

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

4-18-1999

Analyzing and improving team teaching practices in Southampton Township Schools

Susan C. Schaal
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you -
share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Schaal, Susan C., "Analyzing and improving team teaching practices in Southampton Township Schools" (1999). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1881.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1881>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

ANALYZING AND IMPROVING TEAM TEACHING PRACTICES
IN SOUTHAMPTON TOWNSHIP SCHOOLS

by
Susan C. Schaal

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 1999

Approved by

Professor

Date Approved

April 18, 1999

Abstract

Susan C. Schaal

Analyzing and Improving Team Teaching
Practices in Southampton Township Schools
1999

Dr. Theodore Johnson
Educational Administration

The purpose of this study was to analyze current practices of regular and special education teachers working in inclusive settings. The methodology of this study was based on a pre and post test design. The Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP), developed by Rick Welsh, was administered prior to a four day team teaching training session, and again after the training session. This protocol was administered individually and confidentially. The sample consisted of three teams of teachers who had been team teaching together for varying amounts of time. The ITTAP was analyzed for purposes of comparison on twenty team teaching behaviors and seven team teaching domains as identified by the ITTAP. The findings revealed two of the three teaching teams illustrated clear improvement according to responses given on both team teaching behaviors and team teaching domains following training. One team did not illustrate clear improvement on both team teaching behaviors sand team teaching domains following training.

Mini-Abstract

Susan C. Schaal

Analyzing and Improving Team Teaching
Practices in Southampton Township Schools
1999

Dr. Theodore Johnson
Educational Administration

The purpose of this study was to analyze current practices of regular and special education teachers. The findings of this study revealed two of the three teaching teams illustrated clear improvement following training. One team did not illustrate clear improvement following training.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The intern expresses heartfelt gratitude to her husband, children, and parents who provided encouragement and support throughout her graduate program. Also, the intern appreciates the participation of Mr. Rick Welsh and the teachers involved in the team teaching training. Their willingness to share ideas and expertise was a tremendous asset to the study. The intern also thanks Mr. William Martin, Superintendent of Schools and the Southampton Township Board of Education for providing her with the opportunity to further develop her leadership skills within this school district. Finally, the intern expresses sincere thankfulness to Mr. Michael Harris for his unwavering guidance and assurance that she could spread her wings and grow professionally.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables.....	v
Chapter 1.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Definitions.....	2
Limitations of the Study.....	2
Setting of the Study.....	3
Significance of the Study.....	5
Organization of the Study.....	7
Chapter 2 Review of Literature.....	8
Inefficiency of self-contained special education.....	8
Need for teacher training.....	9
A call for change.....	10
Practice of effective team teaching.....	13
Improving team teaching practice.....	15
Chapter 3 Design of the Study.....	20
The research instrument.....	20
Site and population selection.....	21
Data Collection.....	22

Data analysis plan.....	23
Chapter 4 Presentation of Research Findings.....	25
Team A.....	27
Team B.....	29
Team C.....	31
Chapter 5 Conclusions, Implications, Further Study.....	34
Major conclusions	34
Implications	36
Further study.....	36
References.....	38
Appendix A.....	41

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1 ITTAP Results Team Teaching Behaviors - Team A	27
Table 2 ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains - Team A.....	28
Table 3 ITTAP Results Team Teaching Behaviors - Team B	29
Table 4 ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains - Team B.....	30
Table 5 ITTAP Results Team Teaching Behaviors - Team C.....	31
Table 6 ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains - Team C.....	32

Chapter I

Introduction: Focus of the study

According to Turnbull, Turnbull, Shank & Leal (as cited in Yell, 1998), inclusion is considered the movement to merge regular and special education so that all students are educated in general education classrooms.(p. 70) This practice has developed over the years in response to a federal law entitled Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This law mandates that students with disabilities be educated in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). LRE requires that students with disabilities be educated as closely as possible with their non-disabled peers.

The Southampton Township School District accomplishes the task of providing LRE in the form of a team teaching model. As general and special educators work together in the same classroom, skilled teaching is essential to meet the learning needs of all students. The focus of this study is the practice of team teaching. During the course of this study, team teaching practices are analyzed, and team teaching training provided for the purpose of providing high quality instruction for every student.

Purpose of the study

The Southampton Township School District provides special education services for students, within their regularly assigned grade level classroom, in the form of a team teaching model. Each team consists of a regular education and a special education teacher. Both teachers are assigned to the same class to educate the special education student in conjunction with the regular education student. This team teaching model is

utilized in Southampton township Schools in grades one through eight.

The purpose of this study is to analyze current practices of regular and special education teachers, and provide training for these co-teachers working in inclusive settings. Further, this study will result in data that describes methods practiced by teachers assigned to team teaching situations. Additionally, practice of effective team teaching methods will be provided via training sessions.

Definitions

Several definitions are important to the understanding of this project. Regular education teacher refers to a practicing teacher holding a subject area certification such as: English, mathematics, science, social studies, or reading. In addition, regular education teacher may also refer to a teacher certified to teach Elementary Education. Team teaching refers to the practice of pairing a regular education teacher with a special education teacher who, simultaneously, deliver instruction to the same class. Inclusive education refers to the custom of educating special needs students in the same class, and at the same time, as their non-disabled peers. Collaborative planning time refers to the manner of a regular education teacher and a special education teacher planning together the methods and strategies of instruction they will use. Finally, ITTAP refers to the Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol developed by Rick Welsh (1997).

Limitations of the study

One limitation of this project was the amount of funding available. Funds were necessary to pay for the team teaching training, materials, and substitutes required during

the training time. Funds for this project were made available by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) flow-through grant, entitled Capacity Building Aid. Had more funds been available, this project would have been extended to include a wider number of teachers working in team teaching situations. In fact, every teacher working in a team teaching situation should have experienced the training. It was necessary to consider monetary restrictions when planning for necessary substitute teachers. A secondary limitation of this study was the number of substitute teachers available at one time to replace six teachers during the four day training period.

Setting of the study

This study took place in the Southampton Township School District, located in Burlington County, New Jersey. Southampton Township is located 25 miles from downtown Philadelphia. The median income in 1989 was \$38,486. This figure was 9% lower than the eight-county suburban average.

