2.5
2.8
2.2
3.2
3.6
2.0
4.0
100 mm
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.8
1.6
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz1234567890
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
1234567890
1.0 mm
1.5 mm
2.0 mm
A5

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 348 EC 231 157

AUTHOR Wheeler, John J.; And Others

TITLE A Validation of Social Skill Behaviors across Educational Settings Serving Students with Behavior Disorders.

PUB DATE Apr 90

NOTE 41p.; Paper based on paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (68th, Toronto, Canada, April 23-27, 1990).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Disorders; *Behavior Rating Scales; Classroom Environment; *Emotional Disturbances; *Interpersonal Competence; Mainstreaming; Secondary Education; *Social Behavior; Special Education Teachers; Student Behavior; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Phase I of this study sought to identify the specific social skills that 21 teachers of students with serious emotional disturbances (SED) and nine regular education teachers deemed as essential for successful classroom functioning. Subjects were asked to list such behaviors in four categories: environmental behaviors, interpersonal behaviors, self-related behaviors, and task-related behaviors. The resulting list of 214 behaviors was collapsed into a 34-item social skill ranking list. In Phase II, the list was administered to 53 regular education teachers and 68 special education teachers. In Phase III, the list was administered to 129 students in regular and special education junior high and high school programs in southern Illinois. Results indicated that there is a generic set of social skills agreed upon by teachers as being important for successful classroom functioning across special and regular education settings. There was a general level of agreement on the social skills which the teachers ranked as most/least important to functioning successfully in the classroom. Student groups were generally aware of the social skills which were most/least important to teachers in the classrooms. The paper includes a list of 26 references and a copy of the Social Skills Ranking List. (JDD)

A Validation of Social Skill Behaviors Across Educational Settings Serving Students with Behavior Disorders

John J. Wheeler, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Division of Special Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
The University of South Dakota

Sidney R. Miller, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Special Education
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale

Wendy Polsky Wheeler, M.S., CCC-SLP
Speech/Language Clinician
Southeast Area Cooperative
Beresford, South Dakota

Running Head: SOCIAL VALIDATION

Abstract

One issue which remains unanswered by existing research investigations concerns the identification and validation of critical social skills needed by students with Serious Emotional Disturbances (SED) to successfully move from restrictive residential settings to less restrictive educational and community settings. The purpose of this study was to first identify the specific social skills teachers from special education settings serving students with SED and students with no known handicapping conditions deemed as essential for successful classroom functioning. Secondly, this study sought to determine if teachers from junior high and high school regular education, special education self-contained, and special education residential settings were in general agreement regarding the rank ordering of these social skills in terms of most/least importance. A third purpose was to determine if students from these same settings could identify which skills were most-least important to teachers. The results of this study indicate that all but one of the 66 positive correlations in and among teacher and student groups were significant at the .05 level. The classroom implications provided from this research are also discussed.

Introduction

Recent research investigations into transitional programming for students with special needs has primarily focused on the transition of students with moderate and severe handicaps from school to employment and community options (Bates, 1985; Revell, Wehman, & Arnold, 1984; Rusch, 1986). Few studies have attempted to identify and examine the transitional needs of students identified as Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) when attempting to move these students from restrictive to less restrictive educational settings (McConnell, 1987; Walker, 1984, 1986).

The urgency for research in this area with students identified as SED is made apparent by current research findings which indicate SED students are failing at a high rate as they attempt to move from highly restrictive residential educational settings back into community-based public schools. Data from the Department of Mental Health in the State of Illinois indicates that nearly 50 percent of students identified as SED, who are placed into community-based public schools after having been institutionalized, return to residential facilities within the first year (Miller, 1985). It has also been reported by Grosenick (1986) that only 20 percent of public school students identified as SED are reintegrated successfully into regular classrooms each year after having been placed in residential mental health facilities.

