of the process will be further discussed below.

**Managerial Elements**

The move away from the traditional paradigm of special education towards inclusive practices involves many factors. A key theme running through many studies is that the success of inclusion depends to a great extent on the availability and quality of support that is offered in mainstream schools. Findings indicate that results are dependent on whether the inclusion process is carefully managed (Farrell, 2000). Yet, the ‘recipe’ for the right ‘managerial menu’ remains debatable. If regular schools wish to meet SEN more effectively, they need to develop flexible approaches to curriculum and positive attitudes and understanding of individual needs (Tilstone et al., 1998). This includes teachers’ training and support (Rose, 2000; Rose, 2001) and transformations in teachers’ attitudes and instructional practice (Ballard, 1995). These changes need to be effectively communicated towards full staff cooperation. This section offers a short discussion of how managerial elements contribute to the inclusion of LDS.
The focus of study

A study of recent policies towards LDS in Israel implies a change in the rhetoric of the Ministry and of school management. There seems to be a growing awareness with regard to the diversity of students’ needs as well as in respect of equality of opportunities. This means that not only should LDS be offered the chance to be part of mainstream education, they should also be provided with special test accommodations which suit their needs. On the macro level of the Ministry, Acts are in the making on the issue of assessments and LDS’ inclusion, schools’ pedagogic committees have been authorised with regard to school implementation, a special unit for LDS has been established at the Ministry, and measures of supervision have been suggested. The Tel Aviv municipality and other LEAS are constantly trying to suggest new structures for LDS such as the MATIYA centres, school SENCOs and support classes.

The following paragraphs offer an initial justification for the selection of leadership, culture and structures as the main managerial elements that will be explored in this study in the context of inclusion.

Existing literature indicates that values are the touchstone of effective schools and that the headteacher has a critical role in linking values, leadership, vision and culture (Campbell-Evans, 1993) and in initiating and maintaining the desired change (Nias et al., 1989). Moreover, school heads are not only responsible for teachers’ training in the area of LD, but also for developing their will to work well (Evenden and Anderson, 1992). School heads are also responsible for the development, inspiration and communication of attitudes (Kouzes and Posner, 1996).

At the same time, it is not clear whether school heads draw their strategic ideas from school culture, or whether they are the reflection of that same culture. It might be assumed that the culture and leadership in a school whose goal is excellence would differ from those pertaining to a school with a more inclusive orientation. The concept of culture seems to be essential in this research, because culture stresses the informal features of an organisation while the present research seeks to detect gaps between declared and hidden policies regarding LDS. Another point is the acknowledgement...
of the existence of multiple cultures in one organisation (Sergiovanni, 1984). Thus, the study aims at seeing whether school culture can favour inclusion while at the same time strive for excellence. However, it is debatable whether headteachers can intervene at each phase to alter organisational culture as advocated by Schein (1981). Indeed, if school culture totally depended on school management, headteachers would not find it hard at all to alter structures or implement innovations. Weick’s (1985: 382) response to this claim might be that strategic planning and culture are ‘twin concepts’.

The organisational structure of secondary schools currently consists of subject departments, specialist teachers, short time allocations per session, and class movements. Organisational structures are the channels through which goals and objectives can be met effectively. They enable the allocation of responsibilities, coordination, supervision, and all other regular activities (Child, 1984). Schools find it difficult to cope with change, particularly where this requires modifications of classroom practice (Fullan, 1991). However, some structures are associated with inclusion more than others (Sebba and Ainscow, 1996). For example, four of the features of successful inclusion on Giangreco’s (1997) list are structure-related:

- Clear role relationships among professionals
- Effective use of support staff
- Meaningful IEPs
- Procedures for evaluating effectiveness

The present research will dwell on managerial terminology which pertains to leadership, culture and structures, but at the same time it will dwell on inclusive terminology which is associated with inclusive leadership, inclusive culture and inclusive structures.

**Summary**

This section has demonstrated that the Western World of education has increased its awareness towards LDS since the 1980s, and current legislation favours inclusion for LDS as well as for other SEN students in mainstream education. International comparisons have identified problems and ambiguities in the implementation of Acts
and Circulars. At the same time it has been argued that there exists no consensus on the definitions of LD or SEN, and assessment instruments used for the identification of LD are varied. This lack of unanimity of procedures accompanied by increasing numbers of students identified as LDS calls for an in-depth study whose main focus will be managerial, in an attempt to see how the system handles the management of inclusion. More specifically, the study aims to enhance understanding of how school leadership, school structures and school culture as managerial factors are related to the process of inclusion.

The research questions have been formulated on the basis of the Statement of the Problem. The main research question is:

How are perceived school leadership, culture and structures related to the process of inclusion of LDS in mainstream secondary schools in Israel?

The sub-questions which have emerged by ‘unpacking’ the main research question are:

- How are staff perceptions of school leadership and inclusive leadership related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?

- How are staff perceptions of school culture and inclusive culture related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?

- How are staff perceptions of school structures and inclusive structures related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?

- What relationship might be suggested between school leadership, school culture and school structures in the context of inclusion?
Chapter II

Literature Review

The management of change

“Today’s problems come from yesterday’s solutions” (Senge, 1990: 57)

“Change is too important to leave to the experts” (Fullan, 1993: 39)

Introduction

It has already been argued in the Introduction that inclusion policies of SEN students in mainstream education have been imposed as an innovation by the Western Ministries in the 1980s. Farrell (2001: 3) offers an explanation for this decision:

“Only those who live on another planet could have failed to notice that the last 20 years have witnessed major changes in policy and practice in the education of pupils referred to as having special educational needs”.

However, what needs to be asked is why some changes are successfully implemented and sustained, whereas in others a discrepancy between rhetoric and practice is identified. This section will seek to link the specific issue of LDS’ inclusion in mainstream secondary schools to the management of change implementation. On the one hand, it is argued that SEN inclusion was introduced as an innovation in 1988 in the western world of education and one would expect the process of implementation to have been completed by now. On the other hand, conditions of inclusion and awareness towards special needs keep changing. Therefore, it could be argued that implementation is still in process.

The section will mainly focus on models and approaches to change in an attempt to account for the selection of the factors which are in the focus of this study.
The concepts of change and educational change

“Change, uncertainty and openness are the order of the day” (Morisson, 1998: 5)

Change and uncertainty are inescapable in developing societies, because there are no more absolutes. Indeed, we now live in a ‘learning society’ or age (Dearing, 1997; DfEE, 1998f), which is driven by multiple forces for change. Morrison (1998: 13) includes the main features of change in his definition:

“Change can be regarded as a dynamic and continuous process of development and growth that involves a reorganisation in response to ‘felt needs’. It is a process of transformation, a flow from one state to another, either initiated by internal factors or external factors, involving individuals, groups or institutions, leading to a realignment of existing values, practices and outcomes”.

In education, too, “the aims, objectives, content, pedagogy, evaluation and direction...are not fixed but fluid” (Morrison, 1998: 1). Bell (1991) and Sallis (1993) both view the implications of these changes to education as “fundamental, profound, and cannot be ignored” (in West-Burnham et al, 1995: 20). Their importance may lie in the fact that “schools do make a difference” (Reynolds and Cuttance, 1992). However, Mintzberg’s (1987) states that although changes in education are open-ended and unpredictable because of the constantly changing environment of educational settings, planning can be viewed as an attempt to insert a rational model of change into a chaotic system.

The issue of change in educational contexts is bounded by polarisation: greater powers are located with the general government such as the introduction of the National Curriculum and inspection procedures, while at the same time greater autonomy and accountability are placed at institutional level following the LMS and the Open Enrolment. These pressures include new legislation, inspection, pressures from staff, parents and students, new technological developments, and above all the need for schools to survive in an increasingly competitive environment.

Yet, changes can be perceived in different ways. They can lead to frustrations and confusion, require long-term commitment as well as stimulate (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). Further possible drawbacks might
be that “costs outweigh benefits, the few successes are short-lived” (Fullan, 1993: 353). This is even more so in the educational system which is fundamentally conservative (Kogan, 1978).

The implementation of change might differ from school to school, because different schools are different contexts and what works in one location will not necessarily work in another. It is equally important to bear in mind that different people’s definitions of change may vary and may change over time (Connolly et al., 2000). Yet, Schorr (1997: 148), and Coburn and Mayer (1998: 2) hold the view that successful implementation must be backed up by a theory of education (pedagogical reform), as well as a theory of action to address local needs and conditions.

**Approaches to change implementation**

**The incremental and the radical approach**

The incremental and the radical approaches advocate contradictory bases for implementation of change. The incremental approach views change as a continuous process of past and present situations (Johnson, 1993). The journey metaphor is frequently used in the literature to model the process of organisational change (Inns, 1996; Fullan, 1993). The planning of such change addresses the contingencies, the human dimension and the processual factors of change. Quinn (1993) argues that this approach enables managers to handle issues such as decision-making, resistance, commitment among staff members, and communication.

The issue of incremental change is observed in Japanese management. The Japanese business term ‘Kaisen’ which is translated as ‘continuous improvement’ relates to continuous, small-scale improvements (Wickens, 1995). The underlying basis of this philosophy is respect towards workers’ professionalism, autonomy and alertness to possible improvements (Wickens, 1987). Clarke (1994: 179-80) argues that the essence of the Japanese model is “celebration of small-scale, incremental growth through considerable lead-time in consultation and the achievement of consensus, with rapid implementation following it”. The advantages of the Japanese model are summarised by Morrison (1998: 69):
“The importance of long-term planning; the commitment to, and importance of small-scale continuous improvements through the involvement of all staff; the importance of continual openness to change, modification and improvement; the importance of research, development and problem-solving; high investment in technology, research and ongoing training”.

Conversely, the radical approach, which is largely used in the USA and the Western World, advocates rapid decision-making towards change, ensuring over years that it is being implemented. In terms of Cuban’s (1990) typology of change, the Japanese model is associated with ‘first-order’ (superficial) rather than ‘second-order’ change (structural with a ‘knock-on’ affect).

Morrison (1998: 49) makes an analogy to education and contends that educational systems are similar to the Japanese model, because teachers receive a ‘prescribed National Curriculum’ in a ‘downstream’ way, and strive to deliver it efficiently. Indeed, teaching and learning is about creating and recreating ideas constantly. This accords with Clarke (1994) who recommends that the educational system take a closer note of Japanese practice which advocates slower, but more carefully thought-through and agreed change. More specifically, Morrison (1998) asserts that the Japanese model seems to be associated with inclusion, participation, collaboration and involvement, whereas the radical approach is rather associated with exclusion, passivity, coercion and disengagement.

**Phased (staged) models**

Phased models of change are premised on the view that innovations can be planned in a rational, linear way. Their key elements are identification and diagnosis of problems and needs, planning, implementation, and finally evaluation of practices. Such models are offered by Fullan (1991: 47-8), Hargreaves and Hopkins (1991: 4), and Bush and Coleman (2000: 71). Fullan’s model is presented in Table 2.1.
Researchers have found associations between elements of change, improvement and strategic planning (Burridge et al., 1993; Arcaro, 1995a) as demonstrated in Table 2.2.

**Table 2.2. Quality development: a staged process (Burridge et al., 1993)**

- Where are we now? (establishing baseline, strengths, weaknesses)
- Where do we want to get? (vision, mission, aims, objectives)
- What do we need to focus on? (key issues)
- How do we get there? (action planning)

Lewin’s (1958) ‘three-step model’ attempts to ensure that new changes are sustained. Its consists of ‘unfreeze’ (the present situation), ‘moving’ (to the next situation), and ‘refreeze’ (the new situation). Problem-solving models are offered by Arcaro (1995b: 60), Greenwood and Gaunt (1994) and Clarke (1994). An example is provided in (Table 2.3).
Table 2.3. A seven-stage process of problem-solving for Total Quality Management (TQM) (Arcaro, 1995b)

- Defining the problem
- Analysing the problem
- Collecting data to inform analysis of the problem
- Analysing the data collected
- Developing a solution to the problem

It is argued that problem-solving models are the highest level of staged models because they recognise the existence of a problem which needs to be solved rather than simply focus on a reform which needs to be completed. However, whereas people-focussed models are likely to involve ‘bottom-up’ problem-solving because people are trusted to be able to identify and solve problems, product-focussed models are imposed in a ‘top-down’ way as they do not rely on people’s initiatives but on pre-planned outcomes.

Similarly, the action research model is a multistaged approach (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991) which emphasises a move from analysis to practice through the development of ownership and involvement (Burnes, 1996). In fact, this is a response to Peters and Waterman’s (1982) ‘paralysis through analysis’ model which expresses the inability to progress beyond research into action. Figure 1.1 attempts to encapsulate the main elements of approaches to change and demonstrate how they might be adapted to education.
Figure 2.1 Educational systems and approaches to change

The human aspect appears to be linked to the approach to change. Morrison (1998:27) seems to be right by stating that “change, then, is to be regarded less in a rational, linear, objectives-driven way, and more in a human, processual and contextually sensitive way”. Moreover, while referring to the further education system in England and Wales in 1993, Bridge (1994) concludes that changes that are imposed in a drastic, autocratic or too radical way may cause damage to culture.

Ferguson (1982) encapsulates four ways to achieve change:

- Change by exception – whereby the belief system does not change but allows for the exception;
- Incremental change – which is so gradual that it leaves people unaware of its occurrence;
- Pendulum change – where periodically one approach is abandoned in favour of another;
- Paradigm change – where new forms of insight are achieved which facilitate understanding.

The implementation of change

“*Well, the hard work is done. We have the policy passed; now all you have to do is implement it*”

(Outgoing deputy minister of education to colleague, in Fullan, 1990: 65)

The importance of the implementation of change is best reflected in Fullan’s (1991: 9) claim “*the proof is in the putting*” which indicates the importance of combining practice and policy. However, it is the task of management to create conditions that harness people’s motivation and potential, as poor quality arises from bad systems rather than bad people (Wickens, 1987; Smith, 1990).

Carnall (1995) identifies four competencies that are essential to the effective management of change: the ability to make decisions, to build coalitions, to achieve action, and to maintain momentum and effort. Further, it is argued that changes should be explored in the context of contingency theory which rejects the view that there is only ‘one best way’ to management, and contends that contingencies affect structures and content of change.

There are four main issues identified in the literature in respect of how change is implemented. The first issue is addressed by Fullan (1991) and Hargreaves (1994) and concerns whether behaviours are prioritised over beliefs, or whether the assimilation of meaning is prioritised over change of behaviour: “*Drag them by the hair and their hearts and minds will follow*” (Morrison, 1998: 14). The second issue addresses the ‘levers of change’, and the common view is “*to think big but start small*” (Senge, 1990: 63; Hargreaves, 1994: 10). The third issue refers to the relationship between contradictory forces, such as “*over-control and chaos*” (Fullan, 1991: 19), individual cognition and social interaction, trasformation and perpetuation (Mintzberg et al., 1998).
The fourth issue is concerned with the moment of completion which is difficult to recognise, because targets may change over time and success criteria remain elusive.

Change implementation is often accompanied by various forms of pressures: top-down pressure, peer pressure, bottom-up pressure, pressure from customers, and pressure from competitors (Kanji and Asher, 1993: 35). Researchers agree on the negative effect of pressure at least in the long run (Ansoff and McDonnell, 1990; Senge, 1990). For example, Coffield (1989: 46) maintains that the introduction of the National Curriculum by the force of statute to over-ride hostility was “doomed to succeed”. However, Morrison (1998: 129) claims that “the use of pressure and force to induce and sustain change has long been recognised as perhaps unattractive but necessary in organisations”. Moffett (2000: 37) advocates a compromise by claiming that “pressure without support can lead to resistance and alienation. Conversely, support without pressure can result in maintaining the status quo”.

The aspects of the organisation which take part in the implementation can be viewed as different levels of change. Change might occur on the individual level (attitudes and values), on the level of structures and systems, or of climate and interpersonal style (culture) (Goodstein and Burke, 1993). The accumulation of individual responses and understanding towards change creates a ‘shared meaning’ and ‘interactive professionalism’, and combines the individual (teachers’) and social (school’s) levels (Joyce and Showers, 1988). Fullan (1999: 73) introduced the term ‘go to scale’, and a ‘large-scale reform’ which refer to the transformation of the whole system at all levels. This is congruent with Hill and Celio (1998) who suggest long-term planning, an exploration of the roots of the problem.

Yet, Hutchinson (1993) argues that having a plan does no guarantee a successful management of educational change. Therefore, factors which enhance and inhibit change need to be explored.
Resistance to change

“One should not push growth, rather one should remove the factors to limit growth”

(Senge, 1990: 95)

The main conclusion from the survey of the literature is that blocks to change reside within the individual. They encompass perceptual, cognitive, emotional, cultural, and environmental aspects (Adams, 1987). Attitudes towards change range from resistance to acceptance as demonstrated in Table 2.4.

- Antagonistic
- No commitment
- The feeling of ‘let it happen’
- The feeling of ‘help it happen’

*Table 2.4 Five responses to change. Harris (1987)*

Researchers have identified various emotional reactions on a continuum, which range from shock and threat to adaptation (Fink et al., 1971), from a ‘loss cycle’ of denial to ‘acceptance’ (Arrobo and James, 1987: 116-18), from ‘denial’ to ‘internalisation’ (Carnall, 1995: 144). Another example is provided in the seven stages introduced by Adams et al. (1976) (Table 2.5).

- Immobilisation
- Disbelief
- Depression
- Acceptance of the reality of the change
- Testing
- Searching for meaning
- Internalisation of the change

*Table 2.5 Seven stages of reaction to personal change (Adams et al., 1976)*

So far it has been suggested that the acceptance of a new reality involves emotional and psychological states. However, the literature offers a range of ideas with regard to overcoming resistance. Judson (1991) suggests compulsion, persuasion, reassurance,
empathy and understanding, openness to criticism, and personal involvement. Strebel (1996) specifically focusses on empathy. Carnall (1995) proposes a model after De Vries and Miller (1984), and Adams et al. (1976) which relies on an increase in self-esteem. This accords with Kelly (1999: 114) who maintains that powerful pressure from outside will be counterproductive as it will promote opposition and hostility among teachers who will “deliberately and actively sabotage the efforts”. Clarke’s (1994) ideas are presented in Table 2.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for resistance</th>
<th>Means to overcome it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance</td>
<td>Fuller provision of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td>Stress on the value of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal anxieties and concerns</td>
<td>Personal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous failures</td>
<td>Addressing the perception of failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6 Ways to reduce resistance to change (after Clarke, 1994)

However, Macmillan’s (1978) and Thompson’s (1993) strategies (in Morrison, 1998: 129) involve coercion as well as empathy (Table 2.7).

- Explicit and implicit coercion
- Obligation
- Manipulation
- Inducement
- Negotiation and agreement
- Facilitation and support
- Participation and involvement

Table 2.7 A continuum of strategies for overcoming resistance (Macmillan, 1978; Thompson, 1993)

Indeed, Figure 2.2 supports the adoption of strategies aiming to reduce resistance to change by the claim that change is a cycle which is likely to bring about more changes.
As resistance to change seems to be related to emotional and psychological factors, the next two sections will focus on these issues.

**Subjective and objective meanings of change**

The crux of management of change involves the development of meaning in respect of reform or innovation. It is only when true ‘ownership’ is achieved, that people will understand the true sense of change (Sarason, 1990). Moreover, if implementers are denied the chance to assimilate the changes to their purposes, they are treated “as puppets dangling by the threads of their own conceptions” (Marris, 1975: 166).

The meaning of change has a personal as well as a social connotation (Marris 1975; Schon 1971). Subjective realities are “powerful constraints to change or protections against undesirable or thoughtless change” (Fullan, 1991: 36). Geijsel et al. (2001: 130) argue the following: “Not only the objective characteristics of the innovation, but also the manner in which significance is attached to the innovation by those involved appear to be of particular importance for successful innovation”.
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In fact, Louis et al. (1999: 269) advocate that “it is time to bring the individual back to the picture” as well as to recognise that “the most profound and lasting educational change involves changes in teacher’s personal identity”. Thus, ‘false reality’ occurs when people think they have changed but in fact, they have only assimilated the change superficially. Further, ‘painful unclarity’ is experienced when change occurs under conditions which do not support the subjective reality. Other researchers agree that teachers tend to function intuitively and rarely spend time reasoning about how they carry out their jobs (Crandall et al., 1982). Fullan (1991) postulates that teachers are contingent upon new materials and resources, new teaching strategies and approaches, and new conceptions and beliefs underlying the change.

However, the interrelationship of these concepts is complicated. Beliefs are informed by teaching strategies as well as inform them, whereas effective use of materials is informed by beliefs but may also alter them. Indeed, teachers may develop different meanings to these three dimensions making ‘objective’ dimensions totally subjective. Thus, ‘Objective realities’ become “a glorified version of their (producers of change) subjective conception” (Fullan, 1991:37). The writer (ibid.: 43) concludes that changes along the three dimensions will become effective and meaningful if the subjective realities of people are fully addressed within organisational contexts.

The following section offers an overview of the personal aspects of subjective realities.

**Personal and emotional aspects**

“Change changes people but people change change” (Morrison, 1998: 15)

As argued above, changes engender a range of emotions and feelings such as threats to self-esteem, conflicts, stress (Judson, 1991), anxiety and feeling of insecurity, loss, anxiety, and struggle (Marris, 1975), feelings such as accomplishment and empowerment, as well as feelings such as loss, grief, despair, and stress (Walton, 1997). In many cases change invalidates past experiences and starts a painful search of a new identity (Marris, 1993). Two conclusions might be drawn from existing
literature: personal change is the hardest part to manage in a process of change (Clarke, 1994), and changes stand or fall on the people involved (Dalin et al., 1993; Harvey-Jones, 1988).

Dalin et al. (1993) and Burnes (1996) suggest four personal barriers to change:

- Value barriers are set when the proposed change is dissonant with the attitudes and beliefs of the individual;
- Power barriers are set if the individual feels that the innovation will diminish his/her power;
- Psychological barriers are set when feelings of confidence, homeostasis and emotional well-being are at stake;
- Practical barriers are established when resources are inadequate.

Researchers (Duck, 1993; Marris, 1993) tend to agree that change is first and foremost personal and different people have different perceptions of change. However, the success of the implementation is dependent upon the system by changing people’s attitudes and creating motivation towards change. These aspects will be further developed below.

**Organisational factors and change**

Although resistance to change is quite common in organisations, researchers tend to agree that effective management has a lot to do with coping with resistance. Morrison (1998: 174-5) advocates the “marginalisation of resistance and the incorporation of facilitating factors in managing organisational change”. For example, he lists features such as positive interpersonal relations, willingness to try out new ideas, adequate support structures and staff development, organic rather than mechanistic structures. Similarly, Healey and De Stefanos (1997) assert that replication of changes is contingent upon conditions such as school factors or visionary factors.

Headteachers’ role is considered to be a major one in change-making. Over the last decade headteachers are perceived as collaborative leaders of continuous improvements (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1990). They decide about the things one wishes
to hold on to, as well as those one wishes to see changing (Harvey-Jones, 1988). As schools nowadays are “marked by inertia” (Morrison, 1998: 17), leaders should “harness the creativity of all members to the change effort” (Wallace, 1991: 133). Morrison (1998: 15) argues that headteachers need to identify the way change is perceived, ensure a positive response, and address staff concerns at different stages of the innovation. Sleeegers (1999) focusses on leaders’ need to motivate teachers to develop themselves professionally and encourages them to participate in decision-making. Further, Kelly (1999: 111) argues that attempts of ‘transplantation’ by power-coercive strategies lead to ‘tissue rejection’.

Organisational culture is believed to be the principal factor for improvement in organisations even more than structures and strategies (Deal and Kennedy, 1983a), because behaviour is affected by shared beliefs and values. Morrison (1998: 155) claims: “It is frequently the culture of the organisation that needs to be improved rather than having the organisation simply take on a specific innovation”.

Similarly, Kelly (1999: 111) contends that belief and understanding are essential to implementation: “The main danger, then, becomes a possible loss of credibility for the project, a rejection of the principles behind it,...lack of adequate understanding”. Moreover, “…that something has not worked leads too readily to the assumption that it cannot work, rather than to a consideration of the possibility that one has got it wrong”.

Mortimore et al.’s words (1993) highlight the fact that climate is created by the teachers for the pupils and by the head for the teachers. This view is supported by Morrison (1998: 178) who expresses consent with this view: “The organisation will have to evaluate what might cause tissue rejection and what needs to be done to prevent this, how far consensus is desirable and achievable, and what must be a critical mass of support for change to be successful”.

Structures are an essential factor to change implementation, because they refer to all the formal systems and processes through which the work is done (Charan, 1996). Their importance is summarised by Morrison (1998: 177):
“The structure of the organisation will need to be examined in order to maximise its potential for change. This will include an evaluation of what is an acceptable level of bureaucracy, how promotion will be managed within the bureaucracy, and what are the strengths and weaknesses of bureaucratic and collegial structures for facilitating (and impeding) change”.

According to rational models of organisational theories, school structures via ‘procedures’ might foster or inhibit stability or growth, and determine the success or failure of change implementation. Structures are believed to be a major factor for continuation or institutionalisation of innovations, through policies, budget, timetables, roles and staff turnover (Miles, 1987). Stacey (1996a: 349) maintains that too much structure creates gridlock, whereas too little structure creates chaos. The key to effective change is, then, to stay poised on the edge of chaos. Researchers agree that management structures which support collegial management are fundamental for longer-term responsiveness and strategic management (Drundy, 1993; Heller, 1994; Schrage, 1990). These models are considered more conductive to change, whereas more formal, bureaucratic models emphasise stability and stagnation.

The next sections will explore each of these elements separately and attempt to establish the relationship between them in the context of the implementation of inclusive policies.
Leadership

“The quality of leadership makes the difference between the success and failure of a school” (Millett, 1998: 3)

Introduction

A number of issues have arisen from existing literature. The first issue is whether an individual is a leader merely because he/she has been appointed to a position, or whether leadership is affected by one’s personality or the environment in which he/she operates. Another issue is the multiplicity of leaders’ roles. Leaders should be “transforming the organisation, not simply managing it” (Murphy, 1997: 137). Indeed, leaders are expected to initiate changes, communicate them and monitor the process. In fact, “no leader has ever been regarded as successful because of an ability to sustain the status quo” (West-Burnham, 1997:131). In addition, they are expected to “bring human scale to organisational problems” (Carnall, 1999: 139). Griffith (1999) encapsulates the headteacher’s role as a curriculum leader, as well as a manager of interpersonal relations and resources.

Educational leadership is particularly difficult. Firstly, it involves a duality of roles. An educational leader bears management responsibilities as well as educational professionalism. Secondly, educational outcome involves a human capacity (Coleman, 1994). Thirdly, it carries a moral dimension, as “no other institution or complex organisation attends to the general aims of life in quite the same way” (Hodgkinson, 1991: 143). Empirical evidence (e.g. Sommefeldt, 2001) suggests that one of the most persistent features of most lists of empirical evidence in education is the emphasis on leadership.

The determination of central governments to improve educational systems has placed much responsibility and pressure on school leaders, who are expected to bring about change. Effective leadership is about “making choices about how to lead in the context of ever-changing demands and constraints” (Hall, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998: 137). Further, Daniels et al. (1999) claim that it is school leader who ensures the existence of appropriate values, ethos and aspirations for the school.
This section aims at introducing themes and theories from the literature which enhance our understanding concerning what best enables leaders to “respond to a changing world” (West-Burnham, 1997: 243). The concept of leadership will be explored in the context of Trait (Murgatroyd and Gray, 1984), Style (Burns, 1978) and Contingency (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977). An attempt will be made to find out what makes an ‘ideal’ leader: specific leadership characteristics, certain contexts in which the leader operates, or certain styles adopted by the leader. It is equally important to examine the focus of leadership, as well as management and leadership theories which underpin it.

**Leadership and management**

“Business certainly needs managers to make the trains run on time; it more desperately needs heroes to get the engine going” (Deal and Kennedy, 1982: 8)

There is an increasing body of literature on the impact of leadership and management on education, focussing particularly on headteachers (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991, 1992; Grace, 1995; Leithwood et al., 1999). The decision to include the issue of Leadership and Management in the Leadership section arises from the confusion and tension that exist in the literature. Indeed, different attitudes have been observed in the literature towards these concepts. One attitude suggests to use them interchangeably. This attitude is supported by Mintzberg (1973, 1990) who suggests that leadership and management are inextricably intertwined and form a complex gestalt.

Another suggestion is made by some researchers who maintain that leadership and management are overlapping: Morrison (1998: 205) argues that “management and leadership are not an either/or but rather complementary”. Burnes (1996: 152) asserts that the difference between them is a matter of style, and whereas a convergent style tends towards stability, a divergent style is concerned with “moving beyond the stable state”. Hodgkinson’s (1991) maintains that leadership and management are inseparable, as leading a school or college involves translating philosophy into action.

A third way is to draw a distinction between the two concepts, as actually happened in the 1980s. Schon (1984) maintains that one can be an inspirational leader without...
carrying any burdens of management. Conversely, one can control organisational activities and make decisions, without fulfilling the inspirational functions of leadership. Fidler (1996: 21) defines leadership as “those processes of bringing about change by inspiring others to follow”, whereas management is “processes for implementing the change”.

The literature identifies leadership with more spiritual aspects such as transformation, orientation towards people, vision, shared ownership, strategic development, direction, inspiration, motivation, and a ‘humanist’ approach (Stoll and Fink, 1996; West-Burnham, 1997). Leadership involves developing a culture that encourages learning as well as communicating vision with clarity. At the same time, Carnall (1999) highlights the practical side of leadership which depends on the ability to encourage others to action.

Conversely, management is associated with structures and processes and is far more practical (Louis and Miles, 1990; Stoll and Fink, 1996; West-Burnham, 1997; West-Burnham, 1992). It involves day-to-day problem-solving, development and implementation of policies, ‘getting things done’, systems, transaction, controlling and organising people, and a ‘technocratic approach’. Carnall (1999: 137) concludes that managerial performance is “a combination of knowledge and skill applied in practice”.

In practice, leadership has been identified as the most important aspect for successful schools, while management has been relegated to a secondary position (Millett, 1996). This view implies that leaders set the course and managers follow it, or alternatively that “leaders do the right thing” whereas “managers do things right” (Bennis, 1984: 66). Indeed, Sergiovanni (1984b) sets a hierarchy of leadership ‘forces’, in which management underpins the others, and the most advanced forces are aspects of leadership which embed values and culture. However, on the basis of Sergiovanni’s idea it becomes clear that the top floors of the ‘building’ of education which comprise leadership, cannot stand still without the solid pillars of management.

Other views are related to time scale: Mintzberg (1973, 1990) interprets the difference in terms of long-term strategy or as day-to-day operations. Similarly, Wickens (1995)
argues that managers are concerned with the present whereas leaders are concerned with the future.

Regardless of how the combination of leadership and management is perceived, the tension between these concepts still exists. For example, Coleman (1994) indicates the perceived tension between the notion of headteacher as chief executive and as a leading professional. Bush (1995: 11) proceeds: “(Headteachers) are often sandwiched uncomfortably between the conflicting pressures of bureaucracy and professionalism”. However, claims in current literature are made that both leadership and management are equally important functions for educational effectiveness (Bush and Coleman, 2000; Glatter, 1997), and that effective headteachers should create synergy out of ‘leading professional’ roles, and ‘chief executive’ responsibilities (Ribbins 1995; Hall 1996; Law 1999). Indeed, the ‘professional-as-administrator’ model developed by Hughes (1976) presents the head’s dual role as the chief executive of the school and the leading professional within it (Table 2.8), thus emphasising the mediating role. Indeed, schools do not have a leader and a manager. They have one headteacher, and focus should be placed on what constituents of ‘leadership’ or ‘management’ enable him/her best to lead/manage change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational leadership</th>
<th>‘Chief executive officer’</th>
<th>‘Leading professional’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal role</td>
<td>Strategist</td>
<td>Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitrator</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External role</td>
<td>Executive officer</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diplomat</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 Educational leadership: the duality of roles (Hughes, 1976)
The leader/manager role

“The manager may be seen as the conductor of the orchestra and conversely, as a puppet pulled by hundreds of strings”  
(Carnall, 1999: 137)

“Leadership has to be the warp of the school, holding together every aspect of the organisational life, not the embroidery applied for display”  
(West-Burnham, 1997: 115)

Current views in the literature treat the notion of leaders as senior managers who “exercise leadership for change and direction of the organisation” and who “must support changes that have been initiated” (Morrison, 1998: 207). Middlewood (in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998) and Hall et al. (1997) refer to the need of leaders to combine strategic thinking for the future with a capacity for operational management towards improvement. A less conventional view derives from chaos and complexity theory. The task of leaders, according to this view, is to regulate stress (Heifetz and Lawrie, 1997) as planning serves as a defense against stress and anxiety, whilst control is an attempt to stabilise unstable systems.

Existing literature divides headship roles into three types:

- Managerial tasks which comprise activities such as coordinating meetings, and translating mission and vision into action;
- Leading which encompasses setting clear goals, leading by example, supporting, developing and sustaining school culture, and setting vision (Riches, 1993b);
- Pedagogical tasks which focus on the development of social, academic, and intellectual capital in students and teachers (Sergiovanni, 1998).

Existing theories in the literature attempt to account for the combined focus on leadership and management. Fayol’s (1916) Functional (Rational) theories present a hierarchical system operated by rational processes according to which the manager’s
role is to achieve tasks. At the same time, Human Relations theories focus on Human Relations management, whereby the manager stresses understanding of the human dimension (Bush and Middlewood, 1997; Day et al., 1998; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). The shift from rational to more behaviour-based approaches might indicate a recognition of the need for visionary aspects in management roles.

In a similar way, Champy and Nohria’s (1996) theory relies on three aspects which are believed to represent theoretical and practical aspects: thus, identity which relates the past and the future is a more theoretical aspect, whereas initiative, which involves harnessing the employees’ capacity, is a more practical aspect. The third aspect, integrity, which involves the full communication and exemplification of values belongs as well to the implementation of the desired values.

It might be concluded that there is no clear-cut division between the two roles which, in practice, are highly overlapping. Thus, leaders’ role is associated not only with setting direction for and communicating change, but also with translating it into action. Similarly, managers’ role is associated with task functions, but in fact, it relies on the human relations aspect of achieving goals.

Management theories
Existing literature expresses concern as regards the adaptation of management models from non-educational settings to education (Baldridge et al., 1978), but at the same time it expresses interest concerning issues drawn from industry or commerce (Osborne, 1990). Elliott and Hall (1994: 3) express concern about the clash between business approaches and professional values while referring to “the increasing business orientation of the British further education system”.

The development of educational management as a distinct discipline began in the United States in the early part of the century, whereas in the UK it started in the 1960s and expanded rapidly. Among the early researchers in the field of management one could notice Taylor (1947), Fayol (1916), and Weber (1947). Taylor developed a ‘scientific management movement’, which is still subject to a vigorous debate by
those who object to a ‘managerial’ approach in education. Fayol developed ‘general principles of management’, and Weber worked on bureaucracy.

Bush (1995) offers six models of educational management which account for educational practice: the formal, collegial, political, subjective, ambiguity, and cultural models. Formal models dominated the early stages of theory. However, since the 1970s, there has been a gradual realisation that “they are at best partial, and at worst grossly deficient” (Chapman, 1993: 215). The rest of the models seem to be relevant to the management of change. Collegial models advocate teachers’ participation in decision-making, and this collaboration is believed to be essential for the management of change (Evans et al., 1999). Cultural models stress on values and beliefs which are vital for change, and Subjective models emphasise the significance of individual interpretations related to the way change is communicated. Ambiguity models stress the turbulence and anarchy which might lead to or result from change, and Political models focus on conflicts between sub-units or departments, which might be part of the process of implementation of change at all organisational levels.

Leadership theories

Over the last 50 years the focus of leadership studies has shifted from the study of traits of successful leaders, to the exploration of leadership styles, and finally it focussed upon the idea of contingency. This section attempts to explore these concepts and their interrelationships as well as draw a framework for understanding the nature of leadership.

Theories relating to leaders in organisations can be categorised into three main groups: Trait theories which emphasise the qualities of ‘an individual ideal leader’, Contingency theories which emphasise the importance of situational factors and Leadership Styles which emphasise how leadership is worked out. One way to understand the nature of leadership is to explore the way power is exercised via Trait, Style and Contingency theories. The underlying question would be, then, whether power is part of the leader’s style adopted under certain conditions and could be changed as circumstances change, or whether it is the leader’s personality which dictates his/her attitude towards power. It is argued that perceptions of leadership
might be interpreted subjectively by the led. For example, power that derives from a charismatic leader might be perceived by the led as support, while, in fact, it is not.

**Trait theories or ‘What makes people tick’**

“...to be flexible to cope with the unexpected...to have ‘helicopter view’, that is, the ability to take the broad view”

(Bush and Coleman, 2000; 28)

Trait theories focus on the ‘born’ characteristics of leaders, indicating that leaders are not ‘made’. Studies of the first half of the twentieth century point to a number of traits which characterise effective leaders (Stogdill, 1948), some of which are energy, a sense of responsibility, self-confidence, capacity to influence, and originality. The drawback of Trait theories is that they omit the emphasis on situational factors, particularly the dynamic relationship between the leader and the led, and rely solely on the ‘fixed’ personality of the leader.

On the basis of the literature, the ‘recipe’ for successful leaders of change could be divided into skills and competences (knowledge) on the one hand, and to ‘pure’ personality characteristics on the other hand.

Indeed, the set of competences that is offered by different researchers is long and repetitive. Doz and Prahalad (1988) focus on goals, roles, communication, negotiation and ‘managing up’. It is asserted that managers need to identify achievable goals and take risks, they should be able to build teams and identify key people, delegate responsibilities, and communicate through channels for change. Change agents should be able to communicate the need for change and its implication on individuals, but at the same time remain sensitive to people’s concerns. Managers should equally be able to negotiate for resources, and ‘sell’ their ideas effectively, and finally they should see the whole picture and secure commitment. Buchanan and Boddy (1992) add to this list the manager’s expertise in his/her own field, the ability to simplify complex problems, cope with information overload, and get to the heart of the problem.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) list three leadership skills: the ability to diagnose the ‘performance gap’ between the present situation and future needs, the ability to adapt
behaviour and resources to needs, and the ability to communicate the new needs to staff members.

On the basis of this large body of research it might be inferred that the long list of competences comprises people-oriented as well as task-oriented skills. For example, the ability to communicate the change reflects the former whereas the ability to cope with information overload reflects the latter.

Personality characteristics for effective managers of change encompass a strong sense of personal ethics, intellectual abilities, optimism, high degree of self-awareness and abilities of self-monitoring, effective interpersonal skills, the ability to take calculated risks and cope with conflict and ambiguities (Everard and Morris, 1988). Adair (1983) includes in his list perseverance, curiosity, ambition, integrity, enthusiasm, decision-making ability, abstract and analytical ability, imagination and open-mindedness. Other researchers include idealism, energy, pragmatism, cunning, and “unrealistic intolerance of any barrier to success” (Peters, 1987: 248). Clarke (1994) and Rosener (1990) identify the characteristics of clear focus, trustworthiness, respect for others, effective communication skills, personal responsibility and accountability. Galbraith and Lawler (1993) suggest the ability to be involved in constant learning, and Champy and Nohria (1996b) add that leaders have a sense of humility, self-discipline and a constant strive for the truth. Starratt’s (1988: 3) list of characteristics of ideal leaders is less practical and includes “selflessness, altruism, the elevation of reason, harmony with nature”.

West-Burnham, (1997) focusses on vision, sensitivity, subsidiarity and creativity in his analysis. Visionary leadership is featured by openness to ideas, a sense of moral purpose, and constant contact with all staff members. Sensitivity is expressed in listening to others, collaborating and gaining awareness of others. Subsidiarity relies on “seeing people as being capable of infinite improvement and development” (ibid.: 131). Creativity is “the generation of imaginative and radical solutions to apparently intractable problems” (ibid.: 121) and can be best achieved through teamwork.
Fundamental to the enhancement of creative skills in leaders is the view of leaders as learners who constantly reflect, experience failures and successes, expose themselves to new learning situations, work with a learning network, and seek feedback from others. The characteristics of the creative thinker can be summed up in the notion of ‘helicoptering’, which is defined as follows:

"The ability of the individual to rise above the minutiae of a situation, to place it in context, identify the best solution, and then descend with a clear view of what needs to happen. Flying the helicopter helps to identify the wood and the trees..." (ibid.: 121)

Hall (in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998: 135), too, supports the significance of creativity in leaders:

“"The ability to think not only strategically but also creatively is a crucial part for the leader’s repertoire for translating a vision for the school into policies from which decisions can be made, plans formed, and a culture of quality or continuous improvement created and sustained”.

Despite the overlap of characteristics among researchers, it appears that experts are far from being unanimous about ‘recipes’ for effective leaders for change. However, whereas former researchers introduce lists of characteristics the combination of which might be hard to find within individuals, West-Burnham (1997) refers to the combination of features within contingencies which is based on exposure to new learning situations and networks.

However, the literature analysis indicates that personal characteristics and pragmatic competences cannot be easily differentiated. For example, creative leadership involves the ability to find solutions to problems, and at the same time it requires openness to new ideas and the capacity to learn which may be viewed as part of one’s personality. This is demonstrated in Wickens’ (1995: 95-9) who combines ‘personal attributes’, ‘strategic perspective’, ‘communication’, and ‘achievement’ in leadership.

A conceivable body of empirical evidence on Leadership supports Trait theories. Bennis (1984) identified four areas of competence shared by 90 outstanding leaders:

- The ability to clearly communicate objectives;
- The ability to direct and provide meaning;
- The ability to be consistent in complex circumstances;
- The ability to recognise strengths and weaknesses.

Cooper and Hingley’s (1985) study of change-makers in the UK yielded a profile of early experiences of feelings of insecurity and loss which led to a drive to control their own future, strong motivation, a well-developed value system, clear vision and purpose, and early high-level of responsibility. Change-makers were reported to possess the ability to communicate, particularly the ability to be open and honest about feelings. Kouzes and Posner (1996) found out in a survey that deals with characteristics of admired leaders, that over a period of eight years there has been a shift towards leaders that were honest, forward-looking, inspiring and supportive, and less towards leaders who were self-controlled, independent or competent.

**Contingency theories**

Attempts have been made to develop theories which acknowledge that there is no one best way to lead in all situations, and that leadership actions are made in certain contexts, such as external factors and in-school structural and cultural factors (Connolly et al., 2000). Leahy and Wilson (1994) seek to locate leadership in context, describing leaders as ‘tenants of time and context’ rather than defining them in terms of characteristics. Similarly, Handy (1993) asserts that power is perceived differently by different individuals in different situations.

Two main contingency theories are presented below. The first is Hersey and Blanchard’s (1977) ‘situational leadership’, which relies on the match between the workers’ personal and professional maturity towards the organisation, and the approach adopted by the leader. This theory proposes four types of leadership behaviours, each of which is appropriate to a particular level of followers’ maturity, and represents a different combination of ‘task’ and ‘relationship’ behaviour by the leader. Thus, ‘telling’ is for those unable or unwilling to take responsibility, ‘selling’ is for those willing but unable to take responsibility and need feedback to maintain motivation, ‘participating’ is for those whose motivation and commitment might be increased by involvement in decision-making, and finally ‘delegating’ is for high-
maturity followers who take responsibility (Figure 2.3). This model has been further developed by Blanchard and Zigarmi (1991). The drawback of this theory is that it relies on the unquestionable ability of leaders to evaluate the maturity of their employees, as well as on their sophistication to switch behaviours when needed across time and across school settings.

According to Morrison (1998) it is maintained that the concern for results and the ‘tell’ and ‘sell’ styles resonate with the mechanical and closed systems which are not conductive to positive organisational health and climate and hence are not conductive to change, whereas the concern for relationships resonate with the organic and open systems that are conductive to positive organisational health and climate, and hence are conductive to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship-focused</th>
<th>Task-focused</th>
<th>Task-focused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High direction</td>
<td>Low direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High support</td>
<td>High task-direction and high support Coaching (‘selling’)</td>
<td>Low task-direction and high support Supporting (‘sharing’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low support</td>
<td>High task-direction and low support Directing (‘telling’)</td>
<td>Low task-direction and low support Delegating (‘authorizing’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3 Situational leadership (adapted from Hersey and Blanchard, 1977)

However, it might be contended that the concepts of ‘Relationships’ and ‘Tasks’ are related to the issue of ‘staff empowerment’ more than to contingencies. Indeed, it is possible that a leader decides on ‘telling’ because of his/her interpretations of workers’ maturity, but at the same time remains ‘relationship-focused’. In a similar way it is possible that he/she applies ‘supporting’ while being ‘task-oriented’.

Empirical evidence supports contingency as well. Salley’s (1979) claim that principals are captives of their environments is supported by other researchers (e.g.
Griffith, 1999; Hallinger and Heck, 1996) who maintain that principal effectiveness is dependent upon factors of organisational configuration, such as school climate and environmental conditions. These findings seem to be consistent with contingency theories. Contingency is supported by another survey (Norburn, 1988) which encompasses 108 chief executives and 30 executive directors from the 500 companies of the Financial Times. It appears that factors that were found to influence leaders are related to circumstances and contingencies rather than to individual traits. For example, the length of tenure within the organisation, how early their management responsibility began, the variety of managerial functions they experienced, the rapidity of promotion and their exposure to overseas cultures and business.

Peters and Waterman (1982) view the incremental approach not as a carefully prepared plan with clear goals, but as a process whereby the organisation gradually comes to terms with its environment. According to this belief it might be added that the incremental approach matches with the contingency theory, and that headteachers who introduce changes gradually are likely to strive to come to terms with all the parties at school (the environment) in the process of change-making.

The second educational contingency theory formulated by Fiedler (1978) focusses on leader-member relations, task structure and position power. To Fiedler, leadership style is a personality attribute which determines the leader’s orientation, whereas behaviour refers to the judgment exercised with reference to particular situations. Situations are defined by the extent tasks are structured, the quality of relations and the position power of the leader, and leaders’ need to ‘best-fit’ their behaviour to these aspects. Fiedler’s theory has implications on matching leaders to situations and on encouraging leaders to modify situations where possible (Beare et al., in Redy, 1993).

Indeed, it is believed that leaders’ ability to make the match of leadership style to workers is first and foremost dependent upon personal traits such as flexibility that enable the leader to make fast switches and apply the right leadership style at the right time towards the right people. At the same time it relies on the leader’s diagnostic ability and decision-making. Therefore, contingency theories should not be regarded as separate from trait theories. It is contended also that contingency theories do not
focus on the visionary aspect of leadership but rather on the practical aspect of how to best carry out tasks in given contexts and relationships. Another point made by Carnall (1999) with regard to business leadership is that this model considers the situation below the manager, whereas managers themselves work within contexts of constraints.

Leadership styles

Two major factors are assumed to relate leadership style to the management of change. The first one is LMS which helps schools develop new projects and keep improving (Marsh, 1992). Indeed, Caldwell and Spinks (1992) assert that a leader of LMS needs to demonstrate simultaneously cultural, strategic, educational and responsive leadership in order to please all parties. Therefore, such a school cannot be run by command, but by persuasion and consent. The second factor is the need to respond to a changing world (West-Burnham, 1997) which calls for a reconceptualisation of leadership with regard to change, and the adoption of a style which strengthens vision, fosters creativity and communication, stresses spirituality and values, and surrenders power. Yet, a study of both factors indicate that leadership style is dependent upon contingencies.

Scheinman and Ben-Peretz (1993) offer a division into three styles of leadership for change: the ‘responsive’ leader who views teachers as professionals who may initiate changes, the ‘leader-manager’ who does not initiate changes but adopts them particularly if they are initiated by the Ministry, and ‘leaders-initiators’ who do not hesitate to lead changes for school benefit and adapt them to school needs.

Bush and Coleman (2000) suggest two underlying ways of analysing styles of leadership: it is suggested that the first one be named ‘leaders’ attitude towards power’, as it is featured by the extent of freedom experienced by ‘followers’ on the range from autocratic to democratic styles (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1958, 1973; Handy and Aitken, 1986) (Figure 2.4) This view resonates with Hersey and Blanchard’s model (1977) which was discussed previously because the manager determines the extent of freedom that is granted to the staff. In this regard, Louis and Miles (1990) indicate that pressure and support are equally required.
The second way is via the issue of ‘the focus of leadership’. Leaders’ behaviour might be analysed by three models which emphasise the ‘focus of leadership’. Figure 2.5 presents Blake and Mouton’s (1978) model which relates to a leader’s ‘concern for people or relationships’ as opposed to ‘concern for production or results’. They identify five options of concerns for tasks and relations, and argue that leaders tend towards various combinations of these factors. For example, if a leader demonstrates low levels of concern for task and high levels of concern for the people involved, the danger arises that “we have a cheerful crew but we haven’t repaired many engines” (Law and Glover, 2000: 27). Consequently, Impoverished Management (rated 1.1) is featured by low concern for tasks and low concern for people, whereas Team Management which features the ideal leader, maximises concerns of both tasks and people (rated 9.9). Similarly, Likert’s (1967) model ‘Systems 1 to 4’, identified System 4 as his ideal leader located on the democratic/participative end of the continuum.
Everard and Morris (1990) suggest a five-fold way model of coping with conflict. Their model is based on a ‘concern for relationships’ axe, and a ‘concern for results’ axe. Thus, low concern for relationships and results will lead to the adoption of avoidance strategies, whereas high concern for both dimensions will lead to the adoption of problem-solving strategies. Strategies of compromise are located in the mid-point between high and low concern for both relationships and results (Figure 2.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Concern for relationships</th>
<th>‘smoothing’ strategies</th>
<th>Problem-solving strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Avoidance strategies</td>
<td>Fighting strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.5 The managerial grid (after Blake and Mouton, 1978)**

Researchers tend to advocate the focus on ‘relationship’. For instance, Wickens’ (1995) contends that effective leaders study hard the likely effects of change on their followers and ensure that everything is done to ease the effects of change on them. Similarly, Harvey-Jones (1988: 87) suggests that “leaders should be as much enablers as they are drivers” and this balance can be achieved by adopting motivational and problem-solving styles of managing change (Blake and Mouton, 1978). Stoll and Fink (1996: 111) call for a reconceptualisation of leadership and focus on the “human side of education”. They attack the ‘technocratic models’ which were popular in the 1980s and advocated ‘invitational leadership’ as the appropriate style for tomorrow’s schools. They maintain that prior to inviting others to share a vision, leaders must first “invite themselves physically, intellectually, socially, emotionally, spiritually”. On the other hand, Evenden and Anderson (1992) warn that
concern for relationships is problematic because a too friendly leadership style can be intrusive, unfair and maybe two-faced.

It is theoretically possible that the choice of ‘focus of leadership’ (‘task’ versus ‘relationship’) might correlate with the ‘power style’ discussed earlier, as a leader who exercises ‘position power’, for example, is likely to be high on task-oriented measures and low on relationship-oriented measures (Hersey and Blanchard’s ‘Directing’). Adair’s (1988: 44) concept of ‘action-centred leadership’ which emphasises task, team, and individual (Figure 2.7) makes an integrated model of concerns for task and relationship.

![Figure 2.7 Action-centred leadership: interlocking task, team, and individual concerns (Adair, 1988)](image)

Figure 2.7 Action-centred leadership: interlocking task, team, and individual concerns (Adair, 1988)

It is noteworthy that people-focussed models appear to resonate with theory Z (Ouchi, 1981) which encapsulates that workers are a key to success and productivity of the company. Similarly, they accord with Theory Y (McGregor, 1960) which maintains that employees do not need extrinsic incentives because they are naturally inclined towards involvement and self-actualisation. However, these models seem to disaccord with Theory X (McGregor, 1960) which claims that people seek to avoid responsibility and must be coerced to make efforts.

A third way of analysing styles might be seen in Burns (1978) who was the first to distinguish transformational leadership from transactional leadership. The researcher
considers transformational and transactional leadership as the two opposite ends of the spectrum. A survey of the literature reveals that transformational leadership is mainly related to the conduction of change and transformation of school climate. For example, Mitchell and Tucker (1992: 32) consider transformational leadership as inspirational and visionary, engaged in transforming “the feelings, attitudes and beliefs of their followers”. Other researchers (e.g. Bass and Avolio, 1994; Leithwood, 1992) believe it is a people-oriented approach in which leaders mainly motivate, stimulate interest for innovations, take care of staff development, motivate colleagues to look beyond their interests, coach and mentor, and develop a collaborative and professional school culture. Similarly, Leithwood et al. (1999) emphasise the enhancement of participation in decision-making, professional development, and decrease of uncertainty.

Similarly, Sergiovanni (1990: 24) argues that educational change can be guaranteed by transformational leadership, in which “leaders and followers are united in pursuit of high-level goals common to both. Both want to become the best. Both want to shape the school in a new direction”.

At the same time, transactional leadership describes the ‘contract’ between the leader and his/her followers, in which the follower provides efforts towards goals, and the leader ensures good working conditions (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992). This leadership style is about ‘getting things done’. It focusses on structures, development planning, task completion and purpose, through an exchange of services and rewards (Leithwood, 1992: 69).

However, an ‘optimal leadership profile’ exhibits both transformational and transactional leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1994: 5-6). This resonates with situational theories which argue that leaders can adopt different styles, and also with the claim that effective headship should consist of leadership and management features alike.

The over-arching links of existing theories
“Leadership seems to be a gestalt phenomenon; greater than the sum of its parts”

(Duke, 1986: 10)
The previous section has demonstrated that the literature tends to advocate an eclectic view regarding leaders’ profiles. This can be seen in the balance between elements of ‘tasks’ and ‘relationships’, transformational and transactional styles, and the combination between contingencies and traits, teams and individuals. This eclectic approach combines Trait which means the born characteristics, Style which is the mode of operation, and Contingency which consists the environmental conditions, the organisational setting, and the importance of the task. It promotes leadership to a level of integration with the environment and interaction with staff members, while at the same time acknowledging the born traits leaders possess. Handy’s (1993) ‘best-fit’ theory makes an integrated model of Trait, Style, and Contingency approaches and argues that there is no correct style of leadership. Thus, it is contended that leaders shape their environment as well as are shaped by it. Therefore, fit can be measured on a ‘tight-flexible’ scale. Another theory which integrates Trait, Style and Contingency is Myers’ (1995), which claims that leadership integrates being firm and purposeful (Trait), adopting a participative approach (Style), and operating as a leading professional (Contingency).

Indeed, leaders’ behaviour is the most complex of the variables influencing organisational effectiveness (West-Burnham et al., 1995). Goldring (1997) and Hall (1998) advocate a combined model of traits and behaviour: Their main claim is that one possible outcome of a combined model of Trait, Style and Contingency is that leaders’ personality and behaviour make one entity. This view is supported by theories of strategic leadership which emphasise the ability to interpret and respond to environmental and organisational constraints, and to use opportunities they provide by making choices which reflect the leader’s beliefs, values and style.

**Leadership and change**

“Out of the varying motives of persons, out of the combat and competition between groups and between persons, out of the making of countless choices and the sharpening and steeling of purpose, aride the elevating forces of leadership and the achievement of intended change”  
(Burns, 1978: 432)
Burns’ words seem to highlight the importance of the management of change among leaders’ tasks. This idea is reflected in Clark et al. (1989: 160):

“The school improvement researchers examined the impact of the school leader on the ability of the unit to invent, adopt, or adapt practices that would make the school more responsive to contemporary knowledge in education”.

In the past headteachers’ concern about change was limited:

“Not so long ago those interested in reform used to figure out ways of bypassing the principal in an attempt to get changes implemented directly in the classroom. The assumption was that the principal was more of an obstacle than a help, and that anything that would neutralise his or her role would be a good thing… Principals were incorrigible blockers of progress” (Fullan, 1991: 169)

However, as leaders began to understand that school improvement is vital, they realised the active role of the head in leading this process.

Indeed, since the 1980s, heads’ role has shifted from “implementing specific innovations to her or his role in changing the very culture of the school” (Fullan, 1991: 152-3)

Leading change in education is associated with ‘transformational leadership’, which encompasses leaders’ ability to manage value-driven, vision-based, cultural, structural and systematic changes through commitment, empowerment, ownership, and by enthusing others (Stewart, 1990; Senge, 1993). However, this process has some problematic areas: firstly, leaders are expected to find the balance between organisational continuity and organisational change in a way that order is maintained but changes are achieved (Fullan, 1991). Secondly, headteachers are often expected to implement changes they had no hand in developing (ibid.).

Duignan and Macpherson (1992) (Table 2.9) and Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) (Table 2.10) suggest behaviours of effective educational leaders of change.

| Provide opportunities for members to participate in change processes and develop personal understanding of the meaning of |
Table 2.9 Key behaviours for effective leaders of change (Duignan and Macpherson (1992)

| Effective assessment of the environment (identify key people) |
| Leading the whole process of change |
| Setting the context and communicating the need for change |
| Maintaining the balance between change and continuity |
| Linking operational change with overall strategic changes |
| Ensuring coherence in different areas of the organisation. |

Table 2.10 Key characteristics for leaders of change (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1993)

The two models emphasise the involvement of the headteacher in the process of leading a change. However, whereas the former adheres to technical aspects of the management of change and mainly feedback, the latter focusses on much more complicated issues which require higher diagnostic competences. A 1977 RAND Corporation study in 293 federally funded projects indicated that the headteacher is the key to both implementation and continuation, and that principal turnover was a significant factor in abandoning innovations (Berman and McLaughin, 1977).

It is, perhaps, noteworthy to mention that Torrington and Weightman (in Preedy, 1993) contradict the consensus that schools can only succeed when led by the Great
Person “on whom everything depends and to whom everyone else responds” (HMI, 1977). Their main claim is that not all heads can lead to such change.

Vision

“Vision without action is merely a dream. Action without vision just passes the time. Vision with action can change the world” (Barker, 1990)

Current literature is critical of early writings on vision because it is described as “a spark of genius, transcending ability, a kind of magic” (Starratt, 1993: 7) and as “smacks of religious fervour” (Holmes, 1993: 17). Starratt (1988:3) acknowledges that the grandiose and remote language of early definitions presents difficulties for today’s leaders and followers. It is asserted that great leaders’ visions present ‘a common thread’ which “has its roots in those deep, core meanings about human life, its dignity, grandeur, beauty, value, etc. It tends to be expressed in myth, poetry, metaphor”.

Albeit the concept of vision has changed overtime, it still bears meaning as regards leadership. Kouzes and Posner (1996: 18) conclude that whereas most people see vision “as supernatural, as a grace or charm that comes from the gods”, it is actually not a mystical process and “it is bringing together of knowledge and experience to produce new insights” (ibid.: 104-5). Vision is “the distinguishing feature of leadership role” (Foreman, 1998: 18). Indeed, three of the ten ‘emerging generalisations’ for excellent leadership in schools offered by Beare et al. (1993: 147) relate to vision. Vision is a complicated concept because it involves ideals and principles, and requires the ability to communicate and motivate people to work with enthusiasm. Indeed, West-Burnham (1997: 118) argues that vision should “help the school move from the known to the unknown” and “organise meaning for all those involved in working in the school”.

There are several metaphors of vision that appear in the literature. Block’s (1987) compares vision to a risky path. Thus, a leader who avoids creating a vision perhaps protects him/herself from disappointment and failure, but will not lead its organisation forward. Sergiovanni (1991: 57) contends that vision should not be constructed as a
‘road map’ which specifies every turn, but rather as a compass that points the direction to be taken.

Sociological theories of schools as institutionalised organisations (Scott, 1995) and theories about organisational sensemaking (Weick, 1995) advocate that it is finally the leader who decides on the right time for the right things. However, researchers agree that the ability to communicate vision is as important as having one (Foreman, 1998). Indeed, “a two-way information flow is the lifeblood of successful reform” (Moffett, 2000: 35). The way vision is communicated to staff members secures commitment to goals and meaning (Beare et al., ibid.). The most crucial fact emerging from the literature is that vision cannot be imposed or mandated from above because vision-building is about “the primary vehicle for creating alignment of energies within an organisation” (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993: 84). Sergiovanni (1984a: 106) even claims that “the meanings a leader communicates to others is more important than his or her specific leadership style”.

So far vision has been defined as the meaning and insight which serve as guidelines for practice. However, some researchers disagree that vision is a proper basis for practice. Tod (1999: 187) suggests to “start with the reality and not the rhetoric; work from principles - to practice – to manageable and monitorable procedures; and finally, develop policy – and if needs be, some rhetoric”.

The new context of tight central control over school curriculum has created a controversial reality. On the one hand it is contended that vision statements cannot be specific to individual institutions, as schools are expected to apply the same curricular framework. On the other hand, schools are expected to constantly improve and “without some sense of direction which captures both minds and hearts, teachers will indeed be working in a vacuum” (Foreman, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998: 29). Yet, it has been argued that developing a shared vision is the least frequently practised of leadership skills. Indeed, leaders report that “inspiring a shared vision is the leadership practice with which they feel most uncomfortable” (Kouzes and Posner, 1996: 124). In addition, the fact that headteachers can acquire visionary skills seems to stand in contradiction to trait theories which assume that leadership traits are innate.
Evidence arising from studies designates that headteachers see themselves as the source of vision whose aim is to enlist the support of their staff. Beare et al. (1989) maintained that a vision of a school leader includes a personal mental picture of a desirable future state, which reflects assumptions, values and beliefs, and must be ‘institutionalised’ so it can shape school everyday activities. Yet, despite headteachers’ high perception of vision, empirical findings present a rather disappointing picture of vision. For instance, Collins and Porras (1991: 30), following a survey of 75 business organisations, describe vision as “elusive, yet vitally important component of corporate success”, but at the same time conclude that “most mission statements are terribly ineffective as a compelling, guiding force” as they “don’t grab people in the gut and motivate them to work toward a common end”. Evidence shows that the success of vision is questionable (Foreman, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998). Murgatroyd and Morgan (1993: 69) are critical of the use of mission statements: “Such statements tend to be long and complex...Many are not inspiring...are rarely owned by anyone and...often not remembered”. Bolam et al. (1993) argue that the vision headteachers expressed was not specific to their school but was in line of the British system. This finding accords with teachers’ perceptions in these respective schools. Another study conducted by Sagor and Barnett (1994) in the USA provides examples for two schools in which mission statements are extremely general rather than specific to school’s particular organisation.