It is a suburban community that reflects a rural look and feel. In the 1990 census, the population of Southampton Township was 10,202. In 1994, the population was 10,664. These statistics reveal a community experiencing slow growth. This is attributable to the fact that much of this community is located within an area classified as the New Jersey Pine Barrens. The Pine Barrens area is protected from rampant growth and development in an attempt to preserve water, natural forests, wild life, and vegetation.

The community of Southampton Township is diverse. Real estate values range from approximately \$500,00 to \$35,000. The community contains two trailer parks, numerous farms, and housing developments. A large senior citizen housing community

consisting of 2,000 homes, with the potential to grow to 2,200, is located in Southampton Township as well. The township committee recently approved acreage zoned for low cost housing.

Southampton Township School District provides educational services for 928 students in levels kindergarten through eighth grade. Included in this range of educational services is a pre-school program for children who have special needs and meet the criteria for entrance into the program. In addition, educational services are provided for a total of 130 students, district-wide, classified as in need of special education services.

This school district administers the California Achievement Test to students in grades two, three, five, six, and seven. During the 1997-98 school year, students in grade two earned a total battery average in the seventy -eighth percentile, while students in grade three earned an average score in the ninety- first percentile on the total test battery. Fifth grade students earned an average score in the eightieth percentile on the total test battery, sixth grade average was in the seventy-ninth percentile, while seventh grade students scored an average in the eightieth percentile.

The New Jersey Early Warning Test is administered to eighth grade students each year. During the 1997-98 school year, summary statistics report that ninety-four percent of students scored within Proficiency Levels I and II on the reading and mathematics section of this test, while ninety-six and four tenths percent of students scored within Proficiency Levels I and II on the writing section. Students scoring in proficiency level III require remedial instruction.

The district consists of three schools located on the same campus. School #1

houses classes of grades kindergarten through second grade. School #2 houses grades three through five, and School # 3 serves as the district middle school, housing grades six through eight. One hundred percent of the students speak English as the first language spoken at home. There are no students considered to be Limited English Proficient. Cultural diversity is very limited in Southampton Township. There exists a student mobility rate of 6.4 percent, while the state average mobility rate is 16 percent. Average class size is twenty three students. A student faculty ratio of 15.7:1 exists in this district. One hundred thirty students are classified as special needs students. There are five hours and twenty eight minutes of instructional time in the school day schedule.

During 1997-98, the total comparative cost per pupil spent by Southampton Township School District was \$7,164. During the same year, 60 percent of school funding was raised from the total tax levy, while 35.5 percent was raised from state aid, and 2 percent was raised from federal aid. One hundred students were reported as low income.

The students of Southampton Township Schools are taught by a veteran teaching staff. The average number years of teaching experience is fifteen years. Twenty nine percent of this teaching staff have earned Master of Arts degrees.

Significance of the study

This project will make a contribution to improving team teaching practices in Southampton Township School District. The importance of exemplary team teaching practice is well documented. The Council of Exceptional Children, The National Education Association, and The American Association of School Administrators have

made a joint position statement that relates to the need for improvement of the quality and quantity of collaboration between general and special educators (West, Cannon 1988).

They further state that during the last decade, increasing emphasis has been placed on educating learning disabled and other handicapped students in regular classrooms. (p. 56)

Each partner needs to accept responsibility for being cognizant of their practice in the classroom. Paugach and Johnson (1989) believe that certain elements are needed for education to advance to the next level of collaboration. This includes recognizing that collaboration can occur only when all participants have a common understanding of their strengths and weaknesses and demonstrate a willingness to learn from each other. (p.223)

Graycock, Gable, and Korinik (1991) recognize the importance of collaborative approaches as they declare

For school professionals, collaborative approaches sometimes can have the goal of helping them to expand their repertoires of assessment and intervention strategies so that they can address a broader range of student needs. Participants may also learn more explicit and effective problem solving skills. Finally, collaboration offers educators personal and professional support to persist in their work with difficult-to-teach students. (p. 15)

The need for teachers to participate in activities to improve their practice is well documented. Parsons & Meyers (1984) and Pryzwansky (1977) as cited in Cook & Friend (1991) expressed the belief that consultation should be facilitative. Such an approach would emphasize the value of consultees' participation and facilitate the development of their abilities to plan and deliver appropriate services to clients.

Organization of the study

This study will be organized by chapters. Chapter II includes a review of the literature to provide information regarding current practice, and the need for training in the field of team teaching. Further included is Chapter III. This chapter will contain the design of the study. This chapter will state the method for selection of the teams chosen to be the team teaching sample, a description of the Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP) used to investigate the teaching practice of selected teams, the frequency of its use, and team teaching training procedures.

Chapter IV, the presentation of research findings will make known the results of the Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP). Finally, Chapter V will deliver conclusions of the Team Teaching Analysis as well as implications for further study, as they apply to the future for team teaching in Southampton Township School District.

Chapter II

Review of literature

Today, every school delivering special education services is exploring various methods to find a clear answer to the question, “What is the best way to effectively educate all students?” Historically, students with disabilities were taught in self-contained classrooms by teachers certified in special education. These programs created barriers for heterogeneous grouping, isolated students, and injured self-esteem.

Inefficiency of self-contained special education

Pull-out special education programs arrange homogenous groups of students. Gersten and Woodward (1990) quote Singer and Butler who found that once students are placed in pull-out special education programs, they rarely leave. In 1987, a project entitled Mainstream Experiences for Learning Disabled Students (MELD), was designed by Zigmond and Baker. This project sought to accommodate students with learning disabilities in mainstream classes. This project reports that students with learning disabilities adjusted well to a less individualized and more demanding program. They came to school regularly and did not present behavior problems. These students were assigned more stimulating learning opportunities with text materials rather than workbooks commonly used in pull-out programs. However, these student made no significant progress in reading and mathematics and earned lower grades during the implementation year. These results became attributable to the fact that teachers continued with a “business as usual” attitude. This project illustrates the necessity for teachers to be

trained in joint planning, effective instructional practices that address different learning needs and reflective decision making.