A major contributing factor to the problem of unsuccessful transition from restrictive to less-restrictive educational settings for students with SED has been social skill deficits (Green, Vosk, Forehand, Beck, & Vosk, 1980; Kauffman, 1985; Pollack, Levenstein, & Klein, 1968; Simpson, 1987). Social skill deficits have also been identified as one of the major factors associated with poor academic achievement, school expulsion, social avoidance, delinquency, job termination, and avoidance of group activities (Brolin, Elliot, & Corcoran, 1984; Emerich, 1966; Gable, 1984; Greenspan & Shoultz, 1981; O'Conner, 1972). In light of these findings it is essential that the area of social skills be examined from a more critical perspective if students with SED are to successfully reintegrate into community-based schools upon release from mental health residential facilities. Early research conducted by Stephens (1978) surveyed teachers and conducted field observations which identified an extensive list of social skills found to be important in school settings. However, Stephens' (1978) investigation did not specify the skills required in differing educational environments nor if differences existed among these settings regarding requisite skills. Research efforts by Walker (1984, 1986) and Walker and Rankin (1983) have contributed to significant developments in the identification and assessment of behavioral demands required of students with handicaps in mainstreamed educational settings. Recent research investigations have also attempted to identify teachers' judgment of problem behaviors across regular and special education settings

(Safran & Safran, 1987; Safran, Safran, & Barcikowski, 1988). Although these investigations have added considerably to the area of social skills research, questions still remain.

One issue unanswered by recent investigations concerns the identification and validation of critical social skills needed by students with SED to successfully move from highly restrictive residential settings to less restrictive educational and community settings. Validated social skills which teachers consider to be essential for successful functioning in educational settings must be identified across the continuum of educational settings serving students with SED if students with SED are to successfully move from one environment to the next.

The purpose of this study was fourfold and sought:

- First, to identify the specific social skills teachers deemed as essential for successful classroom performance across educational settings serving students with behavior disorders and students with no known handicapping conditions;
- Second, to determine if teachers across these settings were in general agreement regarding the rank ordering of these skills in terms of their importance;
- Third, to determine if students across settings could identify which skills were most important to their teachers for

successful classroom functioning in their specific educational settings; and

- Fourth, to determine if students from the various six subgroups were in general agreement with each other concerning their perceptions of which social skills were most or least important to teachers.

Method

Subjects/Settings

Phase I

The subjects participating in Phase I (Preliminary Survey of Teachers) of the study were 30 certified teachers (21 special education teachers certified in the area of behavior disorders and 9 regular education teachers). The subjects utilized in Phase I were volunteers obtained from an accessible population of teachers enrolled in special education summer session training courses at a large midwestern university. All 30 subjects who participated in Phase I were certified teachers either in regular education or special education with certification in the area of behavior disorders and currently teaching at the elementary, junior high, or secondary levels in the state of Illinois. See Table 1 for a demographic overview of the subjects who participated in Phase I.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Phase II

The subjects participating in Phase II (Social Skill Rank Order Survey of Teachers) were 121 certified regular and special education i.e., certified in the area of Behavior Disorders) teachers from restrictive and nonrestrictive public and/or private school settings throughout southern Illinois. The regular education teachers who participated as subjects in Phase II were currently teaching regular education students with no known handicapping conditions at the junior high and high school levels. The special education teachers who served as subjects in Phase II were currently teaching students with behavior disorders in the following settings: Junior High Special Education (i.e., self-contained classrooms in a community-based school), Junior High Special Education Residential (i.e., special school where students also reside), High School Special Education (i.e., self-contained classrooms in a community-based school), and High School Special Education Residential (i.e., special school where students also reside).

The regular education teachers were randomly selected attendees at a region-wide teachers' conference held in southern Illinois. This sampling method was used because of the high proportion of regular education personnel attending this conference. There were few special education

teachers attending the conference, thus necessitating that the special education teachers be sampled via mailed surveys. The special education teachers serving as subjects in Phase II were currently teaching in 16 out of a total of 19 special education cooperatives serving students with behavior disorders in the southern 36 counties of Illinois. These programs were identified from the Illinois State Board of Education's Public School Districts and Schools Manual, 1986-87. Teacher responses were then solicited using a mailed survey procedure. The demographic variables of the Phase II students are listed in Table 2. See Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here.

Phase III

The subjects who participated in Phase III of the study were 129 junior high and high school students from six regular and special education/ behavior disorders programs throughout the southern Illinois region. These programs were located in communities which ranged in population from approximately 1,900 to 28,000 residents. The regular education students who participated as subjects in Phase III were students with no known handicapping conditions who were enrolled in either Junior High and/or High School programs. The special education students who participated in Phase III were students who were enrolled in either Junior High and/or

High School Special Education Self-contained programs or Junior High and/or High School Residential programs serving students with behavior disorders. The sampling procedure utilized in Phase III of the study consisted of schools who met the established criteria being identified from the Illinois State Board of Education's Public School Districts and Schools Manual, 1986-87. The schools were then randomly selected until one school was selected to represent each of the six groups. The only exception to this occurred with the junior high and high school residential groups. There was no random selection used with these two groups because there was only one state institution/residential facility in the sampling region. The demographic data for Phase III respondents is displayed in Table 3. See Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here.