Stott and Walker’s (1992) conclusions to a study conducted a in 19 Singaporean schools are that government policy was highly influential in the formulation of the statement, although worthy intentions were often articulated in ambiguous terms and expressed uncertainty regarding the use of mission statements. Finally, schools failed to revise or update statements even during a period of major changes. In contrast, a study held in the USA by Wilson and Corcoran (1984) attested to leaders’ success in the reinforcement of desired behaviours and in their ability to ensure the consistency of the belief system. These studies demonstrate differences between England and Wales and Singapore on the one hand, and the USA on the other hand. Whereas evidence shows flaws in vision implementation in the UK, it favours vision in the USA.
**Inclusive leadership**

On the basis of the previous section on leadership, inclusive leadership might be defined as leadership which is open to changes, because inclusion is considered to be first and foremost a process of change implementation. An inclusive leader should, therefore, be able to carry out a value-driven, vision-based inclusion by enthusing others (Senge, 1993) while providing support and feedback along the process (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992). However, prior to communicating this change (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1993), the leader must develop a personal belief, a picture of vision on inclusion (Beare et al., 1989). It is also noteworthy that an inclusive leader is likely to have specific traits such as open-mindedness (Adair, 1983), altruism (Starratt, 1988), vision, sensitivity and subsidiarity (West-Burnham, 1997), and an inspiring and supportive personality (Kouzes and Posner, 1996). Zollers et al. (1999) contended in their study that inclusive leadership is based on a democratic approach, a value-driven leadership, the ability to serve as a model influence, and a broad vision of the community.

Until recent years headteachers’ responsibilities have been relatively static (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988) and their role in leading change has not been widely explored. In addition, much of the empirical knowledge on how headteachers can foster inclusive schooling is either normative (Walker, 1997) or based on single case studies. For example, Cooper (1996) reports a headteacher who managed to make structural changes to establish inclusion, but could not create a shared meaning and had conflicts with veteran teachers, until finally he had to abandon his initiative and resign.

Empirical studies suggest that headteachers are perceived as a key role in the process of inclusion. For example, Stanovich and Jordan’s (1998) declare that the main factor for successful inclusion is related to school culture and climate that is determined by the headteacher. Similarly, Rouse and Florian (1996) allege that the headteacher is the most influential factor on inclusion with regard to school vision. Nelson’s (1995) findings from a survey on leadership in the process of inclusion indicate that leadership is a pre-requisite for inclusion, and the headteacher is the main factor which fosters the inclusion policy. In more practical terms, Mendez-Morse (1991)
argues that a headteacher who is also capable of leading changes regarding SEN is usually involved in typical school activities, such as teachers’ support, identification of resources, and feedback procedures.

Lipsky and Gartner (1998) allege that visionary leadership is a top factor for successful inclusion, whereas Ainscow et al. (1999) relate the concept of leadership to guidance. Finally, Sommefeldt (2001) asserts that headteachers should provide all staff with a sense of direction in promoting an inclusive ethos at school, while Smith (1996) stresses the importance of support which the headteacher provides to SENCO.

On the basis of these findings it might be encapsulated that headteachers enhance the vision, climate and support for staff which are vital for inclusion.

Research point out that headteachers’ knowledge and training in special education appeared to influence inclusive practices (Dessent, 1987) mainly in two areas:

- The establishment of structures for special and mainstream teachers such as modifying class sizes;
- The creation of a supportive climate which will minimise resistance and increase involvement while setting high expectations (Rouse and Florian, 1996).

The topic of inclusive leadership will be further elaborated on in this study in the chapters of the Findings (p. 202-211), Discussion (p. 274-278) and Conclusion (p.337-8).
**Culture**

**Introduction**

The definition of culture is intricate primarily because it refers to abstract terminology and language such as “opaque and imbued with mystique” (Bush and West-Burnham, 1994: 103), the ‘rules of the game’ (Kilmann et al., 1985), and the glue or the psychological qualities that knit an organisation together (Zollers et al., 1999). The second element of intricacy is the duality embedded in this concept. Indeed, in his review of the literature on culture, Jones (1996) identifies three salient components: values, attitudes and behavioural norms. This means that culture is a combination of ‘the visible artefacts’ and ‘the underlying assumptions’ (Schein, 1984). Alternatively it might be contended that school culture is built of layers of practice “both modifying and consolidating the norms” (Torrington and Weightman, in Preedy, 1993). Zollers et al. (1999) argue that culture involves an in-depth exploration of the factors that motivate the members and of the source for their behavioural norms which leads to the understanding of the organisational values and attitudes. This point is similar to Dimmock and Walker (2000: 307) who maintain that cultural dimensions are “core axes around which significant sets of values, beliefs and practices cluster”.

Another area of difficulty concerns the multiplicity of themes related to this concept. The concept of culture appeared in the literature 130 years ago by Linton (1940) and Tylor (1871) who maintained that it meant knowledge, beliefs, morals, customs, attitudes, and habitual behaviour patterns. Since then, various aspects of culture have been emphasised by various researchers. For example, Mintzberg (1973) emphasised its operational norms, attitudes towards employees, rites and ceremonies, formal and informal systems of communication, and the ideology of the organisation. Martin (1985) stressed perceptions. Lawton (1989) claimed that school cultures might be analysed via nine systems, such as social, economic, communication, rationality, and belief.

In his definition, West-Burnham (1997) relates to culture as the personality of the organisation, the sum of all the elements that make it unique, and the way the organisation manifests itself to the world. This explanation is comprehensive in the sense that it comprises both the inner and outer aspects of the organisation. Similarly,
Torrington and Weightman (in Preedy, 1993) argue that school Ethos or Culture is school spirit, “the powerful engine for growth and progress” which creates school’s wholeness.

The complexity of culture is expressed by Schein (1985:6):
“The deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organisation, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a basic taken-for-granted fashion an organisation’s view of itself and its environment”.

On the other hand, Greenfield (1973) asserted that organisations have no character of their own, and ethos reflects “conglomerate power relationships or underlying agreements between individuals rather than any collective will overall”. Indeed, it might be stated that the definition of Culture is complicated because of two main reasons: it encompasses seemingly contradictory aspects, such as unconscious beliefs as opposed to explicit and tangible behaviours, and it relies on attitudes of the individuals as opposed to organisational (group) ethos.

As the educational system today is oriented towards change, the next section will focus on the characteristics of culture which are associated with change.

**Culture and change**

Toffler (1990: 386) pictures a changing culture as ‘a moving mosaic’ which has “many shifting see-through panels, one behind the other, overlapping, interconnected, the colours and shapes continually blending, contrasting, changing”.

Culture has been identified as a key factor in leading change. Morgan (in Preedy, 1993: 41) maintains:
“Effective change also depends on changes in the images and values that are to guide action. Attitudes and values that provide a recipe for success in one situation can prove a positive hindrance in another. Hence, change programmes must give attention to the kind of corporate ethos required in the new situation and find how this can be developed”.
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The culture of a changing school is described by West-Burnham’s (1997: 98): “A quality school is restless, constantly questioning, never satisfied, challenging norms and believing that things can always be better”.

Fullan (1999) argues that the crucial factors in sustaining change are those interventions that have impact on the cultural norms of schools. In this light, Torrington and Weightman (1989: 18) include in their definition of culture “the norms and values that are generally held about how people should treat each other, the nature of the working relationships that should be developed, and attitudes to change”.

Recently, it has been claimed (Joyce and Calhoun, 1996) that cultural changes can occur quickly and at the same time prove to be deep, ‘second-order’ change (Fullan, 1991). They do not necessarily need to take a long time, as has been suggested by Fullan (ibid.). Culture and change are related in the literature in three different ways. Existing culture might foster or inhibit change (Reynolds, 1996). Alternatively, institutionalised changes might lead to a shift in the organisational culture, although a change in culture is believed to be difficult (Turner, 1990). Indeed, Morgan (ibid.: 42) suggests that “since organisation ultimately resides in the heads of the people involved, effective organisational change implies cultural change”. Another link in the literature is Morgan’s (ibid.) assertion that change and culture make one entity.

Although the concept of vision is usually related to leadership, when a school seeks to lead change it does so by creating a culture of ‘visioning community’ in which the range of shared values and commitment is high (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993: 80). Bhindi and Duignan (1996) propose a ‘visionary paradigm’ for leadership in 2020: “Organisations are not solely concerned with outcomes, processes, and resources. They are also concerned with the human spirit and their values and relationships. Authentic leaders breathe the life force into the workplace and keep the people feeling energized and focused. As stewards and guides they build people and their self-esteem. They derive their credibility from personal integrity and ‘walking’ their values”.

89
Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991: 35) argue that the essence of the process is “the transformation of subjective realities” and the creation of shared meaning which forms a new culture. Similarly, Ware (1995) claims that teachers should receive support in constructing a shared meaning as part of an overall cultural transformation of their schools. Table 2.11 and 2.12 introduce factors suggested by two studies which seem to be relevant to change-making:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A shared vision of success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genuine opportunities for active commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed approaches to teaching methods, assessment, discipline and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A common philosophy of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dynamic vision, responsive to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vision integral to school life and identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An orderly ethos/climate developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitudes and optimism among teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding students’ perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering self-understanding, autonomy and responsibility among learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing rapport with the wider community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing responsibilities, interaction and responsiveness, avoidance of authoritarian style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality established between groups through collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.11 Principles of collaborative culture which contribute to effectiveness (National Commission on Education, 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High expectations from staff and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus on values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive, secure environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers performing leadership roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12 School improvement and culture (Hopkins and Harris, 1997)

On the basis of the two studies it might be inferred that the prevailing educational attitudes and climate are related to change and innovations, because a school where vision and responsibility are shared and work is done in collaboration, is more likely to be open to changes than schools which no empowerment is perceived and no common philosophy of education exists. These assumptions are supported by empirical evidence. The HMI report ‘Ten Good Schools’ (DES, 1977: 7) suggests that
“success does not stem merely from the existence of certain structures of organisation...but is dependent on the spirit and understanding that pervades the life and work of a school, faithfully reflecting its basic objectives”.

However, there seems to be an empirical consensus in the literature that collaborative cultures is a ‘black box’ which requires a careful study (Fullan, 1999: 36), and that in understanding processes of school change one must also consider the uniqueness of each organisation (ibid.; Bryk et al., 1998a).

The next section will foster the understanding of the nature of culture by relating to its characteristics.

**Characteristics of culture**

Indeed, Lewis (1996) maintains that auditing the cultural features is necessary for effective management. Deal and Kennedy (1982) identified several key features in ‘strong’ (i.e. clearly identifiable) cultures which are demonstrated in Table 2.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear approach to environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Heroes’ – role models for values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rites and rituals (systems and procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks (informal means of communication)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.13 Key features of corporate cultures (Deal and Kennedy, 1982)**

The fact that Culture is manifested via a multi-sensory amalgam of symbols, routines, and physical resources (Beare et al., 1989:176) is illustrated in Table 2.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptually or verbally</th>
<th>The use of language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviourally</td>
<td>Rituals, ceremonies, rules, support mechanisms, patterns of social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually or materially</td>
<td>Facilities, equipment, memorabilia, mottoes, crests and uniforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.14 Manifestations of culture (Beare et al., 1989)**
Tables 2.13 and 2.14 reveal that the main aspect of Culture is social and environmental. The notion of ‘heroes’ is associated with imitation, which is a social pattern. And finally, rituals and ceremonies usually characterise social groups. Indeed, Sergiovanni (1984) denotes Culture as a process of socialisation and names it ‘collective programming’. Much of the literature on culture reflects the assumption that individual beliefs coalesce into culture: “Shared meaning, shared understanding, and shared sensemaking are all different ways of describing culture” (Nias et al., 1989:11).

Another feature of Culture is introduced in Bush and West-Burnham’s model (1994: 104-5) (Figure 2.8) and in the combined model presented in Figure 2.9. Both Figures denote how norms and behaviours have a mutual effect on one another. Indeed, the two Figures illustrate that values and norms inform behaviours but at the same time they are also modified by behaviours once change occurs. In addition, they show that schools are open systems which are closely linked to their environments and should, therefore, match their cultural manifestations to that environment.

Figure 2.8 The development of organisational culture (Bush and West-Burnham, 1994)

Figure 2.9, in a more specific manner, illustrates the circular process, whereby values provide the foundation for the ethos (Morgan, 1986), which is translated into a mission before it turns into specific goals. These goals are, in turn, translated into behaviours and interpreted within the framework of cultural norms. Thus, organisational values are reinforced by practice.
Types of culture

Although general definitions of culture do not focus on aspects of change, researchers tend to link types of culture to change. One way to categorise cultures is applied by Rosenholtz’s (1989) division of cultures into ‘moving’ or ‘stuck’ (Table 2.15). ‘Moving cultures’ advocate that cultures are dynamic and change might be achieved whereas ‘stuck cultures’ inhibit change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Moving’ cultures</th>
<th>‘Stuck’ cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impoverishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>No risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Gatekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A holistic view</td>
<td>Insular focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.15 ‘Moving’ and ‘stuck’ cultures (Rosenholtz, 1989)

A similar categorisation is introduced by Carnall (1995) model of ‘old’ and ‘new’ cultures (Table 2.16).
Table 2.16  ‘Old’ and ‘new’ cultures (after Carnall, 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Old’ cultures</th>
<th>‘New’ cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic</td>
<td>Trust, support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear boundaries</td>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and risk</td>
<td>Risk-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resonate with Theory X</td>
<td>Resonate with Theory Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It might be inferred that the main differences between ‘stuck’ or ‘old’ and ‘moving’ or ‘new’ cultures are the open-mindedness versus narrow-mindedness and the feeling of ‘togetherness’ as opposed to individualism that prevail in the organisation. Indeed, there seems to be a consensus in the literature that ‘professional learning communities’, which is the more popular term for ‘collaborative cultures’ and ‘the learning organisation’, are essential for success (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1992; Louis and Kruse, 1995). Therefore, Fullan (1999) contends that collaborative cultures mobilise three powerful change forces: the moral purpose which increases commitment, the power purpose which maximises pressure and support for positive action, and the intellectual purpose which generates, tests, and selects ideas. Further, Busher and Blease (2000) interpret the delegation of responsibilities by the leader as part of trust-building, which, in turn, allows staff to pursue initiatives.

Law and Glover (2000:122) suggest a cultural model for educational culture which reflects “the shifting sands of educational development, improvement and decline”. This model relies on Rosenholtz (1989) and Hopkins et al. (1994), and comprises five types of cultures with reference to two dimensions: improvement-decline, and effectiveness-ineffectiveness (Figure 2.10). According to this model, ‘Motivating’ cultures encourage effectiveness, improvement, collaboration, and change, whereas ‘Declining’ cultures express ineffectiveness and avoid improvement. The rest of the categories are midway on both dimensions, and are usually ineffective while endeavouring to improve.
Figure 2.10 The dynamics of educational culture (Law and Glover, 2000)

It is contended that the two scales might be combined into a single measure of ‘effective change’ which reflects if and to what extent change is conducted. Similarly, Harrison (1994) offers a model which consists of four types of culture and addresses the aspect of change (Table 2.17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>culture</th>
<th>indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role culture</td>
<td>Bureaucratic; line management; hierarchical decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power culture</td>
<td>Centralised control; limited collegiality; high significance of micropolitics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement culture</td>
<td>Emphasis on results; collaborative and collegial; task focused; autonomy of teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support culture</td>
<td>Personal centred; formal and informal support; focus on the authority of expertise; personal empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.17 Four cultures of an organisation (Harrison, 1994)

Indeed, the four types should be seen as four elements, and thus, a culture which includes all four elements is likely to be more conductive to change. The rationale for this assertion lies in the fact that the four types address formal, informal, micropolitical, personal and interpersonal aspects of school life which exist in every organisation and every school.
A different way to address types of cultures emerges from Hargreaves (1995) two-factor model: the social factor which focusses on how people are welded into an organisation through control or cohesion, and ‘people’ or ‘task-related’ aims. Thus, school may tend towards the formal, Traditional culture which emphasises social control and attention to tasks, or towards the more relaxed Welfarist culture which focusses on social cohesion and attention to people (Figure 2.11).

![Figure 2.11 Types of school cultures (after Hargreaves, 1995)]

An analysis of the two models in Figures 2.10 and 2.11 shows that the two models differ in their foci: whereas the former addresses elements that are associated with outcomes (effectiveness and improvement), the latter addresses elements associated with the process of change (‘people’ and ‘tasks’, ‘social control’ and ‘social cohesion’).

The following section attempts to investigate how culture is managed in schools.

The management of culture

It has been decided to start this section with Morrison’s (1998) assertion that a striking feature in ‘failing’ schools is that culture cannot be managed, in order to stress that it needs to be managed especially when change is about to occur.

Culture is considered to be a key feature in management. For example, Peters and Waterman’s (1982: 22) assessment of ‘excellent’ companies is the ‘hands-on, value-driven’ management. For them, “clarifying the value system and breathing life into it
are the greatest contributions a leader can make”. West-Burnham (1997: 9) advocates that headteachers’ role in the management of culture is to resolve the obvious tension between the demands of the organisation and the values of the individual:

“The skill in managing cultural change is to generate consensus, to recruit and develop in accordance with the culture, and to help those who cannot ‘fit’ to find an appropriate niche so that they too are fully developed in personal terms”

Culture needs to be managed so that it can permeate all aspects of the organisation (ibid.). The cultural perspective is also useful in identifying sources of resistance and facilitation in organisations (Morrison, 1998). An important management aspect concerning Culture is that “staff teams possessing different cultural values” (Bridge, 1994: 194). In such ‘balkanised’ cultures, teachers give their primary loyalty to sub-units or departments rather than to the whole organisation (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1992). However, the establishment of a unitary culture in a reality which allows divergent cultures in organisations requires skillful leadership (Bush, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998).

The publication of Ethos Indicators in Secondary School Self-Evaluation (Scottish Office Education Department (SOED), 1992) minimised the relationship management-culture. It proved that out of twelve indicators that form the basis of the study only four relate to management issues, whereas the rest of them relate mainly to teachers and pupils’ perceptions (Appendix 1).

**School climate**

School climate is considered to be part of school culture and its investigation started in the 1970s. Various attempts have been made to define this organisational phenomenon. The most comprehensive definition was offered by Tagiuri and Litwin (1968): “The organisational climate is the quality of the inner environment in an organisation as experienced by staff members. This environment affects their behaviour and can be described in terms of clusters of organisational characteristics”.
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School climate refers to the ‘profile’ and ‘personality’ of school’s atmosphere which encompasses teachers’ and students’ perceptions (Fridman et al., 1988). Based on teachers’ perceptions, Halpin and Croft (1962) argued that ‘closed’, negative climates are associated with task-oriented headteachers who apply formal, inflexible structures. They contended that a feeling of alienation, a sense of lack of commitment towards school and school tasks, bureaucracy and paperwork similarly contribute to a negative perception of school climate. Conversely, ‘open’, positive climates are associated with support, teachers’ welfare and satisfaction, enthusiasm, involvement, vision and personal charisma. In addition, a sense of intimacy among teachers, informal relationships, and a team spirit contribute to positive climates.

There seems to be a consensus in the literature that the existence of an orderly, safe climate is conducive to teaching and learning (Stoll, 1991; Thousand and Burchard, 1990), and that teachers’ training on the values that underlie school practice is likely to promote heterogeneous schooling (Thousand and Villa, 1991). Halpin (1966) identified types of climates of organisations where change is likely to occur. The six climates appear on a continuum from openness to closure, whereas the more open the climate is, the more conducive it is to change (Table 2.18).

| The open climate                             |
| The autonomous climate                       |
| The controlled climate                       |
| The familiar climate                         |
| The closed climate                           |

*Table 2.18 A continuum of organisational climates (Halpin, 1966)*

Another approach to school climate was adopted by Stern and Steinhoff (1969) who focussed on factors of climate other than environmental. They argued that schools whose score is high on intellectuality, achievement, motivation and support towards teachers are featured by a drive towards development and change, whereas schools whose score is high on efficiency and structured work are featured by slow and controlled development. Table 2.19 sums up the four possible conditions for school as regards the balance between aspects of innovation and control.
Table 2.19  Climate and change (after Stern and Steinhoff)

The following sections will address three issues of climate: The learning organisation, teamwork and collaboration.

**The learning organisation**

“To cope with a changing world, any entity must develop the capability of shifting and changing, of developing new skills and attitudes: in short, the capability of learning”

(De Gues, 1997:20)

The ‘learning organisation’ as a concept has developed in education at a later point than in business (Southworth, 1994; Boud, 1995). The literature involves two main factors that contribute to this transformation. The external factor is associated with the need to cope with environmental changes (West, 1994). This claim is supported by Hopson and Hough (1985:7) who argued that “we live in a transient society where the only constant phenomenon is change”. Thus, if a school fails to keep pace with technological changes, it could become subject to cultural lag (Lofthouse, 1994a). Among the external factors one might list the Open Enrolment and the competition among schools.

The second factor is internal. Thus, Garrett (1987) maintained that if an organisation wishes to survive and develop, the rate of learning inside it must be equal to, or greater than, the rate of change in the external environment. The internal factor is concerned with a fundamental shift in the mindset (‘metanoia’ in Greek) regarding the
concept of learning (Senge, 1990). Further, the writer (Senge, 1991:13) points that the concept of learning has changed, and that “taking in information is only distantly related to real learning”. Indeed, as opposed to the ‘teaching organisation’ (Rogers, 1980) which advocated that pupils are recipients of knowledge possessed by teachers, it is now acknowledged that the ‘new learning’ paradigm emphasises learners’ autonomy and ‘lifelong learning’ (Ferguson, 1982: 316). Moreover, learning does not result from teachers imparting book knowledge to students. It is an egalitarian process which takes place in an environment conducive to learning, and relies mutually on teaching and learning experiences and experiments beyond basic school training (Ferguson, ibid.). However, researchers agree that “everybody in school is a learner” (West-Burnham, 1997: 108) and that “learning... happens all through life unless we block it” (Handy, 1989: 168).

A necessary follow-up of the change in the mindset is the organisational ability to capture and convert knowledge, because “it is obvious that learning and transformation are part of the same process” (Carnall, 1995: 263). Therefore, organisations should establish a knowledge base where tacit knowledge is converted to explicit knowledge, and where information is made accessible for all members (ibid.).

Yet, how can this mindset be achieved? One suggestion is Fryer’s (1996: 1) advocacy for creativity as a major element within the learning organisation: “The capacity to be creative is intensely human. It is essential for survival. It is, therefore, all the more surprising that creativity is generally neglected in mainstream education”.

Carnall (1999:69-70) points out in this respect that “achieving a mind-set shift is first and foremost a cognitive task undertaken within a social context”. However, the researchers listed below suggest that change is associated with learning. For example, Garvin (1993) suggests modes of learning, such as problem-solving, experimentation with new ideas and approaches, and learning from experience. Miller (1996) identifies six modes of learning that appear in Table 2.20 and argues that a learning organisation should address all these modes.
Formal, linear, rational, systematic

Emphasises discovery, combines knowledge in new ways

Incremental, exploratory

Adaptive, participative

Bureaucratic, through established channels and routines

Vision building, symbolic, emphasises values and beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Analytical learning</strong></th>
<th>Formal, linear, rational, systematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthetic learning</strong></td>
<td>Emphasises discovery, combines knowledge in new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental learning</strong></td>
<td>Incremental, exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive learning</strong></td>
<td>Adaptive, participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural learning</strong></td>
<td>Bureaucratic, through established channels and routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional learning</strong></td>
<td>Vision building, symbolic, emphasises values and beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.20 Modes of learning in organisations (Miller, 1996)*

Indeed, Miller’s (1996) model allows for a varied choice of learning modes which are related to different types of cultures, structures and leadership styles. Hurst (1995) argues that achieving change is contingent upon the ability to become a learning organisation. This process is introduced in Table 2.21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.21 A renewal process of recreation (Hurst, 1995)*

The first look at Table 2.21 seems to be similar to phased models of change. However, an in-depth look reveals that it describes a learning process whose peak is the ability to overcome the confusion which results from a new reality and from the need to create innovations. It is argued, then, that this is first and foremost a learning model. Newmann and Wehlage (1995) support this view in their claim that schools with strong professional learning communities enable teachers to respond more successfully to the needs of students and to sustain positive change.
Teamwork

The concept of teams is complementary to ‘learning organisations’ because “they are a learning organisation in microcosm” (Morrison, 1998: 183). A survey of the literature indicates that teamwork is considered to be advantageous in terms of the improvement of the quality of work. Indeed, one of the main features of collegial approaches is the emphasis on teamwork and the fact that it attempts to harness the talents of all team members (Coleman and Bush, in Bush and West-Burnham, 1994). This view is supported by West-Burnham (1997: 148) who maintains that “the group is one of the most powerful learning vehicles, so the effective team has the potential to heighten the learning of its members”. Similarly, Hopkins et al. (1997) argue that a collegial culture can be achieved via the development of learning partnerships.

Murgatroyd and Morgan (1993) advocate that teams are more powerful learning entities than individuals who are seeking to learn on their own. Teams provide an environment in which learning can be articulated, tested, refined, and examined against the needs of the organisation. Everard and Morris (1990: 172) focus on the aspect of “a group of people that can effectively tackle any task which it has been set up to do”. Indeed, researchers tend to highlight the cultural basis of teamwork, such as commitment, cooperation, and agreed goals (Bell, 1992; West-Burnham, 1992a).

Tuckman’s (1985) model (Table 2.22) clarifies the importance of teamwork in the process of innovation. This includes team resistance while confronting the leader, but it also comprises a mutual establishment of norms and a development of a feeling of confidence as solutions emerge.
Table 2.22 Stages in team maturity (Tuckman, 1985)

Indeed, the researchers emphasise the affective aspect of teamwork: the increase of commitment, the promotability it offers, the social closeness it provides, as well as the development of collaboration and cooperation (Bowring-Carr and West-Burnham, 1994; Wickens, 1995; Sergiovanni, 1994). Furthermore, all teams in a school need to reach a certain level of connectedness and share ideas and concerns, as “no team is an island within an organisation” (Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993: 146).

Yet, dysfunctional teams seem to lack certain cultural features (Weller, 1995). This can be seen in Table 2.23 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of outcomes sought, roles uncertain.</td>
<td>FORMING</td>
<td>Anxiety, uncertainty, ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value and feasibility of task questioned, principles and methods debated</td>
<td>STORMING</td>
<td>Conflict between group resistance and leader, opinions polarised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning starts, standards laid down, roles clear</td>
<td>NORMING</td>
<td>Working procedures established, communication of feelings, mutual support, sense of team identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions emerge, quality improves, decisions translated into action</td>
<td>PERFORMING</td>
<td>High levels of trust and independence, roles are flexible, individuals and teams are confident and relaxed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.22 Stages in team maturity (Tuckman, 1985)

The warring factions team | Lack of cohesion
---|---
The Kalamazoo team | A false consensus
The leaderless team | Unclear goals, low morale, no decisions
The bus-driver team | Indifference, fear of commitment, no real communication
The party team | Socialising and joke telling
The ground-zero team | Open hostility, serious personality clashes, jealousy, destructiveness,
It is also contended that the cultural deficits of these elements are all linked to change. For example, a team which is characterised by fear of commitment is unlikely to welcome changes, whereas personality clashes that exist in a team are likely to inhibit the process of change.

West-Burnham (1997: 138) introduces a synthesis of the research of McGregor (1960), Likert (1961) and Blake and Mouton (1964) (Figure 2.12). The writer maintains that “the strength and creative potential of teams is derived from...the critical mass achieved when they are linked and synergy is achieved”. It is noteworthy that here, too, the main elements of his model are related to culture.
Indeed, this model seems to be in unison with Weller’s (1995) ‘dysfunctional’ teams, because its elements present the other end of the same scale. Thus, openness and candour, pride in the team and socialising would reflect the opposite of the ‘ground-zero’ team, which is featured by open hostility, serious personality clashes, jealousy, and destructiveness.

The literature offers two types of teams in organisations: the ‘Crossfunctional’ team and the ‘Project’ team. Iles and Auluck (1993) advocate the ‘Crossfunctional’ team because putting the function as a high priority enables boundaries of professional departments to be crossed. In practice, however, individual members might unconsciously represent their original teams and this might create ill-feeling among other members. The ‘Project’ team, which is meant to serve as a taskforce for change (McKaskey, 1988) might do so at the expense of staff relationships. For example, super-teams (Hastings et al., 1986) are highly committed, very hardworking, and
driven by success and obsessive pursuit of their goals. At the same time, they might create a culture of elitism in schools.

Critics of teamwork refer to a negative influence on the micropolitics of the organisation: high-stress levels, role conflicts and ambiguities, inter-group rivalries or too great a cohesiveness (Bush, 1993; Beale, 1994). Similarly, Senge (1990: 234) argued that ‘unaligned teams’ are wasted energies. More practically, MacKinnon and Brown (1994) advocate that teams of professionals for problem-solving be set in schools via adhocracies. They contend that ‘innovative responses to difficult problems are less likely to occur if dependence is placed on the efforts of one or two individuals’ (p. 147). They also point out ‘when teamwork is present, teachers feel productive and supported’ (p. 146).

The next section will explore the issue of collaboration which is related to teamwork.

Collaboration

Until the mid-1970s school culture based solely on loyalty to the head. From that time onwards, staff cooperation and responsibility increased (Torrington and Weightman, in Preedy, 1993). The first definition that is offered below relates to collaboration from an organisational point of view, whereas the second reflects workers’ viewpoint.

Cardno (1990:1) argues: “It (Collaboration) is the term employed to express partnership, cooperation, agreement, consent, and working in combination to accomplish institutional objectives”. West-Burnham (1997: 147) states that collaboration comprises of “individuals learning to collaborate so that knowledge, skills, and qualities are deployed to maximum effect”.

Indeed, an empirical study conducted by Busher and Blease (2000) revealed that collegial culture can be achieved when people support each other and work together regardless of their formal job descriptions, or when the formal hierarchies are implicit.

The theoretical basis for collaboration is the commitment strategy for change (Rowan, 1995) which assumes that “collaborative and participative management practices
will unleash the energy and expertise of committed teachers and thereby lead to improved student learning” (Rowan, 1990: 354). Earl and Lee (1998) argue that successful collaboration is a function of urgency, agency and energy for change. It is claimed that urgency can be compared to the shared vision which is the drive for change, agency represents the structures for change, and energy symbolises people’s commitment to carry out the change.

Stacey’s (1996b: 280) definition of collaboration seems to highlight the fact that collaboration is linked to a changing culture of a learning organisation where members are mutually nourished: “It is true dialogue in which people engage with each other, not to be in control but to provoke and be provoked, to learn and contribute to the learning of others, to change their own minds as well as the minds of others”

Indeed, organisational change depends on the creation of a culture which enables individual development, team development, collaboration among individuals and organisational learning. Figure 2.13 suggests a two-way model for the relationship between the three dimensions of a culture which allows for change: ‘the learning organisation’, ‘teamwork’ and ‘collaboration’. It is maintained that the learning organisation stems from the collaboration between teams. Alternatively, it might be claimed that the formation of a learning organisation by school leadership creates a culture which encourages teamwork and collaboration at all school levels.

![Figure 2.13 A model of combined elements of culture](image-url)
Inclusive culture

On the basis of the previous section on culture, inclusive culture might be defined as a culture which is open to changes, because inclusion is considered to be first and foremost a process of change implementation. Inclusive culture relies on some elements of ‘moving’ cultures such as shared values, attitudes towards inclusion, and innovativeness. The issue of shared values and attitudes towards inclusion emerged in Zoller et al.’s (1999: 172) study: “In this inclusive culture students were not intruders that needed to be ‘integrated’...they already belonged...the goal was schooling, not ‘including’”. Furthermore, “The inclusion of students with disabilities at Connolly was highly valued by students, teachers, and parents of both typical children and disabled children” (ibid.: 170). The issue of innovativeness derives from Carnall’s (1995) model.

Indeed, an inclusive school culture takes it for granted that individual students belong. Its main focus is on what can be done to enhance their learning. Ideally, LDS are “to be considered a legitimate identity in an inclusive school, not a pathological condition” (Slee, 1996: 26). Empirical evidence supports the view that culture is perceived by school staff as an important factor to inclusion (Janney et al, 1995). Furthermore, Lunt and Norwich (1999: 74) maintain that inclusion involves values and school cultures, and commitment to inclusion should be seen in the broad context of social inclusion and equity. Therefore, their answer is that “unless effectiveness is defined in terms of inclusiveness, a rhetorical commitment to inclusion may conflict with other values such as individual choice and competition and the values of the market”.

The main shift in the mind-set towards inclusive culture is the “recognition of the value of diversity in schools and communities” (Ballard, 1996: 42). Torrington and Weightman (in Preedy, 1993: 54) express doubts regarding the existence of school culture, following their research on four secondary schools. They advocate “the legitimate plurality of views and styles”, as school contains teams and departments each of which builds its own culture. Thus, “the culture of the school as a whole will be quite different from that in a school where such variety is suppressed”. A related issue that should be considered regarding culture and inclusive culture is the fact that
mainstream and SEN teachers often fail to collaborate (Henderson, 1994). This problem is regarded by Bush (1995) as co-existence of divergent cultures in organisations.

Riehl’s (2000: 60) view of the change in the mind-set is that “the development of inclusive structures and practices must be accompanied by new understandings and values or they will not result in lasting change”.

However, critiques of school inclusive culture advocate that the seemingly inclusive culture is only a “re-articulation of special education” (Slee, 1996: 21).

Past research has focussed on educational practice and inclusion (Hunt and Goetz, 1997) rather than on the relationship between culture and inclusion. However, Zollers et al. (1999) conducted the first research that explored this relationship. The research was a single-case study and it identified three elements of culture that contribute to inclusive culture: a democratic and empowering culture with collaborative decision-making, a broad vision of school community with parental involvement, and shared language and values. The main conclusion was that school culture should not be overlooked while implementing inclusion and that “inclusion may require an inclusive school culture in order to succeed” (ibid.: 172). However, this study could be scrutinised on the grounds that it was conducted in a school which was well-catered for with all necessary aids and services as well as mainstream and SEN staff. It could be argued that the research advocates how culture is determined by structures rather than the relationship between culture and inclusive culture.

MacKinnon and Brown (1994) discovered in their research that teamwork helped teachers to solve problems regarding the development of new ways of teaching all students.

The issue of inclusive culture will be further elaborated on in the chapters of the Findings (p. 228-238), Discussion (p. 290-295) and Conclusion (p.338).
**Structures**

**Introduction**

Structures offer a formal framework in which organisational activities take place. A survey of the literature reveals that the way structure is defined has not changed over the years. It comprises the frameworks of activities, such as organisational arrangements and roles (Fullan, 1992), a description of jobs and relationships (Gray, 1988), formal systems, processes of authority, positions and seniority of authority, division of labour, procedures, a formal description of roles, and relationships within the organisation (Paisey, 1981; Charan, 1996; O’Neill, 1994). At the same time it embodies all activities which take part within the organisation, such as decisions, monitoring, co-ordinating, resourcing, accountability, documentation, tasks (Charan, ibid.; O’Neill, ibid).

The importance of structures is reflected in Riehl’s (2000) statement that school structures, cultures and routines embody the meanings people hold about educational practices. This was equally emphasised by Leavitt (1978) who saw structures as one of the four main organisational systems (Figure 2.14).

![Figure 2.14 Leavitt's diamond (1978)](image)

The main conclusion from this model is the inter-dependence between the ‘technical’ elements and the ‘human’ elements and the fact that all factors have an equal weight in the organisational life.

Handy (1989:71) clarifies the change in the terminology of current structures:
"Today the language is not that of engineering but of politics, with talk of cultures and networks, of teams and coalitions, of influence or power rather than control, of leadership rather than management”

**Structures and change**

The link between a changing environment and Structure has been recognised in the non-educational settings for many years. The basic distinction that characterises much of the theoretical debates distinguishes between ‘mechanistic’ structures which are appropriate in stable conditions, and more flexible, organic structures, that are needed to respond to changing conditions (Burns and Stalker, 1961; Bolman and Deal, 1984; Beare et al., 1989). However, organisational structures need to be explored in order to maximise potential for change (Morrison, 1998).

One example of structural change can be seen in the post-1960s move to comprehensivisation, which encouraged the creation of larger, more hierarchically structured institutions. An almost opposite example is the post-1980s push towards ‘self-management’, marketisation and ‘privatisation’. This change has brought about a re-structuring of education which advocates leaner and flatter hierarchies (Mullins, 1993), ‘delayering’ (Holbeche, 1995), and team-based working (Belbin, 1996).

Researchers tend to agree that schools have to be responsive to the demands of the market in order to survive, and therefore it would also make sense that they adopted flatter, radical, more responsive structures (e.g. Wallace, 1991). Further, it is believed that multifunctional teams, project managers and expertise should replace hierarchical management structures (Morrison, 1998). It is argued that decentralisation reduces overload on managers, develops motivation through empowerment, ensures delegation in sub-units, and increases flexibility of response. Champy and Nohria’s (1996a) operating principles de-emphasise hierarchical structure and prefer flat management. Ostroff and Schmitt (1993) maintain that effective configuration has to do with value orientation that resembles the ‘human relations model’, by which schools are flexible and concerned with morale, growth and development.
Others claim that the fact that effective management structures are “subject to change and development, in order to incorporate new demands made upon the organisation” (O’Neill, in Bush and West-Burnham, 1994: 109-10) might create internal tensions and management difficulties as “the formal structure may be poorly adapted to the actual ongoing activity” (Meyer and Rowan, 1988: 110). In addition, the increase in central control over curriculum delivery requires inspection (O’Neill, 1994). By the same line of thought, Child (1984) advocated centralisation because it identifies the locus of decision-making, it enables managers to maintain an overview of activities, and avoids waste and duplication. Another critique to the changing structures is that in loosely coupled organisational structures, school is more likely to respond to the external environment (parents, political groups) than to students (Chubb and Moe, 1990).

A compromising way of thought is offered by O’Neill (1994: 112-14). It is argued that effective schools are ‘adaptive structures’, which need, on the one hand, ‘loose’, flexible structures to enable them to respond to changing needs, turbulence and uncertainty, and on the other hand should adopt ‘tight’ administrative control for continuing routine demands and accountability.

**Structural analysis**

Two sets of criteria for the analysis of the structures for change are introduced by Paisey’s (1981) (Table 2.24) and by Carnall (1995) (Table 2.25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Implication on school performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The degree of specialisation of function</td>
<td>The division of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree of standardisation of procedures</td>
<td>The existence of rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The formalisation of documentation</td>
<td>The commitment of information to writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree of centralisation of authority</td>
<td>The location of decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The configuration of positions</td>
<td>The ‘shape’ of structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The flexibility of structure</td>
<td>The capacity of structure to meet new conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.24 Structure analysis (Paisey, 1981)*
Centralisation versus decentralisation
Efficiency versus effectiveness
Professional management versus line management
Using control versus developing commitment
Managing change versus managing stability

Table 2.25 Structures and organisational management (Carnall, 1995)

Despite the 14 years of difference between the two models, it might be inferred that they reflect a similar view in respect of criteria for analysis including that of stability and flexibility towards change.

Hierarchies are also believed to have impact on organisational structure. The literature distinguishes between a ‘tall’ hierarchy which is more bureaucratic and is characterised by a narrow span of control, and ‘flat’ hierarchy which is more democratic and is characterised by a broader span of control. Whereas in a ‘tall’ hierarchy the number of people reporting directly to the manager will be small as there are more organisational channels and levels, in a ‘flat’ hierarchy there are less hierarchical levels (Law and Glover, 2000). One of the direct implications of hierarchies is the division of roles and responsibilities. Bolman and Deal (1984) suggested that the basic dilemma in organisations is the tension between ‘differentiation’, which is the definition and allocation of specific roles and responsibilities, and ‘integration’, which is the linking of roles to promote interdependence.

Current management ‘fashion’ often “praises the concept of the ‘horizontal’ organisation” (Law and Glover, 2000: 109). Other features of ‘fashionable’ structures are processes rather than functions, key performance objectives, flattened hierarchies, and team-work (Handy, 1993). The process of change involves a shift from line management to specialism, and to management of professionals (West-Burnham, 1994). Weick (1976: 3) views educational organisations as ‘loose assemblies’ and ‘soft’ structures, where teams are reformed for another task when their initial mission is complete. Teams can take the form of permanent teams or ‘taskforces’, short-term
project teams formed to accomplish a particular task (Beare et al., 1992). The latter (ibid.: 88) assert:

“A single-dimensioned organisational structure is no longer sufficient for an educational enterprise, and the key operators, including the school principal, will need to be adept at changing administrative tactics and structures according to the task at hand”.

The way structures are perceived in agile systems affects the division of roles. Morrison (1998: 160) maintains that organisational structures can be seen as networks which “integrate the formal and social architecture of the organisation”. In a networked structure work is shared rather than divided, and there is an emphasis on teamwork and crossfunctional teams (Champy and Nohria, 1996a). Therefore, authority becomes a matter of expertise rather than position in the hierarchy, and “those informal leaders who have not had space to demonstrate their talents are freed from the structures of hierarchical constraint (Morrison, ibid.).

Table 2.26 encapsulates the main elements discussed in this section with regard to ‘old’ and ‘new’ structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Old’ structures</th>
<th>‘Fashionable’ (network) structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Tall’ hierarchy</td>
<td>‘Flat’ hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Tight’ qualities</td>
<td>‘Loose’ qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line management</td>
<td>Specialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status teams</td>
<td>Crossfunctional (task) teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work divided</td>
<td>Work shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.26 Features of ‘old’ structures and of ‘fashionable’ structures*

Similarly, Table 2.27 presents elements of ‘Traditional’ and ‘Radical’ structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Radical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid</td>
<td>Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Function/Task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.27 Characteristics of organisational structure (O’Neill, 1994)*
Structure: a result or a cause

As a result of educational legislation in the 1980s and 1990s, schools depend on their external environments for their well-being. However, increased centralised control over curricula has dictated changes in school technology. Bolman and Deal (1984) held the view that organisational structure is determined by the technology of the organisation which is defined as the central activities and by its environment. At the same time they assert that organisational problems reflect inappropriate structure and can be resolved through redesign (ibid.).

The impact of technology and environment on structure is linked to the level of uncertainty (Galbraith, 1973; Turner, in Packwood and Turner, 1988): it is possible to establish traditional, bureaucratic, hierarchical structures in a stable environment where activities and responses are predictable, but it is impossible to pre-determine structures in a turbulent environment. As yet, it is not clear whether ‘environment’ means the external environment which affects school structure, or whether it is the extent of certainty within school climate which has this impact over structure.

Some researchers contend that roles, positions and authority are determined by elements such as the shared values of members and the nature of the tasks. This view is supported by Everard and Morris (1990: 163):

“The appropriate structure, management style, etc., are contingent on what the organisation (or part of it) is there to do”

O’Neill (ibid.: 111) advocates a compromise and argues that Structure serves as a balance between variables such as the size, the type of institution, and the range of activities:

“The actual structure will be determined in large part by the culture within the organisation, ultimately being an accommodation between the demands of the organisation’s activities, the existing roles of people in management positions, the degree of motivation of people within the organisation.”
Elements of structure

School curriculum

The dilemma of management the curriculum is introduced by Lofthouse et al. (1995). On the one hand, they claim that “managing the curriculum suggests that you have some specialist knowledge of the academic area being managed” (ibid.: 4). On the other hand, if ‘the school is the curriculum’ then managing the curriculum is only a sub-set of generic management and, therefore, does not require expertise. The most noteworthy issue in the literature as regards the curriculum is the discrepancies between what the curriculum is like and what it should be like. Thus, Kelly (1999) introduces concepts that are used in the literature such as the ‘hidden’ curriculum, ‘planned’ and ‘received’ curriculum, ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ curriculum.

The ‘hidden’ curriculum encompasses “those things which pupils learn at school because of the way in which the work of the school is planned and organised” (Kelly, 1999: 4). Values and attitudes are equally embedded within the ‘hidden’ curriculum. Similarly, the ‘planned’ curriculum reflects “what is laid down in syllabuses, prospectuses”, whereas the ‘received’ curriculum is “the reality of the pupils’ experience” (ibid.:5). On the basis of Kelly’s argumentation, it might be contended that the cause of any mismatch between ‘hidden’ and ‘planned’ curriculum might result from deliberate attempts made by schools to make what is offered appear more attractive than it really is.

Despite the impact of school management and the Ministry on the curriculum, the aspect of the individual teacher needs to be explored too. This belief is expressed by Fullan (1993:10): “The building block is the moral purpose of the individual teacher. Scratch a good teacher and you will find a moral purpose”. Kelly (1999: 9), too, states that “the teachers have a ‘make or break’ role in any curriculum innovation”, and no curricular change can succeed unless teachers fully accept the underlying rationale of the activity. In fact, until some decades ago, curriculum development was associated with teachers’ development (Stenhouse, 1975). However, the statutory requirements of the 1988 Education Act have converted the relationship with the government from influence on the curriculum to direct control. These coercive methods resulted in a situation in which “teachers now have little or no say in the
official curriculum of the nation's schools” (Kelly, 1999: 10). Thus, in earlier periods teachers believed in what they were doing whereas at present it seems to be more difficult to recruit them towards curricular changes.

Different researchers (e.g. Hargreaves, 1989) argue that the National Curriculum resulted in a shift of focus from a diagnostic function of students’ assessment for their future educational provision, to an emphasis on figures for ‘league tables’. Kelly (1999) supports this view by claiming that a shift has been made from a focus on ‘values’ to an emphasis on the ‘delivery’. In addition, the writer states that the adoption of the National Curriculum in England and Wales accords with the serves as evidence for teachers’ disempowerment:

“To endeavour to bring about change from outside the school, is to view the teacher as a technician rather than a professional, as an operative rather than as a decision-maker, as someone whose role is merely to implement the judgements of others and not to act on his or her own”. (ibid.: 113).

It might be encapsulated that the damage of the National Curriculum for the professional standing of teachers lies in the fact that “it represents a technicist rather than an ethical approach to curriculum development” (ibid.). Kelly suggests that “the curriculum development is essentially a matter of local development, that it requires a form of ‘household’ innovation” (ibid.: 115). Indeed, the writer’s view is that the dissemination model itself caused the failure of the curricular change.

Kelly (ibid.) introduces three models to curriculum planning. The first model, however, relates to the curriculum in terms of knowledge acquisition. Hence, teachers are mainly interested in the content of knowledge they wish to transmit or a list of subjects to be taught. The main criticism of this model is that it tends to proceed in a piecemeal way within subjects rather than according to an overall rationale. The second model, the ‘objectives’ model, is featured by aims and objectives. Kelly (ibid.: 81) advocates that “aims and processes cannot be separated; the aims are reflected in the processes and the processes are embodied in the aims”. Thus, educational planning should not be defined merely in terms of outcomes or clear aims, but also in terms of processes and development. However, one of the major criticisms of the
‘objectives’ model of curriculum planning is that it is passive in its nature and operates according to pre-determined goals. The third model of curriculum planning, the ‘developmental’ or ‘process’ model is concerned with the development of the individual and will be discussed in the context of inclusive structures.

The three ideologies are reflected in the selection of content too: the ‘knowledge’ model sees the content as the central issue of the curriculum, the ‘objectives’ model places its aims in the centre and suggests that content be selected to fulfill the aims, and the ‘developmental’ model suggests that the content should fit the processes it is concerned with. It appears that the writer expresses criticism concerning the first and the second curriculum ideologies and advocates the third model. As regards the ‘knowledge’ model it is contended that a curriculum should offer more than a statement about knowledge-content, and it has to provide a rationale of a total curriculum rather than an accumulation of subjects. The ‘objectives’ model is not concerned with the aims of education but rather offers a mechanism for achieving the aims. Hence, it is considered as ‘an instrumental process’. However, it is the ‘developmental’ model which “puts to us the notion of education as the promotion of the human development” (ibid.: 97) while relying on moral and democratic principles (Kelly, 1995).

Staff development, staff training and support

Human resources are “the most valuable asset” to educational organisations (O’Neill, in Bush and West-Burnham, 1994:199) and people are “key components and motors of change” (Morrison, 1998: 35). Indeed, classroom teachers should be placed at the apex of the traditional management pyramid as key players in the context of effective SEN provision (O’Neill, 1996). Part of human resource management (HRM) is to make people perform better than they seem capable of, and help them reach their optimum levels (Drucker, 1988; Riches and Morgan, 1989). The empirical literature (e.g. Fox and Ysseldyke, 1997) suggests that the success of inclusion stands or falls on the availability and expertise of in-class support, which relates to the amount of financial resources made available to employ support staff, the training and professional supervision they receive, and finally their teaching methods.
Since the introduction of LMS, schools have been empowered to devise their own in-service training courses to meet their specific needs. Studies (e.g. Bradely, 1991) distinguish between school-based in-service training (SBIT) and school-focussed in-service training (SFIT). Whereas the former refers to training courses conducted by external experts that take place at school, the latter focus on training designed specifically for school’s or teachers’ needs. Researchers (e.g. Natham, 1990) consider SFIT as advantageous because it reduces professional burnout and isolation by developing cooperative collegiality in planning and setting direction for school. Yogev (1997) has contended that SFIT has become part of school-restructuring movement which emphasises teachers’ professional development. Indeed, Sabar and HaShahar-Francis (1999) have discovered that school-focussed in-service training help in achieving school improvement even in schools where management is centralistic.

The writers (ibid.) have postulated that in schools with a hierarchic-centralistic structure, the in-service training was decided upon by the headteacher without consulting the teachers, whereas in decentralised professional structures the SFIT was characterised by teachers’ responsibility and influence, open and free communication among staff, and mutual concern.

However, in-service courses have been scrutinised on the basis of being ‘quick-fit’ solutions which do little to address long-term development needs (e.g. Lally et al., 1992). Fullan (1991: 315) described them as being ”frustratingly wasteful”.

Ainscow’s (1994) suggestion is that teachers need to be involved in negotiating their own courses to ensure their relevance.

Researchers (e.g. Thousand and Villa, 1989) argue that most barriers to effective inclusion are attributed to administrative disinterest and lack of support. Hall (in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998) maintains that headteachers should constantly ask themselves what support for motivation and development teachers might need. However, Bowd (1991) contends that there are few examples of administrative roles and strategies designed to support staff towards meaningful inclusion. The need for support is strengthened by Fullan (1991) and Lally (1993). The latter suggests support networks and quality circles to help teachers discuss their problems and relieve their
loneliness. In her research work about SEN training, she recommends courses on elements related to learning difficulties and challenging behaviours, such as short and long-term interventions, psychological therapies, stress management and support techniques. While reporting their research, Lacey and Porter (1998) argue that teachers preferred to include practical and relevant activities in their SEN training. Villa (1989) presents four areas of training required by staff which involve a change in school structures: collaborative teaming processes, instructional student management practices, peer tutoring models, and the use of supervisory models.

It might be concluded that some researchers (e.g. Harris et al., 1996) express concern while facing the little specialist support for teachers who work with students with SEN.

Channels of communication

The following definition was adopted in this research: “A message transferred satisfactorily from one party to another so that it can be understood and acted upon if necessary” (Rasberry and Lemoine, 1986:23)

Rogers and Roethlisberger (1952) contended that the greatest barrier to effective communication is ineffective listening. Indeed, communicating vision and motivating teachers are assumed to be related to leadership styles, as part of leadership is the development and communication of a shared vision (Kouzes and Posner, 1996). Other sources of clashes might be personality clashes and departmental rivalries (Riches, in Bush and West-Burnham, 1994). Riehl (2000) summarises existing literature by arguing that the way a leader fosters new meanings about diversity promotes inclusive practices and builds connection between the school and the community. It also determines the degree of inclusion and transformation the leader will practice.

The aspect of democracy and openness of communication is offered by Skidmore’s (1999: 26) findings, which deny the need to establish consensus as a precondition for successful inclusion. A study conducted in two secondary schools suggests that “an open-ended dialogue between contrasting discourses of teaching and learning is vitally necessary to the fostering of a dynamic school culture”, and this can be achieved via the creation of conditions which favour a continuous dialogue.
As regard this specific study, efforts should be made that all professionals ‘speak the same language’ so that misunderstandings are avoided. This is a hard task due to the lack of consensus in defining and identifying LD. It has already been argued that LD are defined differently by different role holders, and in various geographical locations. The individual educator’s viewpoint, skills, knowledge, prejudices and attitudes might affect the way inclusion is perceived.

Another issue which is related to communication is implementation systems. Cardno (in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998) offers a survey of the main existing structures which aim at promoting collaboration. The Ringi technique is a Japanese structure which involves circulation of a written document amongst individuals or groups, and enables a leader to gather information quickly. This technique may be used in the form of a noticeboard Ringi, when staff responds on a notice provided. It can equally be used via electronic communication, such as the Internet. The Formal Meeting structure enables information to flow up and down the system while providing feedback, whereas special meetings are held to discuss specific issues.

The Delphi technique is a forum of discussion-at-a-distance, in which the leader prepares a set of statements and circulates them among those involved, until he/she reaches a summarised draft in which areas of agreement and disagreement are highlighted. This may further be used as materials for discussion for a meeting. Its administration is anonymous and ensures objectivity. The Nominal Group technique is a structured meeting which follows a prescribed format. The leader provides members with an opening statement, to which each member responds individually, until finally responses are refined to a collective statement which is presented to the whole staff. This structure profits from the use the expertise of individuals as well as the wisdom of the group.

It is maintained that Cardno’s (1998) model offers an excellent means to explore the flow of information across school, as well as headteacher’s attitudes towards hierarchy, power/freedom of employees, and school culture.
The role of middle managers

The literature acknowledges the importance of middle managers to organisations. Below are some of the arguments presented in the literature:

“Middle managers have long been recognised as crucial to an organisation’s success” (Earley, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998: 158)

“Leaders need assistants who can transmit the vision on through the organisation, articulate it in practical terms, and work with their colleagues to turn it into reality” (Bennett, 1995: 18)

“...spreading understanding of the leadership and support for that direction so that everyone works to the same objectives” (ibid.: 137)

Indeed, middle managers control and influence the flow of information, and thus, they become potential agents of change. However, Bush (1995: 73) postulates in the light of political models that although empowered by school leaders, middle managers are interested in enhancing their own departments and are likely to restrict to their departmental viewpoint: “Interest groups develop and form alliances in pursuit of particular policy objectives. Conflict is viewed as a natural phenomenon...”. This idea might be applied to the clash between SENCO and Head of Departments at schools whose main interest is mainstream education.

Stone and Clark (2001) argue that school counselors as middle managers in particular can help establish a vision and high aspirations among the staff regarding every student. West and Idol (1993) add that the training counselors receive in communication, interpersonal relationships, problem solving, and conflict resolution enables them to encourage the collaboration among colleagues for the sake of students. Cooper and Sheffield (1994) present a collaborative management model in which headteachers and school counselors’ roles are interchangeable, allowing them to work together.

Upon the first layer of enquiry, the role of middle managers seems to pertain to bureaucratic structures, “with formal chains of command between the different
positions in the hierarchy” as suggested by Bush (1995: 35-6). Yet, it might also be asserted that in more flexible structures, middle managers can serve as a glue which links departments or individuals to one another horizontally, rather than acting along formal hierarchies.

The role of external consultants

The structure of external consultants in education has developed overtime. The main dilemma is introduced by Miles (1987) via the concepts of ‘expertise-seeking’ versus ‘self-reliance’. Indeed, Fullan (1991: 225) claims that school should “develop its own internal capacity to assist and manage both the content and the process of change, relying selectively on external assistance to train insiders and to provide specific program expertise in combination with internal follow-through”. Indeed, Fullan believes that the internal consultant whose main job is to set the system of initiation and follow-through, must become the master of the change process. Fullan (1991: 226) encapsulates empirical literature by stating that external consultants are effective “only when there is an internal consultant or team that supports their activities”.

However, there is no consensus in the literature as for the effectiveness of external bodies. Aoki et al. (1977) reported that in a survey of 1488 teachers in British Columbia, teachers placed ‘Teacher Federation Professional Development Staff’, ‘University Faculty of Education Personnel’, and ‘Ministry of Education Consultants’ at the very bottom of a list of 13 support services. This was further supported by Berman and McLaughlin (1977) who concluded that external consultants were superficially or poorly used.

Conversely, Louis and Rosenblum (1981:7) found in a study which evaluated the R&D Utilisation Project in the United States that “much of the importance of the agents (‘linkers’) can be attributed to the role that they played on-site in both stimulating committees to stay active and to reach decision points, and also of providing logistical support to ensure that the meetings were scheduled regularly, that suggestions for consultants were obtained, etc”.
Monitoring performance
Carnall (1999) asserts that monitoring performance is important because it allows the organisation to implement change more effectively and speedily, and it makes future changes easier to implement because “the organisation will have become more adaptable” (p. 159). However, Carnall’s model of monitoring involves reorganisation, because once ineffectiveness is identified, expertise (could be a new department, internal or external consultants) and in-house staff training are required and this intervention will eventually lead to re-assessment which is another sort of monitoring. Thus, this process is circular and re-assures a perpetual change (Figure 2.15).

![Diagram of monitoring performance]

**Figure 2.15** A model of monitoring as part of change implementation (based on Carnall, 1999)
Inclusive structures

Sebba and Ainscow (1996: 10) define inclusive structures as “providing feedback on existing classroom arrangements...as to how these arrangements might be improved in ways which would be of benefit to all members of the class”. Researchers agree that inclusion requires “a wide array of school-wide modifications to succeed” (Zollers et al., 1999:162) which range from staffing and curriculum to assessment and instructional practices (Lipsky and Gartner, 1997; Skrtic, 1995). Without such modifications, Barth (1996, in Zollers et al., 1999: 158) contends that an inclusive programme is “merely a modification of the preexisting dual system of education and fails to meet the requirements of inclusion”. Further, Henderson (1994) argues that placing disabled students into existing classrooms will make them unsure where they belong.

The holistic approach postulates the “identification and minimising of barriers to learning and participation and the maximising of resources to support learning participation” (Booth et al., 2000: 13). Sommefeldt (2001: 157) emphasises the significant move forward in the general perception of inclusion because in the past ‘integrated’ students were expected to “fit the dominant mould”, and “prove their suitability for normal schooling, rather than schools having to adapt to meet their needs”.

Much emphasis is placed by researchers on the social aspect of inclusion, and school’s willingness to assist SEN students in socialisation processes (Cole, 1991; Thousand and Villa, 1989). This is reflected in the definition of inclusion in the DfEE (1998: 23): “The participation of all pupils in the curriculum and the social life of mainstream schools; the participation of all pupils in learning which leads to the highest possible level of achievement; and the participation of young people in the full range of social experiences and opportunities once they have left school”.

This view is negated by proponents of a social theory of disability (Morris, 1991) who assume that physical, cultural, and institutional arrangements of schools play little or no part in enabling or disabling the child (Slee, 1991).
According to Ainscow (1995) the concept of structures might be interpreted as a two-layer change. Ainscow (1995: 1) contrasts ‘integration’, which implies “additional arrangements...within a system of schooling that remains largely unchanged” with a deeper layer of ‘inclusive education’ which means “to restructure schools in order to respond to the needs of all children”.

Skrtic (1991a) incorporates the literature on organisational theory with the issue of catering for students with widely diverse needs. His main claim is that the professional bureaucracy is congruent with the common image of secondary schools because of a number of reasons:

- Secondary teachers have been trained to provide knowledge in a specific area;
- Teachers are provided with autonomy in their work;
- They work in relative isolation from their colleagues;
- They provide standardised programmes.

MacKinnon and Brown (1994) advocate that SEN students cannot be easily pigeonholed into the standard response of a professional bureaucracy and thus they support Skrtic’s view that schools should transform into adhocracies in order to accommodate students with widely diverse needs in mainstream classes. The adhocracy, too, relies on the expertise of its professionals, but these professionals are assembled in multi-disciplinary teams which deal with problems in a novel way, not by standardised response. The co-operative efforts of the professionals working together generate new knowledge.

The practical differences in approaches to inclusion are demonstrated in Figure 2.16. Two dimensions of managerial responses to inclusion in mainstream education are suggested (Dyson et al., 1994). Whereas ‘categorical provision’ advocates that learners are grouped according to their abilities or inabilities to enable the transmission of knowledge, ‘responsive provision’ is premised on diversity between learners, and acquisition of knowledge is perceived as a process in which meaning is constructed through learning experiences.
Traditionally, North American and European schools advocate a ‘lock step’ curriculum approach, according to which classes are structured by grade (age) levels, rather than by assessed individual needs (Thousand and Villa, in Ainscow, 1991). The shift towards the ‘responsive’ pole indicates a move away from categorisation.

‘Responsive’ provision advocates that curriculum is neither tailored to LDS’ needs, nor that focus is placed on remediation of basic skills as a pre-requisite to gaining access to mainstream curriculum. The concepts of ‘hierarchy of knowledge’ and SEN are replaced by ‘a process of learning’ and by a recognition of different ways or speed in data processing. This means that students (including LDS) are constantly exposed to a broad curricular choice, engaged in a process of constructing their own meaning (ibid.). This shift might also involve a move from SEN coordinator to a teaching and learning coordinator.

![Figure 2.16 Two dimensions of SEN provision in mainstream secondary schools (Dyson et al., 1994)](image)

It is noteworthy that the concept of ‘hierarchically ordered knowledge’ as opposed to ‘learning through participating’ presented in this model are compatible with the shift from ‘function’ to ‘process’ as part of the structural change. Thus, in both cases the
focus lies on how things change rather than on their outcome. Clearly, this shift involves organisational ‘whole-school’ re-structuring alongside the recognition of individual needs. This can be seen by the move from “categorical educational services (e.g. general education, vocational education, special education classes and pull-out services) to a unified educational system in which support would be available to any student or teacher as needed” (Brookover et al., 1982: 169).

Yet, it is maintained that the ability to address a diversity of needs actually relies on the need to categorise individual learners because the concept ‘diversity’ implies the recognition of different levels. In addition, although the shift towards ‘responsive’ provision aims to refer to all learners it is clear that in most cases mainstream students do not require any restructuring of curriculum or different teaching styles whereas SEN students do.

One example of whole-school structures was observed in some schools in North America, such as the Winooski (Vermont) and School District (Villa and Thousand, 1988), where job functions and professional labels were substituted by a single job description labeled ‘teacher’. Indeed, the acknowledgement that “all teachers are teachers of children with special educational needs” (Dessent, 1987: 25) determines a departure from the traditional SEN support in mainstream schools towards a ‘whole-school approach’ which advocates mainstream structures (Table 2.28). This shift involves restructuring roles and responsibilities to foster the involvement of all staff in meeting SEN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Special’ structures</th>
<th>Mainstream structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special sub-committees</td>
<td>Primary/secondary sub-committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education budget</td>
<td>Budgets for primary/secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors/inspectors for special education</td>
<td>Advisors/inspectors for phase and subject areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments/teams of SEN</td>
<td>Departments/teams – phase, curriculum, subject areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial/special education teachers</td>
<td>Class subject area teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.28 Special structures and mainstream structures (after Dessent, 1987)*
The issue of organisational size is also related to inclusive structures. Burnes (1996) associates larger organisations with hierarchical and bureaucratic structures, and smaller organisations with flexible and organic structures. Evidence implies that in secondary schools which are larger than primary schools, the development of flexible structures is problematic, and effective management is defined by “clearly defined areas of authority and autonomy at subject department or faculty level” (Bolam et al., 1993: 125).