As current research points to the inefficiency of pull-out programs used to educate special needs students; the need for special and general educators to work together in a team teaching model is well documented. Wang, Walberg, and Reynolds (1992) stated little reliable information exists to justify students' placement in many special compensatory, or remedial education programs. Evidence on the effect of alternative programs is ambiguous at best. (p. 35)

Need for teacher training

Teacher education programs have not been designed to mold attitudes, foster collaboration, nor prepare teachers to meet diverse needs that may exist within the regular education classroom. A gap exists between teachers' willingness and preparedness to meet the needs of a truly heterogeneous student population (Margolis & McGettigan, 1988). Redditt (1991) established, teacher preparation and in-service training have not kept pace with the rapidly changing demands of contemporary programming. (p. 50)

Bergen (1994) finds:

it is very ironic that university teacher preparation programs now advocate (and supposedly teach) team teaching approaches, while offering few models of such approaches. The university structure is a barrier to team teaching as the K-12 school structure has been. Some creative methods are now being used at both schools and universities to free up time for team planning, identify team roles, reorder age-level and ability groupings and define effective approaches to include

children with special needs. I still think, however, that too little attention is being given to the actual scripts, roles and organizational methods that must be learned if team teaching is to be successful. (p.242)

A call for change

The pairing of a regular and special education teacher in the same classroom will break the barriers stated here. Kabler & Carlton (1982) share the fact that a body of literature exists in the fields of psychology, education, management and decision sciences which lends confidence to the formulation of a team approach to educating exceptional children.

Johnston, Proctor and Corey (1995) describe a successful team approach to inclusion entitled Team Approach to Mastery (TAM). The TAM system has nearly twenty years of research behind it. TAM was developed in the Christiana School District of Newark, Delaware in 1975. Today, this school district has no resource rooms at all. Children with disabilities are educated in the regular classroom alongside their non-disabled peers. One practice that enables TAM to be a successful program is team teaching. A team consists of a general and a special education teacher. These teams of teachers build on a research base as they plan, make decisions, and reflect together regarding instructional practice. Teachers who are new to the program obtain training in pedagogy as well as content knowledge. Teachers who continue to work in this program receive training provided throughout the school year and during the summer. Evaluation of this program reveals achievement of non-disabled students to be as good as, and in some cases, significantly higher than non-disabled students in other general education

classes. In fact, Bear and Proctor (1990) report scores of third grade non-disabled students, enrolled in TAM classes, scored 7 normal curve equivalent units higher than their peers in other general education classes on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. Additionally, attitude surveys have been regularly conducted among teachers, parents and administrators which reveal a high level of satisfaction with the TAM program.

Pugach and Wesson (1995) found collaborative team teaching appears to be an important alternative to traditional models of special and compensatory education. (p.279) Their study, based in a middle-sized Midwestern city, combined teams of teachers comprised of a volunteer regular education teacher and a special education support teacher. The teams taught together in the same classroom. This project represented a reorganization of teaching staff, took place in two fifth grade classrooms housed in the same school, and involved 55 fifth grade students. Preceding the study, 13 of these students were classified as Learning Disabled (LD) and receiving instruction in a resource room pull-out program. For purposes of the study, LD students were divided evenly between the two fifth grade classrooms. Data was collected by transcripts of 18 interviews of nine general education students chosen at random, and nine LD students, and extensive open-ended interviews with teachers. Later, teachers found two LD students not appropriate for the program because one had markedly lower cognitive abilities than her peers', and the second was experiencing extreme emotional trauma.

Student and teacher interviews revealed the results of this study. Interviews were analyzed for content. These teacher and student interviews revealed three general themes. The first theme was identified as classroom social climate, the second theme was identified

as instructional effects, and the third theme was identified as teacher roles and tasks.

Classroom social climate in these two classrooms was described as positive. Both general and special education students remarked that they felt good about themselves, their teachers and their peers. Half of the students described school as being “fun”. They also remarked that everyone needed help and gave help at one time or another. All except one student commented that having two or more teachers in the classroom reduced the amount of time it took the teacher to respond to a call for assistance. Students considered all teachers accessible. Students reported positive social relationships with peers. They remarked that “kids got nicer”.

Instruction and its effects were mentioned with respect to flexible groups and cooperative learning. Seven LD students and all the regular education student commented on the variety of instructional activities, including hands-on activities. Nine LD students mentioned not missing activities due to being in the resource room while events were happening in the regular classroom. Teachers assessed flexible, small group membership weekly. This practice led students to say they did not have to disturb their peers to gain extra help, and there was no embarrassment attached to grouping for extra help.

Teacher roles was addressed during the interview process. Students did not see the help the support teacher provided as being directed toward a particular group of students. However, they did see the support teacher as somewhat of a relief teacher who was capable of taking over when an emergency existed. It is important to mention that teachers addressed the needs of high achieving students with the same flexible group procedure used for students requiring added assistance. Three general education and two

special education students said their teachers switched tasks and were able to carry them out.

Pugach and Wesson (1995) illustrate, clearly, that collaborative team teaching is a potential means of breaking down the barrier of teacher dependence on special education as a permanent pull-out service. The classrooms described here illustrate that it is possible for teachers to create educational environments that foster great feelings of success for LD and general education students alike. (p. 294)

Practice of effective team teaching

The importance of exemplary team teaching practice is well documented. The Council for Exceptional Children, The National Education Association, and The American Association of School Administrators have made a joint position statement that the quality and quantity of collaboration between general and special educators needs to improve (West, Cannon 1988). They further state that during the last decade, increasing emphasis has been placed on educating learning disabled and other handicapped students in the regular classroom. (p. 56)

Collectively, considerable research points to effective practice for successful team teaching. Redditt (1991) outlines components of successful team teaching experiences: conferencing and referencing between co-teachers during a lesson, and shared responsibilities of the classroom duties as equally as possible. Gullledge & Slobe (1990) name a defining characteristic of collaborative teaching models. They illustrate the importance of removing barriers that exist between regular and special education by

highlighting the importance of collaborative planning time. During this time, the regular education teacher shares curriculum knowledge with the special education teacher. The special education teacher, in turn, shares strategies to make the curriculum accessible to all students. In this model, the responsibility for the success of all students becomes a shared one.