Geographic Area

This study was conducted within 36 southern Illinois counties. Southern Illinois is defined as the geographic area bounded on the east by the Ohio River and on the west by the Mississippi River, on the north by Interstate 70, and on the south by the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

Procedures

Phase I Procedures

This study was conducted in three phases. During Phase I (Preliminary Survey of Teachers) 30 volunteer certified teachers (21 special education teachers certified in the area of behavior disorders and 9 regular education teachers) who were enrolled in summer session courses at a large midwestern university were solicited and asked to complete a survey. The survey solicited from the respondents demographic data such as grade level they were currently teaching, type of school and classroom setting, if they were a special or regular education teacher, types of students served (i.e., type of handicapping conditions), highest educational degree earned, and gender. The demographic data was used to measure the homogeneity of respondents. The second portion of the survey asked the teachers to list the social skill behaviors they considered as essential for functioning in their respective classrooms under the following categories: Environmental Behaviors (i.e., the student's behavior in relation to the physical environment and care of the classroom and classroom materials); Interpersonal Behaviors (i.e., the student's social interaction with peers/teacher in the classroom); Self-related Behaviors (i.e., the student's physical self-care and behavioral self-management skills); and Task-related Behaviors (i.e., any behaviors which are directly related to the completion of academic and/or nonacademic tasks assigned by the teacher). The four major categories used were those

identified by Stephens (1978) and were selected because they generally reflected the major behavioral skills areas most frequently described in the existing social skill literature. The results of the Phase I survey generated a list of 214 behaviors.

The 214 behaviors were typewritten as they appeared on the surveys and were given to a panel of experts comprised of the investigator, one Master's, and one Doctoral Special Education graduate student for independent examination. Prior to the independent examination the investigator instructed both panel members to read through the behavioral definitions of each of the four categories and to then re-read each of the 214 behaviors and record the first letter of the category in which they felt the behavior belonged. As an example, if the rater felt the behavior warranted classification under the category of interpersonal behaviors an "I" was placed next to the particular behavior. This process was continued until all behaviors were independently classified by each of the raters. Inter-rater reliability measures were then taken on all 214 behaviors across all three raters. Following the reliability assessments the panel convened and discussed any disagreements occurring between raters. Any disagreement concerning the classification of a behavior was discussed jointly among panel members until unanimous agreement was reached.

Based on the reliability assessments and subsequent discussions among panel members the behaviors were placed in the appropriate categories (i.e.,

environmental, interpersonal, self-related, task-related) by the panel. The list of behaviors was then typewritten and sequentially numbered for each category and examined independently by the investigator and another panel member to determine the frequency that each behavior was cited in an effort to reduce and collapse the 214 items into a more succinct list. The method in which this was done is described as follows: The raters read each behavior on the list beginning with the first behavior. The raters then read through the remaining behaviors included in that particular category in an attempt to identify the same behavior occurring on the list. The rules for scoring were as follows: if the raters discovered that the remaining behaviors were (a) stated in an identical manner, or (b) generally stated the same way based on key descriptors found in both of the statements, then the compatible behavior statements were numbered with the number of the original behavior statement from which the comparison was made. Inter-rater reliability measures were taken to measure the level of concurring agreement between raters. Using a modified Delphi method the compatible behavior statements were then collapsed and rewritten and were placed according to category in a random fashion to compile a 34-item social skill ranking list which is illustrated in Table 4. See Table 4.

- -

Insert Table 4 about here.

- -

Phase II Procedures

The 34-item social skill ranking list accompanied by the same demographic data sheet as described in Phase I was then randomly administered by the investigator and an assistant to 53 regular education teachers (27 junior high and 26 high school) who were attendees at a region-wide teachers' conference for teachers in southern Illinois. The investigator and data collection assistant randomly approached teachers in the main exhibition hall at the conference and asked the teachers if they were certified regular education teachers and if they desired to volunteer as subjects in the research project. The teachers who volunteered to complete the survey were then administered the 34-item Social Rank Order Survey. They were asked to rank order the list of social skills according to those considered most/least important for successful classroom functioning, in each of the four categories from most important to least important.