A shift in school structures is linked to theories of inclusion. For example, there are three approaches as to how ‘make things happen’ as regards inclusive curriculum: according to the Whole School Approach, the same curriculum should be made accessible to all students. This ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach (Fuchs and Fuchs, 1995) has been criticised on the basis of creating differentiated levels of the curriculum rather than a shift of knowledge (Thompson and Barton, 1992). The second approach offers additional support in the context of regular curriculum. In this regard it is advocated in the WCSNE (1994) that school support should range from minimal help extending to external specialist support. The third approach favours an alternative curriculum (Evans et al., 1995) which includes remediation of basic skills unrelated to their curricular experiences.

Tod (1999) advocates the IEP practice despite some reservations. She claims: “Whilst it can be argued that IEPs neither promote excellence or equality (Skrtic, 1991), and are not a necessary or desirable feature of inclusion, it is true to say that many of the features of effective IEP provision mirror conditions cited as being important for inclusion”. Tod reviews the positive features of IEPs and the areas of concern in the twenty-year history in the USA and the five-year history in the UK (since the introduction of the Code of Practice in 1994). The main element on her list of disadvantages seems to be that IEPs could lead back to the ‘remediation deficit’ model for SEN provision because of their schematic pattern, whereas the main advantage seems to be that IEP is a vehicle for raising attainment for all students.

In fact, IEPs are considered as part of the more general issue of inclusive curriculum. Tod (1999:186) suggests that the basis of inclusive strategies is a shift from ‘access and recognition’ to ‘engagement’ and ‘generation of responses’. This shift means a
move from students’ passive accessibility to active engagement, which will enable students to profit more from the curriculum.

Kelly (1999) presents the ‘developmental’ model by which in a democratic society the curriculum should promote the equality of provision. This curriculum operates as follows: “It must do this not by offering a package of subjects and programmes of study on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, and thus creating, as we have seen, more opportunities for failure, disaffection and alienation than for freedom, equality and participation. It must do so by seriously and genuinely seeking to provide all young people with an educational diet which will secure them entry to and involvement in the democratic social context of which they are part” (ibid.: 89).

Indeed, current literature attributes inclusive curriculum to the rights of individuals. For example, Bernstein (1996) speaks of three pedagogic rights:

- The right to individual enhancement;
- The right to be included socially, intellectually, culturally and personally;
- The right to participate in procedures.

Similarly, Edwards and Kelly (1998b: 12) emphasise “the right of each individual to a form of education which will advance his/her development as an individual, which will offer enrichment, and indeed, social and political empowerment”. Further, an inclusive curriculum should not comprise “entitlement to a range of school subjects” but “entitlement to a process of development in which all of one’s potential and capacities will be cultivated and amplified to the fullest possible degree” (Kelly, 1999: 89).

School-based curriculum might also be considered as a form of inclusion as it addresses the specific needs of students. Skilbeck (1976: 93-4) states: “Schools need greatly increased scope and incentive for adapting, modifying, extending and otherwise reordering externally developed curricula than is now commonly the case. Curriculum development related to individual differences must
be a continuous process and it is only the school or school networks that can provide scope for this”.

A major stepping-stone to inclusive curriculum might derive from Dimmock and Walker’s (2000) postulation that curricular re-structuring emphasises creativity, problem-solving skills and higher-order thinking skills. This might present a problem to LDS who might face difficulties regarding the second and third elements of learning. Similarly, Rose and Howley (2001) contend that an ‘outcomes-driven curriculum’ which is judged via performance tables is a direct impediment and a disincentive to schools.

As the implementation of the process of inclusion is problematic, an enquiry of the issues of accountability and monitoring has been made. Indeed, the Audit Commission Report (1992: 57) advocates accountability: “Delegation (of SEN budget) should go hand in hand with accountability”. One of the positive features of IEPs according to Tod et al. (1998) is the increase of monitoring of individual students. At the same time, the writers express concern with reference to the maintenance and monitoring of IEPs up to a point where IEPs remain static documents or become too simplified.

By 1974 nearly 40 states in the USA have attempted to establish a legal base for demanding the accountability of teachers (Hamilton, 1976). Indeed, this model of accountability that was adopted in the USA accords with the ‘management by objectives’ model that has been discussed in respect of school curriculum. It is called the ‘instrumental, bureaucratic model’ (Kelly, 1999: 153), or the ‘systematic efficiency model’ (Stenhouse, 1975: 185). Another model of accountability is the ‘intrinsic, democratic model’ (Kelly, ibid.).

Although the two models refer to teachers’ accountability in general, it is argued that they can be applied to the inclusion of LDS. The main criticism of the bureaucratic model is that it suggests that what cannot be measured cannot be taught (Sockett, 1976b) and that it cannot be translated into behavioural terms (Elliott, 1976). These arguments seem to be relevant to LDS’ inclusion, because certain parts of the process of inclusion cannot be measured, such as the level of inclusive values. Conversely,
the ‘intrinsic, democratic’ model seems to be more suitable for this purpose because it is based on a recognition that educational value resides in the teaching-learning process rather than in its outcomes (ibid.).

Kelly (ibid.) concludes that currently the focus of accountability at schools is placed on ‘control’ rather than on ‘development’, and this orientation is mainly punitive. Thus, schools that are ‘failing’ close down and ‘incompetent’ teachers are fired. The final evidence that the educational system is bureaucratic rather than democratic is that “the stick has replaced the carrot as the preferred motivational device” (p. 157).

Empirical evidence for inclusive structures

Lee and Henkhusens (1996) introduce the main findings from a National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) which highlighted the importance of resources, in terms of time, staffing and funding in successful inclusion practices. In addition, they maintain that ongoing staff training and monitoring procedures are also related to effective inclusion.

There is a growing body of evidence from studies within school effectiveness regarding the key role of middle managers in school improvement (Sammons et al., 1997; Harris et al., 1995; Turner, 1996; O’Neill, 1996). Recent legislation place SENCOs at the heart of school provision (Dyson et al., 1994). References were made to middle managers as ‘king-pins’, ‘the engine room’, or ‘the hub of the school’ (HMI, 1984: 8).

However, empirical evidence regarding the SENCO reports contrary findings. Indeed, a study conducted at Leicestershire indicated that SENCOs are not provided with the authority for decision-making required for that purpose (Sommefeldt, 2001). In addition, the role of SENCO was often an ‘add-on’ to other roles and could even be part of the headteacher’s role. Consequently, it did not sufficiently influence inclusion practices within schools. Sommefeldt (2001) offers empirical evidence with regard to inclusive structures in four schools in England Midlands on the issues of roles and responsibilities, curriculum delivery and resourcing. She found that although the SENCO was a key staff member, responsibility for SEN was mainly in the hands of
the curriculum deputy in mainstream schools. Further, in all mainstream schools SEN issues had a high profile and priority. However, it is noteworthy that the method of enquiry applied in this study has not included any triangulation measures and relied mostly on interviews with headteachers whose natural inclination is to introduce their schools in a positive light regarding inclusive practices.

In practice, the role of SENCO takes different forms and content in different schools and so does the role of support teachers (Hart, 1986; Visser, 1986; Dyer, 1988). Bines (1986) highlighted the conflicts between subject teachers and support teachers, while the former expected the latter to take full responsibility for provision for LDS. There is also considerable evidence that the provision of another adult teacher (such as a support teacher) maintains students’ exclusion rather than inclusion from the curriculum (Allan et al., 1991; Bines, 1986).

The first annual report (1998-9) of the Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) identified a number of issues that need to be addressed, particularly in the area of curriculum development for students with learning difficulties. Fennick (2001) found out that the success of inclusive curriculum is also dependent upon the support of SEN staff who co-taught with mainstream teachers and made appropriate accommodations to allow all students access to curricular activities. And finally, Vermont schools demonstrate a good model for inclusive structures by having contracted a permanent substitute who rotates among schools and relieves general education teachers to participate in meetings concerning SEN students in their classes (Villa and Thousand, 1990).

**The relationship between culture, structures, and leadership**

While lists of classroom and school factors to achievement have been compiled on the basis of research, there is not enough evidence as to the interrelatedness or weight of the individual or groups of factors, such as school or class factors (Gerry et al., 1999).

**The influence of leadership on culture and structures**

There seems to be a consensus among researchers on the impact of leaders on school culture (Hoyle, 1986; Blase and Anderson, 1995; Campbell and Southworth, 1992).
It is believed that heads are the ‘founders’ of their school’s culture. Bush and Coleman (2000) point out that leaders should diagnose the prevailing culture and seek to modify it if it is inconsistent with new strategic aims. Sergiovanni (1984: 9) expresses the importance of leaders in the following paragraph:

“The net effect of the cultural force of leadership is to bond together students, teachers, and others as believers in the work of the school...As persons become members of this strong and binding culture, they are provided with opportunities for enjoying a special sense of personal importance and significance”

However, Morgan (in Preedy, 1993: 42) criticises the clear link made in the literature about the impact of leaders on culture. He claims that in reality their influence is much more limited, and they cannot control culture in the sense that many management writers advocate: “(Leaders) have begun to adopt new roles as corporate gurus attempting to create new forms of corporate consciousness”. Moreover, “managers attempt to become folk heroes shaping and reshaping the culture of their organisation”.

Regarding climate, organisational literature maintains that leadership determines climate but at the same time its effectiveness is determined by it (Kozlowski and Doherty, 1989; Chelte et al., 1989). In addition, heads’ effectiveness is also linked to structural characteristics (Zheng, 1996). Bennett and Harris (1999) argue that structures are important expressions of power relationships and at the same time they are responsible for creating them.

Empirical literature (e.g. Clark and Clark, 2000:11) leads to the conclusion that school leaders develop a ‘responsive’ culture with emphasis on curricular reform. On the other hand, existing school cultures and norms “have been powerful forces in sustaining current unresponsive practices”.

**Structures and culture**

The relatively recent focus on organisational culture (e.g. Morgan, 1986; Nias et al., 1989) contributed to the shift from rigid, hierarchical management structures to the
development of terms such as ‘problem-solving culture’ (Schmuck, 1980), ‘culture of consent’ (Handy, 1989), ‘culture of collaboration’ (Nias et al., 1989), and ‘culture of expectation’ (West-Burnham, 1992). This focus on organisations as cultural phenomena derives from the belief that “organisations are in essence socially constructed” (Morgan, 1986: 131), and human resources enhance organisational goals (McGregor, 1960; Maslow, 1970). This new perspective implies “less overall control and much flatter management structures, with fewer layers of management and control than the systems model” (Law and Glover, 2000: 115).

Other researchers argue that parallel to the shift from school effectiveness to school improvement strategies (Hopkins, 1995) there has been a shift in the emphasis from structure to culture (Quicke, 2000) because school effectiveness is associated with structures, whereas improvement means understanding the process that school goes through in its search for effectiveness (Stoll and Fink, 1996; Bennett and Harris, 1999). However, in order to achieve a complete picture of how change is accomplished in organisations, both organisational structure and culture need to be explored (Law and Glover, ibid.).

There are different ways in which culture and structures are presented in the literature. Bush (1995: 136) argues that “structure may be regarded as the physical manifestation of culture. The values and beliefs of the institution are expressed in the pattern of roles and role relationships established by the school or college.”

West-Burnham (1997) refers to culture and structures as intention and practice or as inner and outer manifestations, and advocates that total quality provides the means to close the gap between intention and practice by changing the basis of organisational management. He uses Hopkins’ (1987) notion of ‘inscape’, which implies harmony between the outward expression and the unique inner quality.

Morgan (1986) argues that a focus on organisations as cultural phenomenon should lead to a reconceptualisation of structure as a derivative of culture. Similarly it is argued that structure serves as a reinforcement of culture, as people interpret ad hoc meetings in the light of their values and beliefs (Hoyle, 1986).
Other researchers (e.g. Harling, 1989) point out the tension between culture and structures. Whereas structures represent the official procedures and formal relationships that help achieve organisational goals, culture represents the informal networks of relationships and unofficial norms which exist within the formal structure. Similarly, Law and Glover (2000) assert that structures refer to roles and responsibilities and culture refers to the level of interaction and collaboration.

Turner (1990: 4) associates structures with myths, and claims that although relationships between role holders reflect “how people should react in given situations” in reality it is people’s interpretation which determines structures. For example, the structure of committees is subject to people’s interpretation, because “meetings are rich in symbolic significance” (Hoyle, 1986: 163-4). Morgan (1986) addresses structures and processes as cultural artifacts designed to support and maintain the desired organisational culture.

The so-called ‘superiority’ of culture over structure might be perceived in Torrington and Weightman (in Preedy, 1993) who argue that without a central sense of unity, schools are no more than a collection of people, whereas the effective school has a few central ideals which are operated by simple rules and clear procedures. Moreover, they claim that an organisation that depends principally on rules for its cohesion is in the process of decay.

Bush and Blease (2000) assert that ‘the delegation of responsibilities’ which is associated with structures can be seen as the reflection of ‘a sense of trust’ which is associated with culture. Although the writers do not use the word ‘reflection’, they claim that ‘delegation of responsibility’ is “an aspect of that trust” (ibid.:100). This indicates that structures are embedded within culture.

Conversely, researchers advocate the influence structures have on culture. Hopkins (1996: 37) believes that leaders may be able to generate culture through structural change: “Significant structural changes, especially ones that bring teachers into working more closely together, will affect how teachers talk to one another and define their professional relationships. It is through the new relationships and the content
and style of talk arising from structural changes, that the culture begins to shift”.
Moreover, Clarke (1994) argues that hierarchical organisations featured by a climate of fear and mistrust are transformed into a climate of openness, trust and support once structures are changed to flatter ones, with teamwork and network.

In the same way, Hargreaves (1995: 30-1) claims that “a structural change often has cultural consequences; a shift in the culture may alter social structures”, and although both are subject to change forces, it seems easier to “legislate about people’s work situation and practices rather than their values and beliefs” (ibid.). O’Neill (1994) argues that a complex organisational structure increases the possibility of developing multiple cultures. Griffith (1999) concludes that the density of student population in schools and classrooms results in a positive school climate and more easily managed schools.

Evidence related to the impact of structure and culture on students’ achievement can be withdrawn from Joyce et al.’s (1991) two-year study in 50 schools in the USA, which aimed to “restructure the workplace” in a gradual process of change (ibid.: 181). The researchers maintained that the provision of continuous training and support as well as the formation of collegial study groups created “quite rapidly” a learning climate, in which “the charisma of the most inspired teachers dominates the environment” (ibid.: 193). This piece of evidence seems to indicate that the new climate is created by the headteachers (‘provision of support’) as well as by the new structures (‘collegial study groups’).

A survey of the literature has revealed an inter-dependence between the concepts. Meyer et al. (1993) claim that school configuration consists of school leadership, structure and organisational climate. Pfeffer (1981) argues that an organisation’s culture and structure must support each other so that the organisation can operate efficiently and effectively. This view is supported by O’Neill (in Bush and West-Burnham, 1994) who argues that educational activities are interpreted in the light of values and beliefs, which in turn are reflected in the management structures that support them (Figure 2.17).
In a total quality school, structure, culture and leadership are intertwined: structure is a disc in which “autonomous teams are able to interact with their customers, each other, and with the center” (West-Burnham, 1997: 103). The function of the centre is to provide leadership, to empower and to facilitate the teams. This idea is summed up by O’Neill (1994: 117) who argues that “numinous organisations are characterised by a synergy of culture, structure and activities”. Table 2.29 provides examples for how this works out in ‘radical’ and ‘traditional’ structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td>Explicitly articulated</td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Implicitly articulated</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.29 The relationship between culture and structure in numinous organisations (O’Neill, 1994)

However, O’Neill’s model does not clarify the nature of this synergy. Thus, it could be argued that in organisations where activities are unpredictable, the structure will become radical and constantly changing. Conversely, in traditionally-structured organisations activities might tend towards routine. Bennett and Harris (1999: 539) argue that organisational change can be understood via the synergy of culture, structure and power because “both represent forms of constraint upon the individual,
and as such represent statements of power relationships between members of the organisation”. However, the fact that leadership is defined as “the nature and enforcement of power within an organisation” (ibid.: 548) gives reason to believe that culture and structure stem from leadership (Figure 2.18).
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**Figure 2.18 The three dimensions of organisational operation (Bennett and Harris, 1999)**

This view is supported by Busher and Blease (2000: 100) who maintain that “the style of leadership, however, does seem to be crucial”. However, it is claimed that both structures and culture contribute to a shift towards ‘education for all’. For example, the fact that special needs staff is to be seen as learning support to general staff (Sebba and Ainscow, 1996) represents a cultural shift, whereas the fact that responsibility rests with all teachers rather than with the learning support department alone might be seen as a structural shift. This might be achieved via collaboration between learning support staff and general staff by preparing materials and planning resources for all students.
The management of change of inclusion policies

The theoretical framework of inclusion

Recent literature on special education is full of debates regarding the essence of inclusion as well as means to achieve it (e.g. Rouse and Florian, 1996). Generally, researchers agree that an inclusive school is a school that has been subject to change and improvement (e.g. Sebba and Ainscow, 1996; Westwood, 1997). More specifically, Slee (1995) claims that the ‘discovery’ of more learning disabilities and SEN categories means that currently schools are unsatisfactory in providing needs for these populations. In this section attempts have been made to present the main educational philosophies as regards inclusion.

The first philosophy dates the 1970s and the 1980s when certain students were perceived as ‘having things wrong with them’, and had difficulties participating in the normal curriculum of schools (Bogdan and Kugelmass, 1984; Mercer, 1973). As a result Fish (1985) argued that LDS would be taken out of circulation to avoid disrupting ordinary children. This philosophy seems to accord with the ‘medical’ model which distinguishes ‘normal’ from ‘abnormal’ children in learning as well as in other areas of the individual (Skrtic, 1986). It is claimed that according to Ainscow’s (1990) categorisation, the approaches which might fit the practice of this philosophy are the ‘remedial’ approach which provides intervention to compensate for deficits in basic skills, and the ‘withdrawal’ (or ‘pull-out’) approach which advocates that students are withdrawn to a special class or school where they are provided with appropriate learning experiences. Fuchs and Fuchs (1994), too, maintain that the needs of SEN students cannot be properly met in mainstream classes.

The second philosophy argues that inclusive education is about responding to a diversity of students (Barton, 1997) in the light of social justice, equity and democratic participation (Clark et al., 1999) and as part of a wider interest in an inclusive society (Thomas, 1997; Booth and Ainscow, 1998). Indeed, ‘mainstream’ or ‘inclusive’ approach is an international movement that advocates educating all students in ordinary classroom settings irrespective of their differences in intellectual, physical, sensory or other characteristics (Ballard, 1992). What underpins this
approach is the belief that disability is not ‘a condition’ that people have but is rather created by a society that fails to meet the needs of all its members (Cahill, 1991). Some schools pushed inclusive policies ‘beyond the whole-school approach’ by questioning the sharp division between students with and without SEN (Clark et al., 1995). Accordingly, they shifted their attention from provision of SEN to the enhancement of ‘education for all’ from which vulnerable students can benefit too (Hopkins et al., 1994). This view is supported by MacKinnon and Brown (1994) who have replaced the terminology of ‘students with disabilities’ to ‘students with widely diverse needs’. In terms of educational practice, it is contended that ‘a second system’ provides disabled students with lower-quality instruction (Biklen and Zollers, 1986) and affords them second-class status by instructing them outside mainstream classes.

This approach influences the nature of SEN inclusion. Farrell (2000: 154) claims that “under this definition phrases such as ‘inclusive education for pupils with SEN’ become subsumed within the wider agenda of school improvement in the pursuit of ‘equity and excellence’ for all pupils”. Thousand and Villa (1989) express the belief that heterogeneity is beneficial and can meet the unique needs of each student. For example, the National Literacy Strategy in the UK is concerned with issues of writing for all pupils (Beard, 1999).

In the light of this philosophy, Tod (1999) suggests a shift from IEPs which are part of the Code of Practice (DfEE, 1994) in the UK and the twenty-year history in the USA, to Inclusive Educational Practices by increasing SEN training and support, as well as by moving away from procedures and paperwork towards practical SEN support. Similarly, Norwich (1996) suggests a shift from individual needs which stress individual differences to common needs which focus on the characteristics shared by all, such as the need to be involved, be valued and feel safe.

The third philosophy can be understood in the light of the shift from ‘within-child’ factors to school factors (Ramasut and Reynolds, 1993; Stoll, 1991). Reynolds (1988) supports this view and replaces ‘child blaming’ with ‘teacher blaming’. This shift called for an organisational reform rather than an individual treatment of SEN students. Ainscow’s (1991: 3) supports this idea:
“In attempting to conceptualise educational difficulty in a more positive way, we can more usefully see pupils experiencing difficulty as indicators of the need for reform”

Researchers within the organisational paradigm both in the UK (Ainscow, 1997) and in the USA (Skrtic, 1995) support Clark et al.’s (1999: 159) advocacy that “SEN are artefacts of practices in ordinary schools which can ultimately be traced back to the organisational characteristics of those institutions” and that “the whole apparatus of special education is not a means of responding to students ‘real’ needs, but of preserving the comfort and stability of the mainstream education system” (ibid.). The writers argue that learning deficits derive from inappropriate organisational responses, and effective inclusion is contingent upon schools’ willingness to develop structures and cultures which enable their staff to solve the problem of diversity by transforming schools into ‘adhocracies’, ‘learning organisations’ or ‘moving schools’. They conclude that “inclusive school, therefore, is different from the non-inclusive school not simply in terms of its commitment to inclusion, but also in terms of its internal structures and practices” (ibid.).

The need to consider organisational factors that are external to the individual is equally raised by Skrtic (1987) and by Hartnett and Naish (1990) who recognise that teachers’ success is constrained by wider school structures and systems. It is argued that in the main, the shift has been towards seeking responses on the organisational level rather than on the individual level. Slee (1996: 105) refers to the tensions between social justice and deficit models as “attempts to manage contests and orchestrate compromises”. His view is that inclusion is not about allocating further resources but about “a challenge to the structure and culture of schooling”. Yet, it might be claimed that addressing the diversity of needs via an organisational framework is another form of acknowledgement of the existence of individual differences.

Although school and classroom factors expressed as percentages do not appear exceptionally large when relating to the variance in student outcomes (between 12 to 18%) (Creemers, 1994), they can be highly significant educationally and statistically (Thomas and Mortimore, 1994). Riehl (2000) argues that fostering new beliefs about diversity and inclusive practice involves not only communicating these ideas but also
providing support. The writer argues: “Groups and individuals are thus not simply the recipients of new meanings, but their co-creators” (p.61).

Some researchers (e.g. Stoll and Fink, 1994) argue that the history and context of specific institutions should be considered regarding school improvement because each school has its own characteristics which are shaped by factors such as location, pupil intake, size, resources, and the quality of staff (Reid et al., 1987). Therefore, individual school factors should be considered alongside organisational factors such as school leadership or culture.

However, the fourth philosophy might be seen as an attempt to reconcile the ‘individual’ and the ‘organisational’ philosophies by the assertion that neither approach is firm enough to account for inclusion. The importance of Lunt and Norwich (1999) work lies in two main issues. Firstly, they set a framework of four levels (national, LEA, school and classroom level) which allows for a close inspection of the macro and micro levels of policy making and implementation, and enables the identification of the soft points along the process. For example, the fact that government is committed to “promoting inclusion where parents want it” (DfEE, 1998: 23) might present a problem in the implementation phase. Secondly, the four different models to inclusion which they introduce (Appendix 2) refer to ‘individual’s blame’ as well as to ‘organisation blame’, and differ in the degree of provision attended to individuals. Whereas the first two models focus on the place of inclusion, which is mainstream, the last two models focus on the individual with SEN.

Lunt and Norwich’s model can be also analysed via models of educational management presented by Bush (1995). It might be argued that the confusion embedded in ‘Full non-exclusionary inclusion’ might relate to ambiguity models which are featured by turbulence, whereas the ‘Focus on individual needs’ and ‘Choice-limited inclusion’ can relate to collegial models.

Farrell (1997) sets out three models for inclusion (Appendix 3). Farrell’s preference seems to expose as he reaches his third option. Indeed, ‘units in mainstream schools’ differs from ‘neighbourhood inclusion’ by the fact that it offers full structures for inclusion which come from savings from the closing down of the special school.
These structures consist of the special management of human resources, equipment, staff development systems, and funds. However, similarities have been observed between Farrell’s ‘neighbourhood inclusion’ and Lunt and Norwich’s ‘full non-exclusive inclusion’ and ‘participation in the same place’ as they advocate full provision in school without referring specifically to how this might be applied. In addition, Farrell’s ‘special school with outreach’ and ‘units in mainstream schools’ accord with Lunt and Norwich’s ‘focus on individual needs’ which prioritise individual needs.

The major similarity between Lunt and Norwich’s and Farrell’s models seems to be that both models identified the importance of Culture and Structures in the process of inclusion. Further, both models appear to be critical towards existing patterns of inclusion and towards almost every variation of inclusion. This can be seen in the use of terminology such as ‘practice seems to be impossible’, ‘unsuitable for LDS’, ‘increase of segregation and stigmatisation’, ‘damage to school climate’, or ‘high cost of operating’. However, this criticism supports the previous claim that these models make a reconciliation of the former philosophies, as they refer to within-child factors, organisational factors and the whole-school approach.

The references below reflect that the focus of inclusion is not uniform. Whereas Mortimore (1998) focusses on school’s necessity to promote the highest academic and other achievement for the maximum of its students, Lunt and Norwich’s (1999:35) argue that “it is the modal not the exceptional pupil who is the focus of interest. Schools are not identified as effective when their lowest attaining pupils show significant attaining gains”.

**Empirical evidence regarding inclusion**

The complexity of the issue of inclusion

Educational researchers tend to agree about the dissonance between inclusion as an educational principle and the realisation of this principle given the complexities of particular situations (Clark et al., 1995, 1999; Lee, 1996; Geijsel et al., 2001) Indeed, empirical evidence indicates that the academic improvement of LDS in inclusive programmes was not impressive (Manset and Semmel, 1997) and that some students
perform better under special education instruction (Salend and Garrick-Duhaney, 1999). Similarly, Vaughn and Klinger (1998) found that the majority of LDS in mainstream schools in the USA prefer to receive specialist help in a separate resource room, although they feel that mainstream classes are beneficial in social terms. However, Farrell (1997), and Sebba and Sachdev (1997) claim that evidence regarding the effectiveness of inclusion is insufficient.

The advocacy for inclusion that emerges from empirical literature (Lindsay, 1997; Farrell, 1997a) might be seen as irrelevant to some authors (e.g. Booth, 1996) who take the stance that inclusion is a human rights issue and therefore it is not open to research. Thus, advocating educational segregation would mean taking an anti-human rights perspective. This idea is strengthened by Thomas (1997) who contends that inequality, which is ‘pampering’ of mainstream schools, results in less pastoral systems and “in a pupil population which is less familiar and less accepting of difference and diversity” (p. 107). However, this issue might also be looked at in the light of the chronological appearance of the two stances, as argued by Avissar (1999). Thus, it is claimed that in the early years of the 1990s research focussed on philosophical and social aspects towards inclusion whereas during the second half of the 1990s researchers dealt with the practical aspect of the implementation.

Inclusion policies have been subject to scrutiny. A recent study of four secondary schools which were chosen for being committed to inclusive values and practices showed that being ‘good’ with SEN students came to be seen “as a doubled-edged sword, as it made the schools less attractive in the market place” (Clark et al., 1999). In addition, research pinpointed implementation problems. A cross-cultural study that was conducted between 1992 and 1994 in the UK and the USA was reported by Rouse and Florian (1996). It indicated that ‘a zero reject philosophy’ and the articulation of shared responsibility towards all students do not erase implementation problems which mainly derive from inadequate training and resources. Practice suggested that the concept of inclusion means different things to different people. This might be the reason that both inclusive and exclusionary practices were found to co-exist within some schools. This picture of inconsistency revealed severely disabled students integrated in regular classes, and in the same school segregated special classes for students with mild disabilities.
A survey conducted in 325 secondary schools by Margalit et al. (2000) in Israel aimed at the identification of differences in assessment policies and specific test accommodations for LDS in different sectors and geographic locations. As procedures and frequency of sending students to assessments is considered to be part of school attitudes towards LDS, findings from this study seem to be relevant. The report revealed that data regarding LDS was not organised or accessible and great effort was required to collect materials from students’ files. This might indicate lack of awareness towards the issue of LDS. The Arab and the Bedouin sectors were featured by low awareness towards LDS and insufficiency of assessment services.

This study unfolded a great diversity among schools in respect of the types and frequencies of test accommodations and assessments applied, as some schools apply didactic and/or psychological assessments whereas others hardly identify students with LD. For example, small-sized and ‘second-chance’ schools seem to encourage assessments. The report identified gaps which result from economic differences and from local initiatives which end up in the creation of more gaps.

An example for the complicated issue of SEN students in mainstream systems was demonstrated in a study conducted in the DfEE on the 1998 GCSE results among 200 schools (Lunt and Norwich, 1999). It aimed to examine the relationship between high results and high proportion of SEN students on roll. Findings indicated that the higher the performance of the school, the lower the proportion of SEN students. This negated the belief that mainstream schools can combine high academic performance and high proportions of SEN students. Yet, the writers pointed out that there are many more secondary schools that have above median GCSE performances as well as high proportions of SEN students.

Perception studies on inclusion
As empirical findings on the influence of school management on inclusion in this thesis will be drawn from staff perceptions, this section includes an overview of perception studies as well as studies on inclusion. Perception studies will address headteachers and teachers’ perceptions of headteachers’ role in the inclusion process, in an attempt to enhance understanding of attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion.
Three main ‘meta-analysis’ bodies of research regarding teachers’ perceptions towards inclusion are introduced below. The first was edited by Miller et al. (1996) and relies on the majority of 620 survey studies conducted between 1982-1993. These studies clearly illustrated that teachers’ perceptions and attitudes have a great influence on measures taken towards inclusion. The second body edited by Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) relies on 28 survey studies conducted between 1958-1995. Findings indicated that teachers’ perception of inclusion tends to be positive if the disability is not too severe. In addition, a direct relationship was discovered between management support, availability of resources including time and human resources, and SEN expertise, and between successful inclusion. Similarly, Villa et al. (1996) claimed that headteacher’s support and staff collaboration are perceived as important factors in the formation of positive attitudes. In addition, teachers perceive headteachers as being detached and ambivalent towards inclusion. The third body of research is introduced by Farrell (2000) and presents international findings on teachers’ attitudes: findings from Australia (Ward et al., 1994) indicated high levels of stress among teachers who experience SEN students in their class. Data from a small-scale study in the USA (Wood, 1998) suggest that a change of attitudes among mainstream teachers depends on careful management. However, there is little evidence as for UK teachers.

The idea of existing gaps between headteachers and teachers’ perceptions was suggested by Rose (2001). Indeed, headteachers’ perceptions towards inclusion were found more positive than teachers’ (Garvar-Pinhas and Schmelkin-Pedhazur, 1989). Yet, headteachers’ attitudes are similar to teachers’ in the sense that they are positive as long as they do not require significant curricular adaptations and as long as teachers can handle them (Barnet and Monda-Amaya, 1998). Indeed, Dyal et al. (1996) conclude that part of headteachers’ perception of inclusion is the recognition that it requires modifications in mainstream and in special education. In addition, significant differences were identified in the definitions and perceptions of inclusion among 65 headteachers (Barnet and Monda-Amaya, 1998). Arick and Krug (1993) reported a strong need for further training among headteachers on the issue of inclusion. They maintained that the broader the headteacher’s formal knowledge in SEN issues is, the greater the number of SEN students included in school. Empirical evidence also
suggests that younger headteachers are more open to inclusion (Center et al., 1985; Nelson, 1995).

**Inclusive practices**

One example of good practice of inclusion is reported by Sommefeldt (2001: 160) regarding the London Borough of Newham which is one of the UK ‘flagship authorities’ for inclusion. It acknowledged the fact that “a root and branch reform of the education service was required to bring about total inclusion in all its schools”. The main factors for the “fully inclusive” schools were full support at the level of local council as well as at the individual school level, shared understanding and motivation to move forward in a new way, and the creation of a new climate which made those who felt unable to commit themselves leave school and the authority.

The OECD’s follow-up study (1999) concludes that a fully inclusive public education system has not been established yet. Even in Italy, which was reported as the most advanced country regarding inclusion, examples were found of teachers who ignored SEN students or expected the support teacher to withdraw students from mainstream for the majority of the time. The UK was located in the middle of the continuum, whereas Germany was regarded as less advanced but more experimental. The report indicated that the main factors blocking inclusion seem to be a mixture of lack of political will (the macro level) and human resistance to change (micro level). However, the study demonstrated a dramatic drop in the number of ‘certificated’ students across secondary schools (from 2.23 per cent to 0.22 per cent according to 1993 figures).

Similarly, the work of Clark et al. (1999) on inclusion indicates lack of consistency in the ‘technology of inclusion’, which comprises the structures and procedures for enabling inclusion. Thus, “organisational learning sat alongside examples of routinised ‘shunting’” (Dyson and Gains, 1993). Arbitrary decisions were made as to which classes would get support, and school was found to be more inclusive for some students and less for others. Clark et al. (ibid.) assert that research foci should be placed on processes of inclusion and exclusion rather than its measurement.
Furthermore, special education was proved to be resilient and despite the commitment to inclusive principles, basic structures and assumptions of special education have not changed. Thus, the persistence of ‘ability grouping’ means that SEN students are segregated in ‘bottom’ classes where they have their ‘own’ intervention despite the commitment to the National Curriculum. Furthermore, teachers’ complaints were made regarding the inflexibility of the National Curriculum to respond to students’ diversity. Moreover, schools realised that inclusive principles made them less attractive in the market place and they began to think of how to reduce a further influx of such students. The researchers were surprised by “the extent to which the movement towards more comprehensive approaches is difficult to manage, the direction is unclear, and movement is at least as much circular as it is linear” (Clark et al., 1999: 167).

It is perhaps Tomlinson’s (1996) report of the Learning Difficulties and/or Disabilities Committee on the success of inclusion in Further and Higher Education which enhanced understanding of the drawbacks of the implementation of the inclusion process. The report is featured by the following managerial deficits: lack of training, lack of a corporate strategy to management, lack of corporate decision to provide for students in all faculties, ad hoc arrangements made by coordinators, lack of a curricular framework for LDS programmes, inadequate development of mechanisms for allocating and accounting, inadequate learning support, absence of a national framework for collaboration, lack of formal arrangements for collaboration, as well as serious shortcomings in the funds available for LDS. Findings also illustrate the absence of comprehensive quality assurance arrangements for monitoring learning, and the lack of high standards for provision designed specifically for LDS.

The studies of Center et al. (1989, 1991) indicate a positive correlation between headteacher’s and staff attitudes towards inclusion and the success of inclusion. Yet, it was impossible to determine the direction of causality between the two factors, because case study data suggest that school commitment has contributed greatly to the perceived success of the situation. This means that members in a school whose culture favours inclusion will perceive the inclusion as successful (Figure 2.19).
It might be concluded on the basis of empirical data that the process of inclusion has not been completed yet and it is featured by inconsistency and deficits on the managerial level.

**Managerial factors of inclusion and their inter-relationships**

As inclusive practices should cater for all abilities, attempts should be made to enhance the formation of an ‘individual-learning-environment’ which addresses needs of individual learners. This state can be achieved following an enquiry of the factors that play part in this process.

The importance of Tomlinson’s (1996) work regarding inclusion practices lies in the identification of managerial factors that influence the inclusion of LDS in further education. He acknowledged that deficits do not reside in the individual but within the institution and that fundamental changes should be made within the system (Appendix 4). The researcher’s ideas are similar to the ‘whole-school’ approach because he focusses on the average learner rather than on LDS. Indeed, he identified factors which are essential to the shift from separate support sections to the deployment of
staff across college. The key to change according to Tomlinson is through restructuring of roles and responsibilities. These new arrangements extend the responsibilities of staff for LDS, foster the role of coordinators as middle managers, and review the resource allocation for inclusive management. In addition, they enhance the establishment of management forums, which are meant to enhance collaboration and partnership.

According to the committee findings, culture proves to be an essential factor in the process of inclusion. Support for learning which was previously seen as a structure which fosters access to school curriculum, is now considered as part of a new learning environment. According to Tomlinson, the key to change seems to be placed mainly on structures and culture, whereas leadership and management’s influence on inclusion seem to be restricted. This analysis seems to be supported by the Inclusion Project (Thomas et al., 1998, Appendix 5) which attempts to clarify the process of change in schools with regard to students’ transition from special schools to mainstream schools. Again, the factors of structures and cultures appear to be more dominant on change than leadership.

The OECD (1995) was conducted in 19 member countries and a follow-up study (1999) in eight member countries with regard to the ‘whole-school approach’. The main findings demonstrate that both ‘flexible structures’ and ‘a shift in attitudes towards change’ (considered as part of culture) are major factors for successful inclusion. However, a closer look at both Tomlinson’s (Appendix 4) and OECD’s Tables (Appendix 6) might lead to different conclusions. Indeed, it is contended that Tomlinson’s ‘leadership’ and ‘strategic planning and management’ underpin the allegedly dominant factors of ‘structures’ and ‘culture’. For example, the ‘management of knowledge, skills, and training’ in the ‘leadership/management’ rubric is compatible with ‘a correct deployment of learning support assistants’ or with the ‘redesign of staff training for different types of learning support’ in the ‘structures’ rubric. Similarly, the ‘strategy for the allocation of finance to learning support’ is reflected in ‘adequate resources’ in the structures rubric.

The same conclusion can be drawn from OECD’s report. The ‘clearly stated goals’ in ‘leadership’ which are specified in ‘vision’ (e.g. ‘cater for individual needs’, ‘focus on
social and life skills and on academic achievements’) offer the framework for issues which appear in ‘structures’, ‘culture’ and ‘environment’ (e.g. ‘flexible and supportive school organisation’, or ‘activities aimed to achieve the stated goals’).

Thus, it might be postulated that leadership is a major element in the implementation of change. This analysis allows for the conclusion that leadership over-rides culture and structures as factors for inclusion. Thomas et al.’s (1998) study might lead to the same conclusion, because ‘The quality of management’ which appears under ‘leadership’ is reflected in any item under ‘culture’ or ‘structures’ such as ‘flexibility’ or ‘physical suitability’.

A relatively early study of inclusion in mainstream classes was conducted in Australia by Center et al. (1989) from Macquarie University. The clear advantage of this research is that it refers to eight specific groups of disabled children with regard to their academic and social integration, unlike other research which view SEN students as one category. One of the research categories was LDS. It aims at identifying ‘within-child’ and organisational factors associated with integration. Research findings indicate that 65% of the total sample of 69 students is regarded as successfully included. Overall data reflect a high degree of satisfaction with the mainstream placements.

Findings demonstrate that “most of the factors which predict success are modifiable and lie outside the child” (ibid.: 75). The main factors (‘measures’) that have been identified as associated with mainstream integration are the amount of structure in teachers’ instruction and strategies, the appropriateness of school provision which seems necessary to promote positive attitudes towards inclusion, and school ethos which is “the degree of commitment of the principal and other staff to integration in general and to the mainstreaming of the target child in particular” (ibid.: 20). Unlike the three previous research, school leadership does not appear to be central in this study which focusses on the shared commitment towards integration as well as the provision of adequate, appropriate and flexible structures.

In their 1991 study Center et al. introduce findings regarding inclusive structures for students with mild intellectual disabilities via support classes in mainstream education. While the factors for integration are the same as indicated in their 1989
study, this study highlights the factors of structures (e.g. curriculum modifications, appropriate integrated activities, physical location), and teacher factors (mainly staff development and expertise in SEN). They claim that support classes seem to be the least effective because they combine larger class sizes with non-specialist teachers, and no support or curriculum modifications.

The ‘inclusive’ philosophy relies on three main bodies of research. The ‘Improving the Quality of Education for All’ project (IQEA) aims to “provide an effective means of reviewing and developing practice within a school” which “helps schools to determine where they are in term of inclusion and exclusion” (Ainscow, 1999: 150). It draws on two previous pieces of research, the first of which was conducted in Australia (Centre, et al., 1991), and the ‘Programme Quality indicators’ (PQI) (Eichinger et al., 1996) which was developed in the USA.

The IQEA project seems to be mainly concerned with leadership. It suggests a shift from transactional approaches which sustain traditional concepts of hierarchy and control to transformational approaches which distribute and empower (Sergiovanni, 1992). This shift has implications on school culture which enhances team-work, empowerment, a problem-solving climate and collaboration. In fact, the research itself is based on collaborative inquiry with active involvement of a ‘critical mass’ of staff members, and it aims to help schools seek structures which enable collaboration and lead to the empowerment of individuals and groups (Ainscow, ibid.: 118). Indeed, the IQEA’s rhetoric is to work with the schools, not ‘on them’ (Ainscow and Southworth, 1996). It is contended that emphasis is placed equally on visionary skills, such as enhancement of awareness toward inclusion, as well as on the coordination of tasks and roles, such as staff development and training (Ainscow, ibid.).

The PQI seems to focus mainly on structures and practical responses to individual students, while concentrating on processes of inclusion and exclusion of students (Ainscow, ibid.). As argued above, the Australian research (Center et al., 1991) analysed provision with association to the quality and quantity of resources and staff training, structures of teaching styles and a positive school ethos.
Compiling evidence from previous research on inclusion-related factors are mainly school inclusive leadership, school inclusive culture and school inclusive structures, although the causal relationships established in the different bodies of research are varied. From the studies presented so far a shift in the focus can be observed from structures and culture to leadership: the PQI (1996) seems to focus on structures, and the Australian study (1991) focusses on the quality of structures and school ethos. However, the IQEA (1999), OECD (1995), Thomas et al. (1998) and Tomlinson (1997) highlight the importance of leadership more than culture and structures.

Sommefeldt (2001: 164) offers a summary to existing literature when she advocates “positive attitudes towards inclusion”, and “flexibility in approach” which are claimed to be part of school culture, “flexibility in practices” and “adequate resourcing” which are considered to be part of structures, and “committed and supportive leadership”, which is part of school leadership. Indeed, “implicit in all the research is that all pupils are capable of learning and that it is the job of schools to promote and support them in this, whatever their individual needs may be” (ibid.). This contention provides further support to the ‘mainstream’ or ‘inclusive’ philosophy as opposed to the ‘medical’ philosophy which relies on ‘within-child’ factors.

MacKinnon and Brown’s (1994) study reveals that structures and culture affect one another mutually. On the one hand, it is contended that a flexibly structured organisation can function only if the professionals work cooperatively and collaboratively to address problems. On the other hand, they claim that the transformation of professional bureaucracies into adhocracies creates a climate which fosters problem-solving and innovations.

Indeed, existing theoretical and empirical literature on inclusion prioritise organisational factors such as school leadership, school culture and internal structures to ‘within-child’ factors in the process of inclusion of SEN students. However, this line of thought seems to risk disregarding individual student factors as well as individual school factors which are necessary to gaining an in-depth understanding of the picture of inclusion.
Although this study will not examine effectiveness measures for inclusion, Rouse and Florian (1996: 83) conclude by stating that “procedures designed to evaluate the effectiveness of inclusion and illuminate the process of change are urgently required”.

**Summary of the literature review**

The literature review has attempted to explore school leadership, school culture and school structures in the context of inclusion policies in educational systems. This section aims at bringing together the theoretical and empirical elements that will be carried forward as a basis for analysis in the Discussion chapter.

Change and uncertainty seem to be the most evident facts in today’s schools. Therefore, the chapter comprised elements regarding the nature of change (Ferguson, 1982) in the context of incremental approach (Johnson, 1993), radical approach (Hurst, 1995) and phased models (Fullan, 1991). These will provide information in respect of the way the implementation of LDS’ inclusion as a process of change is conducted.

The review of the literature indicates that organisational factors rather than personal factors determine the process of the implementation, and that factors can be categorised into school leadership, culture and structures.

The chapter presents aspects of leadership and management roles. It comprises different models which account for the focus of leadership via elements of ‘concern for people or tasks’ (e.g. Blake and Mouton, 1978) and elements of ‘concern for power’ versus ‘freedom’ (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1973). At the same time, theories of Trait, Contingency and Style are presented separately as well as via eclectic approaches such as Handy’s (1993) and Myers’ (1995). As headteachers are perceived as managers of change, their behaviours can be evaluated via models such as Macmillan’s (1978) and Thompson’s (1993) which present strategies for overcoming staff resistance. Leaders’ focus during the process of change is discussed via key characteristics introduced by Duignon and Macpherson (1992) and Pettigrew and Whipp (1993). In addition, it points out recent empirical studies on leadership.
The chapter introduces the main elements of culture and contends that culture is related to change and improvement. It presents characteristics of culture and types of culture via existing models (e.g. Harrison, 1994; Hargreaves, 1995; Law and Glover, 2000). In addition, a categorisation of cultures into ‘old’ and ‘new’ cultures (Carnall, 1995) is provided, as well as to cultures which favour change (‘moving’) or which reject change (‘stuck’) (Rosenholtz, 1989). The concept of climate is explored as a sub-concept of culture. This exploration consists of elements of ‘the learning organisation’, ‘teamwork’ and ‘collaboration’ and their inter-relationship, because it is contended that these are the main features of ‘cultures of change’. This section ends with the recent empirical data on inclusive culture.

The chapter then introduces elements of structure and criteria for structural analysis via a categorisation into ‘old’ and ‘fashionable’ structures and their implications on school performance (e.g. Paisey, 1981). The relationship between structures and change is highlighted. The chapter then provides an overview of the main structural elements of this study: school curriculum, channels of communication, monitoring and accountability, the role of middle managers and of external consultants, staff development, training and support. In the second part of this section the issue of inclusive structures is discussed. The move towards a more ‘responsive’ provision is offered via Dyson et al.’s (1994) model. Recent empirical data are provided as regards the attempts for a structural shift. In addition, the chapter offers an overview of inclusive managerial elements such as the role of SENCO, inclusive curriculum, monitoring and accountability of SEN students.

Once the exploration of each perceived element is completed, the attempts to establish a relationship between Leadership, Culture and Structures. In fact, there is an ongoing debate in the literature in respect of the causal relationships between these elements. The main issues are whether leadership determines culture and structures or whether it is formed by them; whether culture and structure reflect respectively the inner and outer/informal and formal organisational manifestations or whether one generates from the other. This discussion is presented via models such as O’Neill (1994) and Bennett and Harris’ (1999).
The chapter offers the theoretical framework for inclusion and presents four major philosophies: the ‘medical’ or ‘within-child’ philosophy, the ‘mainstream’ philosophy, the organisational philosophy and a philosophy that represents a reconciliation of the previous ones. The fourth philosophy is analysed via the studies of Lunt and Norwich (1999) and Farrell (1997). In addition, the chapter overviews the empirical evidence regarding inclusion practices. The main conclusions of the empirical literature on inclusion are that organisational factors are important in the process of SEN inclusion (e.g. Tomlinson, 1996; OECD, 1995; IQEA, 1999) and that a shift in the focus has been currently made from Culture and Structures to Leadership as the main factor to inclusion.

However, it seems that the research approach and methodology should be selected with care to allow for valid and accurate analysis of such a sensitive issue.
Chapter III
Methodology

The purpose of the study
This thesis aims at the enhancement of understanding school leadership, school structures and school culture in the context of LDS’ inclusion in secondary schools in Israel. This will be achieved by investigating each managerial element in the context of inclusion on the basis of staff perceptions. The picture will be completed with the establishment of relationships between the three elements within the context of inclusion.

The structure of the chapter
The main aim of this chapter is to clarify and justify the paradigm, approach and tools that have been suggested for this research and locate them within the contextual and conceptual framework of the study. The ‘fit’ of research paradigm will be made within the context of the research questions.

The chapter will first introduce the qualitative and quantitative paradigms and will then focus on the choice of the qualitative paradigm and the interpretive approach within the contextual constraints of the study. The conceptual framework of the study comprises elements that have been carried forward from the Literature Review. The chapter proceeds with a detailed process of data collection and administrative procedures that have been taken, followed by an explanation of the research sampling and the research tools that have been applied. The chapter equally offers the method for the presentation and analysis of the findings. Issues of trustworthiness of the research and of the research methods are then raised alongside issues of generalisability and ethics. Finally, the limitations of the research are discussed, followed by a summary of the chapter.
Locating the study
Methodological traditions: the Qualitative and Quantitative paradigms

These two paradigms stand in contradiction to one another in many respects, one of which is the fact that the qualitative paradigm seeks “to understand the subjective world of human experience” (Cohen et al., 2000: 22) whereas the quantitative paradigm “regards human behaviour as passive, essentially determined and controlled, thereby ignoring intention, individualism and freedom” (ibid.: 19). In their discussion of “the paradigm wars” between the quantitative and qualitative approaches, the writers encapsulate the criticism of methodological researchers. The writers (ibid.: 313) list drawbacks of qualitative research such as being “subjective, biased, impressionistic, idiosyncratic and lacking in the precise quantifiable measures that are the hallmark of survey research and experimentation”. At the same time, they argue that the quantitative paradigm is “banal and trivial” and it is compared to “a constructed play of puppets in a restricted environment” (ibid.: 19). A compromising stance is offered by Hammersley (1992) in his objection to the clear-cut distinction between the two paradigms:

“What this means is that in doing research we are not faced with a fork in the road, with two well-defined alternative routes between which to choose. The research process is more like finding one’s way through a maze. And it is rather badly kept and complex maze; where paths are not always clearly distinct, and also wind back to one another; and where one can never be entirely certain that one has reached the center. If this is right, then we need a methodological language that gives us rather more guidance about a range of routes that is available at each point in our journey than the conventional dichotomies between alternative approaches” (ibid.: 183-4)

Indeed, Hammersley (1992) contends that the conventional distinction between the qualitative and quantitative paradigms (which is presented in Table 3.1) is wrong, and argues that “it is not fruitful to think of social research method in terms of contrasting approaches” (p. 196), and that these approaches should be considered as “a range of positions sometimes located on more than one dimension” (ibid.: 172) The researcher’s advocacy is that the two paradigms should be used in combination.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Qualitative paradigm</th>
<th>The Quantitative paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data presented in words</td>
<td>Data presented in numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural settings</td>
<td>Artificial settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A focus on meanings</td>
<td>A focus on behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection of natural science as a model</td>
<td>Adoption of natural science as a model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive approach</td>
<td>Deductive approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural patterns</td>
<td>Scientific laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Realism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Conventional distinction between paradigms (Hammersley, 1992)

However, a close study of Table 3.1 reveals that it might be hard to use these contradictory elements in combination. For example, a study that focusses on meaning is more likely to be presented in words and expose patterns, whereas a study that focusses on behaviours is more likely to be presented in numbers and expose scientific laws. The following section will clarify the contextual constraints of the present research that have determined the paradigm which underpins it.

The contextual framework of the research

The main point regarding the selection of paradigm is that the present study does not focus on the measurement of the effectiveness of inclusion, but rather on gaining the meaning of the ‘phenomenon’ of LDS’ inclusion on the basis of staff perceptions 14 years after it had been first introduced by the Ministry of Education in Israel. The choice of the qualitative paradigm accords with Bogdan and Biklen’s (1998: 39) view that “the best method of studying human behaviour or anything else for this matter is the one which is consistent with the basic nature of the subject matter”.

The enhancement of meaning by gaining access to people’s perceptions is largely advocated in the literature. Bogdan and Biklen (1998: 24) assert that “the reality comes to be understood to human beings only in the form in which it is perceived”. Similarly, Cohen et al. (2000: 20) maintain that “understanding of individuals’ interpretations of the world around them has to come from the inside, not the outside.”
Social science is thus seen as a subjective rather than an objective undertaking, as a means of dealing with the direct experience of people in specific contexts”. The subjective interpretation or “lived experience” (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 10) offers a richness and holism of data “with strong potential for revealing complexity”. The writers argue that this is done by “locating the meanings people place on the events, processes, and structures of their lives: their perceptions, assumptions, prejudgements, presuppositions, and for connecting these meanings to the social world around them” (ibid.).

The main argument for the adoption of the qualitative paradigm for this study lies in the research questions. Indeed, the research seeks to understand the relationship between managerial elements and inclusion on the basis of staff perceptions. It is argued that the interpretation of managerial elements in the specific context of LDS’ inclusion requires the adoption of a paradigm which will allow for a comprehension of a multi-angled, complex phenomenon.

Further, the research has been conducted on school premises. This is consistent with Bogdan and Biklen (1998: 4) who maintain that in naturalistic research “data are collected on the premises and supplemented by the understanding that is gained by being on location”. This argument is supported by Miles and Huberman (1994: 10) who emphasise the “naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings”. Moreover, the researcher’s viewpoint in the present research is that “he or she does not assume that enough is known to recognize important concerns before undertaking the research” (Bogdan and Biklen, ibid.: 7).

This accords with Bogdan and Biklen’s (1998) fourth principle of qualitative research which is that “the theory is grounded in the data” and “you are constructing a picture that takes shape as you collect and examine the parts” (p.6). This view is also supported by Cohen et al. (2000: 23) who assert that “theory is emergent and must arise from particular situations”. Indeed, the research questions were being constantly re-shaped as the study was progressing.

It might be concluded that the present study has adopted the qualitative paradigm because it aims at gaining a rounded, multi-angled picture of a complex phenomenon
in its context via participants’ perspectives. However, as opposed to other studies of inclusion in schools where researchers studied teachers’ attitudes and then examined how they were translated into daily interactions (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998), this study examines attitudes and behaviours as different aspects of the same issue.

**Research approaches**

The selection of approach for this particular study within the qualitative paradigm has not been easy for two reasons: firstly, the analysis relies on subjective interpretations of individuals who participate in the research, and secondly it relies on the interpretation and ‘putting together’ of the data by the researcher. This seems to be the main reason for choosing the interpretive-phenomenological approach as the main approach for analysis. The nature of this approach is reflected in Beck’s (1979) words:

“The purpose of social science is to understand social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how their views shape the action which they take within that reality. Since the social sciences cannot penetrate to what lies behind social reality, they must work directly with man’s definition of reality and with the rules he devises for coping with it”.

The perceptive viewpoint is supported by Cohen et al. (2000) who advocate the examination of situations through the eyes of participants rather than the researcher. Curtis (1978) contended that what underpins the phenomenological approach is the following philosophical viewpoint:

- A belief in the importance of subjective consciousness
- An understanding of consciousness as bestowing meaning
- A belief that certain structures of consciousness enable a process of reflection which results in knowledge

Curtis’ points seem to throw light on the concept of ‘perceptions’ which is the basis for data collection in the present study. Husserl, who was the founder of
phenomenology (Warnock, 1970) explained the notion of ‘consciousness’ as what is left over when we manage to ‘put the world in brackets’ and focus on three elements:

- The ‘I’ – the subject who thinks
- The mental acts of this ‘thinking subject’
- The intentional objects of these thinking acts

This process of reflexivity was further developed by Schutz who focussed on the process of typification by which we typify and classify other people’s behaviour and our everyday world (in Burrel and Morgan, 1979). An attempt has been made to typify findings of the present study in order to generate managerial patterns of inclusion.

So far it has been argued that the interpretive approach is useful in this study because it relies on staff perceptions. However, the analysis will not rely on participants’ subjective understanding only, but also on the researcher’s own subjective interpretation and the way she interprets staff perceptions. This means that the ‘reality’ of school management and inclusion has been elaborated on two levels of subjective interpretations, that of participants and that of the researcher on the basis of staff perceptions. This stance is supported by Miles and Huberman (1994) who argue that interpretivists also insist that researchers are no more ‘detached’ from their objects of study than are their informants. Researchers, they argue, have their own understandings, their own convictions, their own conceptual orientations.

This idea gains further support by LeCompte and Preissle (1993: 45) who introduce two terms: ‘emic’, “where the concern is to catch the subjective meanings placed on situations by participants” and ‘etic’, “where the intention is to identify and understand the objective or researcher’s meaning and constructions of a situation”. In the light of Silverman (1993) who distinguishes between ‘emic’ as the conceptual framework of those being researched, and ‘etic’, as the conceptual framework of the researcher, it is recommended that the present research adopt both approaches, whereas ‘Emic’ provides the subjective data and ‘Etic’ provides the researcher’s interpretation which attempts to gain the objective reality of staff perceptions. Thus,
when the phase of data collection from participants is completed, it is within the hands of the researcher to offer the framework for interpretation.

In addition to the interpretive approach which is the main approach of the present study, elements of the survey approach have been adopted to a limited extent at the outset of the study. This has provided a framework in which the main themes can be presented in a descriptive statistical way as part of the qualitative paradigm. The survey approach has allowed for the coverage of a relatively large number of respondents, although Johnson (1994) maintains that they offer neither the possibility of an in-depth investigation nor a supportive environment. In addition, it has set the ground for the personal interviews with school staff.

Moreover, school documents on inclusion have been examined. Indeed, the documentary approach focusses on documents and printed data rather than on people (ibid.), whereas the main interest of the present research is to gain understanding on a phenomenon via people’s perceptions. Therefore, school documentation has been studied mainly as a means of triangulation on the issue of inclusion.

The conceptual and empirical framework for the analysis

The present research seeks to explore school leadership, school culture and school structures in the context of inclusion according to staff perceptions in Israeli secondary schools. As the investigation refers to LDS’ inclusion as an implementation of change, the analysis will be conducted via approaches to change implementation, models of change, factors for resistance, models to overcome resistance to change and staff perceptions to change. Then, the conceptual framework will offer a thematic presentation and analysis of the broad themes of leadership and inclusive leadership, culture and inclusive culture, structures and inclusive structures. This will be done by offering the findings as regards each ‘pair’ of themes via two ways: a general framework of descriptive statistics for part of the themes on the basis of the questionnaires, and a detailed presentation and analysis which rely on the interviews and school documents.
The present study is innovative in the sense that whereas previous studies have focussed on ‘general’ management (e.g. Busher and Blease, 2000) or on managerial elements in inclusive contexts (e.g. Vislie and Langfeldt, 1996), the present study has explored how ‘general’ management is related to inclusive managerial elements.

Below is a detailed description of the analytical framework.

The concept of leadership will encompass the following elements:

- The foci of leadership:
  - a) Concern for ‘relationships’ or ‘results’
  - b) Headteachers’ focus on leadership versus management
- Theories of leadership: Trait, Contingency, and Style
- Leaders’ attitudes towards change
- Leaders’ attitudes towards resistance to change

The concept of culture will be studied via the following elements of culture:

- School credo
- School climate:
  - a) Teamwork
  - b) Collaboration
  - c) The learning organisation
  - d) Decision-making procedures
- Culture and change
- Types of culture

The enquiry of structures will be done via the following elements:

- The division of responsibility (staff empowerment)
- Peceptions of Change
- School curriculum
- Channels of communication
- Monitoring and accountability
- External consultants and middle managers
- Training and support
Structures and change

The elements of culture and structures are referenced in the Literature Review and in the Discussion chapters. An attempt will be made to prepare school profiles on the basis of criteria from the literature such as the following: authority and hierarchy versus sharing power, rigid job specifications versus few job specifications, formal channels of communication versus formal and informal channels, delegated division of labour versus shared responsibility (Burns and Stalker, 1961 and Bennis, 1969). Further criteria are empowerment, innovativeness, clear boundaries, centralisation versus decentralisation, change versus stability (Carnall, 1995), ‘tall’ versus ‘flat’ hierarchies, ‘line management’ versus ‘specialism’ or ‘professional management’, ‘bureacratic’ versus ‘democratic’ (encapsulated from the literature in Table 2.26). These series of categorisation might eventually form a picture of ‘old’ and ‘new’ cultures (after Carnall, 1995), of types of culture (Harrison, 1994; Rosenholtz, 1989). This picture will indicate whether a particular school favours changes or rejects them and features the kind of structure or culture associated with this change.

The theme of inclusion will be explored via existing studies. The main studies are: Tomlinson (1996); OECD (1995); IQEA, (1999); Lunt and Norwich (1999); Farrell (1997). In the light of these studies the following elements will be investigated:

Inclusive leadership:
   a) Inclusive vision
   b) The provision of personal and professional support regarding LDS
   c) Headteacher’s initiation of staff training on LD.

Inclusive culture:
   a) Attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion
   b) Catering for individual needs
   c) Staff knowledge as regards LD

Inclusive structures:
   a) Categories of SEN structures
b) Inclusive curriculum

c) SEN facilities: test administration, SEN support staff, staff training on LD, procedures of monitoring and accountability, and the role of pedagogic committees.

The thematic analysis which will set the basis for the first three research questions will be followed by an analysis of the relationships between leadership, structures and culture in the fourth research question via models such as Bennett and Harris’ (1999). However, as the last research question presents an analysis which draws on data from the first three questions, it will not be included in the Findings chapter but only in the Discussion.

**Research design and administration**

The research design has been developed carefully because the topic under study is an issue of high sensitivity that comprises a large number of ethical issues. The research design comprises four phases: the identification of the problem (which has been discussed in the Introduction), a selection of research approaches (which has been discussed at the outset of this chapter), data collection, a selection of schools (sampling), and the development of research tools which are discussed below. The research was conducted over the course of a full school year.

**Data collection**

The first stage of data collection was the introductory stage, in which a rapport was set between school and the researcher. This included an initial conversation with the headteacher in which access to school was formally granted, the research aim was clarified, and the researcher met or was provided with the phone numbers of the people presented as ‘contact’ people or key figures in LDS’ inclusion in each school. In that particular meeting the headteacher was given his/her questionnaire. Later on the researcher established more contacts at school which sometimes differed from those provided by the headteacher in the first meeting. It is noteworthy that in all cases the researcher had the feeling that the research was ‘welcomed’ and its importance was acknowledged by headteachers and staff alike.
During the second stage the questionnaires were piloted, administered and collected. Questionnaires were piloted to seven teachers and counselors in the researcher’s secondary school and finetuned according to their comments regarding content and style. Then, twenty questionnaires were administered in each of the five schools to 20 teachers, two to five questionnaires were administered to counselors and one questionnaire to the headteacher. It is noteworthy that in school E where the headteacher is largely assisted by his deputy, two questionnaires were administered upon the headteacher’s request. The issue of sampling of respondents will be addressed later on in the chapter. The questionnaires of the three respondent groups are presented in Appendix 9.

Most questionnaires remained anonymous except for respondents who gave their consent to be interviewed. As it had been expected, the collection of the questionnaires was more difficult. At this stage the researcher was assisted by ‘contact’ people in each school (usually a counselor or a personal acquaintance) whose main help was to motivate staff to fill-in the questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered in October 2000 and their collection was completed by the end of January 2001. The return rate was as follows: 76 teachers (out of 100), 16 counselors (out of 16), and six headteachers (out of six). The return rate in the different schools is described below:

- School A – 80%
- School B – 55%
- School C – 75%
- School D – 90%
- School E – 80%

During the third stage headteachers, counselors and teachers were interviewed. Issues concerning sampling the respondents will be discussed later on in this chapter. However, no technical difficulty was observed while interviewing counselors as they do not have class sessions and therefore they are more available. In addition, they have their own room. However, interviews with teachers were more complicated because they had to be set according to their free periods (which sometimes were not at all free) and often there was no room available and teachers felt threatened to conduct talks in the teachers’ room. The overall number of interviewees was 28: five
headteachers, 11 counselors and 12 teachers. In some cases it took one meeting to complete the interview (which usually lasted about two-three hours) and in others there was a need to ward off closure by a ‘joining’ session prior to the actual interview. Sometimes a follow-up interview was needed to complete missing information.