The role of the special educator as a collaborator with classroom teachers has been clearly established with regard to planning instruction. Donaldson & Christiansen (1990) state effective use of a collaboration model requires that each educator be given an opportunity to provide input during the planning process.

Effective schools research by Rosenholtz, Bassler, and Hoover-Dempsey as cited in Evans (1991) outlines teachers self-reported skill acquisition in relation to organizational conditions. Results suggest the degree to which teachers collaborate with each other distinguish effective from ineffective schools. Professional development appears to be one direct outcome of collaboration, as teachers share new ideas, strategies, and techniques with their peers.

Each partner needs to accept responsibility for being cognizant of their practice in the classroom. Paugach and Johnson (1989) believe that certain elements are needed for education to advance to the next level of collaboration. This includes recognizing that collaboration can occur only when all participants have a common understanding of their strengths and weaknesses and demonstrate a willingness to learn from each other. (p. 233)

Graycock, Gable, and Korinik (1991) recognize the importance of collaborative approaches as they declare:

For school professionals, collaborative approaches sometimes can have the goal of helping them to expand their repertoires of assessment and intervention strategies so that they can address a broader range of student needs. Participants may also learn more explicit and effective problem solving skills. Finally, collaboration offers educators personal and professional support to persist in their work with difficult-to-teach students. (p. 15)

Improving team teaching practice

The need for teachers to participate in activities to improve their practice is well documented. Parsons & Meyers (1984) and Pryzwansky (1977) as cited in Cook & Friend (1991) expressed the belief that consultation should be facilitative. Such an approach would emphasize the value of consultees' participation and facilitate the development of their abilities to plan and deliver appropriate services to clients.

Potential barriers exist whenever two teachers are assigned to the same classroom. These obstacles are documented by Goor & Polhill (1991):

1. Collaborative teaching is intrinsically more time consuming than teaching alone. Successful programs have found that it is essential to schedule common planning time and arrange for release time.
2. Team teaching requires skills that were not part of teacher's training. These include the ability to negotiate, to assess the emotional needs of co-workers, to advocate for teaching practice, and to train teachers to use effective practices. Successful programs arrange for continuous training and supportive consultation

from experienced peers and/or teacher educators.

3. Team teachers may perceive an increase in workload and responsibility.

Successful programs find team teachers who attempt to support one another and encourage teams to remain open to negotiation.

4. Team teachers may disagree on grading practices. Successful teams develop clear, yet flexible, guidelines so that all teachers involved understand how to assign grades and what alternatives exist for grading atypical learners. (p. 12-13)

Rick Welsh (1997) believes that adapting classroom instruction with regard to Dr. Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, paired with the analyzation of team teaching behaviors will serve the purpose of improving team teaching practices. He has identified twenty team teaching behaviors that are analyzed by the Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP), and uses this protocol as an element to train teachers. They are:

1. There is evidence of joint planning.
2. Support teacher's ideas accepted as valid.
3. Support teacher's ideas incorporated into lesson.
4. Both teachers have access to all students in class.
5. Both teachers have access to all teaching facilities in the classroom.
6. Both teachers teach to whole group simultaneously.
7. Teachers have divergent approaches to instruction.
8. Teachers have compatible approaches to management.
9. Both teachers are capable of sharing leadership role.

10. Both teachers are capable of total release.
11. Teachers have verbal access to lesson.
12. Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students.
13. Teachers keep track of each other during the lesson.
14. Teachers conference during the lesson.
15. There is evidence of exchange of professional skills.
16. Teachers use team teaching as an opportunity to practice new skills.
17. Teachers feel comfortable with the team teaching model.
18. Teachers consider the team teaching model to be effective.
19. Both teachers agree on curricular focus.
20. Teachers share the instructional responsibilities during the lesson.

McIntosh and Johnson (1994) have also developed a rating scale to be used with teachers assigned to team teaching situations. They believe that the anxiety level of teachers, assigned to this situation, can be reduced by the use of "The Team Teaching Rating Scale". (p.153) They further address the important issue of using the scale as a key component to the training that these teachers will receive. As they state,

The reason we developed and will continue to use this scale is that, over time, we have observed that the concerns teachers bring to the team-teaching situation can easily be grouped and tend to be common across groups of teachers. Therefore the scale is designed to draw out teachers' feelings about these common concerns, and then allow them to clarify the issue with their partner. (p. 154)

Change is usually difficult, especially in educational settings where teacher

isolation is predominant. Opening doors and crossing demarcation lines raises criticism. Integrating special education and regular education students has met with reproof as well as celebration. Davis (1989) wrote that many special educators feel a “genuine concern that regular education is still not ready—in either attitude or instructional capabilities—to adequately meet the needs of students with special needs.” (p.443)

The strength of communication is especially important in the practice of team teaching. Jellinek, as stated in Price (1991), asserts one reason for stress among teachers, to help formulate and implement new relationships, is the lack of teacher training in the art of communication. (p. 25) Thornton (1990), who has been involved in a team teaching situation for three years, relates the importance of communication. She states, “A central factor has been putting the time and effort into building a relationship based on trust and communication.” (p. 40)

As Bergen (1994) states

many reports about the success of these present team approaches are mixed. Some programs are unanimously viewed as successful, while others are “on paper” but so not really work. We have put many varieties of teams into operation without seriously considering the need for instruction in the art and science of team teaching. This oversight is especially unfortunate in light of the wealth of researched-based information on cooperative learning, social skills, social cognition and group dynamics. All of this research could be used to help teachers learn how to function effectively. (p. 242)

As PL 94-142 addressed the need for handicapped students to be educated, it has

not efficiently dismantled the barriers between general and special education. Gartner and Lipsky as early as 1987, stated that an alternative way to serve students with mild and moderate handicaps is to integrate them into general education programs at the building level. They further maintain that one can shape the educational system to include students with disabilities that is both constant and builds toward an inclusive society by focusing on the features of instruction that can provide improved learning for all students.

Teaching all students effectively is the goal of every school district. As school district administrators and teachers experiment with effective pedagogical practices, look to research for answers to complex questions, and strive to meet federal mandates. Wang et al. (1992) stated, in the year 2000, increasing numbers of special education teachers work directly with teams of teachers in various kinds of regular instructional environments. (p.36) This statement predicts a positive future of growth for team teaching.