The 68 special education personnel who served as subjects in Phase II were employed in 16 of the 19 special education cooperative districts which operated junior high and high school programs for students with behavior disorders within the 36-county southern Illinois region. Once these programs were identified, a packet containing cover letters to program administrators, Human Subjects Release Forms, cover letters to teacher respondents, and surveys were then mailed to each of the program administrators. The teachers from these districts were asked to please

return the completed surveys within ten working days. If the surveys were not returned within ten working days, a follow-up letter was sent. All surveys were numbered to assist in organizing and tabulating the return rate. Of the 19 total special education districts surveyed, teachers in 16 of these districts responded with one or more surveys being completed and returned.

Phase III Procedures

The procedure utilized in Phase III of the study consisted of administering the 34-item Social Skill Ranking List, as was administered to teachers in Phase II, to students. Once school programs were identified as meeting the subject and setting criteria, program administrators were contacted to seek permission to solicit student volunteers to participate in the study. Upon obtaining administrative consent, the investigator personally contacted the individual teachers from the targeted programs and gave instructions on how to administer the survey to students. The classroom teachers were asked to administer the surveys to students to reduce any possible reactive effects that might have occurred if the investigator administered them (Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Students from the individual programs were also informed by the classroom teacher about the survey and were asked if they wished to volunteer. Those students volunteering to participate in the study were each given a survey complete with directions attached. However, prior to students completing the survey the classroom teacher read aloud the directions in order to better ensure that students

understood what they were to do. Teachers were instructed by the investigator to lend assistance only if the students could not read a word or if they had questions regarding the directions.

The students were asked to rank order the same 34-item list of social skills administered to teachers in Phase II. They were instructed to rank order the skills they perceived to be most to least important to teachers for successful classroom functioning. There were 135 surveys administered to students from 6 regular and special education junior high and high school programs in southern Illinois. Six surveys were eliminated from the sample because they were not completed in their entirety.

Reliability Procedures

Inter-rater reliability was used to measure the percent of agreement between the investigator and the masters and doctoral raters following the Phase I data collection, in categorizing the Phase I data, and also in determining the frequency of behaviors cited by the 21 special educators and 9 regular educators as essential school-related social skills. Inter-rater reliability was calculated by agreements being divided by agreements plus disagreements and multiplied by 100. In this study, an agreement was scored when both rates placed the same category code next to the same behavior listed on the social skill list.

Inter-rater reliability was computed among the three panel members in categorizing the behaviors obtained in Phase I. The average inter-rater reliability among the panel members across all 214 behaviors from Phase I was 89%. The overall reliability score between the investigator and panel member A (doctoral-level student) across all 214 behaviors was 89%. The overall reliability score obtained between the investigator and panel member B (masters-level student) was 92%. The overall reliability score obtained between panel member A and panel member B was 87%.

The inter-rater reliability scores obtained between the investigator and panel member A (doctoral-level student) during the frequency tabulation of Phase I data ranged from 88% to 98% across all four categories of behaviors with the average inter-rater reliability score of all categories being 93%.

Results

The results from the survey of teachers and students, Phases II (Teacher *vs.* Teacher Rankings) and III (Student *vs.* Teacher, Student *vs.* Student Rankings) of the study are presented in the following section. All data derived were analyzed using the Statistic Analysis Systems (1984). The median rankings from each group on each of the 34 items were calculated to derive the Spearman Rank Order Correlation. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation was used to determine the correlation among and

between the groups of teachers and students on the 34-item list. The Spearman Correlation coefficients are illustrated in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here.

Phase II

The correlation coefficients among the six teacher groups ranged from .80 to .91 with all correlations among and between teacher subgroups being positive and significant at the .05 level of significance. Comparisons of compatible teacher subgroups (e.g., Regular Education Junior High and High School) indicated that the correlations between the regular education teacher groups resulted in a correlation coefficient of .91, which was significant at the .05 level of significance. Correlations among junior high and high school special education teachers resulted in a correlation coefficient of .80, also significant at the .05 level. The correlation between responses obtained from the special education junior high and high school residential teachers yielded a correlation coefficient of .89, which was also significant at the .05 level.

