1985

An Assessment of Communication and Service Needs to be Provided to the Regular Education Teacher by the Resource Teacher

Jacqueline Lee Holt
Eastern Illinois University

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

August 7, 1985 ____

Date Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____ ____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Date Author

m

An Assessment of Communication and Service Needs to be Provided to the Regular Education Teacher by the Resource Teacher

(TITLE)

BY

Jacqueline Lee Holt

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1985
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

8/6/85
DATE — ADVISER

8/6/85
DATE — COMMITTEE MEMBER

8/6/85
DATE — COMMITTEE MEMBER

8/6/85
DATE — DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

Abstract

This study was designed to determine the types of communication and assistance that should be provided to regular education teachers by the resource teachers. This study also attempted to determine if there was any significance in the needs of regular education teachers based on the grade level, level of education, and/or sex of the respondents. An open-ended questionnaire was distributed to students enrolled in graduate level classes at Eastern Illinois University in Charleston, Illinois. Responses obtained from the questionnaire were used to construct a second, multiple choice questionnaire. The questionnaire analyzed three main areas (a) consultation, (b) materials, and (c) assistance. Other topics which were included in the survey were special equipment, individualized education programs, and staffings. The second questionnaire was distributed to regular education teachers in 6 counties in Central Illinois. The results indicated that regular education teachers were interested in learning about materials used for helping students labeled learning disabled, and high interest/low level reading materials. The regular education teachers indicated a preference for verbal consultations while verbal and written consultations combined was provided as the second favorite choice. The teachers felt the most important change which should occur in staffings was for more communication to occur between all those involved in the staffing. When the individualized education program is developed for each student in the resource program, the regular educators would like to be provided information on the goals and objectives which are specific to their subject area for the student who is mainstreamed. The sex of the respondents revealed the most significance at the .05 level and the .001 level for this survey.

A suggested communication tool was developed from the information provided by the survey to help the regular education teachers and the resource teachers communicate more effectively.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my terrific parents who supported me both emotionally and financially through college, to George who gave me moral support, to Debbie, Dion, and Kathy for helping me duplicate, staple, sort, and mail my surveys, and to Jim for being a friend.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for their assistance in completing this study:

Dr. Andrew Brulle

Dr. Kathlene Shank

Dr. John North

and all of the teachers who took time to participate in my survey.

Table of Contents

page

APPENDIXES

An Assessment of Communication and Service Needs to be Provided to the Regular Education Teacher by the Resource Teacher

Teachers and administrators in every area of education are experiencing the thrust of Public Law 94-142. In attempting to place students in the "least restrictive environment," a variety of alternatives have been assessed (D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo, & Mauser, 1979). The use of the self-contained special class (Sindelar & Deno, 1978) has been a traditional setting for educating students labeled handicapped, but in more recent years the emphasis has shifted to integrating these students into the regular classrooms. Several alternatives have been used to supplement the regular education program with the major alternative being the resource room (Sindelar & Deno, 1978).

Rust, Miller, and Wilson (1978) described the resource room program as an attempt to place learners who are labeled handicapped into the "mainstream" of education. For mainstreaming to be effective, adequate communication must exist between the regular education teachers and the resource room teachers (Rust, Miller & Wilson, 1978). Administrators would be naive to assume that simply changing the students' environment would be conducive to achievement (Rust, Miller, & Wilson, 1978). Attitudes between the regular education teachers and the special education teachers and adequate support services can contribute greatly to providing the best educational alternative.

The shortcomings of the mainstreaming concept (Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979) are the over-reliance on consultations by the resource room teacher and inadequate special education instruction which carry over into the regular classroom. Due to over-crowding in many regular

classrooms, the regular education teacher must instruct according to the average skill level of the group thus making individualized teaching for a small group of mainstreamed students very difficult. Although teachers today are better able to teach a variety of individuals (Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979) since the passage of Public Law 94-142, regular education teachers often lack the appropriate skills to help the students labeled handicapped. In the secondary education realm, additional problems exist. For example, high school teachers are generally trained for specific content areas and group instruction, and students are expected to have independent reading skills by the time the high school level is reached. Therefore, students labeled exceptional are not provided the individualized instruction which is necessary if they are to pass successfully the required graduation requirements (Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979).

Characteristics of effective mainstreaming

Certain advantages have been given to support the resource room concept. These benefits include keeping the student labeled handicapped integrated with his or her friends (D'Alonzo et al., 1979; Hammill, 1972), the cost of operating a resource room is less expensive than the cost needed to maintain a self-contained classroom, children labeled mildly handicapped can be serviced, in hope that, more severe deficits that occur in later years may be prevented, and instead of dealing with labels that students have been assigned previously, the resource room program strives to serve the specific needs of each student (D'Alonzo et al., 1979).

Vandivier and Vandivier (1979) state that mainstreaming can be

even more effective when (a) resource teachers are asked to serve a moderate number of students, (b) regular meetings are held between the regular education teachers and the resource teachers to discuss the progress of students who are mainstreamed, and (c) regular education teachers willingly consent to work with the students who are mainstreamed. For mainstreaming to be successful, research has shown that communication is a needed factor if regular education teachers and special education teachers are to work closely together (Davis, 1982; Graham, Burdg, Hudson, & Carpenter, 1980; Harris & Mahar, 1975; Jenkins & Mayhall, 1976; Johnson & Johnson, 1980; Jones, Gottlieb, Guskin, & Yoshida, 1978; Speece & Mandell, 1980).

Responsibilities of the resource teacher

According to Cierian (1968), a list of duties performed by the resource teacher includes such functions as (a) teaching in his or her own classroom daily, (b) consulting with the classroom teachers before and after school, (c) meeting with the regular education teachers to assist with lesson planning and providing alternatives for the student who is mainstreamed, (d) observing in the regular classroom, (e) discussing student progress with the regular education teachers and parents, (f) screening students for placement and preparing written evauluations for the students, and (g) providing inservice training sessions on appropriate topics. The resource teacher should be more knowledgeable than the majority of teachers he or she serves. By providing a variety of services, the resource teacher will be viewed as an expert in the field of education (Leviton, 1978).