Chapter III

The Design of the Study

This study utilized a pre-test post-test design. This particular design was chosen to illustrate the effects of team teaching training on the actual classroom practice of teachers working in team teaching situations. A four day team teaching training was arranged, then followed by the administration of a questionnaire. The questionnaire, an instrument entitled Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP), designed by Rick Welsh, 1997 was applied as both the pre and post test.

During team teaching training, the teachers participating were afforded the opportunity to plan together, team teach with the trainer, team teach with their assigned teaching partner, and observe other teams teaching. Another integral part of the training was the opportunity to discuss the observed teaching strategies with the group.

The research instrument

The research instrument used in this study was entitled the Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP). This instrument was designed to determine how well inclusion and in-class support teams function, and to assist teams in improving service delivery to their students.

The ITTAP is based on interviews and observations of over four thousand (4,000) public school regular and special education teachers, administrators and support personnel in 15 states. The interviews took place from 1992 to 1996. Issues derived from these interviews and observations served as a basis for the development of a twenty

item questionnaire, entitled ITTAP.

This questionnaire uses five (5) point Likert scale is used to determine strengths and weaknesses of the team teaching partnership. Strengths are indicated by scores of a 4 or 5, while weaknesses are represented by replies of 3 or less. Two different perceptions are measured by the questionnaire. First, a perception of how often events occur over time is measured. Second, a view point of an internal value system is recognized. This is expressed by “agree” and “disagree” as points of measurement. The final item on the ITTAP relates to the division of labor, power and influence in the team teaching relationship. This item is measured by a percentage rating of 0% to 100%. A team choosing a score in the 41% to 60%, or higher, range will represent the existence of parallelism in the classroom.

Site and population selection

The site chosen for this study was the Southampton Township School District. The population of this study consisted of general and special education teachers working in team teaching situations. The sample, drawn randomly, from this population was comprised of three teaching teams. One general and one special education teacher were the members of each team. Six teachers participated.

Since this school district is divided into three buildings, the selection process was simplified. School #1 houses grades kindergarten through second grade. School #2 houses third through fifth grades, while School #3 houses grades six through eight. One team was randomly selected from each of the three school buildings in the district. This selection process enabled a cross section of grade level teachers to participate in the team

teaching training.

Each teaching team included a regular education and a special education teacher. Team A was comprised of two experienced teachers.. This team was assigned to teach a first grade class. They have been team teaching together in a first grade setting for three years. Team B was comprised of an experienced regular education teacher and a newly certified special education teacher. This team was assigned to team teach in a third grade setting. This academic year, 1998-99 was their first year teaching together. Team C was comprised of two experienced teachers. This team was the team assigned to team teach at the middle school level. At the time of this study, the team had been teaching one section of eighth grade English. It is important to note that this team has been team teaching one section of English together for four years. The special education teacher assigned to this team also team teaches with other regular education teachers due to the fact that the middle school instruction is departmentalized. This special education teacher, provides support and replacement instruction in other subject areas as well.

Data collection

The ITTAP was administered to each teacher confidentially. Teaching teams were directed to answer questions honestly, and without collaboration. Each member of the team was given a separate, yet identical, form labeled with certain biographical information supplied by the teacher.

The date for the first administration of the ITTAP was chosen to afford the teaching team an opportunity to settle into a classroom routine together at the start of the school year. Another consideration was to administer the protocol in advance of the

training session. The first administration of the protocol took place on September 22, 1998. Following the team teaching training, which took place from October 19 to 22, 1998, this protocol was administered for the second time on January 20, 1999.

The second issuance of the protocol was for the purpose of determining the effects of the four day training period on the team's ability to function effectively as outlined by the ITTAP. The post test date was chosen to provide the teachers with an opportunity to execute the effective team teaching practices learned during the training session.

Data analysis plan

Analysis of the Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol administered in September, prior to the training, yielded information regarding effective team teaching behaviors currently being practiced by each team. Each of the twenty ITTAP teaming behaviors were rated as functional or needs improvement, the number of behaviors in need of improvement was noted, plus identified growth potential in each of the seven ITTAP domains. The seven ITTAP domains are identified as: Teaching Philosophy, Administrative support, Time and Scheduling, Joint Ownership, Professional Growth, Communication, Status and Team Teaching Mechanics.

Training sessions with trainer, Mr. Rick Welsh, were held for four days. Following the training, the ITTAP was again administered to the teams receiving training. The protocol was completed individually, and analyzed in January. As with the September administration of the protocol, the January administration was analyzed for evidence of effective team teaching behaviors along with evidence of growth following

training sessions. Areas examined for growth were: the twenty ITTAP team teaching behaviors, the number of areas that were previously rated as in need of improvement, and seven ITTAP domains.

Chapter IV

Presentation of the Research Findings

Research findings

A selection of three teams of teachers who work in inclusive settings, completed the Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol (ITTAP), as a pretest post test design. The first administration of the ITTAP took place on September 22, 1998. The post test administration of the same instrument took place on January 20, 1999. The two administration times were purposely chosen to afford the teachers an opportunity to honestly assess their teaming performance in the classroom early in the school year, prior to participation in the training session. Teachers then participated in a four day training. After the training session, a January date was chosen for the follow-up administration of the protocol. This purposeful selection was to determine changes in teacher behavior as a result of the training.

The pretest analyzation occurred relative to the twenty team teaching behaviors domains identified on the ITTAP. This score is referred to as the number of behaviors as functional, or in need of improvement identified from the field of twenty behaviors. Team teaching domains identified as having potential for growth were also analyzed as a pretest.

The post-test analyzation occurred relative to the twenty team teaching behaviors along with the seven identified team teaching domains proposed by the ITTAP. It is important to note that each team had the potential to reach one hundred percent (100%) functioning in each of the seven team teaching domains.. A rating of seventy percent

(70%) or above represents an area of strength for that team, while the remaining percentage represents an existing untapped potential for growth.

For the purpose of this study, teaching teams have been named Team A, Team B, and Team C. Upon pretest analysis of the ITTAP, Team A was found to be functional in all twenty areas of team teaching behavior. There were no areas in need of improvement. However, in the post-test, Team A was found to be in need of improvement in the area of joint planning. This reflects a negative difference from pretest to post-test.