The correlations derived from comparisons between regular education teacher groups and special education teacher groups were all found to be significant at the .05 level. Correlations between group T1 (Regular Education Junior High Teachers) and T3 (Special Education Junior High

Residential Teachers) resulted in correlation coefficients of .86 and .82, respectively). Correlations between group T4 (Regular Education High School Teachers) and groups T5 (Special Education High School Teachers) and T6 (Special Education High School Residential Teachers) resulted in correlation coefficients of .88 and .85, respectively.

Phase III

Correlations between all teacher and student subgroups yielded positive and significant correlations at the .05 level of significance. The correlation coefficients obtained from these groups ranged from .36 to .86. The lowest correlation found between teacher and student subgroups was .36, which occurred between groups T2 (Special Education Junior High School Teachers) and S6 (Special Education High School Residential Students). The highest correlation coefficient (i.e., .86) occurred between groups T1 (Regular Education Junior High School Teachers) and S4 (Regular Education High School Students).

The correlation coefficients occurring between compatible teacher and student subgroups are as follows. For groups T1 and S1 (Regular Education Junior High School) a correlation coefficient of .50 resulted. For groups T2 and S2 (Special Education Junior High School) a correlation coefficient of .50 resulted. Groups T3 and S3 (Special Education Junior High School Residential) yielded a correlation coefficient of .66. For groups T4 and S4 (Regular Education High School) a correlation coefficient of .85 resulted.

Groups T5 and S5 (Special Education High School) yielded a correlation coefficient of .65. And finally, for groups T6 and S6 (Special Education High School Residential) a correlation coefficient of .52 resulted.

The correlation coefficients derived from comparisons of student groups ranged from .15 to .80. All but one of the correlations between student groups were statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. The nonsignificant correlation of .15 occurred between student groups S2 (Special Education Junior High) and S3 (Special Education Junior High Residential). The highest correlation occurred between groups S1 (Regular Education Junior High School Students) and S5 (Special Education High School Students), which resulted in a correlation coefficients of .80. The correlation coefficients for compatible student groups are as follows. For groups S1 (Regular Education Junior High School) and S4 (Regular Education High School) a correlation coefficients of .74 resulted. Groups S2 (Special Education Junior High) and S5 (Special Education High School) yielded a correlation coefficients of .65. The lowest correlation between compatible student groups occurred between groups S3 (Special Education Junior High Residential) and S6 (Special Education High School Residential), which resulted in a correlation coefficients of .55.

Correlations between regular education and special education student groups resulted in the following. Group S1 (Regular Education Junior High) and S2 (Special Education Junior High) yielded a correlation coefficients of

.59. For groups S1 and S3 (Special Education Junior High Residential) a correlation coefficient of .54 resulted. For groups S4 (Regular Education High School) and S5 (Special Education High School) the resulting correlation coefficients was .68. For groups S4 and S6 (Special Education High School Residential) a correlation coefficients of .71 resulted.

Discussion

The findings derived from Phase I (preliminary survey of teachers) indicated that the social skills identified by teachers were similar in their nature to those identified in previous investigations by Hersh and Walker (1982). This similarity may indicate that there is a generic set of social skills agreed upon by teachers as being important for successful classroom functioning across special and regular education settings. The data obtained in Phase II (Rank Order Survey of Teachers) produced significant positive correlations at the .05 level of significance among all teacher groups (i.e., special education and regular education, and restrictive and less restrictive environments). The range of correlation coefficients between the teacher groups was .80 to .91. The results obtained in Phase II indicate that among the teacher groups surveyed there was a general level of agreement on the social skills which the teachers ranked as most/least important to functioning successfully in the classroom. The findings derived from Phase III (Rank Order Survey of Students) also resulted in positive significance correlations

at the .05 level of significance between all six compatible teacher and student groups (e.g., junior high regular education teachers and students). There were also positive significant correlations at the .05 level of significance between all teacher and student groups irrespective of whether they were compatible groups or not. Based on these results it can be inferred that student groups were generally aware of the social skills which were most/least important to teachers in the classroom. There were also significant correlations at the .05 level among student groups, with only one correlation not significant.

The results obtained from this study appear to support the findings of previous investigations (Walker & Rankin, 1983; Walker & Lamon, 1987) which demonstrated that there were strong similarities in the behavioral expectations of special and regular education teachers. The data obtained from the student responses support Gresham (1981), who stated that students may be aware of a teacher's behavioral expectations, but do not display appropriate social skill behavior due to performance deficits or because of motivational reasons.