Davis (1983) conducted a study to determine resource room

teachers perceptions of the skills they felt were most important and necessary in order for the resource room program to be effective. A questionnaire entitled the "Resource Teachers' Survey (RTS)" (p. 596) was developed and distributed to resource teachers in Maine. The questionnaire used a 5-point Likert-type rating scale with 1 representing a score of "not important" and 5 being "extremely or most important." The resource teachers were asked to rate 32 competencies or skills which were needed to fulfill their duties as "effective resource teachers" (p. 596) based upon their own experiences as resource teachers.

The results indicated that the top skill listed by the resource teachers was their ability to teach basic academic skills. The resource teachers felt the ability to handle stress related to their teaching position was also highly important and necessary for an effective resource room program. Other skills that the resource teachers listed as important included, in order, communication skills with parents, behavior management techniques, and skills necessary to consult effectively with the regular education teachers (Davis, 1983).

The importance of communication skills cannot be stressed enough for the resource teacher since the major portion of special education takes place in the regular education classroom where the resource teacher takes on the duty of a consultant to the regular education teacher (Newcomer, 1977). The initial contact between the resource teacher and the regular education teachers may be the most crucial (Safran, 1982). Effective communication is helpful in establishing rapport between the regular education teacher and the resource teacher

(Adamson, 1983). Resource teachers may unintentionally provide information about a student which may lead the regular education teacher to develop positive or negative attitudes about that student (Safran, 1982). Expectations by the regular education teacher can be influenced by the type of background information received and whether the information is a stereotype of a label (Safran & Barcikowski, 1984).

In a study by Gickling and Theobald (1975), less than 15% of the regular education teachers and secondary education teachers who responded to a survey believed they possessed the skills needed to help students labeled exceptional. For this reason, Vandivier and Vandivier (1979) have recommended that the regular education teachers and the resource teachers must work closely together to develop a complete program that can be utilized in the regular classroom. The resource teachers and the regular classroom teachers should include instructions which complement each other. Isolated experiences in each setting may confuse the student (Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979) and present competition between the regular education teacher and the resource teacher. Both teachers should merge their ideas to obtain the best educational results for the students being served (Stainback & Stainback, 1984).

Special education teachers and regular education teachers often have difficulty determining if a student should be referred for special and/or related services such as speech or medical services. By discussing information about the student, the resource teacher and the regular education teacher can determine more accurately if the referral is needed (Sabatino, 1972). One of the functions of the resource

teacher is to screen students who may be eligible for special education services. The resource teacher must be able to interpret the results from the assessment tools to the regular education teacher in terms which are understandable to the regular education teacher (Idol-Maestas, 1981; Safran, 1982; Vance, 1979). Also, interaction between both the resource teacher and the regular education teacher concerning daily problems experienced by the student provides more of an opportunity for problem solving to occur (Sabatino, 1972).

Resource teachers are often called upon to assist the regular education teacher in reducing and remediating learning problems experienced by students in the mainstream of education (Padfield, 1981; Powell, 1981). The resource teacher should set a goal to increase the skill level and the positive attitudes of the regular education teachers when they are dealing with the needs of students labeled handicapped (Ozer, 1978). Although a survey by Davis (1983) indicated that 25% of resource teachers felt demonstrating teaching skills was not an important part of their job, other studies (Leviton, 1978; Padfield, 1981; Powell, 1981; Reger, 1972) have shown that resource teachers should model teaching techniques to regular classroom teachers.

Resource teachers need to explain and provide examples of the special education curriculum to the regular education teachers to increase their knowledge of special education (Sabatino, 1972). The resource teacher should also work closely with the regular education teacher to develop proper teaching techniques to be used with the student who is mainstreamed (Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979) and to lend assistance in modifying materials to be used in the regular classroom

(Hayes, 1981; Leviton, 1978; Safran & Barcikowski, 1984). The resource teacher may also be enlisted to help develop a joint behavior management system (Safran & Barcikowski, 1984).

Consultant/support services

Special education program models take on many forms and a variety of methods have been utilized to develop interaction between the resource teacher and the regular education teacher (Adamson, 1983). When a student labeled handicapped is mainstreamed, the intent is not to have the student go through the education process alone (Weisgerber, Dahl, & Appleby, 1981). To make the resource program effective, support services may be of value to the regular classroom teacher (Speece & Mandell, 1980; Weisgerber et al., 1981).

Consultant services provided by the resource teacher are helpful to keep the line of communication open (Jenkins & Mayhall, 1973; Speece & Mandell, 1980; Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979). By placing the resource teacher into the role of a resource consultant, communication can occur and support services are provided to the regular education teacher concerning the needs of students who are labeled handicapped. A few of the duties of the resource teacher/consultant are to provide information to the regular education teacher concerning the behavioral and academic skills of the student and to provide recommendations for successful mainstreaming of the students (Jenkins & Mayhall, 1973; Lilly & Givens-Ogle, 1981; Neel, 1981; Nelson & Stevens, 1981; Safran, 1982; Reynolds, 1978).

Speece and Mandell (1980) investigated the delivery of support services to the regular classroom teacher from the resource teacher.

A list of 26 services, taken from the literature, was adopted into the Index of Support Services. For each support service on the survey, two sections were developed, importance and frequency. Importance referred to how much the regular education teacher felt this service was of value to the mainstreaming of students diagnosed as learning and behavioral disordered. Five possible responses ranged from "no value" to "vital." The area of frequency was concerned with how often the resource teacher provided these services. The six possible responses ranged from "not provided" to "more than once per week."

A total of 228 regular elementary teachers who had students labeled learning and/or behavior disordered and who were receiving resource room assistance completed the survey. Under the category of importance, teachers rated "attending parent conferences, providing remedial instruction, meeting to discuss student progress, suggesting/supplying materials, and sharing information on student behavioral characteristics" (Speece & Mandell, 1980, p. 51) as the most valued support services.

Some services were not provided frequently, but they were provided as often as necessary. Because of this, eight items under the frequency subgroup could not be analyzed appropriately for comparison. Only two services that were listed as most important by the regular teachers were also rated as being provided frequently. These two areas included "remedial instruction in the resource room and informal meetings on student progress" (Speece & Mandell, 1980, p. 51).