Of the seven team teaching domains analyzed in the pretest, six were determined to be rated at one hundred percent (100%) of the potential function. The domain entitled Teaching Philosophy was rated to have an existing growth potential of 4.72 %. However, in the post-test, Team A was determined to have areas for growth potential in five of the seven domains, while two domains were rated to be functioning at one hundred percent (100%) capacity. A domain is considered to be a strength for that team when their growth potential is below thirty percent (30%). The post-test results represent a negative increase growth potential when compared to the pretest results.

It must be noted that this team has been team teaching together in a first grade classroom for three years. The in-class support teacher was assigned to this classroom for the entire day. The following charts represent the pre and post test administration of the ITTAP results for Team A in the areas measured by Team Teaching Behaviors and Team Teaching Domains. Column one indicates the desired teacher behavior identified for effective team teaching. Column two indicates the pretest rating as functional or in need of improvement as rated by the team of teachers. Column three indicates the post test

rating by the team of teachers.

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Behaviors - Team A

Team Teaching Behaviors	Pretest	Post-test
Evidence of joint planning	Functional	Needs Improvement
Support teachers ideas accepted	Functional	Functional
Support teacher's ideas incorporated	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have access to all students	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have access to all teaching facilities	Functional	Functional
Both teachers teach to whole group simultaneously	Functional	Functional
Teachers have divergent approaches to instruction	Functional	Functional
Teachers have compatible approaches to management	Functional	Functional
Both teachers capable of sharing a leadership role	Functional	Functional
Both teachers capable of total role release	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have verbal access to lesson	Functional	Functional
Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students	Functional	Functional
Teachers keep track of each other during lesson	Functional	Functional
Teachers conference during the lesson	Functional	Functional
Evidence of exchange of professional skills	Functional	Functional
Teachers use team teaching as a way to practice new skills	Functional	Functional
Teachers feel comfortable with team teaching model	Functional	Functional
Teachers consider team teaching model to be effective	Functional	Functional
Both teachers agree on curricular focus	Functional	Functional
Teachers share instructional responsibilities during lesson	Functional	Functional

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains - Team A

Team Teaching Domains	Growth Potential Pretest	Growth Potential Post-test
Educational Philosophy	4.82%	0%
Administrative Support, Time, Scheduling	0%	20.60%
Joint Ownership	0%	6.89%
Professional Growth	0%	4.13%
Communication	0%	10.74%
Status	0%	0%
Team Teaching Mechanics	0%	7.67%

Analysis of the ITTAP found Team B to be functional in sixteen (16) areas of team teaching behavior analysis, while in need of improvement in four (4) behaviors. The behaviors rated as in need of improvement were: both teachers teach to the group simultaneously, teachers have divergent approaches to instruction, teachers have compatible approaches to management, and teachers use team teaching as an opportunity to practice new skills. However, following training, the post-test results found Team B to be rated as functional in all twenty areas of team teaching behaviors.

Of the seven team teaching domains analyzed for pretest purposes, all seven domains were found to be functioning less than 100% with some untapped growth potential. The post-test results revealed this team made improvements in six of the seven team teaching domains. Following training, six areas improved to function at one hundred percent (100%) potential, while one area remained functioning at less than one hundred percent (100%) growth potential.

The following charts represent the pre and post test administration of the ITTAP results for Team B in the areas measured by Team Teaching Behaviors and Team

Teaching Domains.

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Behaviors - Team B

Team Teaching Behaviors	Pretest	Post-test
Evidence of joint planning	Needs Improvement	Functional
Support teachers ideas accepted	Functional	Functional
Support teacher's ideas incorporated	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have access to all students	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have access to all teaching facilities	Functional	Functional
Both teachers teach to whole group simultaneously	Needs Improvement	Functional
Teachers have divergent approaches to instruction	Needs Improvement	Functional
Teachers have compatible approaches to management	Needs Improvement	Functional
Both teachers capable of sharing a leadership role	Functional	Functional
Both teachers capable of total role release	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have verbal access to lesson	Functional	Functional
Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students	Functional	Functional
Teachers keep track of each other during lesson	Functional	Functional
Teachers conference during the lesson	Functional	Functional
Evidence of exchange of professional skills	Functional	Functional
Teachers use team teaching as a way to practice new skills	Functional	Functional
Teachers feel comfortable with team teaching model	Functional	Functional
Teachers consider team teaching model to be effective	Functional	Functional
Both teachers agree on curricular focus	Functional	Functional
Teachers share instructional responsibilities during lesson	Functional	Functional

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains - Team B

Team Teaching Domains	Growth Potential Pretest	Growth Potential Post-test
Educational Philosophy	19.97%	0%
Administrative Support, Time, Scheduling	15.50%	0%
Joint Ownership	7.92%	1.72%
Professional Growth	8.85%	0%
Communication	8.26%	0%
Status	3.44%	0%
Team Teaching Mechanics	5.90%	0%

Team C was found to be rated as functional in fifteen (15) areas of the ITTAP as they are related to team teaching behaviors. This team was rated as needing improvement in five (5) areas of team teaching behavior as rated by the ITTAP. The areas in need of improvement were: evidence of joint planning, both teachers teach to the group simultaneously, teachers have divergent approaches to instruction and both teachers are capable of sharing a leadership role. Following training, Team C was found in need of improvement in only two areas. These areas were both teachers are capable of sharing a leadership role, and both teachers capable of total release.

Prior to the training sessions, Team C was rated at less than one hundred percent (100%) growth potential in all seven team teaching domains. Five of these domains were considered strengths for this team due to the fact that they earned above a seventy percent (70%) capacity rating. The two domains considered to be weaknesses of this team were Administrative, Support, Time, Scheduling, and Team Teaching Mechanics. Both domains were considered to have a growth potential above thirty percent (30%). The ITTAP results for pre test and post-test administration of the ITTAP are located in the following table.