Educational programs serving students with SED must identify if the social skills deficits displayed by students are indeed caused by inadequate skills, lack of reinforcement in school settings, and/or lack of naturally occurring reinforcers in the student's school or home life. The results from the present study suggest that differences in the behavioral demands of

teachers across restrictive and less restrictive settings are possibly not the major variables that contribute to students' poor performance within and between school environments and school and work environments. One could infer from the results of this study that the student's inability or desire to emit these behaviors is the problem. This study suggests that we need to investigate whether students' failure to respond in a socially appropriate manner is due to skill deficits or motivational reasons. Whatever the cause, the need for appropriate social skills is critical to the successful transition of students with SED within school and school and community settings. Those students found to be experiencing skill deficits must receive training in the target skills in the natural environment (i.e., school or community) with an emphasis on modeling, role playing, ad systematic feedback. The issue of motivational problems creates a more complex problem which not only includes school personnel but family as well. The need for identification of such problems is critical to remediation efforts.

Future research endeavors should attempt to replicate the findings of the present study with an independent investigator, instead of the classroom teacher, administering the instruments to students. These studies would be helpful in determining if the teachers influenced the student response in any manner. Observational studies must also be conducted in the various continua of educational settings serving nonhandicapped students as well as students with SED to determine the nature and frequency of social skills

found in these varying environments. Such information would serve as an additional measure when attempting to validate critical social skills needed for transitioning students with SED to less restrictive educational and community settings.

References

Bates, P. (1985). *Illinois transition project: Transition plan development for special education students in Illinois public schools.* Springfield, IL: Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities.

Brolin, D. E., Elliot, T. R., & Corcoran, J. R. (1984). Career education for persons with learning disabilities, *Learning Disabilities, 3*, 1-13.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Emmerick, W. (1966). Continuity and stability in early social development: II. Teacher's ratings. *Child Development, 37*, 17-27.

Gable, R. (1984). A program for pre-vocational instruction for adolescents with severe behavior disorders. In S. Braaten, R. Rutherford, Jr., and C. Kirdash (Eds.), *Programming for adolescents with behavior disorders* (Vol. 1, pp. 59-68). Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.

Gree.., K., Vosk, B., Forehand, R., Beck, S., & Vosk, B. (1980). An assessment of the relationship between measures of children's competence and children's academic achievement. *Child Development, 51*, 1149-1156.

Greenspan, S., & Shoultz, B. (1981). Why mentally retarded adults lose their jobs: Social incompetence as a factor in work adjustment. *Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 2*, 23-38.

Gresham, F. M. (1981). Social Skills training with handicapped children: A review. *Review of Education Research, 51*, 139-176.

Grosenick, J. K. (1986). *Program effectiveness: Current practices and future prospects*. Paper presented at Midwest Symposium for Leadership in Behavioral Disorders, 28 February, at Kansas City, Missouri.

Hersh, R. H., & Walker, H. (1982). *Great expectations: Making schools effective for all students*. Eugene: University of Oregon Department of Special Education.

Illinois State Board of Education (1986-1987). *Illinois public school districts and schools*. Springfield.

Kauffman, J. M. (Ed.) (1985). *Characteristics of children's behavior disorders* (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

McConnell, S. R. (1987). Entrapment effects and the generalization and maintenance of social skills training for elementary school students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 12*, 252-263.

Miller, S. R. (1985). *Transitioning SEC students from residential to community schools: A research project*, Unpublished Manuscript, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

O'Connor, R. D. (1972). The relative efficacy of modeling, shaping, and combined procedures. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 29*, 327-334.

Pollack, M., Levenstein, S., & Klein, D. F. (1968). A three-year post hospital follow-up of adolescent and adult schizophrenics. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 38*, 94-100.

Revell, G., Wehman, P., & Arnold, S. (1984). Supported work model of employment for mentally retarded persons: Implications for rehabilitative services. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 50*, 33-39.

Rusch, F. R. (Ed.) (1986). *Competitive employment issues and strategies*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Safran, J. S., & Safran, S. P. (1987). Teachers' judgment of problem behaviors. *Exceptional Children, 54*, 240-244.

Safran, S. P., Safran, J. S., & Barcikowski, R. S. (1988). Assessing teacher manageability: A factor analytic approach. *Behavioral Disorders, 13*, 245-252.

SAS Institute, Inc. (1985). *SAS user's guide: Basics, version 5 edition*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.