Speece and Mandell (1980) concluded that resource teachers were not providing the support services that regular education teachers expressed as being most important. Several reasons were provided by

Speece and Mandell (1980) explaining why resource teachers may not be providing the necessary services to the regular education teachers (a) class schedules provide only a limited amount of time which can be spent planning lessons (b) resource teachers spend the majority of their time providing instruction to students labeled handicapped, and (c) teacher training programs for special education teachers focus on the education of students labeled handicapped. Therefore, developing consultation skills between teachers is not the major focus of education (Speece & Mandell, 1980).

Indirest/direct service programs

Resource room programs may focus on two types of service models, either the direct or the indirect service model. The difference between these two models is based on who provides the instruction to the student. In the direct service model the student is provided instructions directly from the resource teacher. In the indirect service model the student is provided instruction by the regular classroom teacher with the assistance of a consulting resource teacher (Jenkins & Mayhall, 1973). The Granite School District in Salt Lake City, Utah, incorporated a resource program for the secondary level that used both direct services and indirect services. The major emphasis of the school district was to combine direct instruction and generalization into the resource program. One component of the resource curriculum was to help the students transfer new skills to the regular classroom setting. Each day one of the goals was to observe the progress of students who had been mainstreamed into the regular classroom (Adamson, 1983). In this particular program, "tracking" described the support services which complemented the direct instruction of the students in

the areas of "basic tool and prevocational skills" (Adamson, 1983, p. 71). These services were provided directly to the student in the resource room setting, or indirectly to the student through the regular classroom teacher (Adamson, 1983).

Indirect tracking services provided indirect help to the student by working with the regular classroom teacher. The effectiveness of the indirect tracking service was highly dependent upon a quality relationship between the resource teacher and the regular education teacher. Regular education teachers were more willing to experiment with new suggestions when a high level of rapport and trust was developed with the resource room teacher (Adamson, 1983).

Direct tracking services were provided to help students complete classwork and/or behave properly according to social norms. These services were provided in the resource room, but these activities were also necessary for students who were already in the regular classroom. The students labeled as handicapped were assisted in learning appropriate behaviors because these behaviors related directly to lifelike situations. Therefore, the application of this knowledge could be applied immediately (Adamson, 1983).

Wixson (1980) studied various types of service models to determine which model would serve the most students labeled learning and/or behavior disordered without sacrificing the effectiveness of the program. "Assessment, programming, and instructional services" (p.116) for both a direct service resource program model and a two-component resource program model which combined direct services

and indirect services in a resource room were compared. Wixson (1980) theorized that the two-component resource program model would best serve the needs of the students.

The study (Wixson, 1980) was conducted in seven resource rooms in elementary school settings. Data were collected for both the direct service model and the indirect service model. The school year prior to the study provided the data that were used for comparison for the two programs. During the previous school year, the school district provided only direct services in the special education program.

Students placed in the direct service program were assessed and the educational program for those students were developed and carried out in the resource room. Students placed in the indirect service program were assessed and their educational programs were also developed by the resource teacher. In contrast to the direct service program however, the educational programs for the students in the indirect service model were implemented in the regular classroom by the regular education teacher.

Wixson (1980) discovered various reasons for referring students for the direct and indirect service models. Academic problems were sighted as being the most frequent reason for referring students under the direct service model and behavior disorders were the second most frequent reason for referral. The indirect service model found the opposite to be true. Behavior problems were the first reason sighted for referrals, with academic problems being the second cause for referral.

For this study, Wixson (1980) sought to distinguish which program,

the direct service model or the indirect service model, accomplished the most for the school year. The criteria for a successful program included a recommendation to return the student into the regular classroom full-time next year with the support service from the resource teacher no longer being necessary. Each teacher who instructed the student also had to indicate that the pupil's academic achievement and/or behavior was satisfactory.

Success rates for this study (Wixson, 1980) indicated that 30 percent of the students in the direct service program model were returned to the regular classroom without support services and 57 percent of the students in the indirect service program model were returned to the regular classroom without support services. Wixson (1980) concluded from this study that a greater number of students labeled learning and/or behavior disordered can be placed successfully back into the regular classroom if the resource program includes both the direct service program model and the indirect service program model instead of using only the direct service program model.

In order for a two-component resource room service model to be effective, many demands are placed on the resource teacher. He or she must have expertise in the areas of "assessment, programming, and instructional techniques" (Wixson, 1980, p. 123) Additionally, the resource teacher must work effectively with other teachers. Wilson (1980) stressed that the resource teacher should possess the needed skills for effective communication with other staff members and be able to instruct inservice training sessions. Overall, the resource teacher must be proficient in the area of public relations (Wixson, 1980).

Another effective program, entitled "S.C.A.P.E. (Students Care About Placement in Education)" (Morrill, 1979, p. 456), was conducted in a middle school in Delaware. The program, which was a result of Public Law 94-142, was developed to assist in mainstreaming students in an effective manner. This program allowed students who were handicapped to escape labels in the classroom, and it provided advantages to the teachers by using the special education and the regular education teachers in the same room. The resource teacher could devote more time to assessing the learning styles of each student in the class, and the resource teacher could work directly with students who had been mainstreamed into the regular classroom. Both the regular education teacher and the resource teacher instructed all the students which helped reduce the stigma associated with students labeled exceptional (Morrill, 1979).

The most important factor which contributed to the success of the program (Morrill, 1979) was the communication between the regular classroom teacher and the special education teacher. The shared planning time involved discussing upcoming lessons, goals, materials, and special needs of the student labeled handicapped. The regular classroom teacher was able to feel comfortable with the students who were mainstreamed into the regular classroom because of the constant communication.

Communication and the student labeled learning disabled

The responsibilities which are most frequently designated for the resource teacher of students labeled learning disabled include communication and consultation services that are provided to the

regular classroom teacher (Reynolds, 1978). White and Pryzwansky (1982) examined the effects of consultation training for teachers of students labeled learning disabled and found that regular education teachers rated the resource teachers as having more empathy when the resource teacher had been trained in communication skills.