The last stage of data collection was the study of schools’ written documents. Schools’ marketing brochures were collected in an attempt to examine attitudes and policy towards LDS by school management. The whole process of the research was fully documented and referenced.

**Sampling in the context of the study**

The question whether sampling of school ought to be random or purposive has preoccupied the researcher as the research was being designed. On the one hand, a random selection of secondary schools could serve to avoid the claim of bias, but the same time it might be underpinned by the assumption that secondary schools share similarities more than differences and therefore they can be sampled at random. On the other hand, a purposive sampling might indicate that secondary schools differ from one another in many respects and therefore sampling ought to have a certain rationale. This conflict is demonstrated in the methodological literature. Miles and Huberman (1994) advocate purposive sampling in qualitative research because random sampling might cause biases especially in a small number of cases. In addition, sampling is also related to the conceptual framework. This idea is supported by Firestone (1993) who argues that the most useful generalisations from qualitative data are analytic (i.e. inductive) and not ‘sample-to-population’ (i.e. deductive).

A few decisions had to be made in respect of issues of sampling of this research. Firstly, the concepts of ‘typicality’ or ‘atypicality’ were addressed. Gomm et al. (2000) argue that the researcher has to consider the typicality of his/her cases by comparing the characteristics of the cases with information about the population to which generalisation is intended (‘target population’), or at least to the related dimensions of heterogeneity. On the other hand, they claim that the selection of schools could be done on the basis of ‘atypicality’ as this concept represents the
extremes within the population. The particular context of this research is even more complicated because the issue of ‘typicality’ might refer to ‘typical’ secondary schools or to ‘typical’ inclusion. For example, schools might share similarities as secondary schools but not with regard to LDS’ inclusion. Moreover, the issue of ‘typical’ LDS’ inclusion has never been explored, thus it is impossible to suggest ‘typicalities’.

Margalit et al.’s (2000) report which is based on a survey of 325 schools throughout the country could serve as evidence for ‘atypicality’ in sampling. The research identified three main factors which relate to differences in the inclusion process: educational sectors, areas in the country, and socio-economic situation. Findings indicate differences in respect of percentage of didactic assessments in different sectors (Table 3.2) (findings range from 0.31% to 7.79%) as well as differences in respect of different areas and cities (Table 3.3).

The writers assume that “perhaps the differences in the frequencies of assessments reflect the ‘assessment cultures’ in the different locations and their availability” (p. 12). For example, in less developed places the frequency of assessments is lower compared to more established places. However, the biggest difference was identified between the south and the north of the country. The socio-economic index implies that more students are assessed within high socio-economic standards of populations (10-17% of students) than in low standards (3-9% of students). Although the report emphasises that “the frequency of didactic assessments expresses less clearly ecological uniqueness” (p. 12) than psychological assessments, the picture that is formed in Tables 3.2 and 3.3 clearly reveals differences in respect of these factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Arab</th>
<th>Druze</th>
<th>Agricultural settlements</th>
<th>Special education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of didactic assessments</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7.79%</td>
<td>07.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Percentage of assessments in different educational sectors (Margalit et al., 2000)
The present research has highlighted the typical features of the participating schools. Indeed, the selected schools are all part of the same Municipal Department of Education of Tel Aviv. In addition, these schools currently participate in the marketing competition in order to attract students and parents and they continuously aspire to increase the rate of their graduate students for the same reasons. At the same time, inclusion was explored according to the viewpoint of ‘atypicalities’ in the context of the unique factors of each of these schools.

The question of random or purposive selection is also relevant to the selection of teachers and counselors (‘internal sampling’ by Bogdan and Biklen, 1998: 61). The questionnaires were randomly administered to teachers and counselors who were present in the teachers’ room on the days when the researcher came specifically for this purpose. In case of objection, the researcher withdrew from this particular teacher/counselor. All questionnaires were administered personally by the researcher who introduced herself and the topic of her research to staff members and kindly asked for their cooperation.

As for sampling the interview participants, all interviewees were staff members who had formerly filled-in the questionnaires. Teachers and counselors who had given their written consent on the questionnaires to participate in interviews were contacted on the phone and dates for interviews were set. Yet, a lot of thought was allocated to the fact that participants in interviews were likely to be staff members who were perhaps more willing to talk, who had greater influence in school setting, or who were especially insightful or involved with school life. Another point which was worthwhile considering was the lack of uniformity in the time allocated to each of the


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southern areas</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Jerusalem</th>
<th>Tel Aviv</th>
<th>Northern parts</th>
<th>Haifa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of didactic assessments</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.3 Percentage of assessments in different areas and cities of Israel (Margalit et al., 2000)*

There were 415 teachers and 118 counselors in participating schools, 82.5% of whom were female. The average age of the participating teachers was 41.8 years, ranging from 25 to 68. The average age of the participating counselors was 45.3 years, ranging from 26 to 63. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to describe the sample and inferential statistics to test hypotheses. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to test differences in the average ages of teachers and counselors across the three cities. The results revealed that there were no significant differences in the average ages of teachers and counselors across the three cities.
participants. This could have depended on his/her personality and openness and could have eventually biased the results.

It was finally decided to interview all staff members who expressed their wish to co-operate depending on time constraints. In this sense it is maintained that the sampling of the interviews was random. However, the issue of time sampling seems to be purposive. Indeed, the time of year that was chosen for the research was carefully planned and set for a month after the start of the schoolyear when routine was resumed and staff members were still fresh and energetic after the summer holiday. This idea is supported by Bogdan and Biklen (ibid.:61): “The time you visit a place or a person often will affect the nature of the data you collect”. Another decision concerns the duration of the research. In the case of the present research it has been decided to try and finish data collection in one schoolyear in order to avoid the need to relate to validation issues which derive from changes in schools from one year to another. Bogdan and Biklen (ibid.) argue that some researchers prefer to decide on the frequency of the data collection whereas others leave the question of time open until they reach the point of data saturation.

Although the present study encompasses five individual schools the ‘case-study’ approach for sampling has not been adopted for a number of reasons. Miles and Huberman (1994) maintain that the selection of cases in multiple-case sampling is made on conceptual grounds and “will be guided by the research questions and conceptual framework – either prespecified or emergent” (p.29-30) rather than on representative grounds. This argument serves as a basis in the selection of approach because the main aim of the research is to enhance the understanding of LDS’ inclusion as a phenomenon rather than the investigation of separate schools. Thus, the focus of study is placed on key processes which “serve as the glue holding the research questions together” (p. 33). It is, therefore, argued that data from all schools will be accumulated until a complete picture of inclusion is obtained.

In view of this argumentation, it has been decided to select five schools which share similarities in the light of Miles and Huberman’s (1994: 29) “sampling frame” but which also have their own uniqueness, so that the analyses can be made with regard to contextual school factors in addition to the managerial ones which are incorporated in
the study. In respect of inclusion, it was impossible to decide on a ‘typical’ case prior to the study itself because no previous research has been conducted that could attest to the ‘typical’ level or nature of inclusion. Therefore, the schools that have been selected are all secondary schools with high aspirations towards academic achievements and belong to the Municipal Educational Department of Tel-Aviv, which means that they are subject to the same overall educational policy. Yet, they have their own particularities and will be explored in their unique context as specified in the appendix 7.

**The development of research tools**

The general approach to the research design was that of a funnel: the questionnaires’ analysis offered a framework for the breadth of themes related to the research through the use of descriptive statistics. This framework has provided a general view of themes which was followed by an in-depth exploration obtained via interviews with staff members and documentary analysis. The nature of the interviews and questionnaires that has been applied in the present research is described below.

**Interviews**

The purpose of interviews in this kind of research is more than collection of data, which could have been adequately gained by the use of questionnaires. It aims at gaining in-depth knowledge of the interviewee’s world as regards within-school life and its influence on inclusion. This view is supported by the methodological literature. Kitwood (1977) contrasts three conceptions of interviews. The first one regards interviews as means of pure transfer and collection of data. The second one regards interviews as dominated by non-rational factors governing human behaviour, like emotions, unconscious needs and interpersonal behaviours. The third one sees interviews as a mirror of everyday life sharing many of its features such as trust and curiosity. Accordingly, the interviewer’s role in the first conception would be rather technical, whereas the second role would require building control against bias. However, it is within the third conception that the interviewer needs to apply psychological tools, because behaviours during an interview are very similar to everyday life, such as the use of avoidance tactics in unpleasant situations or the establishment of trust between people.
Another way could be to claim that these conceptions are three research layers, whereas in the basic layer data is collected, in the second one awareness towards biases is increased, and only in the third layer interpretation of human behaviour can be made. Other researchers’ views on this matter can be analysed in the light of the three layers according to Kitwood (1977). For example, Cannell and Kahn (1968) argument that a research interview is “a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information...” might be interpreted in the light of the first layer. Tuckman’s view (1972), on the other hand, seems to be closer to the second layer while taking about what’s ‘inside a person’s head’ in terms of information, values and preferences, and attitudes and beliefs.

The present research seeks to gain understanding of how culture, leadership and structures contribute to LDS’ inclusion. This could be achieved by establishing a rapport with participants which would enable them to share ‘inside-school’ information. Thus, on the one hand, interviews were structured in uniform way, but on the other hand, the researcher had to be flexible so that participants could feel they could talk freely. In addition, the interviews in this study might also be considered as ‘specialised’ because the researcher is an expert in assessing learning disabilities and in ‘remedial’ teaching for LDS, and she felt confident enough to change the sequence of the questions where the need arose.

The methodological literature supports the view that the type of interview that is used in a specific piece of research needs to be determined by its objectives, or ‘fitness for purpose’ as termed by Cohen et al. (2000: 270). The writers’ claim is that the more one wishes to gain comparable data, the more standardised and quantitative one’s interview tends to become, whereas the more one wishes to acquire unique, non-standardised information about how individuals see the world, the more one tends towards qualitative, open-ended, unstructured interviews. Similarly, Morrison (1993) offers a way of relating to types of interviews via five continua, each of which represents a range of how interview materials should be looked at and organised (Table 3.4). It is possible to conclude that whereas one end of each continuum seeks the uniqueness of situations, the other end seeks regularities.
However, the present research combines Cohen et al.’s (2000) and Morrison’s (1993) rationales, because it attempts to gain ‘standardised’ data regarding how the implementation of inclusion is managed, but at the same time it seeks to identify the uniqueness of each school regarding inclusion while relating to their inclusive ‘stories’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One end of continuum</th>
<th>Another end of continuum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First continuum</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative data</td>
<td>Word-based qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second continuum</strong></td>
<td>Closed questions</td>
<td>Open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third continuum</strong></td>
<td>Measuring responses</td>
<td>Capturing the uniqueness of situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth continuum</strong></td>
<td>Formal intent: prescribed categories of response</td>
<td>Informal intent: what is being sought is uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth continuum</strong></td>
<td>Attempt to find regularities</td>
<td>Attempt to catch uniqueness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.4 Continua for conceptualising interviews. After Morrison (1993)*

**Questionnaires**

The use of questionnaires in this research seems to be relevant because questionnaires are anonymous and therefore they encourage greater honesty. Indeed, the topic of inclusion is considered to be sensitive in the sense that it might pinpoint discrepancies between rhetoric and implementation. In addition, questionnaires do not allow for leading questions or for demonstrating some bias on the researcher’s part (Tuckman, 1972). Therefore, the common view in the literature (e.g. Johnson, 1994) is that questionnaires are in the hands of respondents whereas interviews are in the hands of the researcher. Another point which advocates the use of questionnaires is that they enable researchers to reach an extensive number of respondents. On the other hand, it is argued that the problem with questionnaires’ validity lies in the possibility for low percentage of returns, and misunderstandings which result from question formation. Furthermore, respondents might be unwilling to put in energies to fill-in the questionnaires, particularly with regard to open-ended questions.
In contrast to the interviews which were designed in a structured but flexible way, the questionnaires were fully structured because their main purpose was to offer a general statistical framework before the actual in-depth enquiry. Indeed, it is believed (e.g. Oppenheim, 1992) that the more structured questionnaires are, the more they enable comparisons to be made across groups. On the other hand, word-based, semi-structured questionnaires are more appropriate to explore the specificity of a particular situation. Despite the belief frequently expressed in methodological literature that “where measurement is sought then a quantitative approach is required; where rich and personal data are sought, then a word-based qualitative approach might be more suitable” (Cohen et al., 2000: 248), the use of questionnaires in this study has contributed to the overall picture and did not necessitate measurement.

The questionnaires were designed in a way that would allow for a comparison between the three groups of research populations: headteachers, counselors and teachers. They were divided according to the main themes of the research: all three groups were asked about personal details, school climate, definitions of LD, the process of inclusion, and attitudes towards inclusion. Teachers and counselors were specifically enquired about the process of identification and assessment, staff training regarding LD, and curriculum for LDS, and headteachers were asked about strategic planning in respect of inclusion. All questions except two open-ended questions were closed questions (Appendix 9). The closed questions included multiple-choice questions, rank ordering, and rating scale questions on Likert (1932) scale.

The use of records and documents
Johnson (1994: 25) states that documentary research “relies primarily on the use of available and printed data as a source of evidence” and its main advantage is that it is unobtrusive. Although documentary research is not considered as the main research approach in this research, the use of school documents was applied to examine the attitudes of the management towards LDS’ inclusion, mainly as a means of triangulation for the two other tools.
The documents under study, schools’ marketing brochures, aim at addressing prospective school’s ‘clients’: parents and students. The main intent of this analysis was to see to what extent the issue of LDS is made explicit in the process of marketing school to future students and parents. Another purpose was to examine school’s willingness to cater for individual needs of students. The fact that these documents have not been written deliberately on LD but have been used by the researcher for her purpose makes them ‘inadvertent sources’ rather than ‘deliberate’ sources (Bell, 1987), and thus they might serve as a more objective basis for analysis.

**Analysis and presentation of the findings**

The thesis has mainly focussed on staff perceptions of school leadership, culture and structures in the context of LDS’ inclusion in secondary schools. Therefore, data was simultaneously collected on leadership and inclusive leadership, culture and inclusive culture, structures and inclusive structures in five schools which participate in the study. The main objective is to understand how existing leadership, culture and structures are related to the inclusion process according to staff perceptions.

The presentation and analysis of the findings will be organised in a thematic order which emerges from the research questions. Data will be collected, presented and analysed from questionnaires, interviews and school documents in respect of each theme. This will be achieved by an elaboration on the interviews, questionnaires and school documents according to sub-themes in the context of each individual school.

The total number of questionnaires was 98. This included six headteachers, 16 counselors and 76 teachers. It is noteworthy that the response rates differ in the analyses of different themes. The number of respondents from each school or research population is represented by the letter n. At the outset phase an attempt will be made to present themes on the basis of the questionnaires in order to offer an overall view. This will be done by combining questions that relate to the same theme and producing accumulative scores according to the number of respondents. Data will be presented in Tables. There are mainly two ways of constructing accumulative scores. The first way refers to questions which focus on a comparison between the schools. The same weight will be allocated to each staff member which means that the perceptions of
teachers will always sway the overall perception of schools. However, this fact does not pose a threat to validity as these proportions reflect schools’ reality. Issues that will be combined in this way in the Findings chapter are: school climate (the ‘overall’ scores in Table 4.9), and staff perceptions of procedures of accountability (Table 4.22). Equal weight will be allocated to each of the questions combined in the score.

The second way to obtain accumulative scores refers to questions which focus on differences between the three respondent groups. The mean of each group will be figured out according to the number of respondents and the same weight will be allocated to each group while making the comparisons. Scores that are constructed this way in the Findings chapter are: perceptions of attitudes towards LDS (Table 4.10), and perceptions of school climate (Table 4.9). In all combined scores the same weight will be allocated to every question. The questions that will be used to combine scores for the different themes are presented in Appendix 8.

An in-depth analysis of the interviews will follow the statistical description. The data will be presented in a thematic way and interpreted via the conceptual framework. For example, in order to identify headteachers’ ‘foci of leadership’ headteachers’ questionnaires included questions such as the following:

- “Teachers’ satisfaction is the key to success in any school initiative”
- “Headteachers must be available to teachers at all times”.

Similarly, teachers were asked: “Is the headteacher at your school available for teachers as regards personal or professional problems?”. In addition, headteachers’ interviews comprised three specific questions regarding their perception of effective leadership:

- “Are you a leader or a manager”?
- “What are the three most important factors in successful management”?
- “What makes a successful LDS’ inclusion”? 
Data emerging from the questionnaires and from the interviews will be elaborated on to provide the picture of leadership foci. The same procedure will be applied for every theme. Attempts will then be made in the Discussion to establish categories on the basis of the themes and sub-themes. Thus, typologies of Leadership will be made by identifying key characteristics of different leaders’ profiles, Cultures and Structures. This strategy accords with Lecompte and Preissle (1993) who advocate categorisation on the basis of clear criteria.

Three coding systems will be used in the presentation and analysis stages: schools will be codified by letters: A, B, C, D, and E; the three research populations will be codified by their initial letters: H for headteachers, C for counselors and T for teachers; each teacher and counselor will be then codified by an ordinal number in addition to the group number. For example, the third teacher that was interviewed in the second school will be codified as B. T.3 and so forth. As in school E both headteachers participated in the study, their identities were coded as EH1 for school headteacher and EH2 for his deputy.

**Trustworthiness in qualitative research**

The nature of the present research is complicated for a number of reasons. The failure to reach a uniform definition of LD and its implication on the identification of LDS has been demonstrated in the Introduction chapter. The need to gain an overall picture on LDS’ inclusion through perceptions of staff members renders the process of investigation more complex in terms of validity as findings are subjective. In addition, the possibility of existing gaps between spoken and the written levels within the same individual calls for well-planned cautionary measures.

The problem regarding trustworthiness in the interpretive approach is best introduced in Bernstein (1974): “And what of the insistence of the interpretive methodologies on the use of verbal accounts to get at the meaning of events, rules and intentions? Are there not dangers? Subjective reports are sometimes incomplete and they are sometimes misleading”.
Similarly, Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) maintain that validity attaches to accounts, not to data or methods, and attention should be placed on the meaning that subjects give to data and to inferences drawn from data. This attitude seems to be reflected in Agar’s (1993) view asserting that the intensive personal involvement and in-depth responses of individuals secure a sufficient level of validity and reliability.

Indeed, the concept of validity originally referred to the matching between research instruments and what they purport to measure. However, a review of the literature supports the stance adopted in this research whereby validity is related to the level of participants’ understanding of the situation. For example, Cohen et al. (2000: 105) argue that validity might be addressed through “the honesty, depth, richness and scope of the data achieved, the participants approached, the extent of triangulation and the disinterestedness or objectivity of the researcher”. Maxwell (1992) argues that ‘understanding’ is a more suitable term than validity in qualitative research because qualitative researchers seek to understand the world through other people’s perspectives and they cannot be completely objective. Maxwell’s notion of understanding comprises five types:

- Descriptive validity which is the accuracy of the account;
- Interpretive validity which is the ability of the research to catch the subjective meaning of the participants and the situations;
- Theoretical validity which is the extent to which the research explains phenomena;
- Generalisability which is the ability to apply the research to other situations;
- Evaluative validity which is the researchers’ ability to evaluate the data rather than describe it.

Miles and Huberman (1994: 38) maintain that “in qualitative research issues of instrument validity and reliability ride largely on the skills of the researcher”, and argue that the first audience in a qualitative research is the ‘self’, which is followed at a later stage by other audiences such as the readers and other researchers. Yet, researchers (e.g. Hammersley, 1992; Silverman, 1993) maintain that ethnography
must have more rigorous notions of validity and reliability and that data selected must be representative of the sample rather than simply fit a preconceived idea. They acknowledge the fact that “the canons of reliability for quantitative research may be simply unworkable for qualitative research” (Lecompte and Preissle, 1993, in Cohen et al., ibid.: 119).

Trustworthiness of interviews and questionnaires

As the main research tools in this study are interviews and questionnaires, it is worth examining the issue of validity with reference to these specific tools.

It is claimed that an interview is not simply a situation of data collection but it is also a situation of a social and political nature. Therefore, it is quite easy for the researcher to get a misleading picture. Indeed, the first threat to validity is attitudes and biases. Researchers tend to agree that the main cause for biases is that interviews are about humans interacting with humans and their influences on one another (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989). In addition, data is gained by posing questions to people (Fielding and Fielding, 1986). Denscombe (1995) takes it a step further and argues that interviewer neutrality is a chimera. Cohen et al. (2000: 120) assert that “interviewers and interviewees alike bring their own, often unconscious experimental and biographical baggage with them into the interview situation”. Interviewers’ biases can take the form of certain attitudes and expectations and a tendency to see the interviewee in the researcher’s image. They might also express a tendency to seek answers that support preconceived notions or experience misunderstandings between interviewer and interviewee.

The second factor involved in the threat to validity is the management of the interview. Some argue (e.g. Silverman, 1993; Oppenheim, 1992) that a structured interview with clear format and wording guarantees reliability, whereas others (e.g. Scheurich, 1995) maintain that controlling the wording is not controlling the interview. Other issues offered by Oppenheim (1992) concern the type of questions asked, the rapport between interviewer and interviewee, the consistency of coding of responses, poor handling of difficult interviews, and the sequence of questions. Kvale (1996: 163) comments on ‘transcriber selectivity’ which is presenting and interpreting
materials at the researcher’s choice. Another factor which threatens the research trustworthiness is the fact that the interview is basically a conversation and thus the interviewer and interviewee’s character are reflected in its nature and might influence the data.

There are several issues which present a threat to the validity of questionnaires. In contrast to interviews which are social situations, respondents are left on their own while filling-in questionnaires. The absence of non-verbal cues does not allow for the cross-checking of responses of questionnaires or the ability to probe via verbal cues. Indeed, Belson (1986) argued that validity should be examined from the viewpoint of honesty and accuracy of respondents as well as in relation to what non-respondents would have answered had they returned their questionnaires. The low percentage of return (Cohen et al., 2000) also presents a problem to validity. Sometimes misunderstandings occur as a result of unclear phrasing of questions, and the fact that respondents choose to ignore questions for different reasons. Indeed, the fact that questionnaires are anonymous should theoretically allow for more honesty. However, respondents might at the same time feel less committed if they are not particularly interested in the subject under investigation.

**Triangulation in the present research**

Triangulation will be used in this study for different purposes. It will be used to confirm findings, to clarify the complexity of inclusion of SEN students in mainstream schools, and to gain a multi-angled picture. These purposes are supported by the methodological literature. Miles and Huberman (1994) maintain that triangulation is basically a method of confirming findings. However, in qualitative research triangular techniques attempt to “map out or explain more fully the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint, and in so doing, by making use of both quantitative and qualitative data. Triangulation is a powerful way of demonstrating concurrent validity, particularly in qualitative research” (Campbell and Fiske, 1959, in Cohen et al., 2000: 112). Cohen et al. (ibid.: 115) argue that “triangulation has special relevance where a complex phenomenon requires elucidation” such as in the investigation of an aspect of SEN within mainstream schools. On a more elevated, philosophical level Bruner (1984: 7)
interprets triangulation in the following way: “There may be a correspondence between life as lived, life as experienced, and life as told, but the anthropologist should never assume the correspondence, or fail to make the distinction”.

The present research will use mainly four types of triangulation. The first type is ‘triangulation by data source’ (Denzin, 1997). It comprises the three school research populations: headteachers, counselors, and teachers. As the topic of LDS’ inclusion is highly sensitive and no school or headteacher wishes to be featured as rejecting disabled students, it seemed to be important to draw on different perspectives and sources of data in order to obtain a real picture. It is therefore believed that the best way to ensure the validity of the data is by getting a round picture from all parties involved in the process of inclusion. Indeed, data was collected from headteachers, teachers and counselors in respect of the same issues.

The second type of triangulation is ‘methodological triangulation’ (Denzins, 1970). Miles (1982: 125-6) relates methodological triangulation to the way triangulation is defined: “The rhetoric of triangulation...implies that three elements of a triangle are known...Where there are two data points, all we have is a measure of agreement or disagreement...Real triangulation requires additional information, which may be data from an actual third source...”. Triangulation between methods has been subject to critique (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). However, the present research relies on three sources of data: questionnaires, interviews and an analysis of school documents.

It is argued that the need for triangulation is related to the fact that the investigation of LDS’ inclusion is complicated because it involves gaps between rhetoric and implementation among different respondent groups as well as within individuals. Cohen et al. (2000: 115) argue that “multiple methods are suitable where a controversial aspect of education needs to be evaluated more fully”. Smith (1975) asserted that research methods act as filters through which the environment is experienced, and exclusive reliance on one method may distort or bias the researcher’s picture of the ‘slice of reality’ under investigation. However, when different methods yield the same results the researcher’s confidence is increased. Cohen et al. (2000: 112) further this idea and claim that “the more the methods contrast with each other, the greater the researcher’s confidence.”
The third type of triangulation in this study is the ‘space triangulation’ (Denzin, 1970). It is used “when a number of schools in an area or across the country are investigated in some way” (Cohen et al., 2000: 115). Indeed, all five schools in this study belong to Tel Aviv Department of Education. The fourth type of triangulation (Denzin, 1970) is ‘theoretical triangulation’ which draws on alternative theories. Indeed, in the process of data analysis attempts will be made to examine data against existing theories of school leadership, culture and structures, which will contribute to the formation of an overall picture on inclusion.

**Generalisability**

There are a number of issues related to the ability to generalise in this study. Cohen et al. (2000) argue that situations are fluid and change over time and are richly affected by the context. Similarly, events and individuals are unique and “largely non-generalisable”. In addition, there are multiple interpretations and perspectives to events and situations. All the abovementioned factors can be observed in the present study. Firstly, it seems to be hard to generalise on the basis of staff perceptions, because perceptions in the same school were often varied regarding a certain issue. Secondly, an investigation of schools’ histories reveals that events are unique and can be studied in the context of school rather than set a basis to generalise. Finally, school life appeared to be dynamic and changing and therefore it might be hard to draw on situations in order to make a generalisation.

The issue of generalisability in qualitative research should be looked at cautiously. Indeed, despite subjective thinking of interpretivists, they do not necessarily deny a reality ‘out there’ (Blumer, 1980). However, most qualitative researchers see their findings not as a transcendent truth but as "a particular interpretation of reality grounded in the empirical world" (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998: 24-5). Cohen et al. (ibid.) encapsulate the essence of generalisability in qualitative research:

- Humans actively construct their own meanings of situations;
- Meanings and understandings replace proof;
- Situations are unique;
- Geralisability should be established in the context of specific settings and subjects rather than universally.

Indeed, the purpose of the interpretive researcher is complicated, as he/she aims to understand how findings from one time and one place can be compared with what goes on in different times and places (Cohen et al. 2000). However, despite the specific enquiries within unique contexts which are typical to qualitative research, attempts will be made to reach understanding of how inclusion works in the Israeli educational systems beyond the specificity of the five schools.

**Ethical issues**

“*Morals in research are too important to be left to moralists*” (Punch, 1986: 73)

The topic of LDS’ inclusion involves a number of ethical issues, some of which are related to the subject matter and the type of data collected. Others are related to the human factor which is involved in the research, to the context of the research, and the publication of the results.

The main concern of qualitative researchers is their own bias. As interpretivists are of their objects of study, it is difficult to separate the ‘external’ information from their own data decoding and encoding. This means that although the subjective interpretation of the researcher cannot be avoided, it should be taken into consideration. The researcher in the present research has expertise in the domain of LDS and is part of an educational team in the upper grades of a secondary school. Yet, attempts have been made to “*objectively study the subjective states of their subjects*” (Bogdan and Biklen: 33). This will be achieved by the method of triangulation and by presenting the data in different ways. Lincoln and Guba (1985: 187) maintained that the researcher becomes the ‘human instrument’ in the research and the main skills required from him/her are adaptability, responsiveness, ability to handle sensitive matters, ability to see the whole picture, ability to clarify and summarise, to explore and analyse idiosyncratic responses. Thus, it might be argued that the researcher’s personal expertise can be seen as an advantage to the research rather than a weakness as she is constantly exposed to handling delicate situations.
The benefits accruing from this research have enhanced the researcher’s knowledge and understanding of the inclusion process but have also contributed to the participants’ insight of the subject of LDS’ inclusion via a dialogue. This point refers to the primary ethical dilemma in social research is known as the ‘cost/benefits ratio’ (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Miles and Huberman, 1994).

Participants in this research had to provide sensitive information concerning personal inter-relationships at school, and this frequently led to criticism towards headteachers in respect of the implementation of LDS’ inclusion. If such information were to be published with names, not only would it be considered as a violation of their privacy and cause them embarrassment, but also pose a professional threat. The research could be considered an intrusion to participants’ privacy in the sense that it attempted to elicit as much information as possible from them. Yet, the stance taken was of respect towards participants as people and not only as research objects that are used and then discarded (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992). This was achieved by a number of measures: participants’ identities are withheld with the researcher; schools and participants were codified during the data analysis and no information was released as regards data providers.

Indeed, the methodological literature contrasts individual ‘right to privacy’ and the ‘public right to know’ (Pring, 1984; Morrison, 1993). For example, Van Maanen, 1979: 545) views the fieldworker as “penetrating fronts” and using “symbolic violence” when participants “are, to a degree, coaxed, persuaded, pushed, pressured and sometimes almost blackmailed into providing information to the researcher that they might otherwise prefer to shield”. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) address these issues as ‘risk’ and ‘vulnerability’ to participants which accord with the principle of ‘primum non nocere’ (Bogdan and Biklen, 2000). It might be postulated that the abovementioned arguments are actually related to three complementary concepts: intruding participants’ privacy, agreement of confidentiality about the use of the data, and ensuring anonymity.

Further, findings reveal discrepancies among individuals and respondent groups within schools. Thus, they might also endanger schools’ intactness or climate.
Although professionals both on school sites and at the Ministry level have welcomed this research and claim to be looking forward to its results, data had to be anonymised to avoid endangering schools’ prestige and affronts to dignity and embarrassment (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992).

‘Informed consent’ was achieved with research participants to obtain their understanding of what the study involved, and ensure their voluntary participation. The fact that no written consent was required and the interviews were conducted on a basis of trust and joining “more like having a friendship than a contract” (Bogdan and Biklen: 43) increased the commitment for discretion on the part of the interviewer, whereas by asking for a written consent cooperation could have been decreased. In addition, no letters of consent were collected because the law in Israel requires that only minors who have to fill in questionnaires or be interviewed should bring letters of consent from their parents, and as no minors were involved in this research there was no need to ask for such letters.

The research setting arose another ethical problem in respect of interviews. Whereas headteachers’ and counselors’ interviews were held in their private rooms, teachers were too anxious to ‘talk their hearts out’ on public premises such as the teachers’ room, and private rooms were not always available. This problem was resolved by conducting many interviews with teachers in after-school hours at teachers’ convenience.

Another ethical issue involves the question of the ‘ownership’ of data and respondents’ rights to veto the results. The first issue seems to be irrelevant because this is a single-researcher project which has not been sponsored by any organisation. The second issue has not been discussed with participants in the process of research.

Similarly, the issue of ‘overt’ or ‘covert’ research (Lecompte and Preissle, 1993) is discussed with regard to how explicitly the aims of study were exposed to headteachers. The headteachers were told that the aim of the study is to explore and enhance the topic of LDS’ inclusion in secondary schools, but information regarding the managerial factors involved in the process (in which headteachers play an important role) has been withheld with the researcher. However, this ethical problem
does not apply to other staff members, most of whom were willing to share their views about the ‘real’ intentions of the headteacher towards LDS’ inclusion. This ethical problem is recognised in the literature. Some argue (Aronson et al., 1990) that if deception is the only way to discover something of real importance, the truth is worth the lies. Miles and Huberman (ibid.: 292) argue that “some researchers have reported deceiving respondents about the true nature of the inquiry”. Punch (1986: 72-3) maintained: “Subjects are conning you until you gain their trust, and then once you have their confidence you begin conning them”.

**Limitations of the study**

The study intended to explore LDS’ inclusion which is a process that has been implemented in the Israeli Educational System since 1988. However, this longitudinal process was actually investigated at one point in time which was the schoolyear of 2000-1.

The issue of generalisability has been discussed at large in the section above. The study focuses on five schools in the Tel Aviv area in which the socio-economic profile of students is heterogeneous but tends towards medium-high. Tables 3.2 and 3.3 in this chapter demonstrate that geographical locations and educational sectors are factors that are related to the implementation of inclusion via policies of assessment. Therefore, the fact that all five schools are located in one geographical location might constrain the ability to generalise from this research. Similarly, this study did not cover all sectors of education, such as the religious, agricultural, and the Arab sectors which also differ in their assessment policies according to previous findings (Margalit et al., 2000).

**Summary**

The ‘unpacking’ of the research questions indicates that the qualitative paradigm should be adopted in this study because its main aim is to gain a holistic, comprehensive picture on LDS’ inclusion which relies on subjective interpretations and perceptions of staff members. Therefore, the approach which seems to fit within the qualitative paradigm is the interpretive-phenomenological approach.
The research analysis relies on three main tools which triangulate one another: questionnaires, interviews and school documents. Twenty-eight interviews with headteachers, counselors and teachers will be analysed qualitatively. A hundred questionnaires were administered to teachers out of which seventy-six questionnaires were returned. The return rate ranged from 75-90% with the exception of school B where the return rate was 55%. Return rate from counselors and headteachers was 100% in all schools. In addition, the analysis of school documents will reflect school policy towards LDS.

The research design starts off in a funnel-like manner by offering a descriptive statistical framework which reflects the general trends that were identified in the questionnaires, and expands to an in-depth exploration of the five schools. The conceptual framework for analysis will be carried out by themes which emanate from the research questions and from the literature. Both questionnaires and interviews are structured because the research aims at obtaining a picture of the general state of inclusion rather than a picture of individual schools. At the same time, the process of interviewing allowed for flexibility.

Despite problems of generalisability in qualitative research, this study aims at arriving at a generalisation in respect of LDS’ inclusion in the Israeli Educational System. General issues of validity in qualitative research were introduced with particular references to trustworthiness in the use of questionnaires and interviews. At the same time, means to resolve these issues were offered via triangulation. The study of LDS’ inclusion involves a multiplicity of ethical problems which are discussed above. The chapter is completed with a brief list of the limitations of the research.
Chapter IV
Presentation of the Findings

Research question I
“How are staff perceptions of school leadership and inclusive leadership related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?”

Leadership
Managerial foci
The five questions in the questionnaires regarding leadership style were combined into one variable (Appendix 8) and presented in Table 4.1. The mean score of 1 represents task-orientation whereas 5 represents people-orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Leadership style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (N=1)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>B (N=1)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>C (N=1)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>D (N=1)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>E (N=2)</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Leadership styles: task or people oriented

Although most headteachers perceived their style as people-oriented, it is argued that this orientation is marginal because their responses are located on the mean of 3+ indicating that they tend towards tasks as well. However, AH had the lowest score among headteachers which means that he is more task-oriented than people-oriented.

The interviews revealed that four of the headteachers acknowledged the importance of human relations in the process of task achievement. AH perceived himself as “wishing to please all parties and fulfill tasks”. BH claimed: “I am highly oriented towards the task as well as the people. You have to be constantly alert and sensitive towards people’s needs. My aim is to make staff here ‘Big Heads’ because I will earn a great asset if I can make them feel they belong”. CH: “With no teachers there is no school”. Further, “when a teacher feels satisfied, he/she will pass the same message
to his/her students”. DH: “First I tend to the learning needs, then I see how the teachers are incorporated in the system”. In school D’s documents it is claimed: “We grant simultaneously kind services to different customers: learners, parents, supervisors and staff members. We treat each of them as if he/she were the most important customer”. However, EH1 explicitly asserted that “both teachers and students should not be made part of school decisions”.

Table 4.2 which presents headteachers’ components for successful headship indicates that four headteachers included an element related to human relations as part as their ‘recipe for success’: AH’s second component was ‘human relations’, BH’s first component was the creation of ‘a climate of belonging’ for people, CH’s first component was ‘teachers’, and DH’s third component was ‘accepting staff members as they are’. EH1 is considered to be an exception as this element is not included in his list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components for successful headship</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The ability to empower</td>
<td>Creating a supportive climate of belonging for students, parents and teachers</td>
<td>Teachers (human resources)</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>To be at the right place at the right moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>Creativity and innovation</td>
<td>Perpetual strive to be better</td>
<td>Accompanying staff in the process of change</td>
<td>The ability to empower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Openness towards change</td>
<td>Creating working norms</td>
<td>Awareness towards the environment</td>
<td>Accepting staff members as they are</td>
<td>Catering for weak and for excellent students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To be constantly alert</td>
<td>Promoting existing school staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.2 Components for success as perceived by headteachers*

In most cases staff members perceived their headteachers as being task-oriented and their orientation towards people was perceived as a way to achieve their goals. In a
similar way, school staff in all schools perceived that headteachers tended towards students more than towards them. For example, AC.1 argued: “Lately teachers have been complaining that their opinion counts less than that of students”. AT.2 argued that “AH doesn’t mind worsening teachers’ timetables if this enables even two students to have better their curricular choice”.

BT.1 claimed that paradoxically “although BH is people-oriented, teachers seem to be reluctant to express their resistance freely”. Indeed, BC.2 argued: “Students are important here but not at the expense of teachers. BH understands that if teachers are deprived of their welfare the results will be bad for the students. It might be concluded that BH is task-oriented but the people are part of the task”. School staff perceived BH as focussing on students and parents rather than on teachers. BT.1 carried this perception even further: “She almost encourages them to complain about every incident they have with their teachers and she calls the teacher for a clarification”. BH expects teachers to be extremely open with their students so that students will feel at ease. Indeed, some teachers left because they could not cope with the pressure.

Perceptions in school C appear to be similar. CT.1: “Although CH is open to teachers’ problems I still think she does it for the sake of tasks”. CC.3 claimed that CH focusses equally on people and tasks. The same balance is perceived as regards the focus on teachers or students: CT.3: “Although CH claims that school serves teachers’ needs CH will not say ‘more than those of students’”. Similarly, CT.1 asserted that although the message conveyed by the management is ‘marketing and satisfying parents’ wishes” no teacher will say that he/she “has no back”.

DC.3 believes that as a result of the major organisational changes at school DH became more people-oriented. However, DT.2 and DT.1 still see DH as being task-oriented and “in favour of students much more than of teachers”.

Similarly, school E’s staff regard both EH1 and EH2 as task-oriented. ET.2: “EH2’s main goal is to increase the rate of entitlement for matriculations among students and enhance school level”. EC.1: “EH2’s message is ‘I’m functioning, I’m carrying out tasks’. Although she provides teachers with professional support, she is totally unaware of human relations”. EH1, who is also a university lecturer, is perceived by
ET.2 as “more involved in the academic world than in school life”. However, school E stands out in its policy towards teachers. EC.2 stated: “There is no appraisal for the teaching profession. The teachers never get any positive feedback. They feel contempt towards them, apart from those who demonstrate power and remain untouched by the management”.

In schools A and B parental involvement is perceived more strongly than in the rest of the schools. The diagram of the division of work in school A contains six times the word ‘parents’, thus giving reason to believe that parents’ opinions are involved in school decision-making to a large extent. BH admits that she knows one third of the parents who came ‘with her’ from the elementary school she was running to school B and of course “they all have an open door to me”.

Summary
Whereas in Schools A, B, C, and D headteachers are aware of the importance of human relations, school E stands out in its headteachers’ tendency towards tasks. School staff feel that their schools are student rather than teacher-centred with the exception of school E which until recently was neither teachers nor students oriented, and has lately increased its focus on students. On another level, a tendency towards increased parental involvement was identified in schools A and B. It might be concluded that schools are similar in staff perceptions regarding their focus on tasks and on students, and differ mainly in the extent of their focus on the scale.

Attitudes towards staff
This issue was perceived differently in the respective schools. The only similarity is that regardless of headteachers’ attitudes, staff always complain.

AH claimed that his attitude towards teachers is based on trust. This perception was supported by school staff. AT.1: “AH tries to meet teachers’ needs and career aspirations”. AT.3 agreed that “his door is always open to students and teachers alike. When he opens a new learning course in which students can major he will always ‘recruit’ existing staff before he recruits outside professionals”. Yet, this perception is not free of criticism: AC.2: “On the one hand he behaves in an over-
BH’s attitudes are characterised by a combination between an open door to teachers and high requirements. On the one hand, she claims that teachers can come up to her with every problem they have. On the other hand, only recently she has sent letters of reprimand to all teachers when she felt that their discipline has loosened. This letter referred to absences, being late to classes, fulfilling duties during breaks. Part of the staff perceives this balance. BC.2 claimed that BH is able to carry out a dialogue without forcing her opinion, whereas BC.1 argued that BH stopped the work of some of the teachers as homeroom teachers. BO, an external consultant to LDS by the Ministry, perceived contradictory messages: “She seems to be very friendly towards teachers. She may write a letter of thanks to teachers who have no absences but at the same time she may be tough towards others”. Other staff members such as BT.1 saw BH’s attitude as totally negative: “We are all the time under observation. BH’s attitude is all hypocrisy and pretense. Teachers were mad at her when they received the letter last year. I was deprived of the right to go to my son’s birthday in kindergarten. She stopped the work of a teacher who was about to retire and made her sit for a whole year in the teachers’ room. Teachers have a feeling that BH does not care at all about their personal problems”.

Staff members usually see CH as having an open door towards them (CT.1, CT.3). As CH is a new headteacher who is constantly evaluated in comparison to the former headteacher, school staff is divided to CH’s opponents who were formerly in favour of T, and CH’s proponents who were previously T’s opponents. An example of CH’s attitudes towards her opponents can be seen in the following anecdote: NJ, a senior teacher who reached the age of 60, was not allowed to continue her work at school despite the fact that she did a great job with school band, only because she was identified with T. CH explained this issue differently: “Had I wanted to take revenge, I could have made her life miserable at school, but I don’t do these kind of things”. Indeed, this sentence shows that CH is aware of the fact that NJ belongs to ‘the other camp’ although she expresses rejection regarding drastic measures towards her.
Before the organisational changes in school D, DC.3 perceived the management as very centralistic: “Teachers could get through to DH or his deputy via the intercom only. They gave you the impression that their offices were the king’s chambers. This conveyed a sense of haughtiness and arose anger”. However, DT.1 contended that DH has changed over the past 3 years. He is more willing to share, provides feedback, consults and receives suggestions and criticism. Moreover, teachers have an open door to him although they are not convinced that “this change is for real”.

ET.1 deduced EH1’s formal relationships with teachers as “remote politeness”: “He calls teachers ‘Mrs... rather than by their first names”’. However, she prefers it to EH2’s putdowns on teachers. On the other hand, letters of appraisal are written to teachers whose classes have the highest average of grades.

**Summary**

It was hard to identify patterns of similarities in headteacher’s attitude towards staff. In school A the general perception is of positive attitudes towards staff. The situation in school D is similar although DH’s attitude is the result of an overall change at school and school staff are uncertain whether this attitude will be long-lasting. Staff in school C are divided into proponents of the former headteacher (T) who naturally became opponents to CH and vice versa. BH’s attitude seems to be a combination of assertiveness and openness. In school E, staff perceive remoteness by EH1 and disrespect by EH2.

**Headteacher’s traits**

School staff have a high evaluation of AH’s personality. Teachers’ evaluated AH as “warm” (AT.2), “empathic” (AT.1) and “extremely human” (AT.3). Staff reported that in one case AH went to rescue a teacher that was involved in car accident. In another case he encouraged all staff to donate blood for a sick teacher. Every year AH personally leads the school trip to Poland and “acts as a father to all students who absolutely adore him after this trip” (AT.3).

School staff portrayed an ideal educational personality for BH. BC.2: “BH’s leading style is her personality. This is a real educational figure who differentiates between accomplishments and educational processes. In addition, she is all heart. She
combines a humanistic, educational and organisational approach. She can set borders and read the map well. She is able to recruit people and create commitment towards school. She applies humanistic ways of sharing and does not attempt to be Mrs. Know-All as the previous headteacher, but at the same time she has her own requirements”. BT.2: “BH has an EQ of 2000! She feels her audience. Taking and giving in return is a basic principle for her”.

CT.3’s opinion of CH’s character is hinted in the following statement: “What teachers need here is someone who can lead professionally as well as improve human relations”.

DC.3 contended that DH lacks assertiveness as a result of which he has lost his power. She proceeded: “In my opinion DH has not internalised the change and I believe he would easily resume his old style. I sense he’s already become remote and it makes me wonder whether this might be the reason that two members of the contracted management have already quit”.

School staff expressed reluctance regarding EH1’s personality. EC.1: “EH1 used to run school as in a communist party. He handles school matters with Gestapo measures”.

Summary
It is noteworthy that data regarding headteachers’ traits were read and interpreted ‘between the lines’. The way AH’s personality is perceived by the staff accords with their perception of his positive attitude towards them. In school B, however, perceptions of staff seem to be far more positive as regards BH’s personality than as regards attitudes towards staff. In school C perceptions seem to be low but one must remember that CH has only started her job. In school D staff are unconfident of the changes in DH. In school E staff expressed extreme negative attributes towards EH1 and EH2 which go in accordance with their perceptions of EH1 and EH2’s attitudes.

Perceptions of leadership: ‘manager’ versus ‘leader’
Three headteachers perceive their roles as a ‘leadership’ role. AH contended that “most headteachers are managers more than leaders even if they argue otherwise”,
and that “a headteacher should be more of a leader and less of a manager”. Yet, due to time deficiency AH believes that “I’m not enough of a leader”. However, an examination of AH’s words indicates the use of two managerial elements in his perception of leadership. The first one is empowerment: “The only way to achieve this is by allocating more free time to himself via the empowerment of staff members”. The second is the management of budgets: AH maintains that schoolheads should be perceived as general managers of hi-tech companies and be able to take part in the same management training with them “without feeling that they take the money directly from their own students”.

BH perceives school headship as leadership depending on charisma rather than management. School staff support her perceptions. BT.2 admits that BH is a leader: “Before she came, 20% of the teachers worked and the remaining 80% didn’t. Now the picture has reversed. She can make people do their utmost. However, if she suspects someone is malfunctioning, she gets back at him/her. For example, she made three teachers sit in the teachers’ room because she found them unsuitable for teaching until they finally retired”. Indeed, BH’s educational doing shows that she is involved in managerial issues such as staff recruitment and not only in leadership as she perceives herself.

CH’s perception is that “a headteacher must have vision and commitment towards society. He/she must know where he/she leads school. He/she must be able to push the organisation forwards but at the same time look to the sides so that he/she does not keep moving while the rest are left behind… He/she should also be a manager and surround him/herself with management people of high quality”.

DH argues that “a headteacher should be a leader more than a manager because he/she should have a vision for school rather than fulfill missions”. He adds that “a headteacher is isolated in the tree-top but he/she must not forget that there is a whole tree beneath them”. Yet, he is not perceived as a leader by school staff. DT3: “Now that this change has failed, I’m afraid DH will go back to managing the left-overs of change rather than lead school. He might finally understand that a change process should rely on vision rather than on power”.
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EH1 contends that leadership and management are both needed for successful school headship: “Leadership is required at critical intersections before a change is made and the headmaster needs to take a lead. Leadership should not be demonstrated at all times. Not every student in this school should recognise me, I am not a Mussolini. I’m well aware of the fact that leading change is sometimes done at the cost of sympathy because as a leader you sometimes cannot listen to people. On the other hand, a headteacher should be a manager too because he/she is holding the budgets and making the decisions”. EH1 perceives his position at school as ‘a limited autonomy’. He claims: “I’m always shocked when I hear or see headteachers who behave as if school is their own private territory and possession. I’m in favour of feeling autonomous to make decisions and I object to top-down dictations from the Ministry, but I always remember that I may not be here tomorrow as I’ve been appointed to my position and I might be replaced by another headteacher some day”. EC.2 perceives EH1 as “the Minister of foreign Affairs’ who is mainly interested in his job as a lecturer at a university, whereas school is actually run by EH2 who carries out EH1’s policy”.

Summary
Findings indicate that although some headteachers (AH, BH and DH) assert that school headship is about leadership, reality proves to be different. Headship always involves management elements, whether this is perceived by headteachers (as in the case of CH and EH), by staff (DH), or by the examination of their own work (AH and BH).

The management of change and resistance to change
Headteachers perceive leading change processes as a major part of their duties to school. For example, in school A’s documents it is stated: “We make continuous efforts to lead a school with strategies of innovation as seems to be required in this era”. AH states: “A manager in our era should demonstrate openness towards continuous learning and changes. I inserted TQM five years ago because my main objective is to enable staff members to use their full potential”. Another example is CH who contends: “As in hi-tech, school management is in a perpetual race. For example, new subjects in which students can major should be continuously initiated. I’ve added this year Police Studies, Technology, and Spanish”. DH: “Changes in
school will never end because school should be a mirror of society which keeps changing”. The perception of teachers’ role has changed to that of ‘alternative teaching’ which focuses on exposure of students to unique curricular activities which require the role of a challenging instructor rather than a Know-All provider of information. The theme of ‘future challenges’ keeps repeating in school marketing brochure. School E is portrayed according to school documents as “a competitive super-area school which aims at qualifying its students for future challenges”.

School headteachers tend to believe in gradual rather than acute changes and perceive themselves as co-operating rather than imposing changes on staff. AH: “A manager should learn to insist on his ideas in graceful ways”. BH relies on her personality: “I do not believe in big revolutions but rather in a gradual, slow process. Usually I bring my own belief and it is not difficult to convey it to school staff and take them along with me”.

In fact, the following description of BH is considered as an example for gradual, well-planned change implementation:

“During my first year I focussed on getting to know the staff while creating a climate of safety. I took some measures to change the climate: individual talks with all 130 teachers, a school trip for the staff, work with the teachers’ council. But when I said ‘I intend to stay here for many years’, it made people laugh. At the end of the first year I initiated some organisational changes: I fired two deputies who contributed to the climate of anti, I stopped the work of a teacher who used to insult students and another teacher who was unsuitable professionally. These two teachers were the remains of the time when school was vocational and different norms prevailed. I removed the Head of the Senior High School whom I found unsuitable for the job, and I put out a tender for the role of Head of Junior High to all staff. In the third year I introduced an organisational consultant to work with the expanded management as I felt that this was a body of individuals and not a united managerial body. I noticed cliques that resulted from the frequent change in headteachers. Although during the first year everybody was making efforts, in the second year I noticed that people were not interested in each other’s job and I wanted to change that. I believe in the ‘fan
system’ to conduct change. Therefore, if the expanded management works well, it can convey to all professional circles at school the same ideas and the same climate”.

DH argues: “When I go for a change, I take the responsibility to collect all people that are involved, design the process together and then see that it is implemented. I do not impose change on people. Indeed, two years ago I notified teachers that we were about to start a change process and we would build this new organisational-conceptual vision together as one team”. However, EH stands out in his perception of change as he believes that sometimes drastic changes are required and claims that school has survived because “we knew how to read the map and adopt ourselves to the changing environment”. He proceeds: “The way I make people accept changes is via talking, listening, and a lot of patience. I try to make teachers understand that it’s all about surviving”.

All headteachers tend to agree that it is much easier to incorporate changes with young teachers than with senior ones. EHI: “Streaming new blood into the system might be an effective way to overcome resistance”.

Summary
Findings indicated that all headteachers perceive change as an important part of their duties. Most of them believe in gradual change-making with the exception of EH who believes in drastic changes dictated by the changing reality. However, all headteachers claim that they conduct change via staff cooperation. Indeed, in most cases teachers and counselors agree that headteachers are trying to introduce changes in a pleasant way, although they become mostly intolerant when they face resistance. A high level of awareness towards resistance was identified in school D which failed to cope with resistance.

Headteachers tend to agree that inexperienced teachers are easy to be recruited towards change initiatives. The clearest difference concerning headteachers’ attitude towards change seems to be between DH and BH: whereas BH was active and in full control of the organisational moves, DH appeared to follow in a passive way the initiatives of the organisational consultants that seemed to have been somehow imposed on him too.
Summary of the findings on leadership

Findings regarding leadership encompass issues of leadership and management foci, attitudes towards staff and management of change.

Most headteachers perceive themselves as being people-oriented, and are aware of the importance of the human factor. This accords with staff perceptions that headteachers are people-oriented as a means to achieve school goals. In fact, headteachers seem to focus on people and tasks simultaneously. This conclusion is compatible with another finding: headteachers tend to perceive themselves as leaders more than managers (except for EH and CH who claim that they are both leaders and managers). However, reality proves to be different and findings indicate that all headteachers in this research are also managers. Indeed, both findings imply that headship is a combination of people and task orientation, as well as of leadership and management, whereas the differences lie in the placement of these elements on the scale.

Regarding ‘managerial foci’, teachers perceive that headteachers focus on students rather than on teachers. In some cases such as in schools A, C and D it is done implicitly, whereas in school B teachers perceive that it is done explicitly. School E has a slight tendency towards students and a negative tendency towards teachers. The issue of ‘managerial foci’ is also related to ‘attitudes towards staff’. Generally, staff perceive a willingness on headteachers’ part to be open towards staff, with the exception of school E. However, staff perceptions of headteacher’s attitudes were compatible with their perceptions of headteacher’s tendency towards people or tasks. For example, EH1 has stated explicitly that teachers’ interest are not taken into consideration in school management. Similarly, teachers perceive negative attitudes on EH1 and EH2’s part.

The issue of ‘attitudes’ is equally related to ‘leadership traits’. In school E where staff perceive negative attitudes on the part of EH1 and EH2, it also express negative attributes towards them, whereas in school A where attitudes are perceived to be positive, teachers used positive attributes towards AH.
Findings concerning the management of change have yielded the following information: all headteachers are in favour of gradual changes which are to be achieved by consent and cooperation rather than by coercion. School E seems to stand out in EH’s perception of drastic changes. However, when it gets to the point of resistance, headteachers become less tolerant and use their authority.

The facts that most headteachers are aware of the need to be people-oriented, to develop a visionary leadership and to convey change with caution need to be measured now against the concept of inclusive leadership, in an attempt to explore whether and to what extent they are intertwined.

**Inclusive leadership**

**Inclusive vision**

All sixteen questions of concerning strategic vision were combined into one variable (Appendix 8) to represent headteachers’ perceptions of their inclusive vision (Table 4.3). On a scale of 1 to 5, figure 1 represents a policy which encourages excellence whereas 5 represents a policy which encourages the provision of educational needs for weaker populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A (N=1)</th>
<th>School B (N=1)</th>
<th>School C (N=1)</th>
<th>School D (N=1)</th>
<th>School E (N=2)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inclusive vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Table 4.3 Perceptions of inclusive vision of headteachers*

Findings indicate that AH and BH have the highest score in their perceptions of inclusive vision whereas school D and E have the lowest means. These findings are significant for the research because the questions reflect headteachers’ strategic planning as well as attitudes towards inclusion, thus combining management and inclusion aspects. However, all headteachers are presented on the positive end of inclusive vision.
School documents and the interviews were explored in an attempt to verify to what extent inclusive vision can be found in schools’ rhetoric. Findings indicate that school B stand out as it is the only school that stresses the issue of inclusion in its documents. This is done explicitly and to a very large extent: “The enhancement of weak learners has become a top priority for us as part of the support system”. Further, “while waving the flag of materialising individual needs we refer to each and every one of our students including those with special needs”. The top priority on the list of school’s strategic goals is “building a support system for the acquisition of learning skills for weak students and for LDS”. Inclusive vision is expressed in the following words: “School opens its gates for every student from far and near and offers him/her adapted teaching which fits its special needs, encourages pedagogic and social integration and individual care for SEN”. Further, “the need on the part of mainstream students to respond as ‘involved and responsible adults’ who practice daily support for ‘the different’ is part of school vision and not merely a slogan”.

School documents support BH’s inclusive vision: “SEN and LDS are very close to my heart. While I was running the elementary school I felt it was some elitist bubble and I strongly objected to it. Therefore, in every age group we have at least one SEN class with autists and retarded students who have been partly integrated in mainstream classes this year”. The rest of the staff supports BH’s perception. For example, BC.1 feels that “the issue of SEN students and SEN classes has been given a push by BH. It has been made part of school vision”.

On the other hand school E stands out for its non-inclusive vision. Firstly, EH1 expressed his non-involvement regarding ‘field matters’: “You should talk to the people ‘down there’”. Furthermore, EH objects to the policy of inclusion of the Ministry in secondary schools: “I think we are over-preoccupied with weak students. Indeed, we’ve crossed all borderlines. The educational system should determine where each student studies according to his/her abilities even if it this affects the number of students in this school. I strongly object to the policy of Open Enrolment and of Non-exclusion of the Ministry. The educational liberalism has turned into educational anarchy”. However, it is noteworthy that the overall score of headteachers in school E is 3.83 which indicates a tendency towards inclusion. The
statistical mismatch can be explained by the fact that this score has been combined from EH1 and EH2’s responses.

An examination of the remaining schools shows that inclusive vision is sometimes perceived as related to other interests. For example, AH attested: “We wouldn’t have reached that level of entitlement for matriculations had it not been for the 25% assessed as LDS who get special accommodations”. Indeed, AC.1, AC.2 and AT.1 agreed that AH’s vision towards LDS’ inclusion results from his wish to increase the level of students entitled to get matriculation certificates and thus improve school image. AT.1: ”LDS is not a central issue in this school”. AT.2: “School vision provides responses to the day-to-day needs of LDS which do not rely on a deep educational philosophy”. These perceptions stand in contradiction to the statistical findings which rely on questionnaires, as they suggest that AH tends towards inclusion more than all other headteachers with the highest score of 4.83. This mismatch could be explained by the fact that, indeed, AH perceives himself as highly aware of LDS’ needs, and his wish to increase the entitlement for matriculations is an additional reason but not the main one for his inclusive practice.

CT.3 is also the coordinator of the special low-level matriculation-oriented class whose students are integrated in mainstream classes. She perceived CH’s visionary inclusion via school budget. She argued that CH maintains that to open a separate class would cost school more than to have the students partially integrated because this way school gets a double support for them as they actually belong to two classes.

Two main perceptions concerning inclusive vision were observed in school D: DH admitted that his involvement is restricted to “the level of policy”. This indicates that he is not involved in the implementation process at all. DH believes that the number of students assessed as LDS is inflated and the most important thing in his eyes is the full implementation of test accommodations. DH acknowledged that he fears that his school will be viewed as a second-chance school and all LDS will be sent to them. These statements do not provide evidence for inclusive vision in school D. This view is supported by DT.1 who maintains that despite the fact that teachers follow instructions as regards test accommodations and their awareness has increased, they “do not really understand what LD means”.

204
Summary
The statistical findings match the findings from the interviews and school documents partially. Schools D and E have the lowest scores according to both analyses. However, the discrepancy in school E between the picture of non-inclusive vision that emerges from the interviews and the relatively high statistical score of the statistics can be accounted for by the fact that the score is a combination of EH1 and EH2, and EH2 has a more inclusive view than EH1.

The interviews also revealed that the fear that school image will be that of a second-chance school underpins DH’s vision. The highest level of inclusive vision has been marked in school B and this finding accords with the statistical findings. Albeit staff perception of AH’s vision is that it is measured by the number of students assessed rather than by a deep inclusive approach, it might well be the case that sending students to assessments is his way to help LDS. This might explain the fact that AH has the highest score of inclusive leadership in the statistical presentation. Similarly, CH’s inclusive vision is perceived by teachers as related to budgets, although the statistical level of vision is high. The discrepancy between rhetoric and reality in schools A and C seems to derive from the fact that headteachers cannot ‘afford’ to declare a non-inclusive policy.

Headteachers’ support for teachers regarding LDS
Tables 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 illustrate within-school discrepancies in the perceptions of the support teachers get in their daily handling of LDS. Whereas headteachers’ perceptions of their willingness to support teachers range from 4 to 5, teachers’ perceptions of the level of support they believe they receive range from 2.6 to 3.6 and counselors’ perceptions of the support teachers get is even lower and range from 1.5 to 3.25. In addition, counselors tend to believe that teachers are frustrated due to the difficulties they face while handling LDS (Table 4.6). These findings illustrate that one of the major problems of the implementation is the existence of gaps between individual and group perceptions especially in respect of practical responses such as support for teachers.
Table 4.4  Headteachers’ perceptions of support for mainstream teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to support teachers regarding their LDS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I receive adequate support in handling LDS&quot;</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main finding from these Tables is that schools B and C had the highest score of perceptions of counselors and teachers, whereas school D had the lowest counselors’ score. Moreover, the fact that counselors’ perceptions were lower than teachers’, might be related to their higher involvement with SEN students, and consequently higher expectations regarding support for LDS.

Although all headteachers are willing to provide support to mainstream teachers, AH is the only headteacher who relates in the interview to LDS inclusion in particular: “I’m doing my best to recompense teachers but the Ministry policy is like acrobatics”. The counselors, on the other hand, discerned this issue differently.
Table 4.6 Counselors’ perceptions of the support teachers receive as regards LDS

AC.1: “An atomic pressure is placed on school staff regarding special test accommodations. In some classes one teacher has to test 10-12 students orally without getting paid for this extra input. Teachers are continuously evaluated by the matriculation results in their (often weak) classes. In addition, they are in a state of anxiety that more students will get special test accommodations, which means that they will need to allocate more of their free time without being compensated. The same pressure is even stronger on counselors. If AH finds out about a weak student he starts urging us to ‘get oral tests for him’ even though he might not be LDS at all. He also insists that we contact the student’s assessor in order to ‘better’ the test accommodations. This puts an enormous pressure on all of us and makes us feel at complete loss of control”. AC.2 adds that “these pressures on staff increase as the students reach the highest grades of secondary school towards matriculations”. Similarly, teachers complain that they are not compensated for what they do and their efforts are taken for granted.
EH1 argued that he provided support to teachers in respect of the need to integrate the new heterogeneous population that arose with the shift to a comprehensive school. He claimed he did so “with a lot of patience, personally as well as in pedagogic meetings”. Conversely, EC.1 maintained that school does not provide any guidelines to enhance teachers and parents’ awareness towards LDS which is usually low in the south of Tel-Aviv.

Other headteachers (BH, CH, DH) perceived themselves as providing support although they did not refer specifically to LDS in their answers. However, these findings are congruent with the statistics because schools B and C were perceived as the highest in the Tables but no contradictory information is elicited from the interviews concerning support on LD.

**Summary**

The statistical findings as well as the picture emerging from the interviews indicate gaps between headteachers’ high perceptions of support as opposed to staff perceptions which seem to be much lower. School staff argue that no support is provided concerning LDS. Apart from AH, all headteachers referred to other contexts concerning support in their responses and not to the context of LDS.