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Behaviors - Team C

Team Teaching Behaviors	Pretest	Post-test
Evidence of joint planning	Needs Improvement	Functional
Support teachers ideas accepted	Functional	Functional
Support teacher's ideas incorporated	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have access to all students	Functional	Functional
Both teachers have access to all teaching facilities	Functional	Functional
Both teachers teach to whole group simultaneously	Needs Improvement	Functional
Teachers have divergent approaches to instruction	Needs Improvement	Functional
Teachers have compatible approaches to management	Functional	Functional
Both teachers capable of sharing a leadership role	Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement
Both teachers capable of total role release	Functional	Needs Improvement
Both teachers have verbal access to lesson	Functional	Functional
Teachers evaluate the effect of teaming on instruction and students	Functional	Functional
Teachers keep track of each other during lesson	Functional	Functional
Teachers conference during the lesson	Functional	Functional
Evidence of exchange of professional skills	Functional	Functional
Teachers use team teaching as a way to practice new skills	Functional	Functional
Teachers feel comfortable with team teaching model	Functional	Functional
Teachers consider team teaching model to be effective	Functional	Functional
Both teachers agree on curricular focus	Functional	Functional
Teachers share instructional responsibilities during lesson	Needs Improvement	Functional

ITTAP Results Team Teaching Domains - Team C

Team Teaching Domains	Growth Potential Pretest	Growth Potential Post-test
Educational Philosophy	24.10%	8.26%
Administrative Support, Time, Scheduling	44.42%	19.63%
Joint Ownership	28.58%	17.56%
Professional Growth	27.15%	23.61%
Communication	26.45%	15.70%
Status	23.76%	11.71%
Team Teaching Mechanics	34.83%	11.22%

Team A did not show clear improvement following team teaching training as it was analyzed by the ITTAP. In fact, evidence of joint planning, a team teaching behavior, was rated as functional on the pretest, and in need of improvement on the post-test. In the section titled team teaching domains, this team's capacity increased from illustrating a growth potential of 4.82% to 0% in the domain of Educational Philosophy. The area of Status remained at a growth potential of 0%, while all other areas recognized a larger potential for growth on the post-test, than on the pretest. However, all seven domains are rated as strengths for this team due to the fact that they are working with a growth potential of less than thirty percent (30%).

Team B showed clear, strong improvements in team teaching behaviors, as illustrated by the ITTAP. This team moved from needing improvement in four areas of team teaching behavior on the pretest, to being rated as functional in all areas of team teaching behavior on the post-test. This team increased their potential functioning in team teaching domains as well. Of the seven team teaching domains, Team B was considered to have reached 100% of their potential in six domains. The domain of Joint Ownership was considered to exhibit a growth potential of 1.72%. All seven domains of team

teaching were considered a strength for this team.

Team C moved from needing improvement on five areas of team teaching behaviors, as illustrated by the ITTAP, to needing improvement in two areas. This team improved their rating in all seven team teaching domains. Each of the seven domains showed an increased growth. following training, all seven domains could then be considered as strengths for this team.

Chapter V

Conclusions, Implications for Further Study

Major Conclusions

Training relative to team teaching behaviors that affords the participants opportunities to plan lessons together, practice effective team teaching behaviors, and discuss which behaviors are effective and ineffective, did improve team teaching practices for two of the three teams involved in this study. This major conclusion was drawn from the study of three teams of teachers working in inclusive settings. Two of the three teams involved in the study, showed clear improvement when pretest and post-test administration of the ITTAP were compared.

Analysis of all twenty (20) of Team A's teaching behaviors revealed a rating of functional on the pretest. The post-test analysis revealed nineteen (19) ratings of functional, while the behavior of joint planning was rated as needing improvement. The pretest rating of Team Teaching Domains disclosed ratings that illustrated no growth potential in all seven areas, while ratings in a post-test situation illustrated higher growth potential ratings in seven areas. These results represent the fact that Team A now recognizes the areas they must focus upon. Team A was found to be the atypical team, not illustrating improvement following training.

Team B clearly illustrated improvement when pretest and post-test administration of the ITTAP were compared. The pretest administration of the ITTAP found sixteen (16) of twenty (20) Team Teaching Behaviors rated as functional, and four (4) areas rated

as in need of improvement. The post-test administration of the same ITTAP found all twenty Team Teaching Behaviors as functional. Seven (7) Team Teaching Domains were rated in the pretest situation as having growth potential, while the post-test rated only one area as remaining with growth potential. The other six (6) areas were rated as having reached their growth potential.

Pre-test administration of the ITTAP found Team C as functional in fifteen (15) areas, while in need of improvement in five (5) of the twenty rated Team Teaching Behaviors. Post-test administration found eighteen (18) areas as functional, with two (2) areas in need of improvement. Growth potential was reduced in all seven (7) Team Teaching Domains for Team C as the pretest and post-test were compared. This means that this team improved their functioning toward achieving improved functioning in all seven Team Teaching Domains.

Team B and Team C have spent the least amount of time team teaching together overall. These were the two teams that exhibited improvement as reflected by the pre and post-test administration of the ITTAP. Team A, the team that did not show improvement has spent comparatively the most time team teaching together. The fact that this team did not show improvement lead the researcher to believe that the members of this team spent time analyzing their practices more carefully than had been done in the past, and following training understood more clearly the theory of team teaching. This team existed as the pioneers of team teaching in this district. They now realize which behaviors are more effective than others, and have illustrated their growth potential as reflected by the ITTAP.

Implications

The results of this study imply to this researcher, that team teaching practices hold the potential for improvement. Carefully planned training sessions that provide for hands-on practice of effective teaching methods, paired with opportunities for collaborative planning time, and reflective practice, will be a method for improving teaching in the inclusive classroom. During the training sessions, teachers were afforded the time to plan lessons together, team teach with the trainer and one another, explain adaptations, and debrief following each lesson. The three teaching teams in Southampton Township have learned to carefully analyze their behaviors, and adapt lessons to benefit all students in their inclusive classrooms.

The leadership development of the Administrative Intern included leading the teaching teams in developing a district-wide plan to turnkey the team teaching training using the initial group of teachers who had been trained. The initial team teaching training, paired with a turnkey plan would create a lasting change for the school district.