Because teachers of students labeled learning disabled are often the only faculty members in a school building trained to provide instruction to the students labeled handicapped, the role of the resource teacher is that of a specialist. This makes it very critical that he or she serve as a consultant to other educators in the school system (Vance, 1979). As these students are provided with direct instruction from the regular education teachers, support services are needed from the resource teacher (Safran & Barcikowski, 1984). The resource teacher must discuss with the regular education teacher characteristics that are unique to the student labeled learning disabled and suggest techniques which will help the student adjust to the mainstreaming process (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982).

Ozer (1978) devised a planning process for students labeled handicapped that incorporates the use of both the resource teacher and the regular classroom teacher. The steps include stating the objectives, stating the resources to be used in executing the objectives, developing a plan for implementation of the objectives, and evaluation. The emphasis of the plan is based on the experiences of the regular education teacher and the resource teacher during the first two steps, stating the objectives and resources. By consulting with each other for these two steps, the impact of the plan may increase.

Perceived time/actual time utilization

There is often a major difference in the amount of time teachers believe they spend completing various tasks and the actual amount of time spent completing the same task. Sargent (1981) collected data on the "percentage of time resource teachers spend on specified activities" (p. 421). A survey was distributed to 132 resource teachers in five states. The respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time spent on each of 10 activities and then to estimate the amount of time needed to perform each of the 10 activities sufficiently.

Trained observers spent two sessions observing each of 30 randomly selected teachers and collecting data which could be compared to the estimated time provided by the respondents. By measuring the resource teachers time by the time-sampling procedures, Sargent (1981) discoved that 8.51% of the resource teachers time was spent consulting with other staff members and 0% of the time was spend conducting inservice training sessions. Sargent (1981) also found that resource teachers often had to interrupt their instructional time in order to consult with other teachers. It was suggested that scheduling conference times more carefully or adding personnel for consulting purposes may help eliminate this waste of instructional time.

Respondents also indicated that providing inservice training sessions to other staff members was included in their list of duties. This study (Sargent, 1981) did not reveal any time being recorded for providing inservice training sessions although resource teachers estimated 1.25% of their time was spent in this area. This information indicates that administrators may need to provide assistance to the

resource teacher in order to include inservice training sessions in the schools or this duty should be eliminated from the resource teachers job profile.

Evans (1980) developed three instruments to assess the percentage of time that resource teachers spent performing various roles, specifically that of a consultant, the attitudes of school personnel towards a resource teacher in a consultant role, and the elements which are necessary for successful consulting services. Personal data, the amount of time engaged in actual consultation, and a questionnaire to determine which factors respondents felt were essential for resource teachers acting as consultants were distributed to resource teachers, regular classroom teachers, and principals.

Resource teachers did not rate consultations as a priority role with only 5% or less of their time being spent performing this duty. Regular classroom teachers, resource teachers, and principals all believed that the ideal amount of time spent consulting should increase, however the actual time spent in consultation proved to be only half of what the respondents believed it should be. Respondents also indicated that they would be more willing to consult with resource teachers who had obtained a master's degree or a higher level of education (Evans, 1980).

Evans (1981) also studied the perceptions of resource teachers, regular education teachers and principals to determine what they believed the role of the resource teacher should be and what they know it actually is. Two hundred and forty educators were selected "using stratified random sampling" (p. 402) to participate in this study.

The educators represented 34 school districts. In these districts 78% of the regular education teachers and 83% of the resource teachers were female and 88% of the principals were male.

Evans (1981) developed an instrument to measure the subjects' perceptions of the amount of time that resource teachers actually participated in various teaching duties and the amount of time that the subjects believed resource teachers should participate in the various duties. The respondents were asked to provide this information by supplying the percent of time needed for the following eight duties: planning, diagnosis, instruction, assessment, communication, consulting, clerical, miscellaneous. The survey was individually administered to resource teachers, regular classroom teachers, and principals.

"An analysis of differences between and within actual and ideal responses was performed for each of the eight roles for the total group and between each educator pair for each of the eight roles" (Evans, 1981, p. 601). The results indicated that the differences between actual time spent and desired time spent performing the first 4 roles of planning, diagnosis, instruction, and assessment were insignificant, but that the actual time spent and the desired time spent performing the roles of communication, consultation, clerical, and miscellaneous displayed significant differences. These findings indicated that respondents favored more time to be utilized in the area of communication and consultation and less time used performing clerical and miscellaneous duties. Classroom teachers also felt that less time by the resource teacher should be spent in diagnosis and more should be spent in communication. Classroom teachers, principals, and

resource teachers all agreed that the amount of time allotted for consulting should be doubled and the amount of time spent on clerical and miscellaneous tasks should be cut in-half.

For the areas of assessment, consultation, and miscellaneous duties, the actual time the resource teacher performed these roles and the perceived time indicated by all three groups showed no significance. For the areas of planning and diagnosis, classroom teachers overestimated the time necessary in fulfilling these tasks and underestimated the time necessary to complete instructional duties. The principals' perceptions of these duties agreed closely to the responses provided by the resource teachers except in the area of clerical duties, which the principals underestimated in comparison to the classroom teachers and the resource teachers.

The last two studies (Evans, 1980, 1981) indicate that classroom teachers support the idea that resource teachers should increase the amount of time spent in the role of communication, although this is not an indication that consultation should be the major focus of the special education program. The responses to these two studies do suggest that special education personnel should be responsive to input from the regular education teachers in order to implement effective programs for students who are mainstreamed. Resource teachers who hold master's degrees are also accepted more readily as a consultant by the regular education teachers (Evans, 1980).

Effective consulting/consultant training model

If resource teachers are to increase communication with other school personnel certain factors can be included in order to provide

an effective education plan for the student labeled handicapped. Lilly (1971) expressed three major components that should be included for resource teachers participating in a consulting resource teacher program. Lilly believed that all students should remain in the mainstream for education and the resource teacher should support the regular education teacher as he or she works with the student labeled handicapped. The regular education teacher should also handle learning problems as they originate.

If the resource teacher is striving to provide effective consulting services to the regular education teacher, the manner in which information is presented is of importance. The approach that the resource teacher employs to provide information may effect the regular education teacher's opinion of the student labeled handicapped which, in turn, may effect the treatment of that student in the regular classroom. The information provided by the resource teacher must portray the student in a realistic manner if the regular education teacher is to form an accurate opinion of the student (Safran, 1982).