**Headteacher’s initiatives on staff training on LD**

This issue is believed to be a key factor in the process of inclusion, because one of the main claims of staff members was that they are expected to perform tasks with LDS
for which they have never been prepared. Tables 4.7 and 4.8 expose headteachers’ perceptions of staff training on LD and on the number of times such training courses have been offered to members at school (“more than 3 times” was maximum). Both Tables have been worked out on a scale of 1 to 5 whereas 5 indicates high level of training and 1 indicates no training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A (N=1)</th>
<th>School B (N=1)</th>
<th>School C (N=1)</th>
<th>School D (N=1)</th>
<th>School E (N=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the staff have taken courses on LD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7  Headteachers’ perceptions with regard to staff training on LDS
The general impression from the Tables is that except for school E headteachers tended to believe that teachers were trained on LD (schools B and D have the highest average of 4). Headteachers’ perception was that school offered courses (three headteachers believed it was ‘more than 3 times’ and one headteacher said ‘twice or three times’). The exception was school E with a low headteachers’ perception on this issue.

The picture that emerged from the interviews is consistent with the statistical findings. For example, DH perceived that almost all staff members participated in training courses on LD in two in-service courses of 56 hours each, one being for the homeroom teachers and the second for the professional teachers. AH pointed out that at the beginning of every year all teachers get an instruction sheet on how to identify LDS as they teach or correct students’ papers. This might indicate that AH does not perceive a real need for training courses on this topic. BH recalled team meetings with school counselors and psychologists on LDS. In addition, School B was one of eight secondary schools all over the country which gave their consent to participate in a pilot study on LDS, which indicates a positive trend towards staff training. CH is aware of teachers’ difficulty to attend compulsory training courses after school hours. She claimed that “teachers’ training on LDS lies in their intuition”. These findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of in-service training on LD offered by the headteacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twice or three times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 The number of in-service training sessions on LD offered by headteachers
accord with the fact that teachers are not made to attend training offered by school. Contrarily, EH1 did not mention any courses on LD at school.

**Summary**

Findings indicate that apart from EH1 all headteachers demonstrated average to high perceptions as regards in-service LDS training in their schools. The highest perceptions were observed in schools B and D and the lowest perceptions in school E. The average perceptions in schools A and C are consistent with findings from the interviews according to which AH and CH trust teachers’ intuition while handling LDS.

**Summary of the findings on inclusive leadership**

The investigation of inclusive leadership comprised the following issues: inclusive vision, support for teachers regarding LDS, and headteacher’s initiation of staff training on LDS. It was assumed that a headteacher whose level of inclusive vision is high will also support its staff regarding LDS and initiate training on this issue.

The picture which came out of the statistical data indicated a tendency towards inclusive vision by all headteachers. The highest level of inclusive vision from all data sources seems to pertain to school B and the lowest level seems to be of school D and E where headteachers claimed they were not involved with LDS.

Findings on ‘support for teachers’ were not encouraging. In two of the schools (A and E) gaps were observed between headteachers’ perceptions (which were high) and staff perceptions which were much lower. In the rest of the schools headteachers did not refer specifically to LDS in their answers and preferred to mention other aspects of school life for which they provide help. Perceptions of LDS training showed that there was an accord between perceptions of staff and headteachers. The highest overall perceptions were observed in school B and D and the lowest score was observed in school E. In schools A and C headteachers’ perceptions were average and the training that was initiated was indeed minimal.

**Research question 2**
“How are staff perceptions of school culture and inclusive culture related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?”

Culture

School credo

The exploration of school credo encompassed four issues: the values that underpin school work, school’s general approach towards students, points which concern teachers’ role, attitudes towards excellence and learning difficulties. Findings indicate similarities between schools A, B, and C as one group and between school D and E as another group.

Whereas school A emphasises the value of “equal opportunities for all”, “a listening ear” and “personal responses”, school B and C emphasise social values. BH: “Values underpin the choice courses in each field of interest”. School C documents advocate to be “socially involved and contribute to the Israeli society”. However, school B stood out in its social awareness. The core value of school seems to be responsibility which is demonstrated in developing supportive attitudes and social involvement among its mainstream students towards SEN students with severe disabilities who study in four classes and are integrated in school life. This involvement is also demonstrated in the ‘Coaching’ project for the low graders and for the SEN students in school. The emphasis on social values is seen in school’s rapport with the community, mainly with the Scouts in an attempt to develop young leadership. Another project for the enhancement of social awareness is a continuous dialogue with Arab students and with students from low socio-economic areas of Israel.

Schools B and C appeared to be very similar in their approach towards students. They provide listening, warmth and personal response for individual needs. They help them materialise their potential and offer them security and fun in the duration of studies. This approach can be summarised by BT.2: “We’ll bring down the sun for each student, but he/she has to reach a hand for it”. As regards the focus on excellent or weak students, staff members perceived school credo as “open and inclusive towards
all learners” (CT.3) and as “catering for excellent students as well as for potential dropouts” (AH).

In schools D and E which make the second group school values are related to the changing society and the future hi-tech world. School D’s name was changed to ‘the Interdisciplinary Campus for The ‘Languages’ of the New Era’. School documents present the new values: “The new Interdisciplinary Campus for the ‘Languages’ of the New Era is a centre where the learner practices ‘languages’ in combination of new fields of interest which have been adapted to the changing and renewing life environments...The campus is a simulation of the authentic life environment: it enables the learner to meet real life via the acquisition of environmental ‘languages’. The more ‘languages’ a learner acquires, the greater his/her capacity to cope with the complex reality of the world of tomorrow. The central values that feature the campus are: innovation, achievements, dynamism, quality”.

School E’s documents “A Passport to Success in a Hi-Tech World” open up with Socrates’ statement: “The best way to live is to constantly seek the way to become better”. School E strives to convey academic, scientific and technological knowledge to its students and enable them to materialise their potential “in an attempt to encourage independent, creative and critical thinking”. In a larger format other values that are mentioned are social values such as democracy and pluralism, relatedness to the community; human values such as justice, equality, the sacredness of life, and traditional values such as the Jewish history.

Schools D and E do not appear to be student-centred. A noteworthy fact is that in school D’s documents there is no personal addressing to ‘students’, ‘our students’, or ‘students in this school’, but only the general use of the word ‘learners’. An examination of the priority list of school objectives reveals that the issue of ‘students’ welfare’ is ranked as the last item.

Teachers’ roles are viewed differently in School B and school D. BC.2 perceives school credo as “self-commitment to excellence on teachers’ part so that students are enabled to achieve their utmost”. The following idea is expressed in school D’s
documents: “Teachers will be responsible for the growing academic knowledge of the learners in an esthetic environment, rich in stimuli and resources. This system empowers the learner and transfers responsibility to him/her. The supervisors help learners in their encounters to combine data and experience, understanding and experimenting”.

EH1 seems to be the only person in school E who defines school as “a comprehensive school with a technological-scientific orientation which aims at addressing the needs of weak students as well as excellent ones”. However, no other staff member nor school documents refer to this point in schools D and E.

Summary
An in-depth inquiry of school credo indicated that schools A, B, and C focus on social values such as equality of opportunities and responsibility as part of their credo. They advocate personal responses and catering for individual students’ needs. Teachers’ role is perceived as helping students to materialise their needs. Conversely, schools D and E focus on future technology as part of their credo and do not seem to place students in the centre of their interest. They perceive teachers’ role as supervising rather than conveying knowledge and advocate excellence rather than catering for weak students.

School climate
Perceptions of school climate range from ‘positive’, perceived as ‘collaborative and cooperative’, to ‘negative’, marked by a deficiency of collaboration and cooperation. The findings provide data regarding each school as well as on the three respondent groups. Schools’ mean of the perception of climate ranged from 3.4 to 3.8 with the exception of school A with the mean of 2.86. Teachers’ perceptions were around the mean of 3.5 to 4.00 on a scale of 1 to 5 with the exception of school A which seems to have a less collaborative climate with the mean of 2.81. The differences between schools are significant (F(4,67)= 3.50, p<.05). Counselors’ perceptions of culture are inconsistent with teachers’: school D has the least perceived collaborative climate (M=2.83) and school B has the most collaborative climate (M=4.00). Other schools were in between. These results were not significant due to the small number of
counselors. Headteachers’ perceptions do not show major differences among participants. Results ranged from the mean of 3.00 to 3.5. Significance tests were not conducted due to the small number of headteachers. These findings are presented in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headteachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.9 Perceptions of school climate*

These findings suggest inconsistency in the perceptions of the different populations. The highest overall score was observed in school C (3.78) whereas the lowest score was observed in school A (2.86). The section below offers an in-depth exploration of school climate which attempts to clarify these findings.

The main similarity that was observed across the five schools was the positive climate presented in school documents in respect of teachers and students. For example, in school A’s documents it is stated: “School is operated in the light of the principles of democracy by joined committees of teachers and students”. School encourages social
activities, integration with the Scouts, sports, active students’ council, developing youth leadership, students’ musical band and newspaper. Students quoted in school brochure attest that “in our school teachers’ attitudes and personal treatment is not another empty slogan”. AH, too, sees the atmosphere in the teachers’ room as pleasant. However, the big gap in school A between perceptions of climate in school documents and the statistical findings indicates the gap between a ‘declared’ climate and a ‘real’ climate.

However, school documents do not focus on teachers’ and counselors’ perceptions of climate which could be mainly clarified in the interviews. Schools could be divided into two groups as regards this issue. In schools B and C school staff demonstrated the highest awareness towards climate during the interviews. Both headteachers and staff’s perceptions in these schools are that school climate has become more positive since BH and CH were appointed.

CH maintains that she has created a positive climate since she entered her position this year. She sees this climate as characterised by positive attitudes towards teachers: “With T (the former headteacher) there were always terrible shouts. I talk calmly and there are always words of appraisal alongside scrutiny”. CH attests that she fired some people who were associated with the ‘high-volume’ style of T and with the climate of the ‘initiated gossip’ in which “teachers were sent to explore pieces of gossip that were given to them by T herself”. Most school staff supported the view that the climate has changed since CH took over. CC.2, CT.1, CT.2 and CT.3 asserted that T’s management was featured by cliques which are perceived much less this year. CT.1: “CH brings cakes to the teachers’ room for every personal celebration or Holy Days”. CT.1 mentioned the school mugs decorated by the new (green) school logo which were also given as presents to teachers’ homes.

In addition, the system is open to staff initiatives, and there is a feeling of relaxation, warmth and direct rapport with the management (CC.1). CT.3 points out that “there is a feeling of autonomy within teams and there is less pressure to come to pedagogic meetings”. This perceived climate is supported by school documents: “Students in this school are not captured in package deals and are free to make their own IPs”. In addition, CH repeats twice in her introduction to school documents the word
‘happiness’ and ‘enjoy studies’ and this gives the impression that school strives towards a climate in which students are happy and satisfied. Yet, CC.2 acknowledged problems: “It’s difficult to define climate here because it varies from one team to the other. Indeed, in some teams the flow of communication is deficient and is featured by lack of collegiality”.

The climate in school B’s documents was described as “supportive and warm”. It focusses on varied activities related to culture and values, on professionalism, social coherence, professional development and staff welfare. BH asserted that the first change she initiated is that teachers would stop insulting students. Other changes were professional: “I’ve created a positive competition. Staff meetings have become a forum to present achievements. Being ‘Big Heads’ is contagious”. BH is striving towards developing a sense of belonging among staff members: “I still think that subject coordinators care mainly about their subject and do not feel they belong to school. That will have to be changed”. BC.1: “Teachers enjoy working here more than in the past. There are no cliques. There is a feeling that the work is being done and there is someone to talk to. Decisions are not imposed.”. BC.2 supported this view: “There is something different in the climate BH creates around her. No one else would have succeeded to adopt these patterns because it would have seemed pathetic. The feeling BH conveys is ‘I take care of your welfare and you take care of the organisation’s (and students’) welfare’”. Some teachers strengthen this perception. BT.2 who is an age coordinator argued: “We’re very proud to work here. The climate has indeed changed. In the past teachers perceived lack of care and supervision on the part of the manager”. Yet, BT.1 pictured a negative climate: “Teachers are afraid to lose their job if they express their opinion. The main clique at school is the management. There are no forums where teachers can ‘talk things out’ and in the regular teachers’ plenums no one will dare ‘get him/herself into the mud’. On the surface the climate might look ideal but every word is registered and retrieved in due time”.

It is contended that the extremely contradictory perceptions were reflected in teachers’ statistical score which was above the average score, although not very high (3.45).
The study yielded similarity with reference to schools A, D, and E concerning a negative change in the climate following changes made at school. AT.3 perceived fear and anxiety among teachers since the insertion of TQM and damage to school climate, because certain teachers do not get to teach certain classes as a result of the yearly surveys among students. In addition, she perceived tension among teachers who do not share the results of the yearly TQM questionnaires. Indeed, two changes were made: last year the questionnaire was re-phrased and questions that were defined as ‘insulting’ by teachers were removed. In addition, a survey was administered on school management functioning among teachers as well. DC.3 maintained that as a result of major organisational changes, the new leading staff became highly motivated as their status increased. The climate changed to the worst because people who used to be key leaders were deprived of their power and created their own cliques. This resistance became destructive to school climate. DC.3: “The air is full of intrigues at school right now”. DC.3 added: “Anger is addressed towards DH who initiated the change, towards the senior teachers who destroyed the chances to succeed, and towards the municipality who failed to assist”.

It is also noteworthy that school C, D, and E expressed an attempt in their documents to reduce violence and create “an educational climate of security and love among students” (school D). A study of school E’s documents yielded that among school goals, emphasis is placed on “an educatiotional climate of security and love among students”, which will be achieved via attempts to decrease the violence rate, reduce incidents of damaging school equipment, and enhance discipline. EH2’s nomination as the manager of the Senior High school and the shift of school into a comprehensive school have changed school climate. EC.2 reported the consequences of both changes: “In the past teachers were much more independent at school because EH1 was not really involved in their work. As a result some of them used to end their teaching session after 20 minutes and spend the rest of the time in the teachers’ room. The atmosphere was quite chaotic. There were not even forms to report on students’ misbehaviour. When EH1 was appointed, the climate changed. Teachers had to follow regulations and at the same time they were required to cope with school new population featured by behaviour and environmental problems. Moreover, teachers were forced to adapt to it overnight. These frustrations and anger created a new
climate in the teachers’ room, a climate of cooperation and ‘whining’ which resulted from the lack of feedback from the management”.

Although EC.2’s perception seems to be of a more positive climate, teachers see these climatic changes as “a loss of independence which increased their sense of weariness” (ET.1). Furthermore, they acknowledge the existence of cliques which were formed when schools of the same Net had closed down and groups of teachers moved to school E. ET.2 defines school climate as “objecting to EHI who is too direct and blatant towards teachers”.

Summary
The statistical findings suggest inconsistency as regards perceptions of the research populations. The highest overall score was observed in school C (3.78) whereas the lowest score was observed in school A (2.86).

Schools were mainly divided into two groups concerning findings: overall perceptions in schools B and C were that climate has changed for the better since the nomination of BH and CH. In the other group which encompassed schools A, D, and E perceptions indicate that climate has changed for the worse as a result of changes that have been made. However, the abovementioned BT.1 and ET.1’s perceptions show that climatic perceptions are totally subjective and generalisations should be made with caution.

Teamwork and collaboration
This issue is considered as part of school climate because the way teamwork is perceived is related to the perception of school atmosphere. This is clearly expressed in school documents and headteachers’ rhetoric. For example, school C’s documents advocate that success is dependent upon “a feeling of true partnership, mutual respect, the ability to work in rooms with transparent walls and the ability to accept constructive criticism”. AH and EH use metaphors from the world of music: “One man makes a single sound. A group of people makes a melody” (AH); “Education is not for soloists. It is a teamwork” (EH).
School B stood out in its overall perceptions of staff of collaboration and teamwork. School documents refer mainly to subject and professional teamwork. BH maintained that the expanded management is an irrelevant body if it does not work in consolidation. Therefore, she introduced organisational consultants to work with the expanded management, “open things up in the right dosage” and define the purposes of this managerial body. Counselors and teachers alike perceive that “due to BH there is a lot more of teamwork and collaboration in the professional teams accompanied by supervision and control” (BC.2).

In school C staff perceptions are pretty much the same and “teachers perceive attempts on the part of the management to create a positive climate of togetherness” (CT.1). This view applies to students too: “Students in this school are not captured in package deals and are free to make their own IP”. However, CT.3 perceives a decrease in the positive school climate: “When I first arrived 14 years ago this school was a model of teamwork. It is not anymore”. The decrease is mainly in a climate of dispute within the subject teams as a result of which three pedagogic coordinators have quit. CT.2 attested that CH is standing helpless in the face of these disputes. Indeed, teachers perceived the lack of professional leadership and an avoidance strategy on the part of CH as the main factors in the failure of teamwork. Indeed, last year organisational counselors started working with the teams of homeroom teachers which have much fewer disputes than subject teams.

However, as opposed to schools B and C where staff perceive headteachers as contributing to a positive climate of collaboration, staff of school A have a different perception. AC.2: “Explicitly there is collaboration in school but implicitly AH imposes his decisions”. AT.2: “AH doesn’t really care about teamwork. What he really cares about is students’ satisfaction”.

In school D teamwork and collaboration seemed to be part of school credo: “Learning should focus on the common features of different ‘languages’. The interdisciplinary idea, then, is reflected in teams of teachers, learners and parents from various ‘languages’ who strive for a better quality. This can be done in respect of an idea, a process, or a skill”. Similarly, DC.3 maintained that the work in the forums was an example of real teamwork whereas previously there was no teamwork at all: “Even the greatest opponents were ready at some point to collaborate regarding inter-
disciplinary art programmes whereas a year ago they would not even hear about it”.
However, reality proved to be different and DT.2 who was a member of a forum (team) asserted: “To be honest, I’m not even sure who the members of my forum are”.

In school E subject teams meet on a weekly basis. The compensatory profit of teams is reflected in ET.2’s words: “Subject teams is the one place at school where we can get feedback on our work”.

Summary
School documents in all schools express belief in teamwork and collaboration. Findings in this area indicate that a number of factors are involved in this issue. Staff perceptions from school B and C emphasise the contribution or lack thereof of the headteacher’s personality. Perceptions of staff in school E stress the personal and social gains related to teamwork. Perceptions from schools A and D indicate that teamwork and collaboration are not always as they appear in school rhetoric.

Decision-making procedures
The nature of headteachers’ decision-making is believed to be part of school climate because it projects on the atmosphere that prevails among staff. Schools A, B, and C are featured by what seems to be democratic procedures and collaborative decision-making such as a survey aimed to get teachers’ feedback on school matters in school A, and a teachers’ plenum on the Cluster Subjects Model in school B. A documentary analysis of school A supports this view because the whole ‘marketing brochure’ is written in the plural form and signed ‘AH and school teachers’. This certainly indicates a tendency in school rhetoric towards collaborative decision-making.

Indeed, school C stood out in its collaborative decision-making, and it appeared to pertain to the liberal and cooperative climate created by CH. CH declared: “Every attempt is made to let people feel that decisions are made not in a top-down way but in cooperation. We do not tell teachers ‘from now on you do this or that’ because we’d rather listen to them and provide support”. This is obtained by inviting all teachers (150) to meetings on different changes, such as the integration or segregation of the MABAR (SEN) class, or the establishment of a new regulation for school. It is noteworthy that teachers usually show up according to their level of interest: whereas
thirty teachers came to the meeting on the MABAR, only four came to the meeting on school regulation. However, staff members in the three schools claimed that the actual decision-making is conducted by the headteacher. For example, staff in school C argued that teachers are made part of decisions which concern individual students but not the management of school such as the curriculum.

In school D organisational changes resulted in changes which allowed for collaborative decision-making structures. In school documents it is contended: “The teams are part of decision-making as the circles of leadership have widened”. Indeed, DT.1 asserted that whereas previously the Heads of (vocational) Departments took the major decisions, now participants of the Forums are the decision-makers, and once a fortnight a meeting was held between the contracted Forum management and school management. However, reality proved to be different: “Allegedly teachers have been made part of decision-making. In fact, only the organisational counselors, DH, and DC.3 and not even the Heads of Forums are making decisions” (DT.2).

In school E teachers are not part of the process of decision-making. EH1: “Of course, this is not a totalitarian regime. I keep trying convincing the staff in my policy. But teachers are not headteachers”. EC.1 reported that teachers feel frustrated due to the fact that they do not feel as part of decision-making at school.

**Summary**

Findings indicate an increased awareness of democratic procedures in respect of collaborative decision-making in schools A, B, and mostly in school C. However, staff perceive that they are made part of decisions concerning individual students rather than those concerning school management. Despite enabling structures in school D which resulted from recent organisational changes, staff perception is that these changes are not deep. School E stood out by its overall perceptions of lack of collaborative decision-making.

**The learning organisation**

This issue is also claimed to be related to climate because it determines the atmosphere that dominates at school as regards professional development. The main focus of interest was whether studying was voluntary or compulsory.
In schools A and C learning was observed as voluntary, whereas in schools B and E it was observed as compulsory. AH and CH were perceived as encouraging teachers to choose their own training and willing to support them financially in this respect. Indeed, AH in particular was perceived as encouraging teachers towards personal development, be it another degree or a second career. Similarly, teachers’ perception in school C is reflected in CT.2’s words: “They are being flexible towards teachers”.

Conversely, in schools B and E teachers and counselors perceived in-service training as imposed on them. Indeed, BH perceived her school as the ideal learning organisation. BH herself is present in all in-service courses: “I know this is crazy but I think it serves as a model to teachers”. However, all teachers have to be present at in-service training offered by the management although they are not part of decision-making. BC.1 complained: “BH makes teachers crazy with training courses”. This feeling of ‘having to take part’ seems to affect the sense of ‘learning organisation’ in school B.

However, despite resistance to the major changes it went through, school D has functioned as a learning organisation for two years until the whole project collapsed. Staff perceptions in school D were similar to schools B and E in the sense that training is imposed, but the difference is that learning encompassed the whole school and a new learning environment was established. Learning took place around a central table which allowed for interaction between learners and supervisors in multi-aged groups. The principle of the learning organisation is reflected in school documents: “...an innovative learning organisation where teachers, learners and parents gain knowledge through a central code of creativity. This is done via brainstorming, exploration, alternative assessment, presentation, active learning, debates, lectures, laboratory and field study, and projects”.

DC.3 who was one of the major participants in this change perceived the learning processes in a very positive way: “I felt so contented to see all school staff in a plenum once a fortnight working together. It was a body where new ideas and people grew up, which created circles within school, and there was always room for more ideas. That’s why I feel so sad with this failure”. Further, “people profited personally
from this change. They acquired managerial experience and skills and they were empowered and developed responsibility. In addition, school was exposed to innovations and creativity. I truly believe that the workshops have upgraded all participants”.

The way the learning organisation worked is described by DC.3 and DT.2: “Every Head of Forum brought to the meeting with the management once a fortnight the new ideas discussed in the Forum and the needs that came up. The meeting functioned as a logistic team on plan development with sharing of data and control. This structure allowed for exchange of data between the management and staff and empowered the Forum members to reach domains which are extra-curricular, such as Future Trends or the Internet. Every other week a meeting was held with the plenum of all teachers where lectures on related topics were brought”. Other teachers, such as DC.2, admitted that teachers participated in the plenums because the lectures were interesting and also in order to get a credit for participation (teachers are accredited in their salary for every 112 hours they accumulate in training courses).

Summary
Findings showed that teachers’ perceptions concerning their freedom to choose their own training courses has impact on school climate. Findings indicated that both AH and CH contribute financially to teachers’ training, thus encouraging their professional development. Contrarily, teachers’ perceptions in school B and E were that they have no freedom of choice, and training is imposed on them by school management. This finding disagrees with the general image of school B, which is considered to be a learning organisation with BH serving as a learning model. School D, too, turned into a real learning organisation two years ago.

Staff perceptions of change and resistance
Findings indicate that staff perceptions concerning the process of change were not always compatible with those of headteachers’. One of the most explicit finding was that teachers are exhausted from changes. AT.3: “School is too much oriented towards change and we have this feeling that we keep running after changes just to be able to say that we’re initiating them”. Similarly, BC.1 argues that school supports new initiatives and projects to an extreme extent and teachers are simply tired. BO
supports this perception: “I felt they were all simply tired. When I tried to explain to the counselor about findings from a student’s assessment she was impatient and was only interested in the bottom line - the test accommodations”.

Another obvious finding was that staff perceptions within the same school are varied and different people perceive different facts as changes. For example, AT.2 perceived the insertion of alternative assessments, a pedagogic coordinator, subject classrooms and school division into three units as the main recent changes. Upon second thought she added that “responding to students’ pedagogic needs” is the most noticeable change. AT.1 perceived changes through the insertion of TQM and computer laboratories. Upon second thought she pointed out that “the biggest change in school is that the headteacher has learned to empower others”.

In some cases teachers had complaints about the depth of change. AC.1: “Changes in this school are superficial, lacking an in-depth planning. Although AH seems to be supportive and flexible towards change initiation, no processes of internalisation of these changes are observed”. CC.1 provided an example of the new school regulation whose implementation is not subject to supervision. Similarly, CC.2 perceived the system as “being quite ‘stuck’ as regards changes”.

Furthermore, staff perceptions do not always accord with headteachers’ perceptions. For example, EH1 perceived the establishment of the Junior High school eight years ago as the most important change in school because it became a ‘feeding school’ for the Senior High and allowed 85% of students to graduate. Conversely, EC.1 perceived school structures as stable and unyielding to change.

However, the longest list of structural changes was perceived in school C. This included changes in the perception of roles, such as the cancellation of the role of the discipline coordinator, and the division of the pedagogic coordination into Exact Sciences and Humanities. It also included physical changes such as a new gym hall, renovation of school library and computerising school. CT.1 perceived a climate of togetherness in the fact that all rooms on the management floor are arranged in half circle so that role holders in the management can be more available for each other and keep an eye contact.
Perceptions of change in school D were reflected mainly in school documents and sounded quite bombastic, abstract and unclear. For example, the future physical structure of the campus is described as follows: “The learning space reflects the complex life environments that take place in and outside of the campus. The entrance leads to a patio with high ceiling and glass windows. The three school units stream towards the patio and from each one of them smaller units diverge. There is a constant physical and conceptual streaming among the units”. Teachers’ role is also defined in vague terms: “Our mission is to train the learners to function in the present, to create the future...”. Although teachers perceive the last three years as “one continuous change” (DC.3) the actual implementation remains unclear: “Our aim is to become THE school of the region by going through a structural and conceptual change”.

Yet, the most important point to the success of change seems to be how resistance to change is handled. In most cases, there is a discrepancy between the way the headteacher introduces change and the way resistance is handled. For example, AT.3 contended: “AH will manage change by embracing his opponents”. However, “if he believes in something no one will dare object”. Indeed, AT.3 reported that when teachers complained on the frequent use of TQM terminology at school, AH’s reaction was “those who do not like this policy may leave”. Similarly, BH argued: “I always have in mind possible areas of resistance and I make efforts to facilitate change for people. For example, when I wanted to urge the best teachers into the Cluster Project, I added two weekly hours to their salary”. Yet, BT.1 maintained that if a teacher expresses resistance to change, BH will get back at him/her. EH, too, asserted that “teachers who will not apply these changes will not stay here”.

The major resistance to change was observed in school D which went through drastic conceptual and organisational changes that will be detailed in the Structures section. DH argued: “I conduct individual or small-group talks in a way that conveys to people ‘I want to take you along with me’ and offer you my support”. DT.3 maintained that resistance was a key issue that came up in every meeting of the Forums with school expanded management once a fortnight. DC3: “We’ve been so busy rushing forward with the change that we failed to take care of some of the
opponents. We should have understood that drastic changes like these involve feelings and emotions and the mental processes one needs to go through are too big to be achieved over two years. Perhaps if we had given some more time for this change things would have looked different now. I’ve had talks with all those who were willing to communicate, but unfortunately, half of the 55 teachers were quite determined not to cooperate or talk. I realise now that this is the main reason for our failure. I also realise that the conceptual change has not been adequately clarified”.

Summary
Findings indicate that teachers and counselors’ perceptions of change within each school are varied and that sometimes staff and headteachers’ perceptions do not accord. School C appeared to have the longest list of perceived changes and school D stood out in the vague and abstract terms in which changes are presented.

School staff express fatigue with reference to continuous change initiatives and some of them complain about the lack of supervision measures during the implementation. Some staff members perceived changes as lacking in depth and most of them perceived headteachers’ attitude towards resistance to change as intolerant. Staff in school D appeared to be aware of resistance to change and its implications.

Summary of the findings on culture
The themes of culture and climate were explored via elements of school credo and perceptions of change. As regards school credo, schools were divided into two groups: schools A, B, and C made one group which focusses on social values and schools D and E made another group which focusses on future technological education. Findings suggested that perceptions of the concept of change were not uniform among staff. In addition, headteachers usually convey changes with caution which is replaced by intolerance once resistance arises.

School climate was explored via the issues of the learning organisation, teamwork and collaboration, and decision-making. The overall impression of staff members was that BH and CH contributed to the improvement of climate in their schools, whereas the insertion of TQM to school A, the structural change in school E and the major
organisational changes in school D worsened school climate. Despite positive perceptions of climate and collaboration in school B and C and democratic procedures in schools A, B, and C, staff contended that important decisions were made by the headteachers. In school D staff expressed uncertainty regarding attempts towards collaborative decision-making, whereas school E stood out in the negative perceptions of staff on this issue.

Schools B and D seemed to be the closest ones to being learning organisations. Whereas in school B this resulted mainly from the personality of BH, in school D it was due to the recent changes in the organisation which involved learning. However, in schools B, D, and E teachers feel deprived of the freedom to choose their own training courses, whereas CH and AH allow for more freedom as regards teachers’ personal development.

**Inclusive culture**

The purpose of this section is to enhance understanding of how elements of school culture and climate are related to the inclusion of LDS.

**School attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion**

School attitudes towards inclusion was explored as part of school climate. Attitude questions were accumulated into one variable which represents attitudes towards inclusion (Appendix 8). Cronbach’s Reliability analysis of attitude questions shows the scores of Alpha = 0.62, which is a moderate reliability score. This means that the questions reflect various aspects of the concept of attitude towards inclusion. Differences were studied in relation to the different schools as well as to the different populations within schools. No significant differences were detected between schools (F(4,90) = 0.71, N.S). However, overall significant differences were detected between the three populations (F(2.93)=9.64, p<.01). Post-hoc tests show a significant difference between headteachers and teachers (p<.01) and between headteachers and counselors (p<.01). The mean of headteachers’ attitudes is 2.92 whereas teachers’ mean is 3.95 and counselors’ mean is 3.91. These figures indicate that headteachers’ attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion are less supportive than that of counselors and teachers these being almost the same. All these findings are shown in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10 Perceptions of attitudes towards LDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>M=3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>S.D=0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N=73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M=3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S.D=0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N=16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteachers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M=2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.D=0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M=3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>S.D=0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N=95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings indicated that teachers and counselors favour inclusion because all responses were on the positive end of the scale and the mean of both groups was close to 4. On the other hand, headteachers’ attitudes were less positive and resided around 3 with the exception of EH who stood out in his low score. However, it is suggested that the mean score of 2.92 be disregarded because other headteachers’ attitudes were higher.

CH and DH appeared to have the most positive attitudes towards LDS. This was reflected in school rhetoric. CH: “Every student has a place at school. The most important component in the success of LDS’ inclusion is personal treatment”.
Similarly, BH contended: “It is part of school culture to be patient towards students with difficulties”.

However, teachers’ attitude that is basically positive (Table 4.10) was observed as ambivalent due to circumstances. AC.2 referred to the over-inflation in assessment
rates and wondered how come that 25% of students in school A are assessed as LDS as opposed to 1% in developing towns, where parents are less educated and less able to finance assessments. These inflated numbers resulted in a cynical approach among some teachers. AT.1: “Teachers feel that most students have special test accommodations”. Others gave room to suspicion. BT.2: “Teachers think – had this student made more efforts, he/she might have succeeded. Yet, why does one need to try harder when one is provided with test accommodations because one’s parents are willing to pay for it”? 

Other staff members, such as DC.2, relate the moral aspect of attitudes towards inclusion: “School cannot provide response to LDS. It has become a moral question whether schools should allow LDS to register under such conditions”. Part of teachers’ attitude is their frustration from the extra input in LDS for which they are not paid. CT.3 argued that as a result of this frustration “although awareness towards LDS has increased over the last 14 years, teachers still view LDS as a burden”. The counselors in school C supported this idea: “We’re not a trash bin. School has a therapeutic stigma which causes a damage to our marketing. It occurred to us that students registered to school after they had dropped out of another school and only later they presented an assessment”.

The main question that emerged from this inquiry is whether attitudes towards LDS result from understanding or from headteachers’ wish to increase the number of students entitled to get a matriculation certificate. Findings suggested that both factors are valid. In school A, part of school attitude towards inclusion appeared to be sending students to be assessed. Although BT.1 argued that positive school attitudes towards LDS result from understanding, BO, who is an external consultant, perceived wrong attitudes at school because she observed that the emphasis is placed on the number of LDS who improved their grades as a result of their project rather than on whether individual students improved their grades from Fail to Pass. CT.3 perceived that “only now people start to understand what it means to help students fulfill their abilities”.
Summary
Findings indicated that teachers and counselors’ attitudes towards LDS were generally positive. However, the over-inflated numbers of LDS have led to cynicism, skepticism and suspicion. The fact that teachers are not paid for their input added to their feeling of frustration. Moreover, the increase in the number of graduates among LDS appeared to be a factor in headteachers’ attitudes, whereas teachers and counselors tend to focus on the quality of improvement. This might also account for the gaps between the lower headteachers’ perceptions of attitudes to the higher attitudes of school staff.

In terms of implementation of attitudes, staff in school A and B perceive that school undertakes the responsibility to help LDS, whereas staff in school C perceive that the main assistance LDS receive is outside of school hours. In school D it is believed that “LDS are certainly not the top priority in this school”. School E stood out in the gap between teachers and counselors’ high score (3.96 and 4.47 respectively) and headteacher’s low score (2.30).

Inclusive values: catering for LDS or for excellent students
Due to the open enrolment and school marketing, schools are now facing the dilemma of their priorities in respect of catering for excellent or gifted students as opposed to learning-disabled students.

Teachers in school A contended that “the policy of excellence radiates on LDS because the objective remains the same: increasing academic achievement for LDS and mainstream students alike” (AT.1). Counselors, on the other hand, argued that school has undergone a drastic change from “totally ignoring LDS to almost ignoring the excellent students” (AC.1).

A study of documents of school B indicated that attempts are made to cater for the needs of both populations. School B “encourages the freedom of choice, excellence and support for weak learners”. Indeed, school B strives to increase students’ entitlement for matriculation certificate to 97% in regular classes and to 85% in the special weak classes. However, interviews indicated that the emphasis in school B is on catering for the weak populations rather than for excellent students. This finding
has been observed during the interview with BH who has not even once mentioned the excellent students but has constantly referred to weak students. School staff perceive the emphasis on weak populations as resulting from BH’s enthusiasm towards these students. For example, BC.2 claims that the 10% LDS are worth the same attitude as the ‘remaining’ 90%. Conversely, BO perceived that the students who participate in the Cluster Subjects Model (for excellent students) get the best teachers whereas those who cannot manage discipline in a classroom teach in the Individual Assistance Programme. BO also noticed that school management does not like the stigma of orientation towards the weak and in the final meeting they protested that they tend towards excellent students as well.

Similarly, school C’s documents advocate Individualised Programmes for weak students alongside with ‘Achievement’ as one of school’s main principles. Although school’s advocacy is that “every student should materialise his/her potential while turning the learning process into an enriching and profitable experience”, a deeper study revealed an emphasis on “accelerated courses” and “academic studies with advanced technologies”. CH, too, perceives a balance towards the two populations. CH: “We initiated learning tracks for excellent students in Maths, Computers, and Science. At the same time we do our best that weak students get a full matriculation certificate”. However, CC.1 maintained that “the culture in this school is in favour of the weak learners and it is certainly at the cost of excellence”. CT.2 argued that support for weak students is provided to an exaggerated extent which “stands in contradiction to education”.

On the other hand, documents of school D and E emphasise excellence. In school D’s documents it is asserted “students who excel in understanding and using the codes of each of the ‘languages’ will get the chance to study at the university campus where they will be accredited for an academic degree”. Indeed, staff in school D contended that as a result of the change school is oriented more towards excellence because the level of studies is expected to increase alongside academic subjects, and less LDS will eventually apply for school. However, LDS are not ignored and they are well taken care of according to staff perceptions. DH advocates that striving towards excellence and helping weak students do not stand in contradiction.
In school E, the count of concepts such as ‘high achievements’ ‘academic’ or ‘excellence’ in school documents was high (25). Similarly, the list of subjects in which students can major range from the more prestigious (science-engineering; computers-technology; electronics) to the ‘rest’ of the list (social sciences; Arabic, communication, and industrial management). Indeed, twice a year school conducts a ceremony in which ‘certificates of excellence’ are granted. School counselors claimed that “a strive towards excellence is more highlighted than LD” (EC.1). EC.2 concludes that “the topic of LD bears no significance here whereas there are three strong classes in each group age, one of which is an ‘accelerated class’ which later populates the more prestigious tracks”. Yet, EC.2 reported that in some classes each teacher has informally ‘adopted’ a weak student and personally caters for his/her needs. In addition, students are not expelled from school on the basis of low grades, but only on the basis of discipline or violence. ET.1 and ET.2 described projects which address the needs of weak students and are financed by school in association with the municipality ‘TNOUFA’ – which means a drive, and the air force project ‘SOULAMOT’ – which means ladders.

Summary
A study of school documents showed that schools B and C expressed the need to cater for excellent as well as for weak students, whereas schools D and E clearly expressed support for excellent students and no mentioning was made as regards LDS. School A seemed to be ambivalent as it addresses both populations but emphasises excellence.

Perceptions in schools A and B share the view that striving towards higher academic achievements should encompass any learner, be he/she an excellent or a weak student. Yet, due to BH’s tendency towards weak student populations, there is greater emphasis on LDS than on excellence. In school C perceptions portray a picture of balance with a tendency towards LDS. Findings of school D and E were quite surprising. Whereas school documents ignored LDS, the picture of implementation was perceived as balanced. Indeed, staff members were able to provide examples for catering for weak students in both schools.
Staff perceptions of the concept of LD

The knowledge or lack thereof concerning LD sets the theoretical basis for inclusion, because it is hard to make demands on people regarding issues they are unfamiliar with. Staff members were asked seven questions which explored their knowledge on learning disabilities and were included in the questionnaires. The means ranged from 1 to 5 whereas 5 indicated the highest level of agreement with the statement and 1 indicated the lowest level of agreement. No combined score was given and all issues were dealt with separately as specified in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=19)</td>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
<td>(N=18)</td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning difficulties and learning disabilities are the same</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some LD are more difficult to handle than others</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement and attention make adequate basis for teachers’ success with LDS</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disabilities can be controlled by minimising tests materials and assignments</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial teaching and ‘one-on-one teaching’ are the same</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted students might be at the same time LDS</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 Staff perceptions of the concept of learning disabilities
The picture emerging from the findings is that five out of six questions were answered correctly: staff members in all schools were right when they responded that learning difficulties and learning disabilities are not the same; they agreed to a large extent (with the mean of above 4 in four of the schools) that some LD are more difficult to handle; they all knew that ‘remedial’ teaching and ‘one-on-one teaching’ are not the same; they agreed that learning disabilities can be controlled by minimising tests materials and assignments. Finally, staff members were aware of the fact that LDS can be also gifted. However, they falsely tended to believe that encouragement and attention make an adequate basis for teachers’ success with LDS.

In addition, participants were asked to address the following two open-ended questions:

- “Based on your experience, list three features of LDS”
- “Try to define what learning disabilities are”

The headteachers’ responses below are provided in full:

AH: “Features of LDS are attention deficiency, spelling mistakes, gaps between oral and written proficiencies, slowness. LD are personal factors which prevent a student from materialising his/her full potential in the usual ways”.

BH: “Features of LDS are frustration, lack of motivation, difficulties in getting organised, attempts to conceal their disability. LD are a basic deficiency in a specific domain such as visual, auditory or linguistic area”.

CH: no answers were provided by CH.

DH: no answers were provided by DH.

EH1: “LD refer to a motor deficiency which influences the learning”.

EH2: “Features of LD are writing and reading difficulties, attention problems, slowness, discipline problems. LD are difficulties to learn materials, memory or inference deficiency“.

Although headteachers’ answers were similar, BH’s answer stood out in the way she addressed the psychological aspect of LDS. In addition, EH1’s answer was quite inaccurate as motor deficiencies do not accompany all LD and do not exist in all LDS. Attempts were made to identify themes which kept repeating in teachers and
counselors’ answers. Below are some of the answers presented randomly and grouped according to schools:

DT.4: “Difficulties in tests, gaps between intelligence and results”.

DT.8: “Attention deficiency, slowness in copying from the blackboard or during a dictation, giving up easily on tasks, difficulty to cope with large bulks of materials, reading difficulties. LD are objective difficulties to cope with learning tasks and/or deficiency in understanding of written texts”.

DT.9: “A state in which the student’s deciphering processes are slow and he/she cannot express well what he/she knows”.

BC.1: “A student whose ability is normal. LDS are underachievers”.

BT.7: “There are different levels of LD”.

BT.11: “Hyperactivity, fears, exaggerated perfectionism”.

EC.2: “Illegible handwriting, lack of fluency in reading”.

EC.3: “Student’s inability to internalise materials”.

ET.5: “Inability to understand and follow verbal instructions”.

ET.13: “Social problems, cognitive and organisational difficulties”.

CC.1: “Emotional problems, difficulties in retrieval, a chronic situation of a neurological basis”.

ET.10: “LDS are introverts, they demonstrate aggressiveness and high levels of anxieties”.

CC.4: “Difficulties in identifying the main ideas in texts, learning problems which do not result from a low I.Q”.

CT.4 (a ‘remedial’ teacher): “Difficulty in becoming independent learners and taking advantage of learning strategies. An LDS does not perform according to his/her chronological age”.

CT.12: “The student’s general behaviour is highly linked to his/her learning behaviour”.

CT.9: “They need extra time and extra input on teacher’s part”.

AC.2: “A deficiency in the central nerves system which has impact on learning processes. LDS are characterised by easy distraction”.

AC.1: “LDS are characterised by gaps between different areas of learning within the student and between the student and his/her peers”.

AT.8: “Short attention span, difficulties in phrasing”.
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Staff responses seem to encompass all domains related to learning, such as understanding, academic skills, behaviour and emotional aspects of learning. Indeed, most staff members were able to relate the observable symptoms rather than to the etiology (i.e. dysfunctioning of the central nerves system). The overall conclusion is that schools staff are familiar with the concept of LD and have the theoretical basis to understand LDS.

Summary
The picture that emerged from the statistical presentation and the interviews is that school staff are familiar with basic concepts of learning disabilities. Headteachers, counselors and teachers referred mainly to the observed symptoms of the disabilities and less to the etiology of the symptoms which requires a higher knowledge of LD related theories. Only a minority was able to refer to the etiology and demonstrated knowledge of special education aspects.

Summary of the findings on inclusive culture
The main objective of this section was to explore whether the values and attitudes which exist in the five schools favour inclusion and which factors are part of the process.

Findings indicated that teachers and counselors’ perceptions of attitudes towards LDS appeared to be higher than headteachers’ perceptions. The greatest gap was observed in school E. Similarities between schools were perceived more clearly than differences. Despite teachers’ general positive attitude towards LDS, they seemed to express frustration and cynicism due to the over-inflated numbers of students who were assessed as LDS and due to their high input in LDS for which they are not compensated properly. However, headteachers had the highest perceptions as regards their satisfaction from inclusion, and the rest of the staff whose attitudes were more positive, perceived much less satisfaction.

Findings which concern ‘catering for excellent or weak students’ suggested that perceptions may sometimes be incompatible with school documents. For example,
school D and E ignore the issue of LDS in their marketing brochures, although teachers perceived a balance between catering for the two populations. Conversely, school A whose rhetoric is to cater for both populations was perceived by staff as emphasising excellence.

Staff in all schools demonstrated knowledge in reference to LDS which was mainly practical and relied on symptoms which encompassed learning patterns, behaviour at school, and emotional factors. Only few staff members showed knowledge about the theories of learning disabilities and its etiology.

**Research question 3**
“**How are staff perceptions of school structures and inclusive structures related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?**”

**Structures**

The division of responsibility

Findings imply that headteachers share the perception that they empower staff in their schools. For example, BH asserts: "When I appoint a teacher to a position, I take a big step aside and I only make sure that he/she gets all that he/she needs to carry out the job”.

However, it is EH1 who relates to this topic in depth:

“I’m in favour of empowering teachers. I’m not an expert in all domains. I trust decisions reached by the teams and I’m always willing to listen to their arguments. The heads of the two school units that were chosen by me function like headteachers. Talk to them and they’ll tell you about their full independence at work. I should deal with the most urgent matters such as the marketing of the Junior High school, the transfer of ninth graders to Senior High School, or the initiation of new courses. My main task, then, is to make the right decision where I’m mostly needed. Yet, I bear the responsibility for all school matters 24 hours a day, which is becoming more and more difficult due to increasing environmental constraints”.
The perceptions of staff are different. In school A and B staff perceptions are not unanimous. For example, AC.2 argued that middle managers are empowered to a large extent. Conversely, AC.1 claimed that “allegedly middle managers are empowered, but actually AH holds the main sources of power which are staff recruitment and budgets”. AT.1 perceived a positive change since the insertion of TQM. AT.2, on the other hand, quit her position as the manager of the Junior High because she did not feel adequately empowered to make changes.

In school B, some staff perceived BH as a centralistic manager who needs to be involved in everything. For example, BT.2 reported that BH gets a full report about all staff meetings, participates in all pedagogic committees and knows every student. BT.1 contended that teachers are autonomous as long as there are no complaints against them. She added that BH interferes in teachers’ decisions as regards class assignments. Other staff perceived the division of responsibility at school as related to collaboration: BC.2 and BT.2 maintained that “there is no discipline coordinator here” and members of the expanded management take turns in monitoring teachers’ performance and reporting it to BH. Those teachers understood this procedure as they claimed they do the same with their students. BC.2, too, has the feeling that as all other ‘key people’ at school she can do as she wishes.

Documents in school C advised that “we should each take responsibility rather than throw it on our fellows”. CC.1 supported this view in her perception of “a feeling of autonomy and empowerment”. However staff perceptions (e.g. CT.3) implied that empowerment is restricted to the level of coordinators and counselors whereas teachers do not feel empowered at all. Similarly, CT.2 complained that she feels supervised at every step she makes and needs to account for her performance. She also feels that counselors’ status has been strengthened at the expense of teachers. CT.3 who is the coordinator of MABAR class claimed she feels empowered to reach decisions regarding individual students although these decisions are restricted to educational matters and not to budgetary ones.

The division of responsibility in School D and E changed as a result of changes at school. In school D the management which previously comprised DH and his deputy now comprises five members who meet once a week. The new school structure and
role division seem to be very complicated from school documents, as they comprise circles within circles according to teams, themes (languages) and age groups. Each Head of Forum and its members meet with the management once a fortnight. The expanded management now includes DH, his deputy, DC.3 as a major consultant, the Heads of Forums, and the managers of three school units. This managerial body should function as one ‘leading team’ that replaces the formerly hierarchical management. Indeed, under this new structure people are supposed to feel empowered to carry out tasks, but unfortunately they could not always operate their teams due to resistance. DT.1 perceived the new structure through the eyes of the previous Heads of Departments that now had to “do what they considered to be a less prestigious job and be supervised by a Head of Forum who was usually half their age”.

School E went through change regarding the division of responsibility. EC.2 recalls that years ago the concept of ‘middle managers’ was lacking at school and EH1 did not update staff on school matters. The creation of middle managers such as age group coordinators and counselors created a clear hierarchy towards teachers and a strict discipline towards students. EC.1 argued that during the last two years there is an alleged empowerment because age group coordinators function mainly as ‘discipline supervisors’. This view is supported by ET.2 who contended that EH2 does not consult anybody. She gets a full report on each weekly subject team meeting. EC.1 concluded that no one apart from EH2 is truly empowered by EH1 who practically holds school budgets so all decisions are confirmed by him.

**Summary**
Findings advised that headteachers, and mainly EH1 perceive themselves as empowering school staff. In schools A and B staff perceptions seemed to be varied. It is noteworthy that perceptions of empowerment in school B were related to collaboration. Perceptions in school C indicated that teachers feel much less empowered than ‘middle managers’ such as coordinators or counselors. In school D the latest organisational changes resulted in major changes in the division of responsibilities which led to staff disputes and failure to operate the new role division. In school E the concept of ‘middle managers’ has been introduced only recently. Yet, perceptions demonstrated that EH1 and EH2 hardly empower school staff and control school life entirely.
School curriculum

School curriculum is believed to be an important aspect of school structures because it reflects school attitude towards change as well as school credo. The main point of the enquiry was to see whether schools offer a standardised curriculum or Individualised Programmes to students.

Findings clearly indicate that all schools are making efforts to offer ‘special menus’ to students which comprise a varied selection of subjects. BH basic assumption is that students love to study subjects which interest them and therefore it is important to come up with more curricular initiatives. BH initiated the ‘Cluster Subject Model’ which operates in the Junior High School and encompasses an inter-disciplinary curricular variety which mainly relates to Humanities, Social Studies and Sciences. The unique feature of this model is its relatedness to moral dilemmas and the core value of responsibility. In school C students are offered two clusters of subjects out of which they need to choose two to four subjects. The courses are varied and unique. For example, Cinema, Law, Business Management, National Security Studies, Biotechnology, Human Resources, and Environmental Studies. School A, too, offers unique subjects such as Communication, International Relations, Translation Skills.

School D outstands all others because it exposes its curricular choices in its peculiar terminology of ‘languages’. School documents describe a flexible curriculum “which operates in the different life environments”. The ‘languages’ learners can practise are: linguistic languages, the language of creativity, the language of design, the language of sciences, the language of the Internet, the language of marketing, the language of cultures, the language of Maths, the language of negotiation, the language of bridging, and body language. Most of the unique subjects are related to Art: Business enterprise, Photography and Video, Advertising, Journalistic Photography, Graphic Design, Costume Design, Sculpture, Three-Dimension design, Visual Media production. Learners can use school facilities beyond formal hours.

School E, too, offers IEPs but it is done via ‘package deals’ of learning tracks such as Science-Engineering, Computers and Technology, Electronics, Social Sciences, and Industrial Management.
Summary
Findings indicated that all schools are making efforts to enhance IEPs and ‘special menus’ among students. School B stood out by the link it made to moral values. School E stood out because it does not offer individual courses but only pre-planned learning tracks. In school D special ‘languages’ are offered and unique subjects that are related to Art.

Channels of communication
This issue was investigated because it is contended that the channels of communication that are used in school reflect the nature of its culture and climate because they are related to ‘how things are done’.

Findings suggested that all schools hold teachers’ plenums which aim at updating school staff about school issues twice a year. However, these meetings are pre-planned by headteachers and do not provide an opportunity to express opinions or discuss school matters. In addition, staff of schools A, B, and C perceived an open door to the headteachers. Another finding implied that schools developed varied channels of communication, the most popular of which is circulars in teachers’ boxes.

The paragraphs below specify some of the unique channels in the different schools: BH uses letters to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with teachers’ functioning. Indeed, some time ago she sent letters to all teachers as she felt a loosening in teachers’ self-discipline. Individual talks are mainly held for negative feedbacks. In addition, BH pointed out the ‘end-of-the-year talks’ with every teacher. Yet, teachers’ perceptions (e.g. BT.1, BT.2) were that the flow of information is hierarchical and ‘top-down’ and is achieved via letters in teachers’ boxes and via the age group or subject coordinator. CH has introduced this year the email system by which teachers are updated on school matters weekly “in order to increase their involvement” (CH). However, CT.1 admitted that “this system doesn’t work because there is no supervision”. In addition, computer screens were placed at school entrance and near the teachers’ room so that students and staff can be informed of changes in the daily school schedule.
School C’s documents leave an impression that job descriptions, division of
responsibility and hierarchies are greatly emphasised. For example, when a student
wishes to move from one subject to another teachers will be informed only (in bold
letters) by the pedagogic coordinator, although this could have been done more easily
by the homeroom teacher or the age group coordinator who are usually more
accessible to specialist teachers. Also, accountability procedures are channeled from
the homeroom teacher via the age group coordinator to school unit manager.

The channels of communication in school D result from and reflect the organisational
changes. A study of school documents indicated that the main channel of
communication is “a constant flow of data between the Forums”. DT.1 agrees that in
the last two years communication was enabled via the Forums in which teachers could
express themselves. However, school E stood out as teachers and counselors
perceived no direct channels for communication at school. EC.2: “There is no
dialogue between management and staff, only a monologue. What features culture in
this school are formal relationships between management and teachers and between
teachers and students. There is no open door for teachers. Communication is held via
hierarchical channels. Yet, it is perceived that EH2 tries to keep her door open to
students”.

Summary
Findings suggested that the most popular channels of communication in schools are
circulars in teachers’ boxes and plenums held twice yearly. Further, staff in schools A,
B, and C perceived an open door to headteachers, whereas staff of school E perceived
no dialogue with school management. In school D vertical and horizontal Forums
were established to allow for communication. It is noteworthy that the most creative
channels were observed in schools B and C although school C was featured by formal
procedures.

Summary of the findings on school structures
An attempt is made below to put together all aspects of structures that were explored
in this research according to staff perceptions: staff empowerment, structures of
change and stability, school curriculum, and channels of communication.
Findings implied that schools are making efforts to enhance Individualised Programmes and ‘special menus’ in school curriculum. The most popular channels of communication in schools are circulars in teachers’ boxes and plenums that are held twice yearly. It seems that teachers and counselors’ perceptions of change within each school are varied and that sometimes staff and headteachers’ perceptions do not accord. Gaps were observed between headteachers and staff perceptions as regards empowerment. Whereas headteachers perceived themselves as empowering school staff, teachers and counselors’ perceptions are varied.

Staff in schools A, B, and C perceived an open door to headteachers, whereas staff of school E perceived no dialogue with school management. It is noteworthy that the most creative channels of communication were observed in schools B and C.

The picture that was formed of school D as a result of the organisational change is that of vagueness. It stood out in the abstract terminology that was used in respect of school aspects and the bombastic design which ended up in total failure. However, the biggest gaps between headteachers’ perceptions of staff empowerment and between staff perceptions which expressed limited empowerment were observed in school E. In addition, this is the only school where learners are not offered the freedom to choose their courses but must commit themselves to structured learning tracks.

**Inclusive structures**

This section provides perceptions of ‘down-to-earth-responses’ that school provides for its students as regards their accessibility to the standard curriculum and to school life.

**SEN structures**

The investigation of SEN structures encompassed all the structures that exist at school in favour of SEN students, part of which can fit LDS too. BH’s words reflect existing reality: “Students whose parents can afford extra support make progress much faster”. Table 4.12 attempts to bring together data concerning SEN structures in all schools.
Table 4.12 SEN structures in the five schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A class for a 3rd chance ('07')</th>
<th>The Support System</th>
<th>Special Education class for autism, emotional and mental problems</th>
<th>MABAR classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>☺</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the Support System is offered in all secondary schools as part of the municipality, and MABAR classes exist in most of them. These structures address LDS as part of the group of slow learners but are not ‘tailored’ to the needs of LDS in the sense that they do not comprise ‘remedial’ elements. Staff perceptions in school B (e.g. BC.2; BT.2) doubt the efficiency of the Support System for LDS as it is not delivered by teachers who have training on LD. In addition, BO argues that no writing skills are provided for LDS in this framework. In school C the 60 MABAR students have a special coordinator and a special counselor. Pedagogic meetings as regards them are held separately although they are integrated in mainstream classes for most subjects. CT.3 argued that each MABAR class consists of 20 students out of whom 60% are assessed as LDS and teachers in mainstream complain of a mismatch between class work and the support hours which are separate.

The picture of SEN structures in school E appeared to be different. During the interview EH1 made no mention of SEN structures and seemed to be unfamiliar with this concept. Although ET.2 postulated that in each class 30% of the students are
assessed as LDS, school counselors pictured poor inclusion. EC.1: “Until eight years ago there was no counseling system at school because EH1 did not believe in it. Even now school does not employ a psychologist which is quite rare”. School does not provide any ‘remedial’ teaching to LDS: “The recommendations for remediation remain on the paper”. EC.2 proceeded: “School will not open again the MABAR class because school gets more money for students in the technological tracks than for those in the SEN class. Moreover, ET.1 argued that the message with reference to SEN structures is ambiguous. On the one hand, school allows students to take matriculation tests in winter whereas internal secondary schools adhere to summer dates only. On the other hand, support hours are offered to teachers as ‘effective’ (extra) hours and are not made part of their salary, a fact which does not encourage teachers to take them.

Summary
The most common SEN structures in schools are MABAR classes and the Support System. Some schools have other structures such as class 07 in school A or SEN class in school B. Yet, the needs of LDS are not met in these classes because they are meant to address the needs of all weak students. School E stood out as it does not provide any SEN structures after the MABAR class was called off.

Inclusive curriculum
Attempts have been made to present headteachers’ perceptions of inclusive curriculum for LDS. The two questions were combined into one variable (Appendix 8) to represent headteachers’ perceptions, whereas 1 represented the view that it is not within school responsibility to ‘tailor’ a special curriculum for LDS and 5 meant a high tendency towards meeting curricular needs of LDS.

Table 4.13 provides the findings on this issue. It can be deduced that headteachers’ overall tendency to provide an inclusive curriculum was below the average mean of 3 except for the headteacher of school C (mean=3.3). School E had the lowest score of headteacher’s perception (mean=1.8). These findings suggested that headteachers do not perceive that it is their responsibility to ‘tailor’ an inclusive curriculum for LDS.
Table 4.13  Headteachers’ attitudes towards special curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School A (N=3)</th>
<th>School B (N=4)</th>
<th>School C (N=5)</th>
<th>School D (N=1)</th>
<th>School E (N=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I find the curriculum of this school reasonably flexible towards LDS</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LDS are provided with adequate support by school</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School counselors play a major role in decisions regarding learning support for LDS</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students’ views are taken into consideration regarding support</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean of satisfaction from the implementation of curricular inclusion</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School is responsible for ‘tailoring’ a curriculum for its LDS</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 Counselors’ perceptions of school’s inclusive curriculum
Counselors’ perceptions were observed by five questions. Questions 1-4 reflected different levels of counselors’ satisfaction as regards school curriculum. These findings were presented separately and were also given an overall score of satisfaction, whereas 1 meant dissatisfaction from the present curricular inclusion and 5 meant satisfaction. Clearly, the least satisfaction was reflected among counselors in school E and the highest level of satisfaction was observed among counselors of school D. The overall impression was of dissatisfaction (in three of the five schools counselors’ level of satisfaction was below average). Regarding question 5, Figure 1 represented objection to LDS curricula and figure 5 represented a tendency towards LDS. Findings indicated that counselors tend to favour inclusive curricula (all responses have the mean of 3 and above). It might be concluded that although schools D and E demonstrated the average mean of 3, it might be argued that all schools indicated that counselors favour an inclusive curriculum for LDS. These findings demonstrated a discrepancy between headteachers’ and counselors’ perceptions. Table 4.15 presents teachers’ perceptions of inclusive curricula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I find the curriculum of this school reasonably flexible towards LDS</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LDS are provided with adequate support by school</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers’ views are taken into consideration regarding learning support for LDS</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall mean of satisfaction from the implementation of curricular</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15 Teachers’ perceptions of inclusive curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. School is responsible for tailoring a curriculum for its LDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly to counselors, teachers had to respond in respect of two foci: the level of satisfaction from the present situation and favouring or objecting to inclusive curricula. The first issue was presented via questions 1-3 which were presented separately but were also given an overall score of satisfaction, whereas 1 meant dissatisfaction from the present curricular inclusion and 5 meant satisfaction. The highest overall mean of satisfaction seemed to be in school B whereas the lowest level of satisfaction was expressed by teachers in school A. The overall picture of teachers’ level of satisfaction regarding inclusive curricula in their schools appeared to be low (means range from 2.46 to 3.08).

The second issue was reflected via question 4. Most teachers tended to think that it is school responsibility to ‘tailor’ a curriculum for LDS’ needs (means are above 3.0 except for school D with the mean of 2.53). However, similarly to counselors, a discrepancy was identified between headteachers’ and teachers’ perceptions.

The interviews yielded similar results as there is no special curricula for LDS in mainstream classes in any of the schools. However, curricular flexibility was observed in schools A, B, and C which provide English and Maths (and Computers in school C) at differentiated levels starting from the minimal level of 3 credit points, thus allowing for LDS to fit into school curriculum. Indeed, this system addresses all weak students via curricular flexibility from which LDS can profit as well. For example, all weak students in school B including LDS get extra support by the Support System and are exempt from the Cluster Subjects Model in the Junior School. In addition, in schools A and C LDS are exempt from a second foreign language (usually French or Arabic) and instead, they get extra help in reading comprehension.
skills. School C, in particular, provides extra help for the matriculations. CH argued that instead of three groups in English (the usual 3, 4, and 5 credit points) there are three groups within the 3 credit points group: a group for MABAR students, another group for LDS and a group for mainstream students. Practically it means an additional support of nine hours per week. CT.1, who is an English teacher, supported CH’s view and asserted that last year school approved of 1 and 2 points for the weakest of MABAR students in order to allow students to graduate with a diploma.

School E does not offer curricular flexibility but slow learners fit in easy learning tracks. Further, it offers the abovementioned support projects such as SOULAMOT or TNOUFA. Conversely, school D does not offer extra support for weak students. DC.1 contended: “Most of our students could fit in MABAR classes but the number of mainstream classes is too small to maintain a MABAR class”.

Summary
Findings from the interviews indicated that schools A, B, and C make efforts to provide extra support and curricular flexibility for weak students. However, this flexibility does not address particularly the special needs of LDS but refers to all slow learners at school. The most enhanced curricular flexibility was observed in School C. This finding accords with the statistical description. In addition, these schools offer English, Maths and Computers at varied levels. School E provides support projects but not a curricular flexibility, and school D provides neither support nor flexibility as regards curriculum.

The general impression was that teachers and counselors were not satisfied with the level of inclusivity of the curriculum. The highest perceptions were observed in schools B (teachers and counselors) and D (counselors). The lowest perceptions were observed in school E (counselors) and A (teachers). Counselors and teachers’ attitudes towards inclusive curriculum were more positive than headteachers’. Even in schools D and E whose attitudes were the lowest, attitudes resided around the mean of 3.