Stephens, T. M. (1978). *Social skills in the classroom*. Columbus, OH: Cedars Press.

Walker, H. M. (1984). The SBS program: A systematic approach to the integration of handicapped children into less restrictive settings. *Education and Treatment of Children, 6*, 421-432.

Walker, H. M. (1986). The assessment for integration into mainstream settings (AIMS) assessment system: Rationale, instrument, procedures, and outcomes. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 15*, 55-63.

Walker, H. M., & Lamon, W. E. (1987). Social behavior standards and expectations of Australian and U.S. teacher groups. *The Journal of Special Education, 21*, 56-82.

Walker, H. M., & Rankin, R. (1983). Assessing the behavioral expectations and demands of LRS (least restrictive settings). *School Psychology Review, 12*, 274-284.

TABLE 1.

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF PHASE I

SURVEY RESPONDENTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N = 30)

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF PHASE I
SURVEY RESPONDENTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N = 30)

Subject	Gender	Grade Level	$\bar{X}$ Years Experience
Regular Education Teachers	F = 8 M = 1	Elementary = 3 Jr. High = 5 High School = 1	$\bar{X}$ = 7.5 SD = 4.7
Special Education	F = 20 M = 1	Elementary = 7 Jr. High = 6 High School = 7 Itinerant = 1	$\bar{X}$ = 5.7 SD = 5.8

TABLE 2.

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF PHASE II

TEACHER RESPONDENTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N = 121)

TABLE 2

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF PHASE II
TEACHER RESPONDENTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N = 121)

Group	N	Gender	Years of Experience	Type of Setting
T1 Regular Ed.	27	7 M 20 F	$\bar{X}$ = 12.9 SD = 8.2	Regular Ed. = 17 Mainstreamed = 10
T2 Special Ed. Jr. High Residential	18	1 M 17 F	$\bar{X}$ = 8.5 SD = 5.4	Self-contained BD = 18
T3 Special Ed. Jr. High Residential	14	7 M 7 F	$\bar{X}$ = 6.9 SD = 4.7	Self-Contained BD Residential = 14
T4 Regular Ed. High School	26	11 M 15 F	$\bar{X}$ = 15.6 SD = 7.1	Regular Ed. = 13 Mainstreamed = 13
T5 Special Ed. High School	20	7 M 13 F	$\bar{X}$ = 9.9 SD = 5.9	Self-contained BD = 20
T6 Special Ed. High School Residential	16	8 M 8 F	$\bar{X}$ = 7.4 SD = 5.2	Self-contained BD Residential = 16

TABLE 3.

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF PHASE III

STUDENT RESPONDENTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N = 121)

TABLE 3

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW OF PHASE III
STUDENT RESPONDENTS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE (N = 129)

Group	N	Gender	Years of Experience	Grade Level
S1 Regular Ed. Jr. High	21	7 M 14 F	$\bar{X}$ = 12.5 SD = 1.2	Grade 6 = 8 Grade 7 = 6 Grade 8 = 7
S2 Special Ed. Jr. High	18	14 M 6 F	$\bar{X}$ = 12.8 SD = 1.5	Grade 6 = 7 Grade 7 = 6 Grade 8 = 5
S3 Special Ed. Jr. High Residential	18	12 M 6 F	$\bar{X}$ = 13.3 SD = 1.5	Grade 6 = 2 Grade 7 = 4 Grade 8 = 5 Unclassified = 5
S4 Regular Ed. High School	10	9 M 10 F	$\bar{X}$ = 15.1 SD = 1.1	Grade 9 = 8 Grade 10 = 7 Grade 11 = 0 Grade 12 = 4
S5 Special Ed. High School	24	18 M 6 F	$\bar{X}$ = 16.2 SD = 1.6	Grade 9 = 9 Grade 10 = 5 Grade 11 = 9 Grade 12 = 5 Unclassified = 1
S6 Special Ed. High School Residential	29	17 M 12 F	$\bar{X}$ = 16.3 SD = 1.0	Grade 9 = 4 Grade 10 = 5 Grade 11 = 9 Grade 12 = 4 Unclassified = 7

TABLE 4.