To exam this idea, Safran (1982) randomly placed 68 regular education teachers into four experimental groups where written narratives and videotape representations were used to depict the following situations; "positive information-withdrawn behavior, negative information-withdrawn behavior, positive information-acting-out behavior, or negative information-acting-out behavior" (p. 26). The subjects read information that was supposedly provided by a resource teacher depicting a positive or negative portrayal of a student. The subjects then watched a videotape which dramatized the

interactions between a 12-year-old student and one teacher. Some videotapes illustrated the student as withdrawn while other videotapes depicted an acting-out student.

After reading the narrative and viewing the videotape, each teacher was given "the Regular Educator Expectancy Scale (REES)" (Safran, 1982, p. 26) to complete. This scale was developed to measure the expectations of the regular education teacher toward the student labeled handicapped who had been placed into the regular classroom. The Regular Educator Expectancy Scale provided the researcher with three sections: information, behavior, interaction.

A "two-way analysis of variance was administered for each of the three sections of the REES," (Safran, 1982, p. 28). The results indicated that regular education teachers are concerned about inappropriate acting-out behavior which students who are mainstreamed may bring into the regular classroom. The results also indicated that information provided by the resource teacher about the student who is mainstreamed produces higher expectations by the regular education teacher but regular education teachers expected the same success rates for students who act-out and for students who are withdrawn. These results indicate that the communication provided by the resource teacher did not highly influence the regular education teachers' expectations after being exposed to a variety of behaviors (Safran, 1982).

To assist resource teachers of students labeled learning disabled in developing consultation skills, Cohen and Safran (1981) developed a training model comprised of two steps, microteaching and consultation.

Stage one, microteaching, allowed inexperienced teachers to be videotaped while presenting a 10-minute lesson plan. After completing the microteaching lesson, the subjects completed a self-evaluation on their performance and the microteaching experience. The subjects shared this information with consultants in order to initiate rapport. The consultants were experienced teachers enrolled in advanced classes for teaching students labeled learning disabled.

Stage two, consultation, consisted of a 20-minute consulting period between the subjects and the consultants. The consultation centered around the strengths and weaknesses of the microteaching experience and the appropriateness of the lesson for the students labeled learning disabled. The major goal of the consultation was for the subjects to develop communication skills equivalent to those which should be displayed by professionals in the area of education (Cohen & Safran, 1981).

During the consultation stage an instructor observed the consultation process between the inexperienced teachers and the experienced teachers. Feedback was provided to the experienced teachers on their ability to communicate effectively with the inexperienced teachers and on their ability to analyze lessons appropriately. The instructor also assessed the experienced teachers' ability to determine important aspects of the lesson and to present suggestions in an encouraging and unbiased manner. The strengths and weaknesses of each participant could be determined and the need for improvement could be stressed for various skills (Cohen & Safran, 1981).

This consultation model could be modified for inclusion in an inservice training session. Because it provides realistic experiences, this program provides teachers with an opportunity to practice mainstreaming skills which can be transferred into "real" classroom situations. By allowing teachers to experience both the role of the inexperienced teacher and the experienced teacher, the participants could acquire a better understanding of the consultant process (Cohen & Safran, 1981).

Inservice training sessions

The resource teacher has many responsibilities which need to be provided when successfully carrying out his or her role as the special education specialist (Vance, 1979). However, it is not feasible for teacher-training programs to educate enough teachers to handle all the needs of students with specific learning problems. Only a limited number of teachers can return to universities each year in order to broaden their education. For programs which are directed toward helping students with specific learning problems to develop properly, inservice training sessions need to be presented to educators in the local schools (Vance, 1979).

The need for inservice training for regular education teachers developed because of the frustrations the regular educators experienced while attempting to educate the students who had been mainstreamed into their classrooms (Carberry, Waxman, & McKain, 1981). Therefore, one of the major services that can be provided by the resource teacher is to provide inservice training sessions to the regular education teachers (Leviton, 1978; Powell, 1981). The

resource teacher who provides materials and techniques to the regular classroom teacher is actually already providing an ongoing inservice training program to these teachers (Reger, 1972).

Powell (1981) suggested various ways in which inservice training can be provided to the regular classroom teachers. Inservice training can be accomplished by "one-to-one instruction, small group instruction and modeling the procedures to be taught." (p. 185). The resource teacher may find it helpful to model the appropriate techniques for the regular education teacher in the regular classroom. By placing the resource teacher in the regular classroom, immediate feedback can be provided to the regular education teacher (Powell, 1981). Regardless of where or how the inservice training occurs, the main objective is to help the regular education teacher cope with problems which may arise in the regular classroom (Leviton, 1978).

Carberry et al., (1981) offered several suggestions that can be helpful in providing an inservice training session that runs smoothly. Prior to the inservice training session, the presenter may wish to provide all the teachers with a list of vocabulary words and definitions that are used by the resource teacher. The list might include terms such as auditory processing, perceptual difficulty, and visual discrimination. During the inservice training session, the presenter could provide concrete examples of learning problems which are characteristic of the specific handicap being discussed. The resource teacher should also encourage the regular education teachers to provide examples of problems that students being mainstreamed might have experienced.

Carberry et al., (1981) concluded that the major objectives of inservice training programs were to make regular education teachers more aware of the characteristics and problems experienced by students with learning problems, and to increase communication between the resource teacher and the regular education teachers concerning students who have been mainstreamed. Teachers may have more empathy for the student labeled handicapped if they participate in simulated activities specific to various handicapping conditions. Substituting symbols for letters of the alphabet and giving the teachers three minutes to learn the new alphabet and have the teachers decipher words and sentences is one example. This exercise allows the regular education teachers to experience the frustration, anger, and confusion felt by the student labeled learning disabled who has been placed in the regular classroom. Having the teachers write a message with the opposite hand usually preferred is another activity. This provides an example of the trouble experienced by a student with fine motor skills. In order to provide an example of auditory figure ground, playing a taped lecture with disturbing noises in the background and having the teachers tell the main idea of the lecture is just one more task that could be used. A group discussion of the feelings experienced by the teachers during each task and how they might deal more effectively with children is a good culminating experience (Carberry et at., 1981).