Test administration
One of the major complaints of teachers in their handling of LDS was the fact that they find it hard to cope with special test accommodations, such as extra time for oral
testing, and a special room for students who are entitled to get extra time in tests. Teachers and counselors were asked to relate to four issues (Table 4.16). Responses ranged from 1 to 5 whereas figure 1 represented teachers’ perceptions of no extra requirements regarding LDS and figure 5 represented perceptions of extra efforts and tasks. Figure 3 represents the average mean for all issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors associated with test for LDS</th>
<th>School A (N=19)</th>
<th>School B (N=15)</th>
<th>School C (N=20)</th>
<th>School D (N=18)</th>
<th>School E (N=18)</th>
<th>Overall mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers often have to remain in class during recess</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have to split every test into 2-3 sessions</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers are required to put up a special test for a single student

| Teachers often have to record a test for a single student |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                  | 3.94 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 3.18 |

| Teachers often have to record a test for a single student |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                  | 3.66 | 1.58 | 2 | 1.41 | 3.47 | 1.61 | 1.93 | 1.38 | 2.41 | 1.54 | 2.69 |

Table 4.16 Factors associated with test administration for LDS

Findings suggested that teachers perceived the first, second and third issues as a burden (with an overall mean of 3.86, 3.24 and 3.18 respectively). However, it is contended that teachers’ tendency to complain about the difficulties in coping with LDS is marginal (most means did not exceed 4). Staff in schools D and E (and two cases in school B) tended less towards complaints, perhaps because schools did not provide these accommodations. Conversely, perceptions in schools A and C were observed as the most consistent.

CH described a shortage in rooms for LDS who need extra time, and an enormous time input in LDS who need to be tested orally. CH is well aware of the fact that the increasing numbers of LDS puts an enormous pressure on teachers: “Perhaps the problem is that there are too many LDS”. Yet, school employs a university student who comes especially on Fridays when there is no school to test LDS orally. Despite efforts, CT.1 described a chaotic situation in the implementation of test accommodations for LDS. CH had to quit her room a number of times to allow a teacher to test a student orally or give LDS the extra time they need. CT.3: “I tested a student one day in a warehouse because no room was available. When we finally got there, there was no electric accommodation for tape recorders which the student needed for her test”.
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The situation is encapsulated by EC.2: “Teachers do not have the welfare for coping with LDS”.

**Summary**

Most of teachers’ complaints dwelled on the need to stay with LDS who are being tested during the breaks. Teachers also perceived as difficult the need to put up special tests for LDS and to split tests for them, but the levels of complaints seemed to be marginal as they revolved the average of 3. There were less complaints about recording a test, perhaps as this test accommodation is usually restricted to tests in foreign languages.

**Re-design of staff training towards inclusion**

Tables 4.17 and 4.18 presented teachers and counselors’ perceptions of training. In both cases questions were worked out on a scale of 0 to 4, when 0 represented no training and 4 represented four courses or more. All other figures represent two to three courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A (N=2)</th>
<th>School B (N=4)</th>
<th>School C (N=5)</th>
<th>School D (N=2)</th>
<th>School E (N=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many in-service courses on LD has school offered?</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many in-service courses on LD have you attended?</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 4.17 Counselors’ perceptions of their training regarding LD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many in-service courses on LD have you attended during your studies?</th>
<th>School A (N=16)</th>
<th>School B (N=11)</th>
<th>School C (N=15)</th>
<th>School D (N=15)</th>
<th>School E (N=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many courses on LD have you attended?</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many courses on LD have you been offered by school?</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.18 Teachers’ perceptions of their training regarding LD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In how many in-service courses on LD have you participated?</th>
<th>0.31</th>
<th>0.79</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.94</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.29</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.73</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In how many courses on LD have you participated in the course of your studies?</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In how many courses have you participated on the issue of LD?</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview in respect of the four questions disclosed that both counselors and teachers had very little training as regards LDS. School D and E demonstrated the lowest scores on LD training. Conversely, school B had the highest mean scores of counselors’ training and school C had the highest teachers’ training that was acquired outside of school. However, discrepancies were observed between counselors and teachers’ perceptions in school B whereas in school C they were almost equal. It is noteworthy that even the highest scores were not far above the average score of 2.

However, the picture that emerged from Tables 4.17 and 4.18 contradicted findings from the interviews. For example, teachers’ perceptions in school A were that the issue of LDS is not at all on the list of school priorities although AH received the highest score on inclusive vision (Table 4.3). AT.3 pointed out that as opposed to other topics such as computers “no organised courses on LD were provided by school and it is up to teachers’ own initiative to join such training”. AT.2 addressed the pedagogic aspect: “Teachers did not receive proper training regarding LD.”
Counselors ‘translated’ LDS reality to us on a very basic level but teachers do not know what LD means nor can they read assessments of their students”. AC.1 was the only staff member who recalled an introductory lecture on LD that was given at school five years ago and was followed by a training course which lasted over six sessions in which 50 teachers participated. These interview findings are consistent with Table 4.17 but they do not accord the relatively high perceptions of AH on training (Table 4.8).

BC.2 could tell about a lecturer who provided guidance to each subject team separately concerning LDS, and another workshop on the topic organised by the counselors. BC.2 reported another training course for all the teachers who work with the Support System that took place last year. However, the main problem in school B as regards training is presented by BO: “Teachers are simply fed up with courses. In fact, they have never been offered a specific course on LD”. BO, who came as an external consultant perceived exhaustion on the part of the teachers and lack of motivation to receive guidance and training in this respect. BO contended: “Counselors do not know more than teachers. They’re only more emphatic. None of them has ever read a whole assessment. Teachers should be exposed to different teaching methods that suit different learning and cognitive profiles. If teachers gain more knowledge they will be more successful in handling all kinds of learners”. These findings do not accord with the high perceptions of BH (Table 4.8) but they seem to accord with the average staff perceptions in Table 4.18.

Although CC.2 reported compulsory in-service training on LD last year, it was not mentioned by any of the teachers. This appeared to be consistent with the low perceptions that both teachers and counselors expressed (Table 4.17 and 4.18) and with the average perception of CH in this respect (Table 4.8).

DC.1 commented that teachers had a long training on LDS followed up by shorter sessions which were initiated by the headteacher and the counselors, and added that DH has awareness of this issue. These claims accorded with DH’s high perception (Table 4.8) but they did not accord with the low staff perceptions in Table 4.18. All parties in school E perceived a deficit of in-service training on LD. EC.2: “I’m not a
‘remedial’ teacher and I cannot provide teachers with tools apart from granting accommodations”. This claim is consistent with EH1 and EH2’s responses and with Table 4.8 as well.

Summary
Overall findings suggested that counselors and teachers had little training on LD in the course of their career, whether it was during their studies or in courses offered by school. In school C and B perceptions were relatively high. Schools D and E demonstrated the lowest counselors’ perceptions of training while schools D and A demonstrated the lowest teachers’ perceptions of training for LDS.

SEN support staff
Part of the enquiry on structures aimed to clarify to what extent headteachers perceived the issue of SEN support staff as necessary. This information was provided via Table 4.19 and Table 4.20 which offer headteachers’ perceptions of SEN support (the first question in Table 4.20 was inversed to match the scale).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A (N=1)</th>
<th>School B (N=1)</th>
<th>School C (N=1)</th>
<th>School D (N=1)</th>
<th>School E (N=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Headteachers’ perceptions of support staff (1)*

Table 4.19
It might be observed that school C and school B employ SEN staff more than the other schools whereas school A advocates mainstream teaching for LDS. Similarly, BH, CH and DH were the highest on the ‘support scale’ and school A was the lowest. Perceptions in school E were also low regarding SEN support staff.

Findings from the interviews with staff accorded with headteachers’ perceptions as reflected in both Tables. AT.2: “Human resources are the same for SEN and mainstream students and this makes the inclusion of LDS quite impossible”. Findings also accorded in respect of school C and B because teachers of the MABAR classes usually demonstrated some orientation towards SEN students or went through training courses on LDS. Perceptions in school E revealed low levels of support staff and this accords, too, with the descriptive statistics. However, there seemed to be a mismatch in school D: findings from the interview indicated frustration among staff. For example, DC.2 argued: “Students go through the whole educational system and are not provided with professional support or ‘remedial’ skills to help them develop learning strategies to bypass their difficulties. Test accommodations are certainly not the answer”. However, statistical findings created an impression of high perceptions as regards support staff at school (Table 4.19, 4.20).
Summary
In most schools headteachers and staff expressed similar views. Schools A and E appeared to be the lowest concerning provision of SEN support staff and. Schools B and C deploy mainstream teachers who have had some training on LD or who simply demonstrate an orientation towards LDS. A mismatch was observed in school D where headteachers’ perceptions were high and staff perceptions were low.

The pedagogic committee
This section explored the extent to which the pedagogic committee which comprises all teachers is involved with the implementation of test accommodations. Table 4.21 reflects differences between schools in respect of two questions. On the scale of 1-5, 1 represented disagreement and 5 represented agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogic committee can veto test accommodations resulting from assessments</strong></td>
<td>Mean 3.94, S.D 0.97</td>
<td>Mean 4.46, S.D 0.63</td>
<td>Mean 4.23, S.D 1.22</td>
<td>Mean 4.66, S.D 0.76</td>
<td>Mean 4.47, S.D 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Should a gap be detected between the student’s actual functioning and assessment recommendations, the pedagogic committee makes sovereign decisions</strong></td>
<td>Mean 2.84, S.D 1.16</td>
<td>Mean 2.71, S.D 1.13</td>
<td>Mean 3.2, S.D 1.32</td>
<td>Mean 2.18, S.D 1.22</td>
<td>Mean 3.35, S.D 1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 Schools’ perceptions of pedagogic committees

Findings illustrated that the pedagogic committee does not apply its right to modify test accommodations which result from assessments. The fact that means in the first question range from 3.94 to 4.66 and in the second question they range from 2.18 to 3.35 indicates a general policy of non-intervention. However, it also shows that
schools are willing to intervene to some extent in case of gaps between the student’s functioning and the outcome of the assessment.

The interviews allowed for the conclusion that teachers are not at all involved in granting test accommodations. Furthermore, BC.1 and BC.2 maintained that “if school were to decide on it there would be inflated numbers of applicants”.

Indeed, in schools B and D test accommodations are determined by assessments. AC.1 asserted that when AH is dissatisfied with the extent of accommodations, the student is sent to be re-assessed. However, in school C counselors take the initiative to decide on oral or written tests or to expand on existing accommodations. This is done in cooperation with the student on the basis of ‘pilot’ tests. Moreover, CC.2 argued that “school committee which decides on test accommodations consists of the psychologist, the counselor, the pedagogic coordinator and the manager of Senior High School”. In school E, too, test accommodations are decided on at school mainly because students come from low socio-economic backgrounds and parents cannot afford to send them to be assessed (EC.1).

**Summary**

Statistical findings and findings from the interviews seemed to be congruent as both reflect schools’ tendency to avoid interference in test accommodations. This was especially seen in schools B and D. However, in the rest of the schools counselors interfere only when the need arises, either to expand on test accommodations or in case of economic difficulties. Interviews demonstrated that teachers are not involved in the process.

**Accountability and monitoring procedures**

Procedures of accountability and supervision were investigated as part of the process of inclusion. All questions were constructed to one scale in which figure 5 reflected equal extent of accountability for LDS and mainstream students and figure 1 reflected differentiated levels of accountability (Table 4.22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=19)</td>
<td>(N=16)</td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
<td>(N=18)</td>
<td>(N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability procedures regarding mainstream and LDS are the same</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 Staff perceptions of accountability procedures regarding LDS

Findings suggested that apart from school C schools tended towards undifferentiated accountability in respect of LDS and mainstream students. School D and E reflected the least differentiated accountability for LDS whereas school C tended towards extra measures of accountability.

Albeit school D had the highest perceptions of undifferentiated accountability according to Table 4.22, monitoring procedures were not always consistent with this picture. Indeed, DC.1 who is in charge of LDS in school this year asserted that the whole process is orderly and “teachers know exactly what is expected from them”. When a student returns from assessment, teachers, parents and the student sign a form which clarifies his/her test accommodations. Thus, it is ensured that all parties are informed. In case of a problem, it is the student’s responsibility to report. DC.2 listed the three necessary factors in the monitoring system which exist at school: having a professional in charge, having all parties informed, keeping a follow-up. Teachers (e.g. DT.1), too, expressed satisfaction from the monitoring procedure. In addition, all seven-graders are assessed at school to detect problems in reading comprehension. They are then sent over to be assessed outside of school.

The same mismatch was observed in school C. Despite perceptions of differentiated accountability of LDS (Table 4.22), staff seemed to be critical of the efficiency of monitoring procedures. CT.2 argued: “Teachers supervise themselves quite skillfully”. CT.3 claimed that in many cases students have to stand up for their rights.
and that counselors do not do much more than informing teachers of LDS at the outset of the year. Both teachers concluded that “no supervision system is being operated”.

Summary
The results of this exploration indicated that schools have a marginal tendency towards undifferentiated accountability as regards LDS and mainstream students. However, school C was perceived the highest in its tendency towards LDS accountability whereas school E was perceived as the lowest in this respect. Conversely, findings concerning monitoring the process showed that school D was perceived by the entire staff as applying high levels of supervision in respect of LDS whereas in school C staff expressed doubts in this respect.

Schools’ funding of assessments
The only school which initiated in-service assessments for students was school A. Last year 15 students were assessed at a low cost and school received ten per cent of the cost of each assessment. AH intends to carry on with this initiative. All other schools were not involved in assessments, although two of the schools, D and E are part of a Net of schools with an assessment centre.

Summary of the findings on inclusive structures
This section attempted to explore elements that are related to the structural responses schools provide for LDS as perceived by school staff. The exploration comprised SEN structures, inclusive curriculum, the involvement of the pedagogic committee, SEN support staff, accountability and monitoring procedures as regards LDS, staff training on inclusion, funding of assessments and test administration.

Findings indicated that the most common SEN structures at school are MABAR classes and the Support System. Yet, it is noteworthy that these structures are made for weak students regardless whether they are LDS or not. Similarly, schools A, B, and C provide curricular flexibility for slow learners but they do not address LDS needs in particular. Conversely, school D and E do not provide curricular flexibility regarding weak students. The fact that schools do not offer real inclusive curricula for LDS is also reflected in the policy of non-involvement of the pedagogic committee.
Indeed, schools are trying to avoid interference in test accommodations. Thus, teachers are not involved in the process of pre, while and after assessments.

The general picture that emerges is that there is no SEN support staff in the schools, and even in school B and C where perceptions were the highest, support staff only had a minimal training. Similarly, mainstream staff had very little training in the course of their career.

Perceptions in most schools (apart from school D) demonstrated that no supervision is applied by school management on the process of inclusion, and that accountability procedures for LDS and for mainstream students are similar. As regards assessments, apart from an initiative in school A, schools are not involved in funding assessments. Teachers’ complaints regarding their handling of LDS appeared to be marginal according to the statistical findings, and mostly focussed on the need to stay with LDS during breaks and to make special tests.
Chapter V
Analysis and Discussion of the Findings

Introduction
The present research has explored school leadership, culture and structures in the context of inclusion of LDS in mainstream secondary schools in Israel. This aim was obtained by investigating how leadership is related to inclusive leadership, how culture is related to inclusive culture, and how school structures are related to inclusive structures. The Discussion chapter will review the main findings of the research and evaluate the extent to which they have addressed the research questions. It will also attempt to interpret and integrate results within the context of theoretical and empirical literature. Finally, suggestions will be made with reference to practical implications of the management of LDS’ inclusion as well as further studies in the area.

It is worthwhile mentioning at the start of this chapter that the main body of research as regards inclusion does not relate specifically to LDS but rather to SEN in general, and therefore findings will be embedded within the literature with caution. The main contribution of the present research is the fact that it explores the relationship between managerial elements and inclusive elements, while attempting to see whether the level of inclusion can be predicted by managerial elements. Further, the study intends to investigate possible relationships between leadership, culture and structures after the completion of a separate study of each of these elements.

Research question 1
“How are staff perceptions of school leadership and inclusive leadership related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?”

School leadership
The first finding of Leadership indicated gaps between perceptions of headteachers and school staff regarding leadership foci. Findings suggest that headship
demonstrated both people and task orientations. The statistical presentation towards people-orientation appeared to be marginal (around the average of 3) indicating that headteachers tended to respond to people and tasks at the same time. Indeed, most headteachers (AH, BH, CH and DH) seemed to be aware of the importance of the human factor in management as a means of achieving their tasks. A mismatch between the high statistical score and low staff perceptions was observed in school E, and it might be accounted for by EH1’s detachment from school life (ET.2: “EH is more involved in the academic world than in school life”). It is noteworthy that school staff tended to perceive that the focus was placed on students rather than on teachers concerning the concept of ‘people’. This finding could not be confirmed or negated by existing literature because no differentiation is made in the literature between teachers/students foci as part of people-oriented leadership.

The second issue of foci is related to the issue of leadership-management. Most headteachers (except EH) considered themselves as leaders for change rather than managers although they were observed as carrying out managers’ roles as well. Similarly, current literature contends that educational effectiveness should create a synergy out of ‘leading professional roles’ and ‘chief executives’ and sees leadership and management as a complex gestalt and the head’s role as dual (Ribbins, 1995; Hall, 1996; Law, 1999; Morrison, 1998; Hodgkinson, 1991; Glatter, 1997). Theoretical findings in this area are also consistent with empirical evidence (Ainscow and Southworth, 1996).

Findings of this study are consistent with the literature on the topic of leadership-management. For example, BH demonstrated traits that were observed in the literature as ‘leadership’ traits, such as perseverance, curiosity, ambition, idealism, enthusiasm, decision-making ability, open-mindedness (Adair, 1983) and effective communication skills (Clarke, 1994; Rosener, 1990). However, her success in leading changes resulted from her ability to sustain change via her managerial skills, such as monitoring teachers’ performance (e.g. during breaks) and initiating communication channels (e.g. individual end-of-year-talks). Conversely, CH also possessed a sense of openness to new ideas, sensitivity and subsidiarity (West-Burnham, 1997) but failed to sustain change perhaps as a result of a deficit in managerial competences, such as
monitoring teachers’ performance. The element of ‘people’ was supported by findings considering ‘attitudes towards staff’. It appeared that except for school E school staff perceived attempts on the part of the headteacher to treat teachers with respect and openness. This tendency is congruent with headteachers’ understanding that the fulfilment of tasks is dependent on people.

The abovementioned finding is consistent with the models offered in the literature. The models of Everard and Morris (1990), and Blake and Mouton (1978) advocate that leadership styles result from different combinations of ‘people’ and ‘tasks’. For example, BH would be categorised as ‘Problem-solving’ via the first model and ‘Team-driven management’ via the second, as she demonstrates high concern for people and for tasks. Conversely, EH1 and EH2 would be categorised as ‘Fighting strategies’ via the first model and ‘Task-driven management’ via the second model as their main interest lies in task achievement.

Further, the importance of transformational leadership for headteachers (Sergiovanni, 1990; Senge, 1993) was confirmed in the present research. This could be seen in CH whose leadership looked pale in comparison to T’s clear leadership traits. It could also be seen in DH who seemed to have lost his power after the structural changes had taken place because staff did not perceive these changes as resulting from his visionary leadership, but rather as artificial changes. However, the exploration of EH1’s leadership helped in drawing the conclusion that transformational leadership must be combined with ‘people-orientation’ to become effective. Indeed, EH1 appeared to be a leader with vision and clear educational ideas who failed to motivate school staff to look beyond their limited interests when a change was about to take place because of his lack of people-orientation. The result of this communication deficit was staff resistance.

On the other hand, BH proved to be an inspirational and visionary leader (Mitchell and Tucker, 1992) who was focusing on the enhancement of teachers’ welfare and ‘getting things done’ (Caldwell and Spinks, 1992). It might be concluded that BH succeeded in ‘getting things done’ because she focussed on teachers’ welfare. The result of the combination of people-orientation and transformational leadership
enabled BH to focus on the transactional elements and achieve school improvement. These findings are consistent with Bass and Avolio (1994) who advocate that an optimal leadership profile exhibits both transformational and transactional elements of leadership. Indeed, BH’s transformational elements serve as the basis for her ability to carry out transactional elements.

However, whereas empirical findings from the literature indicated a gap between what vision symbolises in theory (e.g. Kouzes and Posner, 1996) and its reduced effectiveness in reality (e.g. Foreman, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998), findings from the present study supported the importance of vision combined with people-orientation. As claimed above, this was mainly seen in BH whose high input in people and personality traits made her successful in recruiting staff towards changes. On the other hand, DH who was not perceived as a visionary leader, failed to recruit staff towards the organisational changes which could have ‘saved’ school D from closing down. These findings demonstrate that staff expect headteachers to possess visionary skills and more than that, they see the deficit in visionary skills as causing a damage to school improvement.

The ‘human aspect’ of leadership is also linked to the discussion of the relationships between three leadership elements that appear in the literature: Trait, Contingency and Style. Findings indicated that leadership style is determined to a large extent by the headteacher’s personality. For example, as a result of a drastic decrease in student applications for registration, school D went through drastic structural and conceptual changes that were conducted by external consultants. As a result, school staff perceived a major shift in DH’s leadership style that was formerly perceived as centralistic and was now perceived as more sharing and people-oriented. However, interviews made it clear that staff were not sure to what degree this change was internalised by DH and how soon he will resume ‘his old style’.

Headteachers’ traits were also found to match their attitudes towards staff. In schools where staff perceived headteacher’s attitude in a positive way, they also perceived his/her traits in this way (e.g. school A). Conversely, in school E where staff perceived headteachers’ attitudes as negative, EH1 and EH2’s traits were also
perceived negatively. Findings from this research support the literature which provides endless trait ‘recipes’ for effective leadership (e.g. Champy and Nohria, 1996b), and in particular vision, sensitivity, subsidiarity and creativity (West-Burnham, 1997; Hall, 1998). The importance of Trait was mainly observed in BH who managed to create a ‘shared vision’ among staff due to her personality, although in the past no other headteacher succeeded in the enhancement of commitment towards school, and staff work was featured by chaos. Indeed, BH has re-shaped the work patterns in school B but has not changed her leadership style due to the circumstances that had prevailed prior to her arrival. Similarly, CH demonstrated a totally different style than T although school contingencies remained the same.

However, school contingencies were also observed as a factor in leadership. Indeed, each of the schools is featured by special contingencies as specified in Appendix 7. For example, the departure of T, the previous headteacher, created a ‘leadership vacuum’. T’s controversial character made CH try to work in a “more peaceful and less noisy” style than T’s. Similarly, DH changed his attitudes towards staff and his management style because contingencies made him realise that school will close down unless a drastic change is conducted. The influence of schools’ contingencies is consistent with the literature (e.g. Stoll and Fink, 1994). It might as well be contended that all headteachers are currently captives of their environment (Hallinger and Heck, 1996) mainly because of school competition and parental involvement.

Findings seemed to be inconsistent with Hersey and Blanchard’s (1977) model because this model claimed that the leader forms his/her approach on the basis of workers’ personal and professional maturity towards the organisation. The main critique against this model is that it offers four different approaches towards different workers whereas data emerging from this research did not indicate differentiated attitudes towards staff by the same headteacher in a given school. This gives reason to believe that leadership approach is determined by Trait rather than by the workers’ maturity which is part of school contingencies.

It might be concluded that this study supports the integrated models of Handy’s ‘best-fit theory’ (1993) and Fiedler’s (1978) theory. These theories integrate Trait, Style
and Contingency and reflect that leaders need to shape their environment as well as being shaped by it.

Headteachers’ perceptions as leaders of change were explored in the light of Scheinman and Ben-Peretz’ (1993) division of ‘responsive’ leaders, ‘leader-manager’, and ‘leaders-initiators’. Findings demonstrated that such a division would be artificial. Indeed, most headteachers’ profiles comprised elements of the three categories. They were ‘responsive’ leaders in the sense that they encouraged staff to initiate changes. AH, BH and CH in particular were willing to discuss ideas that emerge from teachers’ experiences. Headteachers were ‘leaders-initiators’ in the sense that they came up with their own initiatives. For example, AH initiated the TQM, DH initiated major structural and conceptual changes and CH initiated the project of school computerisation. In addition, headteachers were ‘leaders-managers’ in the sense that they followed the Ministry initiatives. This trend was also observed as regards the topic of inclusion.

The literature on change expresses a consensus on the relationship between effective leadership and improvement. Findings of the research deduce that all headteachers perceived their role as leaders for change and improvement although this tendency took different forms in the respective schools. For example, EH focussed on future technological changes whereas CH emphasised new curricular subjects. AH introduced TQM to improve people’s performance whereas DH perceived changes as ‘never-ending’. Findings indicated that all schools went through changes as specified in Appendix 7. However, headteachers of schools A, B, C, and D advocated gradual implementation of change whereas EH was the only headteacher who admitted that “sometimes drastic changes are required”. Yet, all headteachers were perceived as intolerant towards resistance to their initiatives. This might account for the reason for the dissatisfaction expressed by school staff in reference to implementation of change (AT.3, BO, CC.1).

Apart from headteachers’ willingness to cooperate in school improvement, an analysis which relies on the literature was made as regards how changes were carried out by school leaders. AH, for example, took the lead when he inserted the TQM but it
appeared that he failed to set the context and communicate the need for this change to school staff (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992). The result was bitterness and resistance. It could be argued that DH failed in leading the major change process because of his inability to maintain a balance between change and continuity (Pettigrew and Whipp, 1993). Indeed, school D went through drastic re-structuring which left no reminders of the old structure. Similarly, when EH1 initiated the shift from an elite technological school to a comprehensive school, he failed to provide opportunities for teachers to develop personal understanding of the meaning of change (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992), and chose to impose his view on staff claiming that “I know what is best for school”.

Indeed, the concept of change was observed as part of management in all schools. Not only do headteachers acknowledge that part of their role is leading change, but they have already adopted some necessary behaviours such as giving feedbacks (Duignan and Macpherson, 1992). Nevertheless, the more complicated competences mentioned by Pettigrew and Whipp (1993) have not been applied yet. Thus, AH had not adequately assessed the environment before he decided to introduce the TQM. Similarly, DH has not weighed his chances of success while implementing the drastic changes.

Yet, interviews with school staff showed that teachers and counselors were aware of changes mainly when they related to them personally. For example, teachers in school A were unaware of the TQM unless they were affected by the results. Teachers in school D became aware of the major organisational changes only when it affected their status such as in the case of the previous status of Heads of Departments.

According to Ferguson’s (1982) ‘paradigm change’ it might be claimed that as no new forms of insight were achieved to facilitate understanding among staff, the true meaning of change was not acquired. Another interpretation can be that of Ferguson (1982) and Clarke (1994) according to which when change is too gradual it leaves people unaware of its occurrence. However, the changes in schools A, B, D, and E were not observed as too subtle, yet they did not recruit people’s involvement. Thus, it seems that the first explanation which is related to developing insight accounts better for this situation.
It is noteworthy that teachers had subjective interpretations when they were asked about major changes in their schools. This finding is consistent with the claim in the literature of the ‘subjective meaning of change’ (Duck, 1993; Fullan, 1991) as well as with Bush’s (1995) subjective model. Indeed, teachers reflected a whole range of emotions that accord with the literature. For example, teachers in school A that had to be subject to appraisal as part of the TQM perceived anxiety (Marris, 1975) and threats to self-esteem (Judson, 1991). Staff in school D expressed mainly anger and insecurity and some started a search for a new identity (career) (Marris, 1993).

Reactions to change seemed to depend on how drastic changes were. In case expectations were high and demanding such as in the case of school D where people had to give up their positions, the typical reaction was antagonism or non-commitment (Harris, 1987). However, as headteachers were usually aware of the need to be more collegial, reactions never reached the point of ‘immobilisation’ (Adams et al., 1976). The main strategies that headteachers used while facing resistance were coercion and obligation (Macmillan, 1978; Thompson, 1993), although they perceived themselves as acting via negotiation and support (ibid.).

Most headteachers perceived their way of leading changes as incremental. However, the analysis proves that this statement was only partially true. Johnson (1993) states that incremental change addresses the human dimension, the contingencies and the processual factors of change. However, findings demonstrated that although schools A, B, C, and lately D were people-focussed rather than only task-focussed, the human dimension was hardly taken into consideration as decisions were being made. Thus, CH decided on a shift to a five-day-week despite staff resistance, AH inserted TQM despite staff objection, and DH proceeded with the organisational changes despite the increase in staff resistance. However, changes were carried out with reference to contingencies: EH introduced a Junior High School because of the decrease in the number of students, and BH applied supervision on teachers’ duties during breaks due to the lack of discipline teachers demonstrated when she took up the headship.

In addition, decisions were made fast without allowing for the incremental growth and achievement of consensus (Clarke, 1994). For example, CH imposed the shift to a
five-day-week in a way that shocked school staff. This line of thought accords with Morrison (1998) who asserts that the basis of incremental changes is long-term planning and recruitment of all staff members. Indeed, on the one hand, headteachers were trying to demonstrate a continuous openness to change, but on the other hand they managed change in a ‘downstream’ way (Herbig and Palumbo, 1996) which is typical to the Japanese model of change. The changes were neither built on phases and stages as some researchers argue they should (e.g. Bush and Coleman, 2000), nor did they involve all staff (Morrison, 1998).

This ambiguity can be also seen in the fact that headteachers demonstrated a gradual and graceful style in conveying change which consisted of individual talks, tolerance and patience. For example, DC.3 perceived that strategies for change encompassed support, participation, involvement, communication and education, and believed that the initiative failed because the change was applied too fast. However, discrepancies were perceived between headteachers’ efforts to present changes in a non-threatening way and their ‘revengeful’ response in case of resistance. CC.2: “You have a full autonomy until you start expressing your free opinion”. Thus, findings at the same time match and contradict the literature on change which advocates strategies such as empathy, persuasion, reassurance and understanding while coping with change rather than coercion, and obligation (e.g. Judson, 1991; Strebel, 1996).

Throughout the research school staff kept repeating they were ‘not being heard enough’ while being coerced towards different initiatives. This finding is congruent with the literature on the emotional aspect of change-making. Indeed, different researchers specify a long list of feelings that are involved in the process of change such as threats to self-esteem, loss and anxiety, stress and loss (e.g. Walton, 1997). Of course, the most clear-cut example in this study is school D, where the previous Heads of Departments that were substituted by Heads of Forums and were deprived of their positions used the terminology of ‘loss’ and ‘a threat to their self-esteem’. However, teachers in the rest of the schools expressed feelings of hurtfulness when decisions were made for them such as the example of school A where the TQM was imposed by AH. On the basis of the examples that were introduced by teachers it might be agreed that headteachers administer change while using strategies from the
two ends of Macmillan’s (1978) and Thompson’s (1993) scale: ‘explicit or implicit coercion’ as well as ‘communication and education’.

Yet, staff perceptions were more consistent with Harris (1987) whose description ranged from ‘antagonistic’ to ‘the commitment of “make it happen”’ than with Adams et al. (1976) whose description was more acute and ranged from ‘immobilisation’ to ‘internalisation of change’. Finally, it is noteworthy that teachers’ reactions hardly matched the most ‘positive’ end of these models. Indeed, most of the time they resided in the middle of the range which encompassed responses such as ‘the feeling of ‘let it happen’ or ‘acceptance of the reality of the change’. One possible way to account for this phenomenon is that when teachers do not feel too much hurt from the change they do not wish to become too much involved in resistance, mainly for personal interests. However, once they feel threatened (such as in school D) they tend towards the more extreme end of ‘antagonism’ and ‘immobilisation’ or ‘disbelief’.

However, the feeling teachers conveyed during the interviews was exhaustion from too many changes and a feeling that “we keep running after changes” (AT.3). This is congruent with Ferguson’s (1982) ‘pendulum change’ by which periodically one approach is abandoned in favour of another. In some cases (school A) they felt that not enough efforts were put on the internalisation of these changes, or that no supervision measures were applied (school C).

**Summary of the discussion of leadership**

The analysis has confirmed the duality of leadership roles in the schools investigated, as it comprises people and task orientation, and headteachers are both managers and leaders. Similarly, transformational elements of headteachers combined with people-orientation are likely to result in carrying out of transactional tasks, and Trait appears to contribute to leadership style alongside with Contingency. This conclusion is consistent with researchers such as Handy (1993), Myers (1995) and Hall (1998) who introduce integrated models which comprise Trait, Style and Contingency. They maintain that leaders respond to environmental constraints via their born traits and eventually this determines their leadership style.
The analysis as regards the management of change has revealed a complicated reality. Changes in schools are usually introduced in a collegial although not an incremental manner as headteachers claim they are. Reactions to change involve emotions and subjective interpretations both on the part of headteachers and staff. This highlights the importance of the role of headteachers in change implementation. As LDS’ inclusion is considered to be an implementation of change, the next section will explore how leadership elements enhance or inhibit inclusion.

**Inclusive leadership**

The following section explores elements of school leadership which are related to the process of inclusion.

The research confirmed the argument that headteacher’s involvement in school activities contributes to his/her capability of leading change regarding SEN inclusion (e.g. Mendez-Morse, 1991). For example, BH was observed as highly involved in all levels of school activities and participated in all training courses and pedagogic meetings. Indeed, she managed to recruit staff towards inclusion and changed the climate in school B. Conversely, EH1 was perceived as minimally involved and failed to overcome resistance concerning the shift from a vocational to a comprehensive school.

Findings match with Avissar’s (1999) contention that the more senior and professionally developed headteachers are, the less they incline towards inclusion. Indeed, EH1, who is the most senior headteacher in the five schools (45 years in education) was observed as the least ‘inclusive’ headteacher as well as the most professionally developed (a lecturer at the university with a Ph.D). This non-inclusive attitude towards LDS can be accounted by the fact that policies of inclusion are relatively new (from the late 80s) and did not ‘hit’ more old-fashioned educationalists such as EH1.

The first element of inclusive leadership that was explored in the present study is ‘inclusive vision’. Findings of school B which demonstrated that this issue is related to elements of guidance, direction and support were consistent with the literature
(Lipsky and Gartner, 1998; Sommefeldt, 2001; Smith, 1996). Indeed, the highest vision score of ‘inclusive vision’ was marked in school B. However, findings from the rest of the schools indicated that ‘inclusive vision’ is also linked to an aspiration to increase the level of entitlement for matriculations in school A, to school budget in school C, and to the lack of personal involvement in school D. Yet, it might be argued that sending students to be assessed, for example, could be AH’s way of caring for LDS’ inclusion in school A. This finding accords with the high statistical score of AH regarding his perception of inclusive vision (4.83). Similarly, it might be asserted that staff perception of CH’s inclusive vision is lower as she is a new headteacher. In addition, CH’s relationship to budgets could be related to the fact that she is not familiar with the school system yet and feels pressed by budgetary issues. This assumption also accords with CH’s high score (4.36).

Findings concerning ‘support for teachers regarding LDS’ suggested that teachers and counselors’ perceptions are much lower than headteachers’. These gaps were mainly perceived in school A where AH perceived himself as ‘doing the best’ whereas staff felt pressured and frustrated due to the overload and high input with LDS for which teachers are not adequately compensated. The rest of the headteachers did not refer specifically to LDS in their responses. These findings could indicate that headteachers’ tendency towards inclusion as stated in their inclusive vision does not ensure their willingness to provide the actual support that is expected by staff. Headteachers’ high perceptions of support indicate that there is nothing wrong in their attitudes, but rather in the ‘putting into action’ of these attitudes as reflected in staff support. Staff dissatisfaction from the level of inclusion supports Scruggs and Mastropieri’s (1996) postulation that there is a direct relationship between successful inclusion and the management of support.

The analysis indicates that in school B and D where in-service training is compulsory, staff received training on LD. Conversely, in schools C and A where in-service training was not compulsory, headteachers perceived training on LDS as intuitive and did not initiate courses. In school E no training was offered. However, findings appeared to be surprising in respect of school D. Despite the fact that DH was not involved in ‘fieldwork’ and was found to be low in ‘inclusive vision’, findings from
interviews demonstrated a high level in respect of LDS training. This gap might be explained by the fact that within the new framework of the learning organisation that was established with the help of external consultants, staff were offered all kinds of courses one of which was on LD. Indeed, findings indicated that training initiatives of inclusive leaders were considered to be an important element in the eyes of teaching staff. It appeared that staff perceptions focussed on the deficit in training as an inhibiting factor to inclusion. These findings seem to be consistent with empirical literature (Joyce et al., 1991; OECD, 1995; Tomlinson, 1996).

Summary of the discussion of inclusive leadership
While attempting to put the three elements of inclusive leadership together, schools were categorised according to the following typology: school B appeared to be the most inclusive school with emphasis on inclusive vision, in-service training on LD and support for teachers. School E represented the lowest inclusive leadership with no initiatives on LD training, little support for teachers and no inclusive vision. Schools A and C represented an average inclusive leadership. School A demonstrated gaps between headteacher and staff regarding support and inclusive vision, and provided little training on LD. School C demonstrated little training on LD, no particular support for LDS and inclusive vision which is attributed mainly to the previous headteacher. School D made a separate category as school initiated courses on LD but the inclusive elements of leadership of DH were featured by lack of involvement and no special support concerning LDS. This gap might be explained by the fact that as part of the organisational changes at school staff were offered a variety of courses one of which was on LD.

On the basis of the findings it might be deduced that although inclusive vision as reflected in school documents and in staff perceptions is an important element of inclusion, training initiatives and support for teachers appeared to be the more practical indicators for inclusive leadership. This opinion accords with Rouse and Florian (1996) who assert that inadequate training and resources are not less important than the creation of positive attitudes towards inclusion.
How are leadership and inclusive leadership related in this study?

The analysis of the findings indicates that elements of leadership and inclusive leadership seem to be congruent in the ‘extreme’ cases. This conclusion practically means that in cases in which the picture of inclusion is very clear in respect of headteachers’ attitudes towards school staff, leadership focus, style and traits, it is possible to predict the orientation towards inclusion or lack thereof. Indeed, a clear-cut picture was gained in two cases, that of school B and school E.

In school E, elements of inclusion were observed as residing on the negative end of the scale. Both EH1 and EH2 stood out in their task-oriented approach, in their negative attitudes towards staff and in negative staff perceptions regarding their personal traits. Similarly, the level of inclusive vision and initiatives for staff training on LDS on the part of EH1 were low. Compatibility was also observed in school B in which BH demonstrated the highest leadership elements. Indeed, BH’s transformational leadership and visionary traits combined with people-orientation made her succeed in ‘getting things done’ in respect of change in general and inclusion in particular. This was seen in the training on LDS initiated by her, in staff perceptions of her leadership traits as well as in her impressive inclusive vision as perceived by school staff.

However, in other cases this compatibility was not clearly seen. In school A, for instance, teachers’ perceptions of AH’s attitudes towards staff and traits were positive but gaps were perceived concerning SEN support for staff and staff training on LD. Indeed, most headteachers are perceived as higher on elements of leadership such as ‘attitudes towards staff’ and lower on elements of inclusive leadership such as ‘staff training on LDS’. The element which was perceived as the least cared for with reference to inclusion was ‘support for staff on LDS’. This was observed even in schools featured by positive attitudes towards staff and people-orientation such as school B or A. These gaps can be attributed to the fact that the implementation of inclusion is in a transition phase, and although most headteachers have developed awareness towards more vulnerable populations at school, it has not reached the stage of awareness towards the need for adequate support or training for mainstream teachers in respect of LDS.
Moreover, headteachers were observed as combining ‘leader’ and ‘manager’ roles, and similarly being ‘people’ and ‘task’ oriented. This could be due to the fact that headteachers nowadays have an overload due to the competition between schools, the Open Enrolment and school marketing. Therefore, the issue of LDS does not appear to be a top priority as headteachers are rather busy in the ‘day-to-day-survival’ of their schools. Another finding that supports this interpretation is the ambivalence in staff perceptions of headteachers’ attitudes towards them. Clearly, headteachers are now trying to adopt openness and collaboration as part of their management. However, due to their commitment to tasks and constraints of school reality, they have to please all parties and that might be the reason for the ambivalence in staff perceptions.

An alternative explanation for these gaps might be that the issues of leadership and inclusive leadership were found to be associated with change, as LDS’ inclusion was introduced as a concept of change in 1988 but the process of change has not been completed. Indeed, the analysis proved that perceptions of change were varied among all staff members including the headteacher. When staff members were asked to provide an example of a recent change in school, they often failed to identify the major change in their own school. This means that in order to make people aware of a certain change the headteacher had to focus on the development of an insight and ‘institutionalisation’ of the change, and this has not been done in most cases of change including that of inclusion.

It was clearly observed that staff expressed fatigue from the multiplicity of changes over the recent years. In addition, headteachers dealt with resistance with intolerance. Generally, LDS’ inclusion seemed to be perceived as an issue which requires a high input and no satisfactory compensation on the part of the management. If this is to be combined with deficits in inclusive vision, in support for staff on LDS and training on LDS, these discrepancies can be better understood.
Research question 2
“How are staff perceptions of school culture and inclusive culture related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?”

School culture
As culture reflects the unconscious aspect of the organisational life, its exploration is believed to rely on the insight of participants more than other elements discussed in previous and later sections. The overall picture that emerges from the findings is that schools can be divided roughly into two categories: schools A, B, and C make one category and schools D and E make another category. This section aims at understanding the reason for the existence of such a division.

The first finding that was dealt with was school credo. Schools A, B, and C emphasise the importance of values to staff and students. These values include equality of opportunities, responsibility, contribution to society and to the community. Attitudes towards students matched these values. They comprised personal response to individual needs and catering for excellent as well as for weak students. Conversely, schools D and E emphasise values related to the changing world and to hi-tech contexts. In addition, these schools did not appear to be student-centred. These two different types of credos seemed to perceive teachers’ role differently: the former group adhered to the traditional role of teachers whereas the latter group perceived teachers as supervisors rather than knowledge transmitters.

The issue of ‘school credo’ seems to be compatible to ‘inclusive vision’ as the two issues reflect the theoretical stance of school although the former refers to school in general and the latter refers to inclusion in particular. Indeed, DH’s fear of a stigma of ‘a second-chance school’ and EH1’s ‘non-inclusive’ words accord with the credo of these two schools which is featured by an impersonal approach. The issue of fear of stigma is supported by Clark et al. (1999) who argue that schools are looking for ways to reduce a further influx in the number of SEN students.
The tendency towards values of change as part of the credo of these schools will now be analysed in the context of ‘staff perceptions of change and resistance’. An in-depth look into the way change was carried out in schools D and E demonstrated that both headteachers failed to recruit staff to be committed to change. School D closed down at the end of school year 2002 and in school E the senior staff are still feeling hostility as regards the new organisational changes that were made eight years ago. This shows that the fact that school declares a willingness towards change, does not necessarily ensure that headteachers can handle resistance towards change. The present study confirmed the assertions in the literature as for the importance of a vision of change in schools’ credo (Bhindi and Duignan, 1996).

It might be concluded that the issue of ‘school credo’ is incompatible with ‘the management of change’ because despite the fact that schools D and E were waving with the flag of change, they failed to handle change. Conversely, in school B where credo appeared to be more ‘traditional’, BH managed to commit staff to changes with minimal resistance. The present research seems to be inconsistent with the literature in this regard. For example, the combined model (Bush, 1995; Morgan, 1986; Clarke, 1992) in Figure 2.9 in the Literature Review presents the relationship between vision and behaviour as cause and effect via the mediating factor of norms. This proved to be wrong in the present study because the vision towards change in school D and E did not result in management behaviours that allowed for change. On the other hand, school B which allowed for change did not introduce it in its credo.

The issue of ‘school credo’ was also examined against findings from the literature on ‘school vision’. Although ‘vision’ is usually considered as part of school leadership, its definition allows it to be observed as parallel to school credo. Findings accord with the claim in the literature that most mission statements are terribly ineffective because they fail to motivate staff to work toward a common end (Collins and Porras, 1991; Murgatroyd and Morgan, 1993). Findings revealed that school staff perceived rhetoric as detached from reality. For example, school D’s vision used a high-falutin language (specified in the Findings Chapter) which teachers failed to understand. School E’s documents also related to a Hi-Tech world which stood in contradiction to the low levels of students at school. This accords with Beare et al. (1989) who contend that
vision must be ‘institutionalised’ so that it can shape school activities. It is also consistent with empirical studies on perceptions of inclusion that indicated a gap between staff perceptions of headteachers’ rhetoric and practical attitudes towards LDS (Barnet and Monda-Amaya, 1998; Dyal et al., 1996).

Another point which was supported in the literature by the findings is the claim made by Sagor and Barnett (1994) as well as by Bolam et al. (1993) who advocated that the vision expressed by headteachers is not specific to school but is rather quite general. For example, although school C’s vision encouraged social involvement, it remained unclear how it is conveyed to students at school. On the other hand, school B’s vision focussed on transmitting the value of responsibility and this was achieved via specific ways such as the ‘Coaching’ Programme or school curriculum. However, the present study rejected the existing belief (e.g. Stott and Walker, 1992) that schools fail to revise or update statements even during periods of changes. Indeed, findings showed that school vision is updated as a result of changes such as the TQM in school A, the new headteacher in school C and B, and organisational changes in schools D and E.

However, findings mismatch the relationship presented in the combined model (Figure 2.9) regarding the mutual relationships between behaviours and norms. Indeed, in most cases a gap has been observed between school credo and the actual behaviour of inclusion. For example, headteachers declared values such as catering for weak students as well as for excellent ones, whereas in practice AH was more concerned with excellence, and so was CH.

The issue of ‘school climate’ is considered as part of school culture in this study because the atmosphere and the attitudes that prevail at school are likely to affect inclusion. The overall statistical findings indicated that staff tendency towards open and collaborative climate is marginal. However, the only school where climate was perceived negatively was school A with an overall score of 2.86, whereas school C had the highest overall score of 3.78. The interviews emphasised the variety of perceptions of staff members in a given school. The inconsistency within respondent groups might indicate that school factors are more dominant in perceptions of climate than role perceptions. Findings from the statistical description may be explained by
the degree of pressure perceived by staff. Thus, in school A staff perceived high levels of pressure by AH concerning their input in LDS, and perceptions of climate appeared to be the lowest. Conversely, in school C teachers and counselors felt no pressure to participate in in-service training or in pedagogic meetings, and the climate was perceived as positive. The relationship between teamwork and climate in this study stood in contradiction to the literature. Indeed, Halpin and Croft (1962) stated that team spirit is necessary to a positive climate although in school C team work appeared to be problematic, yet staff perceptions concerning climate were positive.

The introduction of changes was found to be related to worsening of schools climate, as observed in schools A, D and E. This accords with Halpin and Croft (1962) who argued for the importance of a sense of commitment for school tasks as related to school climate. It is possible that headteachers failed to increase staff commitment towards the changes at schools, as a result of which the changes seemed to be imposed, and the result was a worsening of school climate. The relationships between school climate and change were examined via Steinhoff’s (1969) model which focussed on the proportions between elements of pressure towards innovations on the one hand and pressures towards control and supervision on the other hand. Yet, none of the schools under study matched the second and fourth possibilities which are featured by low pressures or no pressures towards innovations. In fact, all headteachers seemed to acknowledge the need to adapt to constraints of reality, whether it was AH with the insertion of the TQM, or EH1 by opening the Junior High School despite staff resistance.

Findings enabled to divide schools into two groups: in schools D, B and E staff perceived pressures during the implementation of innovations. Indeed, in the three schools staff had to participate in the in-service training offered at school, but whereas DH and EH1 and EH2 achieved this despite their inavailability to teachers, BH appeared to do so via her personality. This model of climate towards change is consistent with Steinhoff’s (1969) third possibility which is characterised by heavy pressures towards innovation and heavy pressures towards control and supervision. Conversely, in schools C and A teachers were requested to participate in change making but they were also allowed for freedom as regards in-service training and an
open door to the headteacher. This pattern of climate towards change is consistent with the first possibility of the abovementioned model, which meant heavy pressures towards innovations but low pressures towards control and supervision. In the light of this analysis, it is also possible to conclude that school climate and structures are intertwined as the extent of pressures towards innovation is related to climate, whereas the extent of pressures towards control and supervision is related to structures.

The fact that staff perceptions of the concepts of change were varied might result from the fact that change was not institutionalised. Consequently, different people had different concepts of the recent changes that took place in their school. The best example of staff confusion was school D, where changes were perceived as vague and the conceptual change was disregarded in favour of the structural change. The need to assimilate changes is broadly supported in the literature (e.g. Marris, 1975).

Findings on the issue of team-work indicated that teamwork exists in two cases. The first case is when teachers feel a deficiency in the feedback they receive from school management. Indeed, this study denoted that in most schools (except some subject teams in school C) the basis for teamwork is both ‘instrumental’ (professional) and social (Sergiovanni, 1994). This was mainly observed in school E where teachers felt group cohesiveness because it improved their general feeling of dissatisfaction at school due to their frustrations from the management. The second case is when the headteacher is consistent about teamwork and supervision measures are taken, such as the case of school B. The rest of the schools expressed the need for teamwork as part of their rhetoric but failed to supervise structures of teamwork among staff members. Unlike the first part of Tuckman’s claim (1985) which emphasised the importance of clear values and norms in effective teamwork, the current study designated that effective teamwork relies on human relations, openness, concern and honesty more than on the sharing of values and norms.

The present research accords with the critics of teamwork with regard to its negative effect on the micropolitics of the organisation, such as role conflicts and intergroup rivalries (Bush, 1993; Beale, 1994). This was mainly seen in school C where teachers did not wish to become subject coordinators due to role conflicts and high levels of
stress within some of the teams. These findings are consistent with ‘the ground-zero team’ (Weller, 1995) characterised by open hostility, personality clashes, jealousy and destructiveness. Indeed, Bush (1995) was right in his claim that according to the political model, conflicts within or between departments or sub-units might impede the implementation of change.

The issues of collaboration, teamwork and change are linked in the literature. The rationale behind this claim relies on the assumption that collaborative management will unleash the energy and expertise of teachers, contribute to school climate and consequently result in improvement (Rowan, 1995). Further, staff members will change their minds as a result of mutual nourishment (Stacey, 1996b). Indeed, BH managed to recruit staff towards changes and new initiatives at school by enabling them to realise their individual talents. For example, she identified a teacher who was “completely burned-out” and made her the coordinator of the Theatre Class. BH emphasised that her main aim is to make people ‘Big Heads’ in school. BH’s attitude towards change is congruent with Bush’s cultural model which emphasises the importance of vision on change.

The issue of collaboration and change is particularly interesting in the context of school D. The new structures in school D comprise interdisciplinary subject forums. Teachers were grouped into forums not on the basis of their subject or seniority at school. However, findings indicated that collaboration and teamwork in school D which did not exist prior to the organisational changes did not lead to the desired change as school D closed down at the end of 2002. One possible explanation for this can derive from Earl and Lee (1998) who argue that collaboration should rely on ‘urgency, agency and energy’ which practically mean a shared vision for change, structures for change and people’s commitment to change. It can be contended that in school D all senior staff expressed resistance to the changes that were taking place at school and DH failed to convey the new vision to them in a way that would increase their commitment. The only ‘condition’ that allowed for the changes according to this theory is school structures. In fact, the context of change of school D can be even better understood in the light of Bush’s ambiguity model, as the major changes in this
school resulted in a state of chaos and turbulence which were part of teachers’ resistance and unwillingness to cooperate.

Findings on ‘the learning organisation’ demonstrated that school D and B seemed to operate as learning organisations. School A stood out in AH’s encouragement towards personal staff development and also in the fact that in-service courses were not imposed on staff. This tendency was also observed in school C. On the other hand, EH1 and BH made teachers attend courses that had been selected by them. Thus, it seems that the analysis of a certain school as a learning organisation should be subjected to a number of criteria because most teachers and counselors are now taking training courses for which they are accredited in their salaries, and therefore the mere fact that teachers study does not transform school into a learning organisation.

On the basis of an analysis of the findings against models of the literature it might be concluded that schools nowadays tend towards expansion of horizons (Senge, 1993; Otala, 1995) and encourage staff to learn (Handy, 1989). However, it is rather the two remaining criteria that seem to pose problems in respect of school D which has been ‘crowned’ as ‘the’ learning organisation of the five schools. Indeed, Bennett and and O’Brien (1994) focussed on the ability to accomplish and sustain change which school D failed to do. In addition, Garvin (1993) emphasised the adaptations of behaviours to acquired knowledge which school D was also unable to do, as staff could not translate the knowledge it acquired to everyday life at school and to the implementation of school credo. It might be concluded, then, that school D may be considered as partly achieving its objectives to be a learning organisation.

On the other hand, school B fulfils the abovementioned criteria more than school D. Indeed, it proved a capacity to sustain changes and to adapt behaviours to learning. For example, teachers’ attitudes towards students have changed as a result of BH’s involvement and modeling, and teachers who could not cope with this change were forced to leave. However, it is argued that whereas school D might fit into Miller’s (1996) ‘Structural Learning’ because it focussed on structural changes, school B might fit into ‘Institutional Learning’ because it focussed on values and beliefs.
In addition, both schools fit Fryer’s (1996) description of creativity as a major element of a learning organisation. This was seen in BH’s novel solutions, and in the drastic innovations of school D’s credo. However, school B accorded with a change in the mind-set as advocated by Carnall (1999), whereas staff in school D did not seem to change their viewpoint.

While existing literature reflects that teamwork and collaboration are part of ‘the learning organisation’ (Senge, 1990) findings from the present study are inconsistent with this claim. For example, subject teams in school E demonstrated teamwork although school E as a whole was not observed as a learning organisation because it did not fulfill any of the criteria, and processes of learning at school were observed as artificially imposed by EH1.

Findings with reference to teamwork and collaboration did not agree with collaborative decision-making. For example, staff perceptions in school C were featured by democratic procedures of decision-making despite a problematic teamwork. Conversely, school E had no collaborative decision-making but it demonstrated teamwork among teachers. Schools under study were grossly grouped into schools A, B, and C in which attempts for shared decision-making were perceived on the part of the management, and to schools D and E in which teachers did not participate in decision-making. It is noteworthy that although school D had perfect structures for shared decision-making because participants of the Forums were supposed to be the decision-makers and meetings were held on a regular basis, staff perceptions were that these changes were merely structural.

The mismatch between the issues of collaboration and shared decision-making seems to derive from the fact that decision-making reflects the strategy of the management whereas collaboration reflects the atmosphere among staff. This might explain the fact that CH contributes to “a climate of togetherness” (CT.1) but lets staff participate only in decisions with regard to individual students. Similarly, BH succeeded in the enhancement of teamwork and collaboration but does not let staff intervene with decisions as regards school management. The inconsistence between collaboration and shared decision-making is supported by Bush’s (1995) collegial model, which,
according to the writer is frequently featured by ‘top-down’ decision-making. This was seen in schools A, B, and C where despite attempts for collaboration on the part of the management, staff observed decision-making to be a ‘top-down’. This finding is also congruent with Kanji and Asher’s (1993) ‘top-down’ model for implementation of change, which appeared to be the most popular among the headteachers in this study.

**Summary of the discussion of culture**

The analysis of school culture has elicited the following points: school vision must be ‘institutionalised’ so that it can be carried out efficiently, yet teachers often fail to understand and identify with it because it is not specific enough to school context. Further, school values are compatible with inclusive vision in the sense that the values expressed by school are also reflected in the headteacher’s vision towards inclusion. On the other hand, the analysis of findings regarding school attitudes towards change suggested that headteachers’ attitudes towards change can be contradictory to school credo. This means that school credo as appears in school documents does not always reflect the real attitudes towards change. If this statement is taken a step further it might be suggested that the reality of change is expressed in headteachers’ attitudes towards change more than in their inclusive vision.

As regards school climate, a number of points came up in the analysis: positive perceptions of climate are related to the extent of pressure staff perceive. Indeed, change was found to be highly linked to school climate. With the help of models from the literature it was suggested that the ideal way to commit people to change is via pressures towards innovations coupled with pressures towards supervision and control. It is argued that this issue is equally related to school’s ability to transform into a learning organisation. It seems more than a coincidence that in schools B and D where learning was controlled this transformation was enabled, whereas in schools A and C which allowed more freedom learning was limited.

The analysis of the issue of the learning organisation via models from the literature suggested that it takes more than the actual learning and structures to make school a learning organisation. In fact, schools need to be able to adapt to new behaviours and
sustain change. In addition, teamwork and collaboration do not make one entity and can exist independently in different schools. Further, it has been argued that schools might have a collaborative decision-making while at the same time exhibit poor teamwork and collaboration. This was accounted for by the fact that the former is related to headteachers whereas the latter are related to staff, so they should not necessarily be identical.

An overview of the elements of culture and climate has allowed to relate them to change. For example, school B seemed to develop a climate in which BH is able to recruit staff towards change and supervise the behaviours of teachers and counselors. School D developed a climate in which change was enabled but unfortunately could not be sustained. Despite the learning process and major organisational changes in this school, staff perceptions were that changes that had been adopted by DH were not ‘institutionalised’ and might reverse to the previous circumstances at any given time.

**Further points for discussion with reference to culture**

Rosenholtz’s (1989) model included elements of learning, collaboration, supportive leadership, interactivity and holistic/insular view with reference to ‘moving’ or ‘stuck’ cultures. An examination of these elements indicated that schools A, B, C and to some extent school D can be categorised as ‘moving’ cultures because of the following reasons: a learning process is being carried out, and headteachers are trying to be collaborative and supportive and interact with their staff. However, school E seemed to match the definition of a ‘stuck’ culture, because learning was imposed on teachers. In addition, interactivity between staff and EH1/EH2 was quite limited, and both headteachers were not observed as supportive.

The second model which enables to categorise the cultures of the schools under study is Hargreaves (1995). Indeed, the Leadership section implied that schools A, B, C, and D tended towards people and tasks and school E was task-oriented. Yet, Hargreaves’ (1995) model can be used to explain school culture too. It might be contended that culture in schools A and B is ‘Welfarist’ (relaxed and caring) and ‘Hothouse’ (pressured and controlled) in the sense that AH and BH express care and ‘an open door’ towards staff but at the same time exert pressure with relation to tasks.
Staff perceptions in school D seemed to tend towards an ‘Anomic’ culture featured by feelings of insecurity and alienation. Indeed, staff felt that the shift towards people and openness on the part of DH was not real, and the organisational changes followed by role and status changes increased perceptions of insecurity among staff. Staff perceptions in school E seemed to match the ‘Traditional’ culture featured by formally, as EH1 and EH2 created a climate of distance between staff and management which did not leave room for creativity and informal communication.

A study of the National Commission on Education (1996) indicates that schools A, B, C can be clustered as collaborative cultures as they respond to most of the criteria, among which are a dynamic vision, an understanding of students’ perspective, rapport with the wider community, and genuine opportunities for active commitment. On the other hand, school D and E did not manage to develop a shared vision of success or a common philosophy of education. This analysis is further supported by Hopkins and Harris (1997), who consider a consensus of values and a secure environment as vital to the improvement of culture. In the light of their suggestion, school D cannot be considered as an enhanced culture because it reflects alienation and insecurity towards staff, and both schools D and E do not demonstrate real values as they focus on the achievement of advanced technology.

A third model which allows for the analysis of culture is Harrisons’ (1994) model. According to this model school E can be seen as a ‘role culture’ which focusses on achievements while demonstrating a bureaucratic line management, or as a ‘power culture’ with limited collegiality and centralised control. The rest of the schools can be seen as ‘achievement cultures’ which emphasise results while at the same time developing collaboration, with the exception of school B which can also be looked at as a ‘support culture’ via its focus on personal values.

Further examination of this analysis demonstrates an accord with the conclusions drawn in the Leadership section of this chapter. Indeed, the ‘Traditional’ culture of school E reflects high tendency towards tasks and low tendency towards people, and this was the conclusion of the Leadership section. The ‘Anomic’ culture in school D reflects low levels of tendency towards people and towards tasks. This matched staff
perceptions that the shift DH made towards people and towards the content of changes was superficial and artificial. Similarly, perceptions of schools A and B’s cultures which were on the one hand ‘Welfarist’ and on the other hand ‘Hothouse’ are consistent with staff perceptions that AH and BH tended towards people and tasks at the same time. School C seems to tend towards caring and relaxed climate according to this model, as staff perceptions did not reflect any pressure on the part of CH.

**Inclusive culture**

In an attempt to portray the culture in each of the five schools, three elements of inclusive culture will now be analysed in order to examine if and to what extent culture and climate are involved in the process of inclusion.

The stance taken in the present study stands in contradiction to views that appear in the literature (Bush, 1995; Farrell, 1997; Ballard, 1996) who advocate the legitimacy of plurality of cultures as the basis for contrary courses of action adopted by mainstream and SEN education. The present study does not consider SEN as another culture but as a diversity of mainstream culture. Thus, if LDS are seen as part of school culture it seems reasonable that attempts will be made to integrate them, whereas if they are seen as a distinct culture it is more likely that they will not be included in school.

Findings on school attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion indicated that headteachers’ tendency towards inclusion is lower than that of teachers and counselors. It is noteworthy that this does not accord with Garvar-Pinhas and Schmelkin-Pedhazur (1989) who contended that headteachers’ perceptions towards inclusion were found to be more positive than teachers’. The fact that in terms of statistics headteachers’ mean lies on the positive end of the sector while at the same time residing around the mean of 3 might explain perceptions such as DT.1’s: “LDS are certainly not the top priority in this school”. This means that although headteachers do not reject LDS in their schools, their attitudes at school express an average wish to help these students. Therefore, it is recommended that the issue of ‘attitudes towards inclusion’ be examined in association with ‘inclusive vision’ in the leadership section.
A comparative analysis of these two issues indicates the existence of a discrepancy between headteachers’ perceptions of ‘inclusive vision’ and their perceptions of ‘school attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion’. Indeed, the clearest difference lies in headteachers’ high perceptions of the former as opposed to the latter. Although it might be claimed that both issues relate to school inclusive rhetoric, the nature of questions which comprise each of the two issues differs. Indeed, ‘inclusive vision’ refers to more theoretical questions such as the following:

- "All students should be given an equal chance to realise their abilities"
- "Meeting the needs of every individual student should be a top priority"

The questions as regards ‘attitudes towards LDS’ comprise more practical questions such as the following:

- “LDS should be placed in special classes”
- “LDS should be placed in regular classes”
- “LDS should be placed in regular classes alongside support learning groups”

Thus, it is possible that when headteachers were asked about theoretical issues they perceived themselves as highly inclusive, but when it came to ‘down-to-earth’ questions their attitudes towards LDS were reflected in a more accurate way.

This tendency was observed mainly in respect of schools A and E. In the case of school A this gap can be explained by AH’s focus on the number of students assessed as a way to increase students’ percentage of entitlement for matriculation diplomas. Thus, the true attitude towards LDS is much lower (mean=3) than AH’s rhetoric (mean=4.83). In school E the picture is similar although EH1 expresses his anti-inclusive attitudes explicitly. The mean of his inclusive vision is 3.83 whereas his attitudes were perceived with a mean of 3. The fact that in school D the gaps between headteacher’s inclusive vision and attitudes were the lowest (with the mean of 3.58 as opposed to the mean of 3.61) can be accounted for by the fact that school D is a ‘second-chance’ school, most of whose students are LDS including those that have
not been assessed. Therefore, in order to sustain school, staff had to develop a relatively positive attitude towards its student population.