SOCIAL SKILL RANKING LIST

TABLE 4

SOCIAL SKILL RANKING LIST

A. ENVIRONMENTAL-RELATED SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

____ Student deposits trash in waste can and not on floor.

____ Student does not use books or classroom furniture as objects of aggression.

____ Student returns classroom materials to assigned areas.

____ Student does not physically destroy or abuse school or classroom property and/or materials.

B. INTERPERSONAL-RELATED SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

____ Student makes positive statements about others.

____ Student makes eye contact with others during conversations.

____ Student seeks permission or assistance from teacher by raising hand.

____ Student interacts with peers in a positive manner (e.g., sharing, cooperating) during leisure time and small group activities.

____ Student does no destroy classmate's property (e.g., books, pencils, paper).

____ Student verbally greets teacher and classmates.

____ Student responds positively (verbally/physically) to other's greetings.

____ Student states higher opinion in a nonthreatening manner.

____ Student waits for others to finish talking before interrupting.

____ Student refrains from verbal and physical aggression with teachers and classmates.

C. SELF-RELATED SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

____ Student does not physically hit, bite, scratch, or injure him/herself in any manner.

____ Student displays appropriate dining skills (e.g., uses napkin, eating utensils) during meals.

____ Student does not make disruptive noises during instructional time.

____ Student is able to dress appropriately with shirts and pants being buttoned correctly and shoes being tied or buckled and worn on the correct feet.

____ Student arrives at school with clean hair, face, and hands, and with hair combed, teeth brushed, and wearing clean clothes.

____ Student does not write on him/herself.

____ Student cares for personal belongings (i.e., pencils, books, paper).

____ Student makes positive comments about him/herself.

____ Student waits patiently for turn during classroom activities.

____ Student walks in and around classroom quietly without disturbing others.

D. TASK-RELATED SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

____ Student abides by classroom rules.

____ Student complies with teacher requests.

__ Student uses writing materials (e.g., pens, pencils) in an appropriate manner.

____ Student remains in seat and on task during instructional time.

____ Student gets out necessary materials for instruction.

____ Student sits quietly at seat and waits for teacher to call upon him/her.

____ Student completes in entirety homework and in-class assignments and returns them to the teacher.

____ Student remains in assigned area after teacher identifies it.

____ Student uses available time efficiently to complete in-class assignments.

____ Student independently attempts to follow the teacher's oral and/or written instructions.

TABLE 5.

SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

OF TEACHER AND STUDENT GROUPS

TABLE 5

SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
OF TEACHER AND STUDENT GROUPS

	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
T1		0.86589	0.82550	0.91327	0.86409	0.84446	0.73026	0.57906	0.49369	0.86775	0.59655	0.57191
		0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0003	0.0030	0.0001	0.0002	0.0004
T2			0.81290	0.85716	0.80161	0.83208	0.65667	0.50853	0.47180	0.78778	0.51289	0.36199
			0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0021	0.0049	0.0001	0.0019	0.0354
T3				0.80174	0.85851	0.89730	0.68731	0.50331	0.66677	0.72790	0.66981	0.51119
				0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0024	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0020
T4					0.88438	0.85729	0.79709	0.56029	0.57121	0.85892	0.71912	0.54669
					0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0006	0.0004	0.0001	0.0001	0.0008
T5						0.90382	0.71175	0.52170	0.62830	0.77216	0.65799	0.60125
						0.0001	0.0001	0.0016	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002
T6							0.64130	0.55133	0.59478	0.79164	0.62563	0.52335
							0.0001	0.0007	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0015
S1								0.59962	0.54183	0.74724	0.80364	0.66361
								0.0002	0.0009	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
S2									0.15806*	0.57934	0.65653	0.44616
									0.3720	0.0003	0.0001	0.0082
S3										0.52824	0.53725	0.55302
										0.0013	0.0011	0.0007
S4											0.68095	0.71953
											0.0001	0.0001
S5												0.67880
												0.0001
S6												

Note: N = 34. * P > .05

Legend:

T1 = Regular Ed. Jr. High Teachers
T2 = Special Ed. Jr. High Teachers
T3 = Special Ed. Jr. High Residential Teachers
T4 = Regular Ed. High School Teachers
T5 = Special Ed. High School Teacher
T6 = Special Ed. High School Residential Teachers

S1 = Regular Ed. Jr. High Students
S2 = Special Ed. Jr. High Students
S3 = Special Ed. Jr. High Residential Students
S4 = Regular Ed. High School Students
S5 = Special Ed. High School Students
S6 = Special Ed. High School Residential Students

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (68th, Toronto, Canada, April 23-27, 1990).