The last topic of the workshop should consist of open-ended questioning for the regular education teachers and the resource teachers. Questions should deal with the responsibilities of each teacher toward the student labeled exceptional, developing a system for

communication between the teachers, problems which may arise due to scheduling, and how to solve these problems. Other topics which should be open to discussion include teaching styles, learning styles of the students, and grading procedures of the students who have been mainstreamed into the regular classrooms. Each workshop should conclude with an evaluation of the workshop. This may be accomplished by having each teacher complete a rating scale (Carberry et al., 1981).

Attitudes toward inservice training, planning, and programs

Resource room programs are considered the most appropriate alternative for educating students labeled handicapped (Adams, 1982; Leviton, 1978; Miller & Sabatino, 1978). The resource program would be even more beneficial to the student if the regular education teachers and the resource teachers agreed on the many aspects of education. Gickling, Murphy, and Mallory (1979) developed a survey to assess how regular education teachers and resource teachers felt about inservice training programs, cooperative planning, and resource programs. The only teachers involved in this study were those who had displayed positive attitudes for placing students labeled handicapped into regular classrooms.

The instrument that Gickling et al. (1979) applied consisted of an "open-ended Delphi type questionnaire" (p. 443). This questionnaire was given to regular and special education teachers. After the first form was completed, this knowledge was used to create a second form which involved forced choice answers. The questionnaire included four sections. These areas covered demographic information about the teachers and the school system, the procedure in which inservices were

selected, scheduling and planning time, and considerations dealing with case loads and placements. In the last three areas, teachers were asked to supply suggestions that would help assist in mainstreaming. The questionnaire was completed by 60 teachers and administrators in Tennessee.

The educators ranked the questions numerically. These rankings displayed the educators personal preference for each question. The responses of special education teachers were scored independently from the responses of the regular classroom teachers. The totals of each statement were transformed into percentages to compare the responses given by each group (Gickling et al., 1979).

In this study, Gickling et al. (1979) found that attitudes are very important in the issue of special education. The results revealed that although group inservice training was considered important by both groups of educators, working on a one-to-one basis with each other concerning a student would be a more effective type of ongoing inservice. Both regular and special educators agreed on the appropriate size of the case load and the amount of direct teaching involved for each child. Both groups felt a conference time should occur between them concerning the students, and both groups agreed that services should be provided regularly to the students, preferably on a daily basis. Both groups also felt that the regular curriculum program should be used by both teachers in class, however, the special educators may need to help modify materials (Gickling et al., 1979).

Problems experienced with the resource room program

Various problems may develop which may hinder the effectiveness of

a resource program. One problem area deals with organizational readiness. This refers to the "existance of a well developed need for change, together with a positive attitude toward the resource concept" (Harris, & Mahar, 1975), p. 96). A well trained resource teacher may provide many services, but the help of supportive service combined with a resource program will benefit the students more. For organizational readiness to exist, educators and administrators must be understanding, supportive, and committed to the program (Harris & Mahar, 1975).

The second problem area is referred to by Harris and Mahar (1975) as "system shock" (p. 97). "System shock occurs when the delicate balance of role functions and relationships within a system must be readjusted to include a previously unfamiliar, undefined, and potentially threatening role" (p. 97). An example of this would be when a new resource teacher is added to a rural district where there previously was no resource teacher, the system must adjust.

A study done by McLoughlin and Kelly (1982) indicated that the lack of unclear role descriptions was a vital issue plaguing resource programs. One indication of this role conflict was developed by a lack of adequate time for vital functions such as individual planning, consulting, and observing. Harris and Mahar (1975) felt that good public relations may help overcome these problems, and that administrators and educators must know exactly what their roles are.

Harris and Mahar (1975) also discovered that interpersonal characteristics may create problems. These problems were referred to as "interpersonal roadblocks" (p. 98). Classroom teachers may be on the defense concerning their teaching styles, and they may be unwilling to

move away from the same procedures they have used previously. Problems also arise when the resource teacher presents ideas that show little or no results. Some resource teachers have problems working closely with the regular education teachers. Resource teachers must have a knowledge of materials that can be used in the classroom and methods that can be employed (Harris & Mahar, 1975).

Graham et al., (1980) evaluated the concept of resource rooms by examining the attitudes of educational personnel to mainstreaming. The objectives of the study were to determine the skill competency of the regular teachers, the support from the resource room, and the communication between the resource and regular education teachers. Twenty-three resource room teachers and 144 regular teachers contributed as subjects for the study. Each regular education teacher had at least one student who was diagnosed as being handicapped and was receiving services from a resource program.

Two forms of an opinion instrument were designed for the study, one form for the resource room teachers and one for the regular education teachers. Twenty-five Likert-type items were presented on each form to assess the subject's attitudes toward mainstreaming. A factor analysis presented five factors on which to base the study. These factors consisted of communication, attitudes on the effectiveness of mainstreaming, the mainstreaming skills possessed by the regular teachers, the availability of the resource room for assistance, and the perceptions of teachers concerning how appropriate mainstreaming can be.

The results of this study (Graham et al., 1980) indicated that

resource room teachers and regular education teachers agreed that the resource room was available for assistance. Both groups believed that mainstreaming was appropriate, however, both the regular education teachers and the resource teachers agreed that the regular teachers may not have the necessary skills to deal with students labeled handicapped. Resource teachers stated that ample communication existed between themselves and the regular teachers. In contrast, the regular teachers stressed that sufficient communication did not exist between the two groups. Last, the resource teachers did not feel the students labeled handicapped would show more academic gains in the mainstreamed program.

McLoughlin and Kelly (1982) sought to identify problems experienced by resource teachers and to present these problems in the order of their importance. The five areas which were covered included policy and procedure, attitudes, time, materials, and instructional skills. To determine which areas presented problems for the resource teachers a 35 item questionnaire was distributed to 89 resource teachers. The subjects were asked to rate the degree of difficulty experienced when dealing with certain aspects of the resource room model. Respondents rated the items on the following 1 to 4 point scale. "1=not at all a problem; 2=somewhat a problem; 3=usually a problem; 4=always a problem" (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982, p. 59). The respondents were also asked to list who would be most effective in solving the problem. The choices included "teacher training institution, school district, some other agency or person, more than one of these or none of these" (p. 59). The teachers were also asked to complete demographic

data stating their teaching area, teaching level, teaching experiences, and teaching background.