The discrepancy between headteachers’ perceptions as opposed to other staff might be explained by the fact that because teachers feel committed to LDS and it is part of their duties to cope with their everyday difficulties, they have developed a positive attitude towards these students which probably results from empathy towards them. On the other hand, some researchers (e.g. Garvar-Pinhas and Schmelkin-Pedhazur, 1989) argue that headteachers have more positive attitudes than teachers due to the fact that they are remote from the daily problems of inclusion. Although the literature and findings from this research disagree, it is noteworthy that due to over-inflated numbers of students assessed as LDS and the fact that teachers are not properly compensated for their input, this positive attitude is sometimes accompanied by cynicism and frustration. Teachers also seemed to be less satisfied from the process of inclusion than headteachers (as described in previous sections).

This ‘negative’ thinking is also expressed in the literature by Barnet and Monda-Amaya (1998) who claim that positive attitudes towards LDS are sustained by teachers and headteachers alike if they feel they are capable of handling special curricular adaptations for LDS. Indeed, findings from this study are consistent with the researcher by that despite everyday hardships, teachers’ attitudes remain positive. A third possibility that may be part of the discussion is expressed in the literature by Center et al., (1989, 1991) who advocate a commonality and a positive correlation between headteachers’ and staff attitudes. However, the present research proved that headteachers and other staff differed in their attitudes towards inclusion.

The issue of ‘inclusive values’ was examined with reference to catering for LDS or weak students as opposed to excellent students. An analysis of the findings indicated a discrepancy in all schools between the rhetoric as perceived in school documents and by headteachers, and between staff perceptions. Moreover, the analysis yielded surprising results: reality as reflected in staff perceptions appeared to be in favour of inclusion more than according to school rhetoric. For example, although school A’s documents advocated catering for both parties, a focus was observed on excellent students. Yet, staff perceptions were that school focusses on both parties in an attempt
to increase the grade average of all students. The rhetoric of school B and C was observed as favouring LDS and mainstream students, although staff perceptions tended towards weak students. Even in schools D and E which had clear rhetoric towards excellence, staff perceived that weak students were catered for as well.

The picture that was formed regarding ‘inclusive values’ accorded with the analysis in relation to ‘attitudes towards LDS’ because staff attitudes in all schools appeared to be positive.

So far, it might be concluded that schools have demonstrated positive attitudes towards LDS although teachers and counselors appeared to be more motivated. At the same time, teachers developed cynicism facing the over-inflated numbers of LDS. A study of staff perceptions revealed that teachers and counselors’ perceptions of catering for LDS are higher than school rhetoric. It would now be important to explore whether positive attitudes are related to the extent of knowledge on LD school staff have gained overtime. Findings suggested that school staff demonstrate knowledge about the symptoms of LD and a minority of the staff was able to refer to the neurological aspect which underpins the etiology. The picture that was formed as regards staff knowledge encompassed most aspects which are part of teachers’ handling of LDS: learning, behavioural, and emotional aspects.

If these findings are to be linked to the issue of ‘headteacher’s initiatives on staff training on LD’, three main conclusions might be drawn. Schools reflected similarity in respect of the knowledge teachers demonstrated, but the same time differences were observed regarding training on LDS. In addition, school staff complained about the deficit of training. Schools B and D offered the highest extent of in-service courses whereas school E offered no courses at all. It is noteworthy that AH, BH, and EH2 provided complete answers on the open-ended questions on LD, whereas the rest of them provided partial or no answers at all. This might support Arick and Krug (1993) who advocate a strong need for further training on the issue of inclusion. On the other hand, it can also be part of the claim that LDS are not a top priority for headteachers.
It is suggested that the discrepancy between the knowledge and the practice of training can be resolved by the fact that the knowledge teachers demonstrated did not include teaching strategies or ‘remedial’ teaching for coping with LDS. Such strategies could have been acquired in special long-term training courses on LD, whereas the theoretical knowledge that was demonstrated could be acquired in any short training. However, knowledge alone does not ensure successful implementation, and this study has already identified problematic areas in the process of implementation despite teachers’ knowledge on LD. This argument supports the body of research introduced by Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) who postulate that SEN expertise is directly related to successful inclusion. Indeed, it cannot be expected that the limited in-service training initiated by headteachers will turn staff into experts for LDS.

Summary of the discussion of inclusive culture

The analysis of inclusive culture has brought forth the discussion of staff attitudes towards inclusion. The common views in the literature were that headteachers’ attitudes were higher than teachers’, or that there is a commonality in the attitudes. However, findings from the research disagreed with this claim and suggested that teachers and counselors’ attitudes are higher. This was explained by the empathy they are likely to develop while observing the difficulties of LDS in daily school life. At the same time, the high input of teachers as opposed to the zero compensation they get increases their feelings of frustration and cynicism towards this issue.

The fact that headteachers’ attitudes towards inclusion are lower than their inclusive vision was accounted for by the fact that the questions which comprised attitudes were more practical than questions which comprised inclusive vision and this reflected the down-to-earth responses of headteachers.

An examination of the issue of ‘catering for individual needs’ indicated that LDS and slow learners in all schools were catered for more than expressed in school rhetoric. This tendency was observed in schools such as A, B, and C whose rhetoric was inclusive, in school D whose rhetoric was less inclusive and in school E whose rhetoric was non-inclusive. This gap can be partly explained by the knowledge which
staff demonstrated on the issue of LD which contributed to the positive attitudes and willingness to help.

How are school culture and inclusive culture related in this study?
Existing literature has made a clear link between culture and inclusive culture. This is mainly seen in the criteria suggested by the National Commission on Education (1996) and in Hopkins and Harris’ work on school improvement (1997). These two works imply that certain factors that are associated with school climate and culture are relevant to the development of inclusive culture. These features include an orderly ethos, a dynamic vision responsive to change, shared responsibilities and interaction, collaboration, consensus on values, and optimistic attitudes among teachers. However, the relationship emerging from the present research seems to be far more complicated. The overall impression was that the issue of culture is closely linked to change but not specifically to the change of LDS inclusion.

The analysis of culture mainly refers to three layers: the first level is school rhetoric as reflected similarly in reference to school credo and to inclusive vision. The second level is staff attitudes that are linked to practical implementation more directly than to rhetoric. More specifically, this level refers to ‘Headteachers’ attitudes towards change’ and ‘Staff attitudes towards inclusion’. The third level as regards culture is the actual carrying out of change, and includes adaptation of new behaviours and sustaining change. The latter is assumed to be achieved via collaboration and staff recruitment towards tasks on the one hand, and supervision and control on the other hand.

Eventually, this analysis allowed for the categorisation of schools into ‘moving’ and ‘stuck’ cultures with reference to change. Thus, schools A, B, C and D were observed as tending towards ‘moving’ cultures which allow for change, whereas school E was observed as tending towards a ‘stuck’ culture. However, this categorisation accorded only partially with the level of inclusion schools offered. Findings indicated that all schools tended to cater for individual needs of weak students. Furthermore, data implied a firm basis of knowledge on LD, and staff demonstrated positive attitudes
towards inclusion. This included school E which was defined as a ‘stuck’ culture and was featured by a non-inclusive policy.
Research question 3
“How are staff perceptions of school structures and inclusive structures related in the context of secondary schools in Israel?”

School structures
This research question is different from the two previous ones because as opposed to school culture and to school leadership, schools structures seem to comprise more concrete and less abstract issues such as roles, hierarchies and bureaucracies, and organisational units. Indeed, the examination of school structures in this study has encompassed the following issues: the division of responsibility at school, school curriculum, staff development and training, channels of communication, the role of middle managers, and the role of external consultants.

The division of responsibility
The first conclusion that emerged is that headteachers express satisfaction in reference to staff empowerment, whereas staff mainly expressed dissatisfaction as regards this issue. This conclusion has been deduced via the differentiation of ‘division of responsibility’ into ‘empowerment’ and ‘responsibility’. Thus, staff empowerment appeared to be restricted to the ‘here and now’ tasks whereas the overall responsibility of school lies in the hands of headteachers. For example, staff in schools A, C and E perceive that no real empowerment exists in schools because the budgetary responsibility lies fully in the headteachers’ hands. Indeed, teachers did not feel they had enough power in their hands to initiate or carry out change. This complaint of staff with relation to their feeling of disempowerment is supported by the literature. Walace (1991) argues that decentralisation develops motivation through empowerment and increases flexibility of response.

Perceptions of empowerment can be analysed via Tannenbaum and Schmidt’s model (1973). It appears that four headteachers (AH, BH, CH, and DH) could be placed at different points of the scale ‘autocratic to democratic’ styles. For instance, CH invited staff to participate in the making of a new school regulation. However, headteachers usually tried to empower and be collaborative without allowing teachers for too much freedom. EH1, on the other hand, demonstrated the style of ‘decides and declares’
which is located at the ‘authority’ rather than at the ‘freedom’ end. Yet, an enormous
gap has been observed between EH1’s rhetoric (in the Findings chapter: ‘perceptions
of leadership’) which can be categorised as ‘anti-power’ and his practical policy.

Empowerment was observed as related to different aspects of school life. In school A
and B empowerment seemed to result from collaboration. In school A empowerment
has been enhanced since the insertion of the TQM, whereas in school B it is featured
by collaborative monitoring of teachers’ and students’ performance. However, in both
schools perceptions are that empowerment is limited. For example, it was claimed that
empowerment does not really exist since AH holds all the budgets and resources and
is also in charge of staff recruitment. In school B it was contended that BH is involved
in teachers’ work on class level and with regard to individual students.

In school D, empowerment was observed as related to structures. The new expanded
management and the Heads of Forums were empowered to carry out their tasks in
teamwork. At the same time, resistance to the change arose among the former Heads
of Departments who felt disempowered as a result of organisational change. Staff
perceptions of the total control on the part of EH1 and EH2 in school E were similarly
linked to structures. It seems that both headteachers have not internalised the pattern
of staff empowerment as yet, and the only real empowerment perceived in school E
was on the part of EH1 towards EH2. In school C empowerment was perceived as
related to school hierarchy. Teachers’ main claim was that empowerment goes as far
as the level of ‘middle managers’ and teachers do not feel empowered at all. This
accords with the belief expressed in the literature (Charan, 1996) that teams and
networks of specialists do not require formal supervision.

The importance of collaboration between headteachers and counselors was pointed
out by Cooper and Sheffield (1994) and Stone and Clark (2001). The present study
showed that counselors of schools B and D worked in full collaboration with BH and
DH, and indeed these two schools worked as learning organisations. However, the
impression that was accumulated in the present study is that counselors’ contribution
to inclusion lies in their sensitivity to LDS rather than in their hierarchical status.
Indeed, counselors of schools A, B, D initiated in-service training on LDS even if to a limited extent.

Another way of analysing empowerment could be via the identification of the ranking of schools on an empowerment scale. Thus, school A might be placed at the most ‘empowering’ end as staff perceived freedom in the carrying out of tasks since the introduction of the TQM, and no specific complaints were made on the part of teachers who felt deprived of responsibility. School D could be located next, because the organisational changes have allowed for empowerment. The problem in both schools B and C according to staff perceptions was that empowerment did not go further than the level of ‘middle managers’ and so teachers felt completely deprived of rights in this respect. And finally, at the other end of the scale school E is located, because the concept of empowerment seems to be strange to staff despite the strong belief of EH1 in his empowering style.

The issue of ‘division of responsibility’ might be juxtaposed with the issue of ‘decision-making procedures’ which appears in the chapter on School Culture and Climate. Indeed, the analysis of the division of responsibility and decision-making appears to be complementary. It is argued that a school in which the headteacher shares decision-making with staff is likely to empower staff in the carrying out of roles and tasks. Indeed, the present analysis revealed that these two issues are usually compatible. For example, despite democratic procedures, staff in schools A, B, and C felt that decision-making regarding major school issues was restricted to the headteacher. Similarly, the extent of empowerment granted by the headteacher was limited. For example, school C was featured by attempts for collaborative decision-making procedures on the part of the management. All teachers were invited to plenum meetings that dealt with changes, such as school new regulation. Yet, perceptions indicated that this pattern was reserved to the less important decisions or to decisions concerning individual students, whereas the more crucial decisions concerning whole school matters such as curriculum or budgetary issues were made by CH.
School curriculum

The analysis of this issue mainly deals with students’ accessibility to mainstream curriculum and IEPs which allow for individual differences between learners.

The impression that emerges from the findings is that schools A, B, and C provide students with curricular flexibility. This means that students can make their own choices according to their talents, wishes and future plans. School D, too, offers a choice of ‘languages’ (subjects) although it seems that learners (as well as readers of school documents) find it hard to decipher the meaning of these languages. It is noteworthy that the use of languages is contradictory to Handy (1989) who asserted that current structures avoid the use of ‘the language of engineering’ in favour of ‘a language of politics’ which indicates more appealing and communicative means of communication. School E offers learning trends which might be considered as ‘package deals’ in the sense that students who choose a certain learning track have to major in a cluster of subjects that have been determined by school. However, none of these schools offers individualised programmes ‘tailored’ to learner’s needs. What schools offer might be considered at best as a curricular choice. Yet, this choice does not result from assessments or professional consultation, and selection is made randomly with little or no supervision by school.

Current curricular provision supports Kelly’s (1999) first model as it mainly focuses on knowledge and content rather than on values. However, school B appeared to match Kelly’s ‘developmental’ model, because school embedded social values and mainly social responsibility in the curricular ‘menus’ it offered. The curricular picture is equally supported by Kelly’s emphasis on the significance of individual teachers in the ‘make or break’ of curricular implementation in spite of the fact that teachers are limited by the National Curriculum. This postulation is congruent with teachers’ willingness to assist in curriculum flexibility more than headteachers’.

One way to explain the picture which emerges from this analysis is that the Open Enrolment and the competition between schools resulted in a shift towards student-centred educational environments. One of the implications of this shift is school curriculum. As curriculum is a major factor in the selection of a secondary school,
schools advocate a curricular variety in their documents although none of them has ‘tailored’ an individual curriculum (IEP) and this includes modified curricula for LDS. The issue of school curriculum will be re-examined in the next section which includes ‘Inclusive school curricula’ in an attempt to examine this issue in the context of inclusion.

**Staff development and training**

The reality of in-service training in Israel has been made part of the discussion, because it seems to be relevant to the present situation of training. School-based in-service training originated in a wage agreement between the Ministry of Education and the teachers’ unions in 1994. This agreement reflected a shift in the attitudes of the Ministry toward the teaching profession (Ministry of Education, 1993). It was agreed that teachers would be compensated for their participation in training sessions. This new set-up allowed teachers to participate in a fifty-six or a hundred and twelve hour training courses which offer a half or a full salary credit respectively. Indeed, in 1995 more than sixty per cent of the teachers took part in these programmes, and in 1996 eighty-five per cent of the teachers participated in courses which were selected by schools.

Although the present research is consistent with the literature (e.g. Lacey and Porter, 1998) regarding teachers’ wish to have practical courses on LDS, it might be claimed that teachers’ motivation to participate in courses derives from their wish to increase their salary rather than from pure motivation and involvement with LDS. Yet, this does not mean that LDS training will not enhance improvement as contended by Yogev (1997). However, no or very little SFIT courses have been offered in the five schools on LDS. This is congruent with concerns in the literature regarding staff in-service training (e.g. Harris et al., 1996).

This study is partially congruent with the literature regarding the link between high levels of hierarchic-centralistic structures and headteacher’s decisions on in-service training courses (Sabar and HaShahar-Francis, 1999). For example, in school E which demonstrated hierarchic-centralistic structures, staff were made to attend courses upon the management’s (usually EH1’s) decisions. However, in schools A
and C which demonstrated hierarchic structures with a shift to democratic procedures, staff were free to make their own decisions.

Channels of communication
The importance of communication flow (Skidmore, 1999) was supported in this study, which also advocated the need to foster democratic procedures and an open dialogue among staff. Furthermore, the study supports Riehl (2000) in the assertion that the way inclusive vision is communicated enhances or inhibits change. This was observed in the way BH recruited staff towards the acknowledgement of a diversity of students at school and her open dialogue with teachers, and conversely, in DH’s failure to recruit staff towards the organisational changes and his ‘artificial’ communication with teachers. These findings support Kouzes and Posner’s (1996) postulation that the way vision is communicated is related to leadership style.

Data analysis indicated that the most common channels of communication at schools are teachers’ plenums which are held twice yearly and circulars placed in teachers’ boxes. It is argued that both techniques are featured by remoteness and impersonal communication. Teachers’ plenums are an allegedly democratic forum. However, teachers do not get to express their views and criticism because the plenum schedule is pre-planned and seems to serve mainly headteachers’ purposes. This does not accord with the concept of Formal Meeting Structures (Cardno, 1998) which enable a flow of information up and down the system, whereas the plenum mainly enables a top-down flow. Circulars in teachers’ boxes serve mainly the purpose of fast and easy spreading of information and updating staff on current events. Both techniques appear to be a one-way, top-down means of communication rather than a dialogue.

At the same time schools demonstrated means of communication that reflected their uniqueness and were found to be congruent with elements of leadership and culture that were pointed out earlier. Headteachers’ open door in schools A, B, and C match perceived attitudes towards staff in the Leadership section. The human relations BH demonstrates towards staff are also reflected in the personal means of communication she has adopted: personal letters, individual talks, ‘end-of-the-year’ talks with teachers. It is noteworthy that these techniques were used for providing positive as
well as for negative feedbacks. This accords with the fact that teachers perceived BH’s attitude towards staff as a combination of assertiveness and openness.

CH’s introduction of the e-mail as a means of spreading data across school has failed as a result of lack of supervision. This also accords with the lack of control measures that was observed as regards other issues such as in-service training. The use of e-mail is congruent with the Ringi technique discussed in Cardno (1998). Yet, the Ringi technique does not take into consideration that its success is dependent upon teachers’ responses. Indeed, not only did teachers avoid responding to the electronic mail but they failed to operate this service altogether. It is argued that the high hierarchical procedures which were observed at school might explain the intergroup rivalries within teams, as teachers felt captured by the strict procedures. This eventually reflected in their objection to cooperate within teams which were perceived as another imposed framework.

The conclusion drawn from the analysis of school D is quite similar to that of school C in the sense that the rhetoric of school D on communication failed to take into consideration the fact that a constant flow of communication between Forums is dependent to a great extent on the human factor. Therefore, on the one hand, school structures allowed for a flow, whereas on the other hand the human factor including the resistance staff might develop facing major changes was not taken into consideration. The factors of communication in school E that were found to be dominant were hierarchy and formal relationships. This finding is also consistent with other elements of culture and leadership, such as perceptions of negative attitudes towards staff and towards LDS on the part of EH1.

It might be noteworthy to point out that Cardno’s (1998) discussion of the Nominal Group Technique which relies on teamwork while refining a collective statement was not observed in any of the schools. This is consistent with the previous discussion that shared decision-making in the schools under study is restricted and headteachers tend to keep issues that are related to school management under their control.
The role of middle managers
The role of school counselors as middle managers has been found to be linked to LDS’ inclusion. However, their main role in the process of inclusion has been observed as administrative regarding tests administration and accommodations. It seems that existing literature over-estimates the work of counselors in respect of LDS’ inclusion. Indeed, middle managers in general and school counselors in particular are viewed as crucial to the organisation (Earley, in Middlewood and Lumby, 1998), as ‘vision transmitters’ (Bennett, 1995; Stone and Clark, 2001), as experts to interpersonal relationships and problem-solving (West and Idol, 1993), as ‘links’ and ‘glue’ between role holders, and as potential agents of change (Bennett, 1995).

The reality of inclusion, however, has revealed that counselors are mainly involved with paper-work and with getting teachers updated on individual learners’ disabilities rather than with assisting teachers either by institutionalising inclusive values or solving ‘field’ problems that teachers face daily. It is noteworthy that whereas in four of the schools counselors’ role has been existing for years, school E introduced counselors into the school system two years ago, and it is definitely considered as change in terms of flexibility of structures.

The role of external consultants
The role of external consultants has been observed as part of change-making as some of the headteachers have recruited external consultants to conduct change in their schools. Despite Fullan’s (1991) advocacy for internal consultants, headteachers seemed to prefer external consultants. DH felt that school should undergo major re-organisation so that it can survive. AH needed experts on TQM as part of improving staff performance. BH needed them to improve teamwork among management staff.

The present research supports the literature by being doubtful as for the effectiveness of external bodies. Indeed, Berman and McLaughlin (1977) and Aoki et al. (1977) concluded that external consultants were superficially or poorly used. The conclusion of this study relies on the failure of change-making in school D and the objection to the TQM in school A both of which expressed resistance to change. The impression from staff interviews was that the external body did not integrate into school and the
consultants remained totally distinct from staff. This relationship could be explained as a result of staff resistance, but it can also be seen as a failure of the external consultants to recruit staff which might have eventually led to staff objection.

School structures and change
The exploration of this relationship appears to be relevant to the practical implications which might result from this study. The most clear-cut evidence in this respect was observed in school D, where structural changes had been conducted before attempts were made to recruit staff towards school new conceptual and organisational structures. Resistance to these changes arose among senior teachers whose position was threatened, and eventually these changes failed and school closed down in June 2002. The fact that changes which aimed at leading school to academisation failed, might suggest that structures are dependent on the institutionalisation of values and ideas, and on properly conveying vision to staff. This failure supports Stacey’s (1996a) claim that structures that are too tight create a gridlock.

The psychological impact of change in school D and E is supported by Galbraith (1973) and Turner (in Packwood and Turner, 1988) who suggested a link between the impact of technology and environment and the level of uncertainty. According to this theory, stable and predictable environments enable the establishment of bureaucratic and traditional structures, whereas turbulent environments do not allow for the determination of structures. Teachers in school D expressed uncertainty concerning the new structures, which perhaps were imposed on school at a too early stage before any preparatory steps had been taken. In addition, it is argued that the organisational changes were far from ‘traditional’, and therefore hierarchical structures would probably not be found suitable even if structures could be pre-planned.

A similar process was observed in school E where eight years ago a Junior High School opened upon EH1’s decision. This change caused resistance among senior staff because it was followed by a drastic decrease in the level of students’ population and the opening of facilitated learning tracks for these students. These changes were perceived as a shift from an elite school of an academic-scientific nature, to a school which should open its gates to weaker population. The processes in school D and E
appear to be similar in the sense that changes led to resistance which, in turn, led to too late attempts to recruit staff to these changes.

However, the picture in schools A, B, and C is far less clear. On the one hand, it appeared that new structures would automatically lead to the expected change. AH introduced the TQM as part as a strive towards school improvement; CH introduced the email system in order to improve the flow of communication; BH introduced the supervision by school management on how teachers carry out their duty during the breaks in an attempt to improve teachers’ performance. Yet, the first two initiatives did not prove to be successful. These findings accord with Bolman and Deal (1984) who asserted that organisational problems reflect inappropriate structure and can be resolved through re-design. This might imply that AH and CH have chosen the wrong structures for their schools.

Further, the writers’ claim that structures are determined by the central activities of the organisation and its environment. Similarly, O’Neill (1994) believes that roles, positions and authority are determined by shared values and the nature of tasks. This line of thought seems to accord with Contingency theories (Everard and Morris, 1990) by which school structures are formed automatically on the basis of school activities and values. Findings from all schools are consistent with this claim: it might be argued that TQM failed in school A, because the nature of the activities at school such as the open door to AH and the collegial relationship between AH and school staff were not suitable for the insertion of an artificial initiative, and therefore this initiative was rejected in a natural way. Similarly, the impersonal system of electronic mail was naturally rejected in school C which favours collaborative decision-making. Likewise, DH and EH1 have decided on the major changes due to school contingencies (decrease in students’ registration).

On the basis of this analysis it might be concluded that school structures appeared to be determined by school vision, values and environment. School structures can be compared to modelling clay in the sense that they should be flexible enough to allow for change but at the same time they should be solid enough to help sustain the change. Indeed, O’Neill (1994) argued that structures should serve as a balance (‘accommodation’) between new demands placed upon the organisation, existing
roles and culture, and factors such as size, type of institution and range of activities. Thus, streamlined bureaucratic structures (Wallace, 1991) are needed to cope with formal changes while flexible structures will allow for drastic changes.

This ‘compromise’ is also advocated on the basis of the current study. For example, if structures in school E were less formal and more flexible, resistance might have been avoided. Similarly, if new structures in school D had been inserted in a less drastic way, their impact on staff could have been lighter. On the other hand, structures need to be solid enough to sustain the change. This was observed in school C which was less strict concerning in-service training and the need to attend pedagogic meetings. This might be the reason that CH failed to introduce the e-mail system as staff perceived participating in changes on a voluntary basis.

Summary of the discussion of structures

The picture of school structures was found to be related to the aspect of change. The examination of elements of structure was featured by a transition stage. An analysis of the division of responsibility indicated that attempts are being made to empower staff, and although this process has not been completed yet, headteachers have clearly demonstrated this tendency. Teachers perceive that they are empowered in their schools as far as the level of the individual student and not in respect of whole-school matters. Furthermore, they perceive that the main elements of school life which lie solely in headteachers’ hands are school budgets and staff recruitment. This includes EH1 who introduced counselors into school only two years ago although no empowerment towards staff has been observed as yet.

The same pattern of transition has been observed as regards school curriculum. Although no IEPs are offered in any of the schools under study, schools are attempting to widen their curricular offers towards students. Yet, there is no system at school which provides professional consultance or assessment apart from individual (and limited) talks with school counselor, as each counselor is responsible for about 250-300 students.
Further, although channels of communication were observed as impersonal, schools are trying to develop their own unique channels to improve communication, such as the electronic mail in school C, or ‘end-of-the-year talks’ in school B. This process indicates an increase in the awareness of communication within the system.

Indeed, Table 2.26 and 2.27 in the Literature Review illustrates that schools are in a ‘transition’ stage from ‘old structures’ to ‘fashionable’ or ‘new’ structures. Indeed, they are still dominated by clear-cut hierarchies, but at the same time a move towards more democratic procedures has been observed. Structures demonstrate line management but tend to recruit specialists to carry out tasks or projects rather than rely on existing roles. This has been observed in schools A (TQM experts), B (BO), and D (external consultants). However, in the meantime schools are featured by a combination of old and new characteristics. For example, findings indicated that in school C great emphasis is placed on ‘bureaucracies’, but at the same time democratic procedures are being implemented.

In school D where ‘crossfunctional’ teams (the Forums) (Champy and Nohria, 1996a) were set as a result of the organisational changes, the former ‘status’ teams of the senior teachers who were deprived of their status still make a powerful group. In addition, the new expanded management now comprises of 12 people, and the limited management consists of five people instead of only two members prior to the change. This might be seen as a move from ‘tall’ hierarchies to ‘flat’ hierarchies (Law and Glover, 2000). However, staff perceptions indicated that DH and DC.3 were the only decision-makers. Staff in school D also felt that the changes that have been achieved were shallow and could not be trusted to be continuous and sustainable.

In school E where staff perceptions were that school is totally task-oriented with ‘tight’ qualities, ‘loose’ qualities (Peters and Waterman, 1982) such as a wider variety of curricular subjects and learning tracks were also perceived. In all schools ‘line management’ still exists, but at the same time there is a move towards ‘specialism’ (West-Burnham, 1994). For example, AH and CH introduced a pedagogic consultant to school who is in charge of improving school curriculum, and they acknowledge that this is a ‘process’ rather than a ‘function’ (Handy, 1993) in the sense that school staff will have to get accustomed to this new role.
Inclusive structures

As this study eventually aims at exploring the implementation of LDS’ inclusion, an attempt was made below to accumulate all inclusive elements in order to evaluate the practical responses schools offer for LDS. The analysis of inclusive structures comprised the following issues: SEN structures, inclusive curriculum, test administration, staff training on LD, SEN support staff, the pedagogic committee, accountability and monitoring procedures.

The analysis started by examining the level of standardisation of the process of identification and assessment of learning disabilities. Paisey’s (1981) suggested criteria for the analysis of structures the first of which is ‘The degree of standardisation of procedures’. Schools were examined via procedures of inclusion. For example, teachers were asked the following question:

"What would you do if you suspected that one of your students had a learning disability?"

Findings revealed that procedures for the identification of LDS were not uniform within schools. Some teachers claimed they would prefer to talk to the student, whereas others would rather summon his/her parents, send the student to the counselor, talk to the homeroom teacher, or do all of the above simultaneously. This variety of responses indicates lack of standardisation in respect of inclusion, perhaps because the issue of inclusion was not adequately developed. The need for standardisation is negated by Skrtic (1991) who prefers novel solutions before standardisation procedures are applied.

The second issue that Paisey has brought forth is ‘The formalisation of documentation’. The formalisation of documents was examined with reference to LDS’ files. Indeed, school counselors keep students’ assessments and prepare a summary of test accommodations that each LDS is entitled to on uniform forms. It might be encapsulated that although procedures of identification and assessment of LDS have not been standardised as yet at school, counselors have already managed to formalise documents in order to facilitate the process of inclusion.
An analysis of SEN structures at school implied that SEN structures address weak students in general and not LDS in particular. The main structures for weak students are the MABAR class and the Support System which were initiated by the Tel-Aviv Department of Education. The MABAR class in school A, B and C is a separate class although students in school C are integrated in a mainstream class for part of the subjects. It can be inferred that LDS do not profit from present structures. Although it could be contended that by not establishing structures for LDS school conveys a message of inclusion, this idea seems to be false because in most schools MABAR students are separate from mainstream students. Thus, not only are LDS stigmatised as SEN and are socially segregated, but they practically do not profit from the ‘remedial’ help they need.

The point of the social segregation of MABAR students is supported by Thousand and Villa (1989) and Cole (1991) who claim that the success of integration programmes depends on school’s willingness to assist SEN students in socialisation processes and alter the relationships between abled and disabled students. Such socialisation processes were emphasised in school B (as detailed in the Findings chapter). The claim of not offering practical responses for LDS is supported by Ainscow (1995) who differentiates between ‘integration’ which is more superficial and ‘inclusive education’ which involves re-structuring. Thus, MABAR and the Support System might be considered as ‘integration’ whereas if more suitable structures existed, they would be considered as ‘inclusive education’.

School D does not offer a MABAR class, most probably because most of its students are LDS who dropped out of other schools. In school E no SEN structures were observed, and the MABAR class was canceled. Thus, the fact that students are allowed to take winter matriculations in school E can be explicated as part of school’s strive towards achievements and improvement of the matriculation average rather than as attempts to help slow learners.

The rationale against having a MABAR class can be found in Brookover et al. (1982) in the shift from ‘categorical educational services’ to a ‘unified educational system’,
which is supposed to address the diversity of needs of all learners. The main claim against this method is that the concept of ‘a diversity of needs’ also relies on a categorisation, thus such a shift is likely to become artificial. This last claim accords with the findings of Clark et al. (1999) who argue that the persistence of ability groupings (which MABAR classes seem to be part of) means that SEN students are still segregated in ‘bottom’ classes.

However, it is argued that the main response of school for its LDS learners is via the accessibility to school curriculum. The fact that most headteachers did not express a belief that they were responsible for a modified curriculum for LDS was juxtaposed with their general attitude as regards inclusion. An attempt to analyse both elements showed compatibility. Headteachers’ attitudes towards LDS and towards inclusive curriculum were lower than other staff at school. This means that counselors and teachers are more willing than headteachers to include LDS and help them gain access to school curriculum even if it needs to be modified. It might be concluded that while LDS are not rejected by headteachers, they are not a top priority either.

Headteachers’ less positive attitudes towards inclusive curriculum and also towards inclusion of LDS might be explained in the light of ‘mainstream’ or ‘inclusion’ approach which gained a wide consent in the literature (Farrell, 2000; Ballard, 1992; Norwich, 1996; Ainscow, 1997; Skrtic, 1995). Thus, it might be claimed that school needs to cater for all students equally in the pursuit of “equity and excellence” (Farrell, 2000: 154). The same line of thought follows Dyson et al.’s (1994) model which advocates a shift from ‘categorical provision’ which enhances SEN interests to ‘responsive provision’ which represents a whole-school approach. However, the rationale of this approach does not seem to make much sense in the context of LDS, because the wish to achieve equity must be preceded by equal chances to materialise learners’ abilities, and the only way to do so in the case of LDS is by offering them ‘remedial’ tools. Albeit this approach currently prevails in the literature of inclusion, it is contended that the establishment of MABAR or SEN classes stands in contradiction to the ‘inclusive’ approach, and therefore it cannot be considered as a basis for headteachers’ inclusive belief.
It is also noteworthy that staff perceptions in school C and E were that economic factors played a major part in headteachers’ decision with relation to inclusion. Indeed, EC.2 claimed that school will not re-open MABAR classes because it gets more money for students in the technological learning tracks than in a SEN class. Similarly, CT.3 argued that CH prefers to see MABAR students partly integrated in mainstream classes because then school is paid for each student twice – once as a SEN student and another time as a mainstream student. Ideally, this tendency by headteachers for merging of instructional resources of general and special education represents a shared responsibility for all students (Villa and Thousand, 1988). The present research supports the view that other factors such as budgets are also involved in educational decisions regarding inclusion.

Teachers and counselors’ attitudes towards inclusive curriculum were found to be higher than headteachers’ similarly to their attitudes towards LDS. Some researchers contend that teachers are unable to make innovations as they are ‘performers’ who can perfect existing programmes (Skrtic, 1991; Weick, 1976). Although it is true that teachers’ freedom is restricted nowadays because of the constraints of the National Curriculum (Kelly, 1999), the high willingness of teachers and their dissatisfaction from the present situation gives reason to believe that they are indeed ‘the make or the break’ of the implementation of inclusive curriculum (ibid.; Fullan, 1993).

The smallest discrepancies between the three populations towards inclusive curriculum were demonstrated in school D, and the biggest gaps between headteacher and staff were seen in school E. No gaps were observed in school C which indicated the most positive attitudes, and in school B slight gaps were identified. This issue will be clarified in combination with the issue of satisfaction from the level of inclusive curriculum which is discussed in the following paragraphs. It is noteworthy that interviews with staff in schools A and C reflected a higher level of awareness towards inclusive curriculum than the questionnaires did. This discrepancy might be explained by the fact that teachers’ awareness of this issue was increased during interviews by discussing this subject out loud.
The analysis reflects that school B accords with Kelly’s (1999) ‘developmental’ model as school focusses on the different subjects that are taught in the context of values (e.g. ‘responsibility’), whereas the rest of the schools seem to correspond to the ‘knowledge-content’ model which focusses on the acquisition of knowledge. This observed orientation of schools can be accounted for by the fact that providing knowledge per subject is much easier than developing a holistic approach which addresses students’ development.

Teachers and counselors demonstrated dissatisfaction from the current situation as regards curriculum for LDS. However, the fact that counselors expressed dissatisfaction in three of the schools whereas teachers expressed dissatisfaction in four schools might be due to the fact that teachers are more involved with curricular issues than counselors and therefore they have probably experienced more disappointment in this respect. Furthermore, the fact that the lowest level of satisfaction was observed in school E both by counselors and by teachers can be explained by the fact that so far school E demonstrated the lowest interest in LDS’ inclusion of all schools. Conversely, counselors’ level of satisfaction in school D was the highest (3.6) probably due to the fact that most students in this school are weak learners and therefore curricular adaptation is made for LDS among other slow learners. At the same time, a mismatch was observed in school C between the impressive extra-curricular support that weak students receive from school, and the below-average levels of satisfaction of staff. This might stem from the fact that CH is a new headteacher who failed to convey her vision to staff at this point, although efforts for a flexible curriculum can be seen. The highest overall staff satisfaction was observed in school B and this accords with BH’s consistency in delivering her inclusive mission at school.

The issues of satisfaction from school curriculum towards LDS among staff and perceptions of inclusive curriculum appeared to be compatible. Thus, in schools where a high level of satisfaction was observed (e.g. school B), small gaps were detected between the three groups on the issue of attitudes. Conversely, in schools where the level of satisfaction was found to be low (e.g. school E), big discrepancies between the three groups were identified as regards their attitudes towards curriculum
for LDS. Further, this analysis suggests a closed circle: once teachers are satisfied from school’s inclusive curriculum, their motivation towards LDS and towards curriculum will improve. Contrarily, if teachers feel dissatisfied, their motivation is likely to decrease and their overall attitude towards LDS as well as towards inclusion might worsen. Indeed, schools B and C which had high levels of satisfaction and positive attitudes towards curriculum demonstrated curricular flexibility and support for slow learners and provided extra-curricular support for weak learners. Conversely, in school E, EH1’s attitude towards inclusive curriculum was low, no curricular flexibility was observed, and perceptions concerning curricular satisfaction were the lowest.

The issue of teachers’ dissatisfaction from the inclusive curriculum is consistent with Clark et al. (1999). They found out that teachers’ complaints were made with regard to the inflexibility of the National Curriculum to respond to students’ diversity. Similarly, Tod (1999: 186) argues that “staff feel these students are locationally integrated but not effectively included”.

However, whether school’s curriculum is inclusive or not, LDS and their teachers share a common problem which is test administration. These problems consist of technical issues, such as not having a room allocated for time expansion or for oral testing for dysgraphic students. These technical problems demand an extra input on the part of teachers for which they are usually not paid, but it also complicates testing for LDS for whom tests are never easy.

At the outset, teachers and counselors were asked whether they have to remain in class during recess because of their LDS. All answers were above the mean of 3.5 except for schools D and E whose mean was over 4. It might be concluded that teachers in schools D and E felt less able to handle test situations with LDS than teachers in the rest of the schools, although all teachers expressed frustration. While combining these findings with findings of general attitudes towards LDS it was noted that counselors in school E had the most positive attitudes, and that teachers’ attitudes in the two schools were not lower than in the rest of the schools. One way to explain this gap is that teachers’ attitudes towards LDS in schools D and E were indeed
positive, however, teachers were concerned with technical issues and lack of support on the part of school management.

An examination of the rest of the questions yielded the following results: teachers’ and counselors’ perceptions were that they had to split each test for the sake of LDS. Similarly, staff usually felt they had to put up a special test for a single student if needed, and that tests had to be recorded. However, in schools D and E staff did not perceive pressures as regards the abovementioned issues. The only explanation for the gaps with reference to these issues is that teachers were simply not expected to carry out these duties, perhaps because school did not feel committed to LDS’ interests. However, teachers’ responses in school B as regards question 3 and 4 did not reflect that they were bothered, as opposed to questions 1 and 2 which reflected high concerns of what is expected from them. These discrepancies cannot be explained by negative attitudes towards LDS, because BH’s policy towards LDS was observed as positive.

Schools A and C expressed the most consistent concern on the part of staff towards special requirements (means ranged from 3 to 4.18). This can be understood in the context of AH who was perceived as pressuring staff towards LDS, and in the context of school C which is known for its inclusive policies. Findings are further supported by CH’s detailed description of the technical problems with LDS’ testing.

In conclusion, the main points of the analysis are that teachers perceive their role with LDS as demanding, but not impossible to cope with (as the means rarely exceeded the mean of 4). Another point is that the most consistent complaints were perceived in the most inclusive schools. The gaps in school B remained unclear at this point. Further, the least threatening requirement for teachers was to record tests for students. This can be explained by the fact that this test accommodation is quite rare and restricted to the most severe LD and therefore, teachers don’t have too much experience in this respect.

Further, perceptions of staff training revealed deficits among teachers and counselors alike. Indeed, teachers’ main complaint was that their abilities are taken for granted
regarding teaching LDS. The fact that school E had the lowest scores is consistent with previous findings on headteachers’ initiation of training which was the lowest (mean=1.5). However, big discrepancies were observed between DH’s perceptions of training in the Leadership section which were high (mean=4) and staff perceptions in this section which were almost zero. The fact that only DC.1 could attest to the existence of a training course might indicate one of the following: either teachers are so tired of continuous training in this school so they cannot recall the LDS training, or this training did not contribute to their skills.

The highest counselors’ perceptions of training were observed in schools B and C, whereas the highest teachers’ perceptions were observed in school C. An in-depth analysis of the findings of school C revealed that counselors’ and teachers’ high perceptions focussed on training outside of school, whereas the scores on in-service courses were below the average of 2. This might account for the discrepancies which appeared in the interviews, according to which training offered by school was quite limited. Findings of school B showed a low level of training for teachers, which was congruent with BO’s observation of school’s unwillingness to initiate LDS training. Staff perceptions in school B indicated a mismatch with BH’ high perceptions which cannot be explained. Findings of school A and C reflected an accord between AH’s and CH’s average awareness of training and the limited in-service training offered by school.

However, the fact that most training offered by schools is SBIT rather than SFIT (Bradely, 1991) might explicate the lack of specific courses on LDS. This means that school offers general courses on school premises rather than seeks the best solutions for its specific needs. Therefore, Lally et al. (1992) and Ainscow (1994) view current training as a waste and a ‘quick-fit’, which is mainly characterised by teachers’ lack of involvement.

The major question that naturally follows this analysis is how this limited training on LDS can be in unison with staff familiarity with the concept of LD. It is contended that the theoretical knowledge teachers demonstrated does not ensure gaining the practical skills that are necessary to cope with disabilities. It is contended that whereas major concepts can be acquired by doing some readings on the issue, practical
knowledge requires, perhaps, a long-term workshop which combines theory and practice.

Headteachers’ attitudes towards staff also reflect the extent of SEN support staff that headteachers are willing to provide for school mainstream teachers. As opposed to the literature which views support for SEN as a major element of inclusive leadership (Smith, 1996) this study proved that support is not perceived by headteachers as an important element to inclusion. It has already been noted that mainstream teachers believe that their ability to teach LDS is limited and should not be taken for granted. On the basis of the findings headteachers can be divided into two groups: BH, CH and DH advocate a combination of mainstream and SEN teachers for the treatment of LDS, whereas AH and to a lesser extent EH prefer to employ mainstream staff. A primary analysis could lead to the conclusion that AH and EH tend to the mainstream approach and advocate equity among learners. However, a closer look at other inclusive elements that were discussed earlier gives reason to believe that other factors apart from a strive for inclusion took part in the decision as regards support SEN teachers. This analysis is related to Skrtic (1991) who expressed doubts as to the extent of collaboration with other professionals which might be achieved within schools. This view could be considered as another factor in headteachers’ avoidance of introducing SEN staff at school.

Findings concerning the issue of SEN coordinator (SENCO) were compatible with findings which reflect the existence of SEN staff at school. Thus, in schools B, C, and D where SEN and mainstream teachers work together, SENCO was empowered to take care of LDS’ interests, whereas in school A where no SEN staff were observed, the role of SENCO did not exist. Similarly, in school E where there were only a few SEN teachers, SENCO was in charge of LDS’ interests only to a limited extent. However, the present study agrees with Sommefeldt (2001) who claims that SENCOs are not provided with the authority to make decisions on LDS matters. One way to account for it could be Bolman and Deal’s (1984) view that it is a major problem to set a role and integrate it within the organisation. Another explanation could be the low priority of SEN matters at school. Nevertheless, it might be concluded that up to
now, SENCOs have not gained the high status of middle managers as contended by the literature (e.g. Sammons et al., 1997).

A juxtaposition of the issue of ‘SEN support staff’ and ‘headteachers’ attitudes towards LDS’ has led to the conclusion that the two concepts are congruent. For example, EH1’s attitude towards LDS was observed as negative (2.3). Similarly, he does not provide SEN staff to mainstream teachers (mean=2). Conversely, BH and CH employ mainstream teachers who went through a limited training on LDS while at the same time they expressed positive (but average) attitudes towards having SEN teachers. The discrepancy that was observed in school D between DH’s high perceptions of support and low perceptions of staff can be explicated by the fact that DH was passive and detached from the daily problems of LDS.

The issue of ‘SEN support staff” can also be studied in relation to ‘headteacher’s support for staff on LD’. Discrepancies were identified on both issues between headteachers and staff. In the first case discrepancies were detected in three schools, and in the second case in all schools. Indeed, if teachers and counselors are to be seen as the customers and the headteacher is the service-provider, it seems quite reasonable that headteachers will tend to perceive that they provide more, whereas teachers will tend to perceive they get less. However, SEN support staff for mainstream teachers was found to be low, although it is identified as an important element in the literature of inclusion (Fennick, 2001; Hall, 1998).

At present, schools are not involved in the process of assessments, and students usually are assessed outside of schools. However, the recent Ministry circulars allow for the pedagogic councils at schools to expand on test accommodations or alter them according to the student’s level of functioning at school (as detailed in the Introduction). Yet, overall findings demonstrated gaps between school’s entitlement to intervene and the reality of non-intervention. It has been observed that different schools react differently to this issue. Some intervene only when the need arises, such as the need to decide between oral or written tests, or when the test recommendations are not clear enough. These findings indicate that the instructions on the part of the Ministry are not clearly-cut and further steps should be taken to standardise these
procedures. Further, the impression that schools are trying to avoid interference might stem from the wish to avoid the need to make hard decisions and leave these decisions to outsourced assessors.

Another way to explain the policy of non-intervention of test accommodations is via Kelly’s (1999) explanation of the duality of the role given to the Council as regards curriculum. The main fear expressed by staff is that the number of students assessed as LDS will become over-inflated and students will not need to make the effort to go to an assessment once test accommodations can be granted by the Council. Further, the more LDS are identified at school, the more difficult teachers’ tasks become as teachers are not compensated for their input in LDS. On the other hand, teachers in all schools have expressed positive attitudes towards LDS and they certainly wish to help them. Thus, their role is dual in the sense that they are concerned with school reputation and their own welfare but at the same time they are concerned with providing assistance to LDS.

The issue of school involvement was cross-checked with the following question from the questionnaire: “I would like to increase the extent of my involvement in the process”

Teachers mean of 3.16 (Table 5.1) illustrates that mainstream teachers have reached a point in which they understand that an increase in their involvement will better the process of inclusion, but on the other hand they are not sure whether they are qualified to do so. The facts that teachers in school D and E have the least motivation to be involved whereas all the rest of the schools are above the average of 3 are consistent with the general inclusive attitude that was discussed earlier. This finding also accords with the policy of avoidance that has been adopted by the pedagogic councils.
Table 5.1 Teachers’ wish to increase their involvement in the process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion of school councils is also related to the issue of assessment services provided by the schools. Indeed, AH is the only headteacher who takes care of assessments at school out of which school profits too. This finding is congruent with the businesslike approach that AH demonstrated by claiming that a headteacher should be like a hi-tech company, and also in the insertion of the TQM which is built on the concept of providing service to ‘customers’ and ‘clients’. This finding also accords with staff perceptions of AH as being mainly concerned with increasing school grade average, and with the pressures he applies towards assessing as many students as possible for the same purpose. The research findings are congruent with the literature on assessment policies (Margalit et al., 2000) in respect of the fact that small-sized, second-chance schools send more students to be assessed. This is true in the case of school D. In addition, the headteacher’s orientation plays a major role as indicated by the high figures of assessed students in school D.

Indeed, AH’s initiative stood out among other headteachers who view the assessment process as totally separated from school’s responsibility. It is noteworthy that even schools such as E or D which are part of a Net of schools which provides assessment services, did not make real attempts to send their students over to the assessment centres which were not located on school premises. This fact can be accounted for by the previous claim whose rationale is schools’ attempts to avoid involvement in the assessment process in order to avoid parents’ and students’ pressures.

However, part of the issue of change is how to sustain it over time. Therefore, the issue of monitoring and accountability of the inclusion of LDS seems to be of high
importance. An analysis of the findings demonstrated that most schools tend to apply the same accountability procedures for mainstream students and LDS. This tendency was observed in schools B, D, but mostly in school E. Conversely, school C was the only school that tended towards extra accountability procedures for LDS. This tendency was cross-checked with the findings of the three research populations (Table 4.22 in the Findings chapter) which all shared the mean of 3 and above in their perceptions of accountability. This orientation can be explicated via the ‘instrumental, bureaucratic’ model introduced by Kelly (1999). It might be argued that schools which advocate high levels of hierarchy will also favour the bureaucratic model of accountability. Thus, school C whose hierarchies were emphasised in previous sections required from its staff higher levels of accountability procedures than the rest of the schools.

This tendency can also be related to the approach towards inclusion. Thus, in a school such as C which favours inclusion, further focus is likely to be placed on extra accountability for LDS, whereas in school such as E which does not favour inclusion, there will be no such procedures. The approach towards inclusion as a means to understand accountability can be introduced via the ‘intrinsic, democratic’ model (Kelly, ibid.). It is argued that schools such as C which favour the enhancement of inclusion will require high levels of accountability in order to improve the quality of the process. It seems, then, that the two models which first appeared to be contradictory, are in fact complementary as they present the two sides of the same coin.

Yet, monitoring the process did not always accord with the level of accountability. This was mainly seen in school D where the monitoring process was very orderly and systematic as opposed to the lack of extra accountability for LDS. It was similarly observed in school C, where extra attention to accountability on LDS was required, although monitoring on the process was not applied. These discrepancies might be explained by the claim that extra accountability is related to the approach towards inclusion. According to this logic, extra measures as regards LDS are likely to imply higher sensitivity and concern. At the same time, monitoring can be related to a
systematic pattern of work provided by school in all respects including the less ‘popular’ area of LDS.

The meagre extent of monitoring that has been observed in schools might be understood in the light of the model presented after Carnall (1999) (Figure 2.15 in the Literature Review). According to this model, if there is no or little monitoring, change cannot be fully implemented as there is no circular movement. It might be argued that in the case of LDS’ inclusion, lack of monitoring could be purposeful. Indeed, all findings give way to believe that presently headteachers avoid too much involvement in the process of inclusion, and lack of monitoring certainly completes the picture.

**Summary of the discussion of inclusive structures**

The analysis of this section aimed at forming a picture of the inclusive structures provided by the schools. The main finding of the analysis is that schools offer limited inclusive structures to LDS. This conclusion is consistent with Clark et al. (1999) who have found out that special education is resilient and that despite the commitment to inclusive principles, basic structures and assumptions of special education have not changed.

Firstly, no standardised procedures have been observed among teachers in the process of identification of LDS as opposed to counselors who apply more standardisation in their work. This finding in itself might indicate that school structures are in a transition stage towards inclusion. Indeed, this transition process is likely to start with school counselors as they are currently in charge of LDS in most schools. However, schools offer no special structures for LDS in mainstream classes. The most common structure, the MABAR class, seems to enhance the social seclusion of LDS and stress the categorical rather than the unified approach towards them. This finding is congruent with Vaughn and Klinger (1998) who maintain that mainstream classes are beneficial in social terms.

The fact that headteachers do not see themselves as responsible for an inclusive curriculum at school and that they do not provide LDS with ‘remedial’ tools provides further proof for the lack of inclusive, whole-school approach in the respective
schools. Of course, these judgements are mainly relevant for schools such as C or B which have an inclusive vision and not to schools such as E whose rhetoric does not favour inclusion. The analysis yielded that headteachers’ attitude towards inclusive curriculum is similar to their general attitude towards LDS in the sense that LDS might not be openly rejected by schools but they certainly are not the top priority. It has been suggested that in schools where there was a high level of satisfaction from the curricular attitudes towards LDS, low or no gaps were observed between the three research populations in respect of attitudes towards inclusive curriculum, and vice versa.

Further, schools do not offer adequate training on LDS and this accords with the lack of headteachers’ initiatives on this issue. In addition, even schools which perceive themselves as employing mainstream and SEN support staff, do not refer to SEN staff but rather to teachers who are naturally oriented towards LDS or those that received minimal training. This finding does not accord with the importance of this issue in the literature (e.g. Fennick, 2001). Here, too, it is claimed that limited SEN staff deployment does not result from an inclusive approach. The fact that perceptions of training sometimes accord and other times disaccord with headteachers’ perceptions might be ascribed to the fact that training on LDS is not standardised at schools, and headteachers might sometimes perceive a ten-hour course as adequate training. In addition, teachers and counselors might also have had their training in other or previous frameworks such as academic institutes.

As for the practice of inclusion, it might be concluded that headteachers were observed as less motivated towards inclusive curriculum than other research populations. Teachers’ openness was equally observed in respect of test administration. Although the main daily duties with LDS lie in the hands of teachers who perceive this role as demanding, they seem to cope. Further, the most consistent complaints were observed in the most inclusive schools. This could be related to the fact that only schools which are willing to include LDS make requirements from their staff.
Schools attempt to avoid interference with assessment procedures as they wish to avoid pressures from students and parents alike. This might be the reason that the pedagogic council does not take advantage of its rights to alter or expand on test accommodations. Most schools apply the same accountability procedures for LDS and mainstream students. Yet, only one school (D) applied monitoring procedures perhaps as result of major organisational changes which included standardisation procedures.

**How are school structures and inclusive structures related in this study?**

The third research question attempted to provide a response for the relationship between school structures and inclusive structures in mainstream secondary schools.

The main finding of the analysis is that whereas school structures are in a transition phase, school inclusive structures seem to fall behind. Indeed, headteachers were observed as making efforts to empower staff and to provide students with a flexible curricular choice. In addition, efforts are observed towards the improvement of channels of communication at school. It might be claimed, therefore, that schools structures are moving from ‘old’ to ‘fashionable’ (‘new’) structures, from linear management to specialism. Yet, elements of both types still prevail in schools.

Staff perceptions indicate that LDS may not be rejected by schools but they certainly do not make a top priority. The basis for this conclusion is the limited inclusive curricula offered by schools. Indeed, LDS are not offered any structures specifically made for them, and an observation of MABAR classes demonstrates that students do not profit from this structure which is made for slow learners, as on the one hand the assistance they get does not include the ‘remedial’ skills they need to acquire, and on the other hand they are socially secluded and stigmatised as SEN students.

If these conclusions are analysed via Dyson et al.’s (1994) model, it is contended that all schools currently demonstrate ‘hierarchically-ordered knowledge’ which is transmitted by teachers, rather than ‘learning through participation’. Thus, the stress is put on the outcome of learning and not on the process of learning. It might be argued that schools acknowledge the diversity of needs of LDS or other SEN students but not
the diversity of learning styles of all students. Yet, schools provide neither ‘responsive’ nor ‘categorical’ provision. Indeed, there is no ‘remedial’ teaching or alternative curriculum, nor is there diversified teaching for different learning styles. This accords with Dessent’s (1987) model indicating that schools tend towards mainstream structures more than towards special structures.

Further, procedures as regards identification of LD are not standardised as yet and school staff are not adequately trained to teach them. In addition, neither supervisory procedures on the process of inclusion nor enhanced accountability measures have been observed in respect of LDS. However, teachers were found to be generally open towards these learners although they are never properly compensated for their high input in respect of time and energies.

It seems, then, that whereas school structures are in the process of development, inclusive structures are still falling behind and are offered only to a limited extent.

Another way of putting together structures and inclusive structures is via the four personal barriers to change suggested by Dalin et al. (1993) and Burnes (1996). On the basis of the study it is deduced that the way to inclusion is not blocked by ‘value’ barriers, as staff generally demonstrated positive attitudes towards LDS. ‘Power’ barriers were observed mainly in school D where organisational changes involved changes of status. Similarly, ‘psychological’ barriers were observed in all schools which conducted change but mainly in school D where feelings of homeostasis were at stake. However, ‘practical’ barriers were also found to be related to inclusion because school inclusive structures and resources were found to be inadequate and thus, inclusion was not achieved in full.

Indeed, the main reasons for resistance to change in this study were observed as ‘personal anxieties and concerns’ and ‘ignorance’ (Clarke, 1994). Anxieties and concerns were seen in school A where staff resented the TQM mainly because they dreaded the yearly report. However, staff in school C objected to the electronic mail as means of communication because they seemed to fear the unknown. They similarly rejected the idea of a five-day week as they thought it might affect their personal life.
Discussion of possible relationships

Research question 4

“What relationship might be suggested between school leadership, school culture and school structures in the context of inclusion?”

One of the clear points that emerged from the section on ‘Empirical evidence regarding inclusion’ is the importance of each of the abovementioned elements in the process of inclusion. One of the objectives of this research was to identify possible relationships between the elements of leadership, culture and structures. This is because in schools’ reality all three elements interrelate and do not stand separately.

The first point which emerges in the context of leadership is that leadership can change culture and climate. This was observed in a number of cases. In school A, the climate has worsened since AH inserted the TQM. Teachers perceived they were being constantly evaluated by the management. As the yearly-evaluation-form is approaching, teachers become tense because they know that some of them will not get to teach classes they wish to teach on the basis of the results. In addition, teachers became competitive and they do not share the results of the survey with their colleagues. Further, some of them perceive the questions that appeared on the questionnaires as insulting and have asked for the rephrasing of the questions. At the same time, AH has contributed to students’ perceptions of a positive climate and they feel that school is ‘like their second home’.

The influence of EH1 on school climate can also be interpreted as negative although his contribution to school values was positive. When EH1 was nominated teachers had to start working by regulations, and although their independence was more restricted there was no more chaos and the quality of work improved. However, the shift from an elite academic school to a comprehensive heterogeneous school that was imposed by EH1 led to frustration and anger that were not taken care of properly, and eventually school climate was damaged.
However, School B is an example of the contribution of the headteacher to improving school culture and values as well as school climate. BH contends that the atmosphere has changed in the sense that teachers do not insult students anymore. They are encouraged to become ‘Big Heads’, and a sense of belonging has developed among school staff. Teachers and counselors alike perceive that there are less cliques, there is an ‘open door’ to BH, and teachers feel proud to work in this school. It seems that BH managed to do the impossible in a school where seven headteachers have changed over a period of ten years. She has created an atmosphere in which supervision and control over teachers’ work are perceived with understanding as teachers know that at the same time they receive feedback on their work. This is an impressive shift from a previous situation in which uncertainty led to confusion and to chaos, and consequently work has not been done properly. BH also succeeded in arising staff awareness of inclusive values, such as the fact that the 10% of LDS are worth the same attitude as the remaining 90% of non-disabled. She increased awareness towards involvement with the community, such as the Scouts and enhanced staff attitudes regarding individual learners.

CH, too, succeeded in improving school climate. School staff perceive now a more pleasant, less ‘noisy’, calm and warm atmosphere to which CH has contributed by making personal gestures such as bringing cakes to the teachers’ room on special events. Teachers also perceive a more responsive and a less bureaucratic attitude on the part of CH whereas previously they perceived that “students were always right” (CT.3). There is also less pressure on teachers to participate in in-service courses at school. It is noteworthy, however, that teachers who were identified with the previous headteacher, T, did not successfully integrate into this climate. This is supported by CT.2’ claim that “school credo has been incorporated in me by T and I honestly don’t need CH to understand what school credo is”.

As opposed to all other schools, DH’s headship was not observed as having influence on culture and structures and this will be discussed later on in this section.

These findings are consistent with existing literature where the influence of leaders on culture is emphasised to a great extent. Researchers share the belief that headteachers
are the founders of their school’s culture (Bush and Coleman, 2000; Blase and Anderson, 1995). The discussion of the importance of leadership on inclusion is supported by the OECD report (1995). Indeed, the concept of vision appeared to include elements of structures and cultures, such as ‘flexible school organisation’ and ‘activities aimed to achieve the stated goals’.

On the basis of the previous paragraphs it might be concluded that not only can headteachers change culture but they can also change structures. This relationship is relatively easy to detect because it is enough to look at the structural changes at the different schools to clarify this relationship. For example, the insertion of TQM was originated by AH. Similarly, the establishment of the Junior High School and the conceptual change from a selective technological school to a comprehensive school was brought upon by EH1. CH can be seen as responsible for changes in the role division and emphasis on computerisation, whereas BH initiated curricular changes such as the Cluster Subject Project. And finally, DH and members of the previous management are responsible for the major organisational change that took place in school D.

This view is congruent with Bennett and Harris (1999) who argue that both culture and structures derive from “the nature of enforcement of power within an organisation” which appears to be a different terminology for leadership. It is noteworthy that the fact that headteachers’ attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion were lower than those of general staff can be regarded as further support for the claim that school structures are determined by headteachers. This assertion is consistent with Busher and Blase (2000) who contend that leadership is crucial in the creation of collegial culture and the delegation of responsibilities. This view is also supported by the research of Tomlinson (1996) and OECD (1995).

Having argued that leadership determines culture and structures an attempt will be now made to establish a relationship between structures and culture. One of the claims in the literature is that culture has a ‘superiority’ over structures in the sense that school values and ideas as well as people’s interpretations are put into action by structures (Turner, 1990; Torrington and Weightman, 1993). The latter argue that an
organisation which depends principally on rules is in the process of decay. Findings from the present study seem to be consistent with this claim. On the basis of the findings it might be postulated that culture is indeed ‘superior’ to structures in the sense that inclusive culture precedes inclusive structures by a process of ‘maturation’. The study indicated that school staff became aware of the need to develop inclusive values earlier than inclusive structures and this enabled the enhancement of the process of inclusion.

It has been contended that teachers and counselors more than headteachers demonstrated positive attitudes towards inclusion of LDS. In addition, they have the basic knowledge and are familiar with the basic terminology related to LD. The orientation towards catering for slow learners was also identified in the documents of schools A, B, and C, in the rhetoric of AH, BH, CH, and to some extent of DH. However, schools failed to provide general staff with proper training and conditions to fulfil their tasks. This indicates that the values of inclusion are more ‘institutionalised’ than the ‘putting into action’ of these values. For example, school B demonstrated a greater focus on weak learners than on excellent learners. It was argued earlier that BH created an inclusive climate in school B. However, the level of inclusive structures does not match the high level of values as yet. Staff training was observed as minimal and curricular flexibility was not specific to LDS.

The fact that staff in school A have rejected the TQM, and the fact that teachers did not want to communicate via the electronic mail in school C might be interpreted as the natural rejection of what is perceived as ‘inappropriate structures’ by certain cultures. This process can be compared to the rejection of external objects by the human body. As cultures in both schools are featured by openness and democracy, staff did not find the impersonal channel of e-mail or the formal procedures of TQM appropriate. This interpretation could serve as further support for the influence of culture on structure.

However, the present study equally supports the view that a cultural shift may be generated from structures. This belief is advocated by Hopkins, who stated (1996) that significant structural changes which bring teachers into working closely together will affect their professional relationships and the way they talk to one another, and
thus create a new culture. It seems that school D might serve as the best example to support this argument. Indeed, a major structural shift in school D has worsened school climate. Senior teachers lost their status as Heads of Departments as a result of the re-organisation of school and the shift into an academic school. As a result, younger and more motivated teachers became Heads of Forums which were cross-departmental and required less expertise. This created a climate of anger, frustration, and resistance up to a point where teachers did not speak to one another. Although cooperation and collaboration were observed in the Forums, the climate as a whole had been deteriorated as a result of the structural change.