Further study

The further application that becomes appropriate as a result of this study would be to research a method of providing collaborative planning time for team teachers at the middle school level. Providing collaborative planning time for teachers in this setting is especially difficult because teaching of subject matter is departmentalized.

Further, and most importantly, it would become appropriate to implement a turnkey project. The team teaching training could be expanded by using the initial group of teachers to train all teachers working in inclusive settings in this

district. The Team Teaching Core could be used to perfect additional teams' abilities to adapt instruction to meet the needs of all students, to train additional teams in reflective practice by conducting debriefing sessions following instruction, and promote an atmosphere of respect and trust with regard to peer collaboration.

REFERENCES

Bear, G., Proctor, W. (1990). Impact of a full-time integrated program on the achievement of nonhandicapped and mildly handicapped children. Exceptionality, 227-238.

Bergen, D. (1994, Summer). Developing the art and science of team teaching. Childhood Education, 242-243.

Davis, W.E. (1980). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. Exceptional Children, 55, 440-447.

Donaldson, R., Christansen, J. (1990, Winter). Consultation and collaboration: A decision making model. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22-25.

Evans, S. B. (1991). A realistic look at the research base for collaboration in special education. Preventing School Failure, 35 (4), 10-13.

Gartner, A., Lipsky, D.K. (1987, November). Beyond special education: toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review, 57 (4), 367-391.

Gersten, R., Woodward, J. (1990, May/June). Rethinking the regular education initiative: Focus on the classroom teacher. Remedial and Special Education, 3, 7-15.

Goor, M., Polhill, F. (1991). New help for the middle school student with learning disabilities. Atlanta, GA: annual Conference Council for Exceptional Children. (EIRC document Reproduction Service No, Ed334775).

Gulledge, J., Slobe, P. (1990, September). Collaboration: A key to successful mainstreaming. Middle School Journal, 34-36.

Harris, K.C. (1990). Collaborative instruction in schools: Key principles. Los Angeles. CA: California State University School of Education. (EIRC Document

Reproduction Service No. ED 326001).

Johnston, D., Proctor, W., Corey, S. (1995, January). Not a way out: A way in. Educational Leadership, 46-49.

Kabler, M.L., Carlton, G.R. (1982). Educating exceptional students: A comprehensive team approach. Theory into Practice, XII (2), 88-96.

Krmpotich, J. G. (1995). From "intrusion" to inclusion; success for all learners. Apple Valley, MN: HBK Publishing Company, Inc.

Laycock, V.K., Gable, R.A., & Korinek, R.A. (1991). A realistic look at the research base for collaboration in special education. Preventing School Failure, 35 (4), 15-18.

McIntosh, M., E., Johnson, D., L. (1994 January/February). An instrument to facilitate communication between prospective team teachers. The Clearing House, 152-154.

Pugach, M.C., Johnson, L.J. (1989, November). The challenge of implementing collaboration between general and special education. Exceptional Children, 232-235.

Pugach, M. C., Wesson, C. L. (1995). Teachers' and students' views of team teaching of general and learning-disabled students in two fifth grade classrooms. The Elementary School Journal, 95 (3) 279-295.

Price, J., P. (1991, Summer). Effective communication a key to successful collaboration. Preventing School Failure, 35, (4) 25-27.

Redditt, S., (1991). Two teachers working as one. Co-teaching for special / regular education integration. Equity and Choice, 8 (1), 49-56.

Thornton, J., R. (1990, July). Team teaching: A relationship based on trust and communication. Young Children, 40-43.

U.S. Congress. Public Law 94-142, Education for all handicapped children act of 1975. Washington, D.C., 1975.

Wang, M.C., Walberg, H., Reynolds, M. C. (1992, October). A scenario for better – not separate – special education. Educational Leadership, 35-38.

Welsh, R., (1997). Inclusion team teaching analysis protocol. Rick Welsh, Sanford, NC.

Yell, M., L. (1998, October). The legal basis for inclusion. Educational Leadership, 56 (2), 70 - 73.

Zigmond, N., Baker, N., (1990 October/November). Mainstream experiences for learning disabled students (Project MELD): Preliminary report. Exceptional children 176-184.

Appendix A

Inclusion Team Teaching Analysis Protocol

FORM A: HOST CLASSROOM TEACHER, TEAM TEACHER INTERVIEW

Your name: _____
 Your school: _____
 Your teaching partner's name _____
 Times per week you teach with this partner? _____
 Average length of team teaching period or class _____
 Your grade level: _____
 Your school system: _____
 How long have you been teaching with your partner? _____
 Subject(s) you teach with your partner _____
 Today's date: _____

Directions: Circle the number that most closely corresponds to your perception or opinion. Answer as honestly as possible.

Codes: 1 - strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = undecided 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
 or 1 = never 2 = rarely 3 = sometimes 4 = usually 5 = always

Statement

1. My partner offers input to the teaching plan before the lesson.
2. I look forward to partner's suggestions and comments.
3. I incorporate my partner's ideas into the lesson.
4. I expect my partner to work with all students in the classroom.
5. I share all teaching facilities in the room with my teaching partner.
6. My partner and I both present information to the entire class at the same time.
7. My partner and I tend to present information in different ways.
8. My partner's management style is compatible with mine.
9. My partner and I are both capable of leading the lesson.
10. My partner and I can assume each other's roles spontaneously.
11. My partner's interjections are appropriate and well timed.
12. We discuss how our teaming succeeds or fails to meet student needs.
13. I am aware of my partner's actions and location during the lesson.
14. My partner and I talk to each other during the lesson.
15. I learn new skills from my partner.
16. My partner and I deliberately practice new skills when we are together.
17. I feel comfortable working in a team teaching environment.
18. My partner and I accomplish more together than we could separately.
19. My partner's role is to support the teaching of the curriculum.
20. My partner has an equal share of the teaching responsibility when in my classroom.

Semantic scale

never.....always	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
strongly disagree.....strongly agree		1	2	3	4	5
never.....always		1	2	3	4	5

Biographical Data

Name	Susan Christine Schaal
High School	Neshaminy Senior High School Langhorne, PA
Undergraduate	Bachelor of Science Elementary Education Lock Haven State College Lock Haven, PA
Present Occupation	Special Education Teacher Southampton Township Schools Southampton, NJ