Grand means were computed to show the degree of difficulty experienced by the resource teacher for each of the five areas: policy and procedures, attitudes, time, materials, instructional skills. Analyses of variance were also performed on the five areas based on the following demographic data: teaching type, teaching level, teaching experience, teaching background. Teaching level, experience, and background did not influence the ratings of these problem areas by the resource teachers, but teachers of students labeled learning disabled did feel a lack of materials which teachers of students labeled educable mentally handicapped did not indicate (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982).

One area which presented a substantial problem for the subjects of the survey was the policies and procedures for the resource room. Teachers of students labeled educable mentally handicapped, more experienced teachers, and teachers who had taught in a variety of classroom settings questioned the procedure used to determine eligibility of students for mainstreaming. Elementary resource teachers were more concerned with the number of students served in the classroom as compared to resource teachers in the junior high school. Elementary resource teachers felt there was a problem with the number of students they were asked to serve and the number that was permitted by law.

The resource teachers agreed upon the problems presented in the area of attitudes, however elementary teachers were more concerned about the image their classes presented while secondary teachers were not as

concerned. Secondary classes were seen as more suitable resource room settings as compared to elementary classrooms because students who leave to attend resource room programs were more noticed. Time also presented many problems for the teachers. Teachers of students labeled educable mentally handicapped had more of a problem finding time to consult with other teaching professionals than the teachers of students labeled learning disabled. Elementary resource teachers did not feel that there was adequate time for planning, program writing, modifying and selecting materials and programs while the junior high resource teachers did not feel this was as great a problem (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982).

A few significant differences were found in the area of materials and instructional skills. Teachers with regular and special class background and more experienced teachers revealed a lack of knowledge concerning the regular classroom curriculum, which may hinder the placement of students who are labeled exceptional.

This study (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982) revealed problem areas which may be addressed by school districts. Local schools should look at the policies and procedures used by the resource room, the criteria used for mainstreaming students labeled handicapped, the capacity of students in the resource room, and the training of the staff to prepare them for effective mainstreaming. Resource room teachers must help provide positive attitudes toward the resource room and the mainstreaming concept. This can be accomplished by inservice training sessions, communicating with other members of the teaching staff, and providing proficient resource programs. Teacher roles should be clarified to avoid

conflicts in the resource program. The resource teacher should have adequate time to plan for each student, consult with others, and observe students in the regular classroom setting. Teacher roles should be clearly defined and time must be provided for teachers to perform the necessary tasks (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982).

Solutions for effective mainstreaming

Resource room teachers undertake many duties and responsibilities and it is not easy to find the necessary time needed to add other responsibilities to the list (Adamson, 1983). Due to class schedules, daytime meetings for regular and resource teachers are impractical, and teacher conference days are usually filled with a wide variety of topics which need to be covered (Vandivier & Vandivier, 1979). Resource teachers need time to schedule three major areas into an already busy schedule. One area which should be included is consultation time with the students who are mainstreamed and the regular classroom teachers, and time to observe the performance of each student labeled exceptional who has been placed in the regular classroom. The curriculum in the resource room must be changed to include daily survival skills and behavioral skills which will be carried into regular classroom situations, and finally, resource teachers also need to build a working relationship with the regular education teachers based on trust to allow effective consultation to occur (Adamson, 1983).

Finding extra time to observe students in the regular classroom and to consult with the regular education teacher posses a serious problem for the resource teacher who has no preparation period during the school day (Adamson, 1983). One possible solution to this was

suggested by Sabatino (1972). This solution evolved around the concept of a "relief teacher" (p. 343). The relief teacher would relieve the regular teacher or the special education teacher so that consultations can take place between the two teachers. This idea would allow the regular teacher to visit the resource room, examine the students at work, and learn teaching techniques that may be of value to him or her in the regular classroom. This idea also provides time for the resource teacher to observe in the regular classroom.

Two solutions which helped rectify the time conflict were used by the Granite School District in Salt Lake City, Utah. The resource room teachers were given an extra free period each day to carry out added duties. Providing this extra free period helped to eliminate before and after school meetings which might have created resentment between teachers or have been impossible to carry out. Meeting times which were scheduled during the school day were often easier to attend. During the extra preparation period, resource teachers were able to consult with regular education teachers, consult with students, observe students who were mainstreamed, monitor student interaction, provide insight for crisis intervention, and many other services which were not feasible before, due to limited time (Adamson, 1983).

Another solution (Adamson, 1983) was to select the students labeled exceptional who could be placed in a regular classroom full-time if support services would still be provided. These students would not have daily contact with the resource teacher but they would be able to consult with the resource teacher in order to solve problems and when instruction was needed on a short-term basis. These students would also

be served by indirect services which were provided through the regular education teacher.

In order for the resource teachers in the Granite School District in Salt Lake City, Utah (Adamson, 1983) to include functional life skills and behavioral skills in the resource program, a change was made in the curriculum. The resource room provided services to students only in the areas of "reading, math, language arts, functional life skills, and behavioral skills" (p. 73). This change allowed the resource teacher to help the students in the areas of "academic school survival skills and behavioral skills" (p. 73).

Finding time to build rapport with the regular education teacher was accomplished in various ways (Adamson, 1983). Resource teachers would try to meet with the regular education teachers during coinciding preparation periods. Eating in the faculty lounge or lunchroom was helpful. The resource teacher sponsored extra curricular activities jointly with the regular education teachers, took turns at supervisory positions, and supported faculty events. The resource teacher made his or her services known to the regular education teachers and was available to provide the services.

Tips for successful support services/consultation

One of the best methods to determine what assistance is needed in the regular classroom and how to provide assistance is by observing in the regular classroom. Observing in the regular classroom provides the resource teacher with answers to questions such as how the regular teacher manages class time, how the students interact with the teacher, and vice versa. When the resource teacher enters the regular

classroom, the regular education teacher may be uncomfortable with an observer in the room. Resource teachers should remember this is a natural response and certain safeguards can make the observation a smooth process. One suggestion was to enter the room quietly and sit in an inconspicuous location instead of making a "grand entrance." It might be helpful to talk to the classroom teacher and emphasize the positive aspects of the regular educator's teaching style and the classroom environment which were observed. Another suggestion involved having the resource teacher observe the regular classroom often enough that the regular education teacher and the class were no longer threatened by an extra person in the room (Montgomery, 1978).