Another example that supports this view is school E, where senior staff developed resistance and demonstrated lack of communication with other staff members, on the basis of their objection to the shift from a selective technological school into a six-year comprehensive school. It might be encapsulated that both in schools D and E the main cultural shift was in the dissonance between the senior and junior teachers, because the former were feeling that they were losing their status in favour of younger teachers who were easier to manipulate by the headteacher. If this is taken a step further, it might be argued that structures influence climate in a negative way.

It might be deduced that structures and culture mutually influence one another. This analysis seems to be congruent with West-Burnham (1997:107) who argues that culture and structures are “the intention and practice”, or the “inner quality” and “outward expression”. In this line of thought the shift in school A “from totally ignoring LDS to almost totally ignoring the excellent students” (AC.1) could be seen as the intention. In contrast, the lack of training, the lack of SEN support staff, and the dissatisfaction as regards inclusive curriculum indicate that practice, or the ‘outer manifestations’ fall behind the intention. A similar argument is presented by Harling (1989) who states that structures represent the formal procedures whereas culture represents the informal relationships. The present study seems to be in line with this argument as well, because much of the data on culture was inferred from informal relationships which rely on emotions, such as the problematic teamwork in school C or teachers’ frustration in school A. Contrarily, data on structures seemed to be more concrete and easy to categorise and decode. This claim is supported by Hargreaves
(1995: 30-31) who argues that it is easier to change “people's work situation and practices” rather than “their values and beliefs”.

However, it might be equally argued that leadership and structures create school climate and are at the same time influenced by it. This can be seen in school D, where the organisational reform that had been initiated by DH created a new climate of empowerment and collaboration, although it actually caused damage to staff relationships and eventually to school climate. As a result, the new structures were abolished by the collapse of the whole school system and DH had to resign. The same phenomenon occurred in school A, where the TQM that had been inserted by AH caused damage to the open climate of school, as a result of which AH rephrased the questionnaires and became more cautious in using this structure. This model of relationships is supported by Ainscow (1999) who points out that visionary skills (i.e. leadership) as well as the coordination of tasks and roles (i.e. structures) are equally necessary to enhance awareness towards inclusion. Similarly, this model accords with Joyce et al. (1991) who maintain that climate is created by an element of school leadership (‘provision of support’) and an element of structures (‘collegial study groups’).

The analysis of empirical literature on factors of inclusion revealed that leadership, structures and culture participate in the process of inclusion (Tomlinson, 1996; Thomas et al., 1998; OECD, 1995, 1999; IQEA, 1999). Although a synergy of leadership, culture and structures has been advocated (Carnall, 1995; O’Neill, 1994), this study has identified specific relationships. It is argued that culture and structures are affected by leadership, and at the same time leadership is affected by climate. In addition, culture and structures demonstrate a mutual effect on one another. However, the main conclusion was that a shift in the focus has been made from culture and structures to leadership. This brings the discussion back to the importance of the headteacher in the process.
Summary of the study

This chapter aimed to discuss the research findings and evaluate the extent to which the Discussion chapter provided responses to the four research questions. The main intention of all four questions was to explore school leadership, school culture and school structures in the context of LDS’ inclusion.

The first question attempted to analyse the relationship between school leadership and the process of LDS’ inclusion. The analysis generated the conclusion that it is possible to predict the extent of inclusion in a certain school in cases in which the picture of leadership is very clear such as in school B or E. In all other cases headteachers were perceived higher on elements of leadership than on inclusive leadership. It is noteworthy that both issues were observed as related to change because in most schools headteachers attempt to enhance awareness towards inclusion. However, the study pinpointed a mismatch with Joyce and Calhoun (1996) who claim that headteachers can conduct changes fast. It appears that LDS’ inclusion is a long process that has not yet reached a state of maturity.

The second question attempted to analyse the relationship between school culture and climate and LDS’ inclusion. The analysis pointed to a relationship between culture and change and consequently enabled a categorisation of schools to ‘stuck’ and ‘moving’ cultures. Moreover, the facts that inclusive elements reflected positive attitudes towards inclusion and that most cultures were categorised as ‘moving’ might suggest that schools which tend to be ‘moving’ cultures are likely to develop an inclusive culture.

The third research question attempted to analyse the relationship between school structures and LDS’ inclusion. The main points that emerged from the analysis indicated that school structures were more ‘mature’ than inclusive structures. It has been concluded that structures are on a transition phase from ‘old’ to ‘new’ as regards aspects of staff empowerment, channels of communication and school curriculum, whereas inclusive structures fall behind general structures.
The overall picture that emerges from the analysis is that LDS presently fall by the wayside for a number of reasons. Firstly, they are not offered real inclusive responses, and the main response they are provided with, the MABAR class, seems to lead to social segregation. In addition, schools offer the same responses to all categories of weak learners with no reference to the etiology of their difficulties. On the other hand, four of the schools appear to be in a transition phase. Headteachers have increased their awareness towards SEN students in general and LDS in particular. Further, the culture in most of the schools was found to be ‘moving’ towards change. Indeed, staff attitudes towards inclusion and knowledge on LD have developed overtime, and openness on the part of school staff seems to be increasing by the day. The study is consistent with the literature regarding the ‘transition phase’ of LDS’ inclusion (OECD, 1999; Clark et al., 1999). The study has also highlighted the drawbacks of the process, and thus accorded with Tomlinson’s (1996) list of drawbacks.

The fourth research question attempted to investigate the possible relationships between leadership, culture and structures in the context of inclusion. The analysis suggested that culture and structures affect one another mutually and both derive from leadership. At the same time, leadership and structures affect climate and are determined by it. Structures were observed as less ‘mature’ than culture, suggesting that cultural changes should precede structural changes. In general, the study has confirmed findings from the literature (Harvey-Jones, 1988; Kelly, 1999; Morrison, 1998) with reference to the contribution of leadership, culture and climate, and structures to the process of change-making and inclusion. Figure 5.1 introduces a two-way model to describe these relationships.
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*Figure 5.1 The two-way model of relationships between managerial elements*
Chapter VI

Conclusion

The present study has attempted to explore how school leadership, school culture and school structures are perceived by staff in the context of inclusion of LDS within mainstream secondary schools in Israel.

The need for the study has arisen because the numbers of LDS seem to be increasing by the day as a result of the development of worldwide awareness of special educational needs of individuals in general, and of LDS in particular. Current educational movements of inclusion and integration and the realisation that the educational system should be responsible for all learners have established the need for a research which will relate managerialism to inclusion. The research has adopted the qualitative paradigm, the interpretive approach and elements from the survey approach and documentary analysis. The main research tools were questionnaires and interviews. This chapter aims at reviewing the main conclusions of the study. This will be obtained by adopting a ‘helicopter view’ which will enable to look at the data from different angles and perspectives. As this chapter attempts to provide the conclusions to the research questions its outline has been planned accordingly.

Sections A1 and A2 draw on a horizontal view which introduces the conclusions regarding leadership, culture and structures and proceeds with conclusions regarding inclusive leadership, inclusive culture and inclusive structures (Figure 6.1). Section B draws on a vertical view which focusses on how inclusive elements are reflected within managerial elements (Figure 6.2). Section C draws on horizontal and vertical views and attempts to identify the inter-relationships between the ‘pairs’ of managerial and inclusive elements (Figure 6.3). Section D summarises the way changes towards inclusion may be affected. Finally, this chapter presents the implications of the study and suggestions for further research.
Section A1: staff perceptions of managerial elements

The main conclusion regarding managerial elements is that school leadership, school culture and school structures are currently in a transition phase. This tendency will be explained below.

Leadership  ➔  Culture  ➔  Structures

Inclusive leadership  ➔  Inclusive culture  ➔  Inclusive structures

Figure 6.1 A horizontal view of managerial and inclusive elements

Staff perceptions of school leadership

While the study has identified varied profiles of leadership, an overview of the elements of leadership indicates that the concept of leadership is currently in process of change, although elements from the past are still preserved. Most headteachers seem to be aware now of the importance of the human factor in management even as a means of achieving their tasks. Indeed, headteachers make attempts to treat staff with respect and openness. Yet, most headteachers make decisions as regards changes according to needs and contingencies regardless of staff objections. Although headteachers perceive their change-making as incremental and considerate in respect of staff, staff perceptions are that headteachers could become hostile while facing resistance.

Secondly, most headteachers consider themselves as leaders of change rather than managers although they have been observed as carrying out management roles as well. It seems that headteachers realise that transformational elements make a firm basis for and should precede transactional elements so that tasks are conducted effectively.

Staff perceptions of school culture and climate

Similarly to the concept of school leadership, school culture and climate have been undergoing a process of change. Indeed, headteachers have become aware of the
importance of improving school climate. This has been observed in four of the schools when external consultants have been introduced into the school system in order to improve team-work, help turn school into a learning organisation, or enhance staff performance. In addition, in most schools headteachers have attempted to demonstrate collaborative decision-making and democratic procedures.

However, likewise leadership, cultures still preserve elements from the past. Patterns of teamwork and collaboration have not been institutionalised in schools and in most cases they are imposed on teachers or exist for social reasons. Schools have not been found to be ‘learning organisations’ even in cases where learning takes place and in-service courses are offered, and teachers’ motivation to participate in courses seems to be related to an increase in their salary or coercion on headteachers’ part.

Nevertheless, four of the schools can be viewed as ‘moving’ cultures rather than ‘stuck’ cultures in the sense that headteachers do not reject to teamwork, aim at collaboration, encourage learning and are aware of the advantages of empowerment. Indeed, attempts are constantly made to turn schools into collaborative environments where all of these elements reside.

Staff perceptions of school structure
Most schools have been perceived as moving from ‘old’ to ‘new’ structures. This conclusion indicates that schools are gradually turning into more flexible environments. This has been observed in headteachers’ styles and perceptions of their role as well as in the climate and values that prevail. However, it can also be seen in terms of how school life is operated. As structures are practical and concrete, unlike elements of leadership or culture, such a shift can be seen and not only felt.

The overall impression from this study is that current school structures allow for more flexibility than in the past although elements from the past are still there. Most headteachers acknowledge the need to empower staff albeit staff perceptions are varied regarding real empowerment. Perceptions have demonstrated that middle managers such as counselors are more empowered than teachers and that teachers are empowered in respect of individual students rather than in respect of whole-school
matters. Staff perceptions are that as long as headteachers have a total responsibility as regards staff recruitment and budgets, staff empowerment will be limited. However, the fact that staff cannot reach a consensus whether real empowerment exists in their schools indicates that this issue has not been standardised yet.

The same conclusion applies for school curriculum. Whereas in the past schools had a uniform curriculum to which all students had to adapt, schools have begun to realise that students are individuals with unique needs and attempts are being made to offer a variety of curricular menus out of which students can choose. The main idea is to enable all students to graduate with a matriculation diploma in whatever subjects they want or can major.

Staff plenums which are held once a semester and circulars in teachers boxes are the most popular and dominant channels of communication at schools. Indeed, these means of communication are non-democratic and serve headteachers’ purposes to spread information fast across schools and update staff without evoking too many discussions. At the same time headteachers are constantly developing means which are unique to their schools. This gives reason to believe that schools are departing from the traditional ways of communication and are moving towards an understanding that blocks to communication present hardships to school work.

The main conclusion concerning structures is that schools are in a transition stage from ‘old’ to ‘fashionable’ structures, but they are still featured by a combination of old and new. This means that on the one hand schools are still bureaucratic organisations with a focus on ‘tall’ hierarchies, although most of them are striving towards more democratic and more ‘flat’ hierarchical procedures. All schools are still run by a ‘line management’ but there seems to be a slight tendency towards specialism, either by being more open to introduce external consultants to the school system, or by taking advantage of in-house teachers expertise to enhance learning.

**Summary**
The over-arching conclusion is that the main change in respect of managerial elements has been identified as developing a better insight and understanding among
headteachers regarding staff relations, individual teachers’ needs, and openness towards changes. On the whole, schools culture and structures in most of the schools are more dynamic and flexible and less rigid and linear, and shifts as regards implementation are now in process. The following section attempts to conclude staff perceptions of inclusive elements.

**Section A2: Staff perceptions of inclusive elements**

The main conclusion regarding inclusive elements is that inclusion should be considered as a process of change that has not been finalised despite the fact that it was initiated in 1988. This conclusion will be explained further in the sections below.

**Staff perceptions of school inclusive leadership**

The main conclusion in respect of inclusive leadership is that there are gaps between rhetoric and implementation. Headteachers’ perceptions of their inclusive vision appear to be much higher than staff perceptions of this issue. In some cases staff perceive headteachers’ vision as deriving from micro-political factors such as a strive to increase the number of students entitled for matriculation diplomas. Furthermore, headteachers perceive themselves as willing to provide support for teachers on LDS as well as offering adequate training for teachers in this respect. According to staff perceptions, however, the ‘putting into action’ of these wishes is insufficient. Yet, it seems that headteachers have developed some sense of inclusive vision in at least part of the schools (three out of five) although it is stated explicitly in the documents of only one of the schools.

The investigation of inclusive leadership highlights the importance of headteachers in the process of inclusion: they are responsible for the provision of professional SEN support to mainstream teachers, for adequate training on SEN for teachers who have never had the need to be trained on LDS, and for the development of an inclusive vision which will recruit school staff. Moreover, on the basis of the present research it might be deduced that not only is there a discrepancy between headteachers’ rhetoric and ‘putting into action’, but that a gap exists also between headteachers and staff.
However, it seems that the basis for these discrepancies does not lie in headteachers’ negative attitudes or total lack of inclusive vision, but in the implementation of their policy.

**Staff perceptions of school inclusive culture**

The main conclusion is that headteachers’ attitudes towards LDS have gained an average score in most of the schools and in one school they were found to be low, although staff attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion were observed as higher. Likewise, reality proved that school was catering for excellent as well as for weak individual students, even in cases where school documents favoured excellence and disregarded weak students. This conclusion is congruent with the former one because LDS are primarily catered for by teachers who were observed as having more positive attitudes than headteachers. Another point regarding the shift in school values is concerned with the knowledge staff have demonstrated on the issue of LD, which sets a basis for developing positive attitudes.

Although a shift has been seen in staff attitudes, knowledge, and catering for weak learners, school values seem to be only half way towards change as three of the schools appear to focus on social values and equality of opportunities, whereas the two remaining schools focus on technological excellence. It is claimed that although technology appears to be related to modernism and change, it should not be considered as a feature of an improved culture in the context of inclusion because inclusion needs to rely upon human values rather than upon aspiration towards achievement.

It might be argued that inclusive cultures are not really ‘moving’ cultures in the sense that teachers feel alone in their daily struggle while handling LDS, and there is little collaboration or support on the part of headteachers.

**Staff perceptions of school inclusive structures**

The main conclusion from the study of inclusive structures is that while a shift has been observed on the rhetorical level of inclusion, the ‘down-to-earth’ responses that are provided by schools are still insufficient for the enhancement of LDS. Firstly, the
process of identification and assessment of LDS has not been standardised yet, although formal procedures are being applied by school counselors in respect of updating teachers on test accommodations. Perhaps the major conclusion is that no structures are offered by school at this stage for LDS. The most common inclusive structure which is the MABAR class is not meant for LDS but for all slow learners in general, regardless of the etiological basis of their difficulties. Thus, LDS do not profit from present structures because they are not provided with any ‘remedial’ or strategic tools for learning while at the same time they are stigmatised and feel socially segregated in the MABAR class.

Furthermore, the study indicated indifference on headteachers’ part to adjust school curriculum to LDS needs. Conversely, staff demonstrated motivation for a high input concerning curricular modifications for LDS. This motivation was accompanied by dissatisfaction from the present situation. Teachers’ complaints were often related to technical problems concerning test administration, such as rooms for time extension or for oral testing. Teachers’ main complaint is their lack of training or minimal training on LDS as opposed to the high expectations from them. Indeed, big discrepancies were observed between staff perceptions which expressed dissatisfaction and headteachers who felt satisfied from the training they have offered. However, despite the fact that teachers perceive their job with LDS as demanding, they do not think it is impossible to cope with.

Moreover, most schools do not require extra accountability and monitoring of LDS’ inclusion, a fact that might be interpreted as lack of involvement on headteachers’ part. Inclusive structures cannot be considered as ‘fashionable’ structures because SENCO expertise has been introduced only in some schools, and the counselors who are not experts on LDS are in charge of them at school. Schools do not offer expert consultation with reference to assessments, and students have to manage on their own. Moreover, only part of the headteachers advocate SEN support staff to assist mainstream teachers with LDS in their classes. The study accords with Clark et al. (1999) in their claim that basic structures have not changed and students are still categorised by ‘ability groupings’.
Summary of section A

The over-arching and to an extent a surprising conclusion is that teachers were found to be more willing than headteachers to a higher input in LDS. Their attitudes and wish to cater for individual students and slow learners seem to be higher than headteachers. For example, despite schools’ entitlement to veto the test accommodations via pedagogic committees, most schools seem to avoid handling this problem, although individual teachers express their wish to increase their involvement in the process. Teachers’ openness has also been observed in respect of test administration and curricular adaptations. The points below offer a summary of most headteachers’ strategy on the basis of the present study:

- Avoid too much involvement in the process of inclusion;
- Avoid highlighting inclusivity in school documents;
- Avoid the standardisation of procedures of accountability and monitoring for LDS;
- Avoid initiating interference in the process by pedagogic committees;

In view of school marketing and the policy of non-exclusion of the Ministry of Education which objects to exclusion of students from the educational system, it is clear that LDS cannot be openly rejected by schools. Yet, this section has proved that they present a burden to headteachers and that headteachers’ inclusive vision and attitudes towards LDS have not fully ripened at this point. In addition, practical responses regarding accessibility to school curriculum and technical problems have not been provided yet. The following section attempts to account for the relationship between managerial and inclusive elements.

Section B: The reflection of inclusive elements within managerial elements

One of the aims of the present study has been to explore the relationships between each managerial element and its ‘twin’ pair (e.g. leadership and inclusive leadership). The intention of this objective has been to explore whether managerial elements can help to predict the level of inclusion. This section is structured vertically as its main interest is to examine the relationships between the seemingly ‘opposite’ groups: the
managerial and the inclusive (Figure 6.2). The investigation was conducted via the formation of school clusters. Indeed, attempts have been made to create a typology for leadership, structures and culture and similarly for inclusive leadership, inclusive culture and inclusive structures. The main conclusion from this research is that inclusive elements fall behind managerial elements in the sense that they are still in a transition phase and have not fully ripened. Specific conclusions concerning each pair are provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>Inclusive culture</td>
<td>Inclusive structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6.2 A vertical view of managerial and inclusive elements*

**Leadership and inclusive leadership**

An attempt has been made to cluster schools according to leadership elements and inclusive leadership elements and reach a conclusion regarding how the two groups are related to one another.

In respect of leadership it might be concluded that four of the schools (A, B, C, and D) could be clustered as one group whereas school E is located on the negative end of the scale. Indeed, headteachers from the first group who were identified as people-oriented tended to demonstrate positive attitudes towards staff and were perceived as having leadership traits. As for inclusive leadership, the investigation identified flaws regarding the following inclusive elements in most schools: poor training, lack of adequate support for teachers on LDS, and inclusive vision.

It might be argued that inclusive leadership can be predicted by leadership elements in cases in which the picture obtained on leadership is very clear, or differently put, in the more extreme cases. This could be seen in school B where the headteacher was perceived as people-oriented, visionary, inspirational, responsive and mostly human. Accordingly, BH demonstrated the highest inclusive vision and willingness to support teachers with their LDS. Consequently, she managed to carry out change and sustain
it. Conversely, EH1 was identified as a task-oriented headteacher, who has never been too much involved with school life or responsive towards individual staff members. Likewise, he lacked inclusive vision and did not provide any support or training for teachers with their LDS.

The main conclusion is, therefore, that leadership elements are more ‘mature’ than inclusive leadership elements.

**Culture and inclusive culture**

An attempt has been made below to cluster schools according to culture elements and inclusive culture elements, and explore how the two groups are related to one another.

Categorisation has not been easy in the case of culture because schools exhibited different features as regards various issues of culture which could be sometimes interpreted as contradictory, such as having a socially-oriented credo but no teamwork. However, three of the schools that were identified as ‘moving’ cultures (A, B, and C) are in process of developing collaborative decision-making and values that reflect high levels of social responsibility. It is also argued that social and human values and the spirit of democracy and openness over-ride the existence of teamwork and learning organisation in ‘moving’ cultures. This was observed in school D which was defined as a ‘learning organisation’ and in school E where teamwork exists, although both schools are not characterised by human orientation or democratic orientation.

The main conclusion in respect of inclusive culture is the positive tendency among teachers to cater for slow learners’ needs, which appeared to be higher than what is expressed in school documents or by headteachers. This tendency was observed not only in the three ‘moving’ cultures but also in school E. The same conclusion applies to the issue of ‘Staff knowledge on LD’. Staff in all schools demonstrated knowledge on LD. Furthermore, attitudes towards LDS appeared to be positive too.

At the outset of the investigation it was assumed that ‘moving’ cultures would advocate inclusion as they would advocate innovations at large. Indeed, it seems that
elements of inclusive culture have reached a level of maturity which does not seem to fall behind school culture. Therefore, it might be postulated that ‘moving’ cultures are likely to develop an inclusive culture.

**Structures and inclusive structures**

The biggest discrepancies have been observed between structures and inclusive structures. Whereas school structures appear to be in a state of transition in respect of curriculum, staff empowerment, and channels of communication, inclusive structures are improving more slowly and even then, responses are provided for general SEN rather than specifically for LDS. The fact that elements of inclusive structures fall behind elements of structures can be clearly observed, because structures represent the implementation much more than leadership and culture.

In an attempt to cluster schools according to structures and inclusive structures it is argued that most schools are gradually developing their inner structures as described in sections A1 and A2, but the slowest pace was observed in school E. Indeed, it is the least democratic school which exhibited ‘line’ or ‘tall’ management more than the rest of the schools. Similarly, it was perceived as the least inclusive school in all respects.

It might be concluded that school structures enable to set predictions for inclusivity mostly in schools which pertain to ‘old’ structures, whereas the rest of the schools differ in their enhancement of structures and of inclusive structures.

**Summary of section B**

As it was argued earlier, LDS are not rejected by the school system but they are not a top priority either. Micro-politics seem to be a major factor in headteachers’ policy towards LDS, an example of which is the fact that the issue of LDS does not appear in school documents. As school marketing plays an important issue in schools’ survival, headteachers do not wish to present their schools as a ‘trash bin’ or as a second-chance school, and although this argument was presented explicitly by two headteachers only, there appears to be a silent consensus among headteachers on this matter. Another political issue which is also related to school marketing is the fact that schools’ main aim is to increase the rate of entitlement for matriculation diplomas. Thus, on the one hand schools encourage their LDS to be assessed so they
can get test accommodations which, in turn, help them improve their grades, whereas on the other hand they are not too keen on having these students.

As it was stated earlier in this chapter, most inclusive elements fall behind managerial elements at this point. This means that the process of inclusion is slower than the process of management improvement and it has not reached its full maturity yet. Thus, leadership elements were found to be predictors for inclusion in the more extreme cases, culture elements and inclusive culture elements were found to be equally ‘ripe’ reflecting similar levels of cultural and inclusive enhancement, whereas elements of structure can predict low levels of inclusion on the basis of ‘old’ structures.

**Section C: The inter-relationships between leadership, culture and structures within the context of inclusion**

This section will focus on the horizontal relationships between leadership, culture and structures, as well as between inclusive leadership, inclusive culture and inclusive structures. In addition, it will explore vertically the relationships between each element and its ‘twin’ in an attempt to form a picture that will contain the richness of data that has been gained from this complicated study (Figure 6.3).

![Figure 6.3](image.png)

The over-arching picture from this study presents a complex set of relationships. School leaders seem to influence culture, climate and structures both in positive and negative ways, and are at the same time influenced by climate. Culture and structures have a mutual effect on one another, although the influence of culture seems to be stronger in the sense that values were found to precede the establishment of practical
responses. Structures were mainly observed as influencing culture in a negative way. Another conclusion which ascertains to the strength of school culture is the fact that inappropriate school structures have naturally rejected inappropriate structures in the same way that the human body might reject a foreign object. However, the investigation of the inter-relationships between leadership, culture and structures has proved that leadership over-rides the two other elements in the context of inclusion.

Finally, while attempting to put together horizontal and vertical relationships, it is noteworthy that managerialism seems to over-ride inclusion in the sense that in many cases staff members preferred to relate to ‘managerial stories’ in their answers rather than to ‘stories of inclusion’. This clearly indicates that inclusion does not play major part in school life and among staff at the moment. Figure 6.4 offers a two-way model to describe the relationships between the managerial elements in this study.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 6.4 The two-way model of relationships between managerial elements*

The final conclusion is a reconfirmation of existing literature (e.g. Skrtic, 1995; Ainscow, 1997; Slee, 1996) regarding the influence of managerial elements on the process of inclusion. It is suggested that prior to undertaking a complex process of innovation such as inclusion, leadership, culture and structures of the intended school should be studied thoroughly.
Section D: Implications of the study and suggestions for further research

The overall analysis reflects that although the issue of inclusion as a process of change was introduced to schools fourteen years ago, it still be looked at as incomplete in most schools. Indeed, the analysis suggests that the management of inclusion has not fully matured as yet. However, given the fourteen years that have passed since this change was first introduced, it seems that the present situation of inclusion needs re-evaluation before further measures can be taken to implement the change in full.

This thesis has explored the way managerial elements and inclusive managerial elements are related, but it has equally dwelled on how inclusion may be affected by these elements. The discussion of the findings has demonstrated that the level of inclusion is affected by elements of leadership, culture, and structures. Therefore, elaborating on these elements could enhance inclusion.

Firstly, inclusion seems to be dependent, to a great extent, on school leadership. Findings indicate that inclusive schools’ heads are willing to take risks and make innovations. Their leadership style comprises transformational elements alongside people-orientation and care for teachers’ welfare. In addition, they manage to combine inspirational leadership and the ability to enthuse staff towards inclusion, and they possess the ability to evaluate the readiness of the environment towards change as well as sustain change once it has been obtained. Therefore, it is recommended that the educational system offer headteachers further training on leadership and interpersonal skills which will facilitate their task to recruit mainstream staff towards inclusion. In addition, regardless whether headteachers do not reject LDS because of their ‘inclusive’ personality or because of the socially-oriented educational system in Israel, their training regarding SEN students and LDS should be re-designed too, because like the other staff, they have not been offered courses on SEN or LD matters as part of their initial training.

Secondly, inclusion seems to be affected by school culture and climate. Indeed, the analysis reflects that the school’s head contributes, to a great extent, to the
development of appropriate inclusive culture and structures. Inclusive schools are likely to demonstrate a climate of openness and collaboration among staff, in which teamwork is encouraged and learning takes place. Moreover, inclusion was found to be related to the enhancement of social responsibility and democratic decision-making. Indeed, data indicate that a school which favors staff involvement in collaborative decisions, and encourages the implementation of social values such as membership in the Scouts or students helping their SEN peers, is more likely to become an inclusive school.

Finally, inclusion was found to be influenced by school structures. Indeed, inclusion depends on headteachers’ willingness to provide support and SEN training for mainstream teachers, and on the level of the inclusive vision they develop. In inclusive schools the dominant structures tend to be more flexible, staff are empowered, and headteachers seek to develop more effective channels of communication. At the same time, attempts are made so that all students gain access to school curriculum, and expertise is preferred to status. Moreover, the process of inclusion is monitored and standardised, and this includes adequate training on LD matters and support for staff. In addition, staff are involved in the process of inclusion, and pedagogic committees are encouraged to express their views regarding test accommodations. Findings show that much needs to be done by schools to improve the level of inclusive structures, and this mainly depends on the allocation of budgets.

Although the shift towards more inclusive schooling seems to call for specific changes regarding more inclusive structures, the main shift seems to be the acknowledgement that schools should start considering LDS’ inclusion as an issue which requires standardisation and monitoring. The present study clearly indicates that most headteachers are trying to avoid being too inclusive when they ‘market’ their schools. Following the shift in the mindset towards inclusion, schools will have to relate explicitly to the level of provision for LDS in school documents, as well as establish extra accountability measures for inclusion and standardisation of students’ files.
One of the implications of becoming more inclusive is that more efforts should be made to enable LDS gain access to school curriculum. This study has proved that currently LDS fall by the wayside because they get neither a responsive nor a categorical (remedial) provision. In fact, they are usually placed in low-ability groups which do not suit their needs. Becoming more inclusive means that schools will need to decide on a shift from a categorical provision which consists of an alternative curriculum or ‘pull-out’ classes towards a unified curriculum. Schools will need to allocate budgets and staff to provide remedial skills in order to compensate LDS for their deficits and eventually enable them to participate in mainstream curriculum. Alternatively, they might decide to go about whole-school re-structuring for the benefit of all students. However, all options require a thorough training for headteachers and mainstream teachers on LD, and an allocation of budgets for this purpose.

A major element in the enhancement of inclusion is the acknowledgement that teachers are the ‘make or the break’ (Kelly, 1999) in curricular adaptation. Until the present moment they were expected to manage on their own with little or no support from headteachers, and with little or no SEN training at all. Yet, teachers’ attitudes towards LDS and towards curricular flexibility were found to be more positive than headteachers’. It is vital, then, that they be offered adequate training which will reduce their high levels of frustration and sustain their motivation to help these students.

Further research is suggested in the area of LDS as this study has proved that the implementation of LDS’ inclusion is only half way through. Because the present research mainly relied on staff perceptions, it is suggested that it be repeated while involving students and parents’ perceptions as well. In addition, it is recommended that efficiency measures and inclusion indices of qualitative and quantitative measures be established so that the process of inclusion can be standardised and evaluated with more precision.

It is proposed that further studies on LDS be repeated in primary schools where competition between schools is less perceived as no Open Enrolment or marketing are involved. This might allow for the neutralisation of ‘environmental’ elements in the
exploration. Further, since this study was conducted in the Tel-Aviv area, it is advised that further research be carried out in other educational and geographical sectors, such as in religious, agricultural and the Arab sectors, in order to obtain a more rounded picture of inclusion.
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Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators related to management</th>
<th>Indicators related to teachers and pupils</th>
<th>Main issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher morale</td>
<td>Support and recognition from colleagues, parents and management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and justice</td>
<td>Policies agreed upon and implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School leadership</td>
<td>Inspiration, direction and support provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ job satisfaction</td>
<td>A sense of professional value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical environment</td>
<td>School being safe and enjoyable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The learning context Classroom as a stimulating environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-pupil relationship</td>
<td>Harmony and respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>Social and learning opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>An orderly environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to parents</td>
<td>Progress, development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-teacher consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ethos Indicators in secondary school self-evaluation (SOED, 1992)*
## Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Criticism</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full non-exclusionary inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Meeting diverse needs without support;</td>
<td>Relates to ineffectiveness and lack of motivation in Law and Glover's (2000) model; it is confusing in the sense that it is both inclusive and exclusionary;</td>
<td>No real structures are supported, although adapted responses to diversity are expected on classroom level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grouping practices seem to be impossible;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsuitable for severe LDS;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on definitions rather than on real practices;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parental choice regarding distinct settings is restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participating in the same place</strong></td>
<td>Seems to be more practical than the ‘full non-exclusionary inclusion’ because it realises the needs for extra budgeting; Creates exclusion of more severe LDS; Parental choice regarding distinct settings is restricted</td>
<td>Implies an artificial level of inclusion because inclusion seems to be equated with budgets and resources; The need of legislation might damage the institutionalisation (Fullan, 1991) of the process of inclusion</td>
<td>Confined to schools which are additionally resourced for a full diversity of needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to participation in mainstream settings is dependent on special support systems; Depends on special legislation to protect the rights of SEN students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on individual needs</strong></td>
<td>The greatest level of compatibility between SEN and the mainstream; Key decision-making criterion is individual needs rather than place;</td>
<td>Seems to be a flexible model which allows for continuous reconsiderations of decisions; It might limit student’s social experiences and enhance stigma; Involves more parental choice than the previous models;</td>
<td>Accords with the Welfarist culture (Hargreaves, 1995) which is characterised by high social cohesion and people-related aims; Enhances collaboration between special and mainstream settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice-limited inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Justifies separate inclusion while maintaining rights to participate in mainstream schools and classes</td>
<td>Involves parental choice of separate settings and programmes; Inclusion into mainstream is restricted to parental choice; Parental powered rather than professional-powered; Student’s social experiences might be limited while stigma increases;</td>
<td>Further accords with the Welfarist culture (Hargreaves, 1995) which is characterised by high social cohesion and people-related aims; Enhances collaboration between special and mainstream settings; Collaboration between school and the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Lunt and Norwich’s (1999) model of provision*
## Appendix 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models for inclusion (after Farrell, 1997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood inclusion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special school with outreach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units in mainstream schools</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning and management</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Staff attitudes and awareness towards inclusion</td>
<td>Suitable staff time and conditions of service</td>
<td>Personal characteristics such as being courageous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate strategy for managing teaching and learning</td>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>An inclusive and valued curriculum designed for LDS</td>
<td>Personal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Adequate resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strategy for the allocation of finance to learning support</td>
<td>A corporate committee with representatives from each faculty</td>
<td>The organisation of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality initiative: management of knowledge, skills, and training</td>
<td>An understanding of the vision</td>
<td>Coordinator for learning support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to inclusion</td>
<td>Correct deployment of learning support assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning environment</td>
<td>Redesign of staff training for different types of learning support, support of basic skills, one-on-one additional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective networks for collaboration</td>
<td>Sufficient time for the coordination of programmes and liaison between departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed and comprehensive documentation on inclusive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings with inclusive learning organisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information system regarding the provision of support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation boards for monitoring inclusive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and enabling technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic funding for staff development, equipment, assessment of needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of factors of inclusion (after Tomlinson, 1996)*
## Appendix 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing role models of leadership</td>
<td>Staff training programmes at all levels to develop necessary skills and attitudes</td>
<td>Access to curriculum via equipment and pedagogy</td>
<td>Working with parents to increase involvement</td>
<td>Civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly stated goals</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Flexible and supportive school organisation</td>
<td>Parental attitudes</td>
<td>Equal opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of expertise</td>
<td>Activities aimed to achieve the stated goals</td>
<td>Periodical assessment procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on social and life skills and on academic achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased cooperation and sharing among staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changed perception of disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient time</td>
<td>Catering for individual needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient material resources</td>
<td>Involving all members in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Better differentiation of teaching for all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Features of the process of change in the Inclusion Project (after Thomas et al., 1998)*
Appendix 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of staff</td>
<td>Physical suitability</td>
<td>Quality of management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of learning</td>
<td>Adequate resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing trust</td>
<td>Changing roles of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Channels of communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing attitude towards school and problems</td>
<td>Organisation of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous professional development</td>
<td>A development forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on OECD findings (1995, 1999) on integration

Appendix 7

Background description of schools as perceived by staff members

School A
School A is located in the north-east part of Tel-Aviv and is known for being ‘a school of the community’ with a students-centred approach. Most students come from average to high socio-economic background. School was founded in 1975 and serves a population of 1200 students. The headteacher has been in his position for 17 years. Five years ago he inserted TQM into school and it has been running ever since. The fact that AH has been running the school for so long implies that school equates AH.

School B
School B is also known as ‘a school of the community’ as well as for the ‘inclusive’ personality of its headteacher. It is part of a Net of vocational schools. School B has vocational classes as well as academic classes. The economic background of most families is average to high. School B was founded in 1972 and serves a population of 1352 students.

BH contends: “When I first came here four years ago, it was after seven headteachers have changed over a period of ten years. School year started with one headteacher and ended with another. I’ve identified three teachers’ populations: those who were anti, those who worked despite the situation of uncertainty, and those who made no efforts and took advantage of the chaos”. BC.2 argues: “Each of the seven headteachers came with different ideas and there was no one to provide feedback on teachers’ work. Teachers got confused and adopted the view of ‘bending your head until the storm is over’”. As regards LDS, it is noteworthy that school volunteered to
participate in a pilot experiment of the Ministry on LD and a special teacher (BO) comes every week for eight hours to help and to provide tools for teachers regarding LDS.

School C
School C is located in the north of Tel-Aviv and its large student population (1520 students) is featured by mixed economic background. (27% of the students come from the south of Tel Aviv). It is one of the oldest schools in Tel-Aviv (founded in 1937). For years it has been known for the democratic and open climate among teachers and students. CH is a new headteacher (2001 is her first year) in this school who has ‘grown professionally’ in it and has been nominated to this position by T, the previous headteacher, who got an educational managerial position overseas. In the past CH was a homeroom teacher, an age group coordinator, a pedagogic coordinator, a deputy. The main problem that emerged during interviews was that staff at school still compare CH to T. Sometimes this comparison is in favour of CH and at other times it is against her.

For example, CT.3 complained that “with T teachers perceived it was a school that gave students the feeling they were always right”. Others claim that CH is more responsive and less bureaucratic towards teachers’ wishes. Indeed, staff perceived T’s decision-making as top-down management although it was allegedly collaborative. Although she used to initiate plenums in which teachers expressed their opposition, in the next meeting she could notify her decision which stood in contrast to teachers’ wishes. Furthermore, CT.1 argues that with T roles were divided according to the level of closeness to her whereas with CH the key to role division does not rely on friendships.

On the other hand, T was perceived as a leader much more than CH. CT.1: “CH is not a leader. In fact, she is hardly felt in school management. In the past people claimed that all T cared about was public relations, but she really knew how to take the utmost from people. My feeling is that CH was placed to ‘keep an eye on the ship’ and that T wants to control the ship from overseas”. CT.2 argued that CH is not really involved in school matters and that school is run by the two managers of the Senior and Junior High schools. Teachers claimed that they do their jobs regardless of CH who does not seem to have any impact on their work. CT.1 asserted: “School credo has been incorporated in me by T and I honestly do not need CH to understand what school credo is. Indeed, in T’s times it focussed on listening and understanding students, respecting them and responding to their needs. These things are hardly perceived now”.

School D
School D is located in the north of Tel-Aviv and was considered over the years as a ‘second-chance school’. It was founded in 1935 and it is one of the oldest schools in Tel-aviv. It comprises 404 students. Therefore, students come from Tel Aviv as well as from the periphery (60% as opposed to 40% respectively) and the socio-economic level of students is mixed. School D belongs to a Net of schools. It is as an example for an organisation that has undergone major changes recently. Four years ago the Junior High School was established in an attempt to increase the number of students. Three years ago major organisational and conceptual changes were initiated by the headteacher. School orientation shifted from a pure vocational school to an academic
More academic subjects were introduced and the width of vocational subjects was reduced.

This conceptual change resulted in drastic structural changes. The previously central roles of Heads of (vocational) Departments were canceled and staff members were divided into professional forums with the help of organisational consultants who became involved in the process. The Forums were: Human Resources, Physical, Community-related, and Future Trends. School management consisted now of five people whereas previously it comprised the headteacher and his deputy. Another expanded management was established which consisted of eleven people including the Heads of Forums and Heads of the three age groups. A year ago all roles were opened in a tender and this changed the picture of all leading staff at school.

Major curricular changes followed the structural and conceptual changes. For example, a learning track such as Photography now became a choice subject and the number of hours reduced accordingly from seventeen to seven a week. At the same time students could now take academic subjects such as English or Maths at a highest level of five points. Whereas previously students graduated with a technological certificate they could now graduate with a full matriculation certificate.

The whole process evoked resistance up to a point of rebellion among the senior staff members who have now lost their prestige and almost their job. Not only did they refuse to cooperate but they also created chaos and a negative climate. DT.1 supports the view that the negative climate was created by the formerly role holders who refused to cooperate in the new division to forums. As a result, some developed apathy, some joined the resistance and some preferred to quit. DC.3 maintained:

“The change worked nicely with young teachers. However, professional ‘subject’ teachers could not liberate themselves from the previous conception. Thus, instead of recruiting their creative abilities (as most of them are Art teachers) and joining the leading team they created an anti in the teachers’ room as well as among students. For example, they told students that ‘the management cares for the new students more than for them (the technological students)’. A Fashion Design teacher who previously had fifteen weekly hours in her Fashion Design learning track used to sit in class and make her students decorate boxes to show that this is the only thing they can do in five weekly hours’.

A different school climate was featured by a new terminology that seemed to be awkward:

- ‘Learners’ instead of ‘students’;
- ‘Practices’ instead of ‘lessons’;
- ‘Languages’ instead of ‘learning tracks’;
- ‘Supervisor’ instead of ‘teacher’;
- ‘Practice methods’ instead of ‘teaching methods’;
- ‘Environment’ instead of ‘subject’;
- ‘Quality product’ instead of ‘high achievements’;
- ‘Customers’ instead of ‘students’ and ‘parents’.

Indeed, some of the sections of school brochure are hard to read with no directory. It is argued that school credo as it appears throughout the documents seems unrelated to
students’ social and learning context. Unfortunately, all attempts have failed and school D was still under the menace of being closed down as only sixteen students registered for the schoolyear of 2002 for the seventh grade. The three possible scenarios at the time the research was being conducted were: an immediate closure of school, keeping it running with support from the municipality, or a gradual closure. By the time this section is being written, a decision had been made to close down school D in the schoolyear that starts in September 2002.

School E
School E is located in the south-east part of Tel-Aviv. School E is part of a vocational net of schools. It was founded in 1949 and comprises 1450 students. Most of its students (75%) come from the south whereas 25% come from the periphery. The socio-economic situation of most students’ families is low. Its headteacher (EH1) has been in school for decades in different positions but four years ago he was nominated as the head of school. He is largely assisted by EH2 and that is why the leadership issues were investigated in respect of both headteachers. EH1 defines school as a comprehensive school which offers prestigious learning tracks in which 70% of the students study: Computers, Electronics, Science and ‘Advanced Academic Classes’. The remaining 30% study in easier tracks: Industrial Management, Electricity, and Mechanics.

Until six years ago the secondary school was under the responsibility of the head of the adjacent college and EH1 was the pedagogic manager who was the senior deputy of the Head of College. School E is a vocational school which attracts students from all over the city as well as from the periphery. School E changed its vocation eight years ago from an elective technological school to a comprehensive school of heterogeneous population. EC.1: “Until 8 years ago teachers had ‘an academic orientation’ towards students most of whom came to school from the peripheries after a strict selection”. Yet, school documents still emphasise the elective aspect. The title of school’s marketing brochure is ‘A Passport to Success in a Hi-Tech World’ and it is highlighted by Socrates’ phrase “The best way to live is to constantly seek the way to become better”.

Appendix 8

Combined scores
Leadership style: task or people-oriented
1. School heads should be accessible to teachers at all times
2. School heads should be accessible to students at all times
3. School should focus on students rather than on teachers’ welfare
4. Satisfied staff is the key to success in leading change
5. Teachers should apply through formal channels of hierarchy if they wish to express their view or make a complaint

Inclusive vision
1. All students should be given an equal chance to realise their abilities
2. Meeting the needs of every individual student should be a top priority
3. School policy towards LDS has improved over the past years
4. Educational objectives in our era should emphasise excellence
5. Educational objectives in our era should emphasise quality of service to students
6. The main objective regarding training is that teachers will not mistake LDS for lazy students
7. School marketing does not stand in contradiction to values and care for individual students
8. With the Open Enrolment school must be sensitive to views of parents of ‘mainstream’ learners regarding the inclusion of LDS
9. Successful inclusion of LDS might affect registration
10. Special resources should be allocated to enhance LDS’ inclusion
11. It is within school responsibility to provide LDS with special equipment, such as audio-visual aids, special boards, coloured chalks.
12. Headmasters should dismiss parents of ‘regular’ students who advocate against the inclusion of LDS
13. I consider establishing an in-service assessment unit for LDS
14. It is highly important for school to set clear performance indicators for successful inclusion of LDS
15. I’m planning to offer staff more in-service training on LD

School climate
1. Students find this school attractive
2. There is a cross-departmental cooperation at school
3. Teachers work in teams
4. There is a continuous learning process in the teachers’ room
5. Teachers provide help to one another

School attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion
1. I believe that every teacher should acquire knowledge on LD
2. Most headteachers would prefer high achievers to LDS in their school
3. LDS have no more rights than any other ‘minority’ group of students with special needs
4. A school that is known for successful inclusion will eventually become less attractive to mainstream students
5. LDS are entitled to more of teachers’ time than other students
6. LDS should be placed in special classes
7. LDS should be placed in regular classes
8. LDS should be placed in regular classes alongside support learning groups
9. Only part of learning disabilities should be included in regular educational systems

Headteachers’ perceptions of inclusive curriculum
1. School curriculum should meet the needs of LDS
2. LDS in mainstream classes should adapt to all curriculum requirements

Staff perceptions of accountability and monitoring procedures
1. It is up to teachers to decide on the extent and frequency of accountability on LDS
2. Teachers’ duty of accountability is part of their job description
3. Teachers’ accountability regarding LDS should be more detailed or frequent than regarding mainstream learners

Appendix 9
Schoolheads’ questionnaire with regard to LDS’ inclusion

Background details

Number of years as school headteacher

Number of years in this school

Male/female

Number of students in school
Number of students identified as LD
Special features of school population
School name

Please answer the questions using the following key: 1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Enjoy your work!

School climate
* Students find this school attractive 1 2 3 4 5
* There is cross-departmental cooperation in this school 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers work in teams 1 2 3 4 5
* There is a continuous learning process in the teachers’ room 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers provide help to one another 1 2 3 4 5

Leadership style: task or people oriented
* School heads should be accessible to all teachers at all times 1 2 3 4 5
* School heads should be accessible to students at all times 1 2 3 4 5
* School should focus on students’ rather than on teachers’ welfare 1 2 3 4 5
* Satisfied teachers are the key to success in leading change 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers should apply through formal channels of hierarchy if they wish to express their view or make a complaint 1 2 3 4 5
* The best way to increase teachers’ motivation is:
  1. Show interest in their work
  2. Provide them with constant professional support
  3. Send them a note of appreciation
  4. Reward them financially
  5. Praise them in public
  6. Other
Visionary leadership
* All students should be given an equal chance to realise their abilities 1 2 3 4 5
* Meeting the needs of every individual student should be a top priority 1 2 3 4 5
* School policy towards LDS has improved over the past years 1 2 3 4 5
* School educational objectives in our era should emphasise excellence 1 2 3 4 5
* School educational objectives in our era should emphasise quality of service to students 1 2 3 4 5
* The main objective regarding training is that teachers will not mistake LDS for lazy students 1 2 3 4 5
* School marketing does not stand in contradiction to values and care for individual students 1 2 3 4 5
* With the Open Enrolment, school must be sensitive to views of parents of ‘mainstream’ learners regarding the inclusion of LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Successful inclusion of LDS might affect registration 1 2 3 4 5
* Special resources should be allocated to enhance LDS’ inclusion 1 2 3 4 5
* It is within school responsibility to provide LDS with special equipment, such as audio-visual aids, special boards, coloured chalks 1 2 3 4 5
* Headmasters should dismiss parents of ‘regular’ students who advocate against the inclusion of LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* I consider establishing an in-service assessment unit for LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* I’m planning to offer staff more in-service training on LD 1 2 3 4 5

Attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion
* I believe that every teacher should acquire knowledge about LD 1 2 3 4 5
* Most headteachers would prefer high achievers to LDS in their school 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS have no more rights than any other ‘minority’ group of students with special needs 1 2 3 4 5
* A school that is known for a successful inclusion will eventually become less attractive to mainstream students 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS are entitled to more of teachers’ time than mainstream students 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in special classes 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes alongside support learning groups 1 2 3 4 5
* Only part of learning disabilities should be included in regular educational systems 1 2 3 4 5

Headteachers’ perceptions of inclusive curriculum
* School curriculum should meet the needs of LDS and ‘tailor’ a special curriculum for them 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS in mainstream classes should adapt to all curriculum requirements 1 2 3 4 5

Headteachers’ perceptions of SEN support staff for mainstream teachers
* School should provide teachers with professional and personal support in their handling of LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers’ complaints regarding LDS should be treated with respect 1 2 3 4 5

Perceptions of accountability and monitoring procedures
* It is up to teachers to make the decision as regards the frequency of
accountability on LDS  1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers’ duty of accountability on LDS should be more detailed or frequent than on mainstream learners  1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers’ duty of accountability is part of their job description  1 2 3 4 5

Definitions and assumptions regarding learning disabilities
*Please list three features of LDS

* Try to define learning disabilities

* Learning disabilities and learning difficulties are the same  1 2 3 4 5

* Some learning disabilities are more difficult to handle than others  1 2 3 4 5

* Encouragement and attention make an adequate basis for teachers’ success with LD students  1 2 3 4 5
* Learning disability can be controlled by minimising tests materials and assignments  1 2 3 4 5
* ‘Remedial’ teaching’ and ‘one-on-one’ teaching are the same  1 2 3 4 5
* LDs can be gifted  1 2 3 4 5

Attitudes towards inclusion of LDS

* I believe that every teacher should acquire knowledge about learning disabilities  1 2 3 4 5
* Most headteachers would prefer high achievers to LDS in their school  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS have no more rights than any other ‘minority’ group of students with special needs  1 2 3 4 5
* A school that is known for a successful inclusion will eventually become less attractive to mainstream students  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS are entitled to more of teachers’ time than other student  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in special classes  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes alongside support learning groups  1 2 3 4 5
* Only part of learning disabilities should be included in regular educational systems  1 2 3 4 5
* Which of the following indicates best a successful inclusion:
1. Students’ achievements
2. Lack of discipline problems
3. Students’ general satisfaction
4. Other
* Rank the following factors of a successful inclusion of LDS according to their significance:
1. Extra-curricular assistance
2. Teacher’s personality
3. A general feeling of comfort in class
4. Peers’ help
5. Students’ motivation
6. Students’ parental support
7. Other
   * School should allocate resources to improve LDS’ inclusion 1 2 3 4 5
   * School should be involved with assessment procedures 1 2 3 4 5
   * I am satisfied with staff attitudes towards LDS 1 2 3 4 5
   * I am satisfied with the level of inclusion in this school 1 2 3 4 5

Structures for the identification and inclusion of LDS

* A SEN coordinator is keeping LD’s interests 1 2 3 4 5
* All complaints regarding implementation should be addressed to:
  1. The homeroom teacher
  2. The counselor
  3. The headteacher
  4. Most complaints should be disregarded
* If a student’s disability has not been properly diagnosed:
  1. School management bears the responsibility
  2. School counselor bears the responsibility
  3. The homeroom teacher bears the responsibility
  4. The parents bear the responsibility
  5. Other
* If a student has not been referred to an assessment
  1. School management should bear the responsibility
  2. The counselor should bear the responsibility
  3. The homeroom teacher should bear the responsibility
  4. The parents should bear the responsibility
  5. Other
* LDS are taught by special education teachers 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS are taught be mainstream teachers 1 2 3 4 5
* School’s pedagogic committee cannot veto test accommodations 1 2 3 4 5
* A student’s functioning at school is related to test accommodations 1 2 3 4 5
* Should a gap be detected between the student’s actual functioning and test accommodations, the pedagogic committee is entitled to decide 1 2 3 4 5
* The work of the pedagogic committee regarding LDS is efficient 1 2 3 4 5

Staff training on LDS

* In-service teachers’ training on LD has been offered in this school
  1. Never
  2. Once
  3. Two to three times
  4. More than three times
* Most teachers in this school have had some training on LD 1 2 3 4 5

Thanks for your time and cooperation 😊

Tsafi Timor
Specialist and homeroom teachers’ questionnaire with regard to LDS’ inclusion

Background Details

Number of years as a teacher

Number of years in this school

Male/female

Subject of teaching

Homeroom teacher Y/N

School name

Please answer the questions using the following key: 1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Enjoy your work!

School climate
* Students find this school attractive 1 2 3 4 5
* There is cross-departmental cooperation in this school 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers work in teams 1 2 3 4 5
* School policy towards LDS has changed over the past years 1 2 3 4 5
* There is a continuous learning process in the teachers’ room 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers provide help to one another 1 2 3 4 5

Definitions and assumptions regarding LD
* Based on your experience, list three features of LDs

* Try to define learning disabilities

* Learning disabilities and learning difficulties are the same 1 2 3 4 5
* Some learning disabilities are more difficult to handle than others 1 2 3 4 5
* Encouragement and attention make adequate basis for teachers’ success with LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Learning disabilities can be controlled by minimising tests materials and assignments 1 2 3 4 5
* ‘Remedial teaching’ and ‘one-on-one’ teaching are the same 1 2 3 4 5
* Some teachers manage with LDS better than others 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS can be gifted 1 2 3 4 5

Teachers’ training on LDS
* Have you ever been offered an in-service teacher training on learning disabilities in this school?
  1. Never
  2. Once
  3. Two to three times
  4. More than three times
* How many LD training sessions have you attended? 0 1 2 3 4 more
* How many LD training sessions have you attended in the course of
Attitudes regarding LDS' inclusion
*LDS should be placed in regular/special classes (circle the suitable answer)
* Some learning disabilities should be included in regular schools whereas others should not  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes alongside support groups  1 2 3 4 5
* I am satisfied with attitudes towards LD in this school  1 2 3 4 5
* I would join LD training course offered by my school leaders  1 2 3 4 5
* I believe that LDS are entitled to more of teachers’ time
  than ‘mainstream’ students or students with other needs  1 2 3 4 5
* I believe that LDS learning career should be handled by expert teachers  1 2 3 4 5
* LDS learning career should be handled by qualified members of staff  1 2 3 4 5
* Every teacher should be trained to handle LDS  1 2 3 4 5

Perceptions of school structures for LDS
* What do you do when you suspect you have a student with learning disabilities in your class?
  1. Encourage the student to go to an assessment
  2. Talk directly to student’s parents about it
  3. Talk to his/her homeroom teacher
  4. Consult the school counselor
  5. Tell myself to mind my own business
  6. Other
* I feel adequately involved in the process of assessment of my LDS  1 2 3 4 5
* I would like to increase the extent of my involvement in the process  1 2 3 4 5
* I am satisfied with the information offered to me pre and post assessment  1 2 3 4 5
* I often feel doubtful about correctly interpreting a student’s learning disability  1 2 3 4 5
* I sometimes disagree with assessment findings based on my class experience with the student  1 2 3 4 5
* I would like to have a School Assessment and Treatment Unit for LDS  1 2 3 4 5
* School’s pedagogic committee cannot veto test accommodations  1 2 3 4 5
* The student’s functioning at school is taken into consideration regarding the test accommodations he/she is provided with  1 2 3 4 5
* Should a gap be detected between the student’s actual functioning and test accommodations, the pedagogic committee is entitled to decide  1 2 3 4 5

The process of inclusion of LDS
* Some of the problems of having LDS in class are:
  1. They constantly fall behind the class  1 2 3 4 5
  2. They never stop complaining  1 2 3 4 5
  3. They can’t cope with class speed in writing  1 2 3 4 5
  4. Their belongings are always messed up  1 2 3 4 5
  5. They always seem to be involved in troubles  1 2 3 4 5
  6. Their concentration span is very short  1 2 3 4 5
  7. Their parents are too much involved  1 2 3 4 5
  8. Other
* Some of the problems regarding tests administration are:
  1. I often have to remain in class during recess  1 2 3 4 5
2. I often can’t read their handwriting 1 2 3 4 5
3. I have to split every test into two or three sessions 1 2 3 4 5
4. I am sometimes required to put up a special test for a single student 1 2 3 4 5
5. I often have to record a test for a single student 1 2 3 4 5
6. Their parents call me before almost every test 1 2 3 4 5
7. Other
* I get adequate support from school regarding LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Which of the following indicates best a successful inclusion?
  1. Student’s achievements
  2. Lack of discipline problems
  3. Student’s general satisfaction
  4. Other
* Rank the factors of a successful LD inclusion according to their significance:
  1. Extra-curricular assistance
  2. Teacher’s personality
  3. A general feeling of comfort in class
  4. Peers’ help
  5. Student’s motivation
  6. Student’s parental support
  7. Other
* Accountability procedures regarding ‘regular’ and LD students are the same 1 2 3 4 5
* It is up to teachers to make the decision as regards the frequency of accountability on LDS
* It is highly important for a school to set clear performance indicators for successful inclusion of LDS 1 2 3 4 5

Inclusive curriculum
* I find school curriculum flexible towards LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS are provided with adequate support by school 1 2 3 4 5
* My view is taken into consideration regarding learning support for LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* School is responsible for ‘tailoring’ a curriculum to LDS’ needs 1 2 3 4 5

Thanks for your cooperation :-)

Tsafi Timor
Questionnaire for school counselor regarding LDS’ inclusion

Background Details

Number of years as a counselor
Number of years in this school
Male/female
School name

Please answer the following questions using the following key: 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. Enjoy your work!

School climate
* Students find this school attractive    1 2 3 4 5
* There is cross-departmental cooperation in this school    1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers work in teams    1 2 3 4 5
* School policy towards LDS has changed over the past years    1 2 3 4 5
* There is a continuous learning process in the teachers’ room    1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers provide help to one another    1 2 3 4 5

Definitions and assumptions regarding learning disabilities
* Based on your experience, list three features of LDS

* Try to define learning disabilities.

* Some learning disabilities are more difficult to cope with than others    1 2 3 4 5
* Some teachers can handle LDS better than others    1 2 3 4 5
* Learning disabilities and learning difficulties are the same    1 2 3 4 5

* LDS can be gifted    2 3 4 5

* Learning disabilities can be controlled by minimising test materials and assignments    1 2 3 4 5
* ‘Remedial teaching’ and ‘one-on-one teaching’ are the same    1 2 3 4 5
* Encouragement and attention make an adequate basis for teachers’ success with LDS    1 2 3 4 5

Attitudes towards LDS’ inclusion
* School counselors should be trained to handle personal and learning problems of LDS    1 2 3 4 5
* School counselors should be trained in teaching methods suitable for LDS    1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in special classes    1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes    1 2 3 4 5
* LDS should be placed in regular classes alongside support learning groups    1 2 3 4 5
* Part of the learning disabilities should be included in mainstream educational systems    1 2 3 4 5
* The level of inclusion in this school is satisfactory 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS are entitled to more of teachers’ time than mainstream students or students with other needs 1 2 3 4 5
* The learning career of LDS should be handled by qualified members of staff 1 2 3 4 5
* Every teacher should be trained to handle LDS 1 2 3 4 5

Staff training on LDS

* This school has offered in-service teachers’ training on LD
  1. Never
  2. Once
  3. Two to three times
  4. More than three times
* How many LD training sessions have you attended? 0 1 2 3 4 more
* How many LD training sessions have you attended in the course of your studies? 0 1 2 3 4 more

Perceptions of structures for LDS

* In most cases learning disabilities are detected by:
  1. A homeroom teacher
  2. A specialist teacher
  3. The student himself/herself
  4. A poor learning profile
  5. His/her parents
* I sometimes disagree with assessment findings 1 2 3 4 5
* The written report is addressed to:
  1. School
  2. Parents (student’s home)
  3. The counselor
  4. The homeroom teacher
  5. Other
* Assessment results are communicated to the relevant staff members
  - In full
  - Only relevant parts are handed out to the relevant teachers
* In order to ensure that teachers interpret test accommodations properly, the following procedures are taken:
  - Informal talks are conducted with individual teachers
  - Explanations are provided during teachers’ meetings
  - Areas of difficulties are detected by counselor-student talks
  - Other
* I feel adequately involved in the process of assessment of my LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* I would like to increase the extent of my involvement in the process 1 2 3 4 5
* I would like to have a school assessment and treatment unit for LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* If a student’s disability has not been properly diagnosed
  1. School management bears the responsibility
  2. The counselor bears the responsibility
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3. The homeroom teacher bears the responsibility
4. The parents bear the responsibility
5. Other
* If a student has not been referred to an assessment or has been referred too late
  1. School management bears the responsibility
  2. The counselor’s bears the responsibility
  3. The homeroom teacher bears the responsibility
  4. The parents bear the responsibility
  5. Other
* School’s pedagogic committee cannot veto test accommodations 1 2 3 4 5
* Student’s functioning at school is taken into consideration regarding test accommodations he/she is provided with 1 2 3 4 5
* Should a gap be detected between the student’s actual functioning and test accommodations, the pedagogic committee is entitled to decide  1 2 3 4 5

The process of inclusion of LDS
* Rank the following factors of a successful inclusion of LDS according to their significance:
  1. Extra-curricular assistance
  2. Teacher’s personality
  3. A general feeling of comfort in class
  4. Peers’ help
  5. Student’s motivation
  6. Student’s parental support
  7. Other
* Some of the problems of having LDS in class are:
  1. They constantly fall behind the class 1 2 3 4 5
  2. They never stop complaining 1 2 3 4 5
  3. They can’t cope with class speed in writing 1 2 3 4 5
  4. Their belongings are always messed up 1 2 3 4 5
  5. They always seem to be involved in troubles 1 2 3 4 5
  6. Their concentration span is very short 1 2 3 4 5
  7. Their parents are too much involved 1 2 3 4 5
  8. Other
* Some of the problems regarding the administration of tests are:
  1. Teachers often have to remain in class during recess 1 2 3 4 5
  2. Teachers can’t read their handwriting 1 2 3 4 5
  3. Teachers have to split every test into two or three sessions 1 2 3 4 5
  4. Teachers are sometimes required to put up a special test for a single student 1 2 3 4 5
  5. Teachers often have to record a test for a single student 1 2 3 4 5
  6. Parents call teachers before almost every test 1 2 3 4 5
  7. Other
* LDS often need to become their own self-advocates and fight for their rights 1 2 3 4 5
* All complaints regarding the implementation are usually addressed to:
  1. School counselor
  2. School head
  3. Homeroom teacher
4. The press
5. Other
* Teachers often complain of manageability problems with LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Teachers get adequate support from school regarding LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Which of the following indicates best a successful inclusion?
  1. Student’s achievements
  2. Lack of discipline problems
  3. Student’s general satisfaction
  4. Other
* Accountability procedures regarding mainstream and LDS in your school are the same 1 2 3 4 5
* It is up to teachers to make the decision regarding the frequency of accountability on LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Each teacher is asked to fill-in reports for LDS in addition to reports regarding all students
  1. Once a trimester/semester
  2. Once a year
  3. No specific reports are required
* If a teacher refuses to apply the special test accommodations of LDS:
  1. School counselor should interfere immediately
  2. School counselor should instruct the student how to advocate his case
  3. The matter should be passed on to the school head
  4. The second option should be tried and only then counselor should interfere
* It is highly important for school to set clear performance indicators for successful inclusion of LDS 1 2 3 4 5

Inclusive curriculum
* Every school is responsible for tailoring a curriculum according to LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* I find the curriculum of this school reasonably flexible towards LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* LDS are provided with adequate support by school 1 2 3 4 5
* School counselors play a major role in decisions regarding learning support for LDS 1 2 3 4 5
* Categorisation criteria for learning support groups are:
  1. Class schedule constraints
  2. Student’s weaknesses and strengths
  3. Gender division,
  4. Other
* Students’ views are taken into consideration regarding support 1 2 3 4 5

Thanks for your cooperation ☺
Tsafi Timor
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