If consultations between the regular education teacher and the resource teacher are to be successful, the key is the ability to communicate well. Idol-Maestas (1981) and Montgomery (1978) suggested that communication skills begin by being an active listener. Listening exhibits an interest in the topic and respect for the other teacher (Idol-Maestas, 1981). Montgomery (1978) stated that listening to the regular education teacher helped him or her to relieve frustration, and it provided the resource teacher with valuable information concerning the student's problems in the regular classroom.

Various suggestions could be provided to the resource teacher for useful consultation to occur (a) translate terminology into terms which could be understood by other faculty members (Idol-Maestas, 1981; Safran, 1982), and (b) stress that the work with the student would be a joint effort using pronouns such as "we" not "I." The resource teacher must learn to be supportive of other teachers who may find the experience

of working with students who are mainstreamed very frustrating (Idol-Maestas, 1981).

Bauer (1975) suggested four steps that might also be helpful for consultation purposes. First, a contract could be drawn between the resource teacher and regular education teacher to explain the role of each teacher involved in the student's education and the objectives to be met. Second, both teachers should agree that they are willing to work together. The teachers must work to keep communication a continual process, and last, agreement must be made concerning the evaluations and conclusion of the consulting service for each student. The key to this idea (Bauer, 1975) involved establishing well-defined rules and dialogue in a continuous manner.

To a great extent, rapport is contingent upon the personality of the resource teacher with time, effort, and sincerity being key elements for building rapport. The resource teacher must have the ability to become a good listener but refrain from being judgmental. He or she must have the ability to help the regular education teacher solve problems without lecturing, and the resource teacher should help the regular education teacher to become confident in his or her work with the student labeled handicapped. The resource teacher should be as willing to accept advice from the regular education teacher as he or she is to offering advice (Adamson, 1983).

In order for resource teachers and regular education teachers to work effectively together, training must be provided at the heart of every educational system. Universities which provide teacher training programs should critique their programs to determine how communication

skills are addressed in the curriculum. The area of communication and consultation should not be overlooked in order that both teachers and students may benefit more from the special education program (Davis, 1983).

Although educators cannot deny the need for effective communication and support services for the regular education teachers, limited research has been found to indicate exactly how the resource teacher can best serve the regular educators needs, and exactly what needs the regular educators have. In view of the importance of this subject, the present study served as an assessment of the needs of regular education teachers by surveying regular educaion teachers to determine what information they should receive from the special education teachers to make mainstreaming effective. The study also attempted to determine if there was an significance in the needs of regular education teachers based on the grade level, level of education, and/or sex of the respondent.

Method

Subjects and setting

The subjects in this study were 307 regular education teachers in 6 counties in Central Illinois who returned a survey. Regular education teachers were defined as all teachers in the school system except those teaching in self-contained special education classes or resource room programs. The teachers represented grade levels kindergarten through high school with the following distribution: 30 kindergarten teachers, 35 first grade teachers, 32 second grade teachers, 28 third grade teachers, 34 fourth grade teachers, 38 fifth grade teachers, 30 sixth grade

teachers, 39 seventh grade teachers, 30 eighth grade teachers, 91 high school teachers. The highest level of education achieved by 201 of the respondents was a bachelor's degree, 78 respondents had received master's degrees, 96 respondents had received master's degrees with additional education, 11 respondents had received specialist's degrees, and 1 respondent had received a doctorate degree. Of the participants that completed the survey, 74.4% or 288 individuals were female and 25.6% or 99 individuals were male.

Procedure

A pilot survey was developed from information taken from the literature. This pilot survey contained open-ended questions which were used to solicit information from the respondents. This information was included in the final survey. The pilot survey was distributed to 60 students who were currently enrolled in graduate level education and educational foundation classes at Eastern Illinois University and who were currently teaching or qualified to teach. These students were chosen as participants to provide social validation to the study in the form of subjective evaluation. Kazdin (1982) described subjective evaluation as "soliciting the opinions of others who by expertise, consensus, or familiarity with the client are in a position to judge or evaluate the behaviors in need of treatment" (p. 21).

The subjects were instructed to respond to each item as thoroughly as possible by writing their opinions and attitudes in short answer form. The responses to the questionnaires were scored to determine if similar responses were provided by several individuals.

The top responses for each question were formulated into new questions for the final survey.

Survey design.

A questionnaire containing 19 items concerning important communication aspects between regular education teachers and resource room teachers was developed from the information obtained from the pilot survey and distributed to 1554 teachers in the six county area. The questions were developed to determine regular educators attitudes toward the categories of materials, equipment, scheduling, consultation, assistance and classroom management, individualized education programs and testing procedures. Responses to each question were in a multiple-choice format with four to six responses provided for each question. The responses were coded on computer answer sheets.

The coding section of the survey was used to represent demographic data of each participant. These data included the subject area being taught, grade level being taught, years of teaching experience, sex, and the highest level of education achieved by each respondent.

An appropriate number of surveys were distributed, by mail, to each school in the six county area. Enclosed in each envelope was a letter to the principal (see Appendix A) explaining the purpose of the study, and the procedure to follow for distributing the survey. Each envelope contained enough surveys and computer answer sheets for each regular education teacher in the school building.

The subjects were asked to complete the surveys and return the surveys to the main office in their school. A pre-addressed, stamped envelope with deadlines for the return of the surveys was provided to

each school. The principals or office personnel were asked to mail only the computer sheets at the end of the specified time in the return envelopes. A copy of this survey can be found in this study (see Appendix B for the complete survey).

Results

The response rate for the survey was 24%. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Bent, & Hull, 1975). The categories that were analyzed by this survey, according to the author, included materials, equipment, scheduling, consultation, assistance and classroom management, and individualized education programs (IEP) and testing procedures. In order to determine if these were the actual categories sampled, a factor analysis was employed. In the factor analysis, the Varimax rotation was used.

The categories which were developed for this survey were similar to the results indicated by the factor analysis. Survey item numbers 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 all dealt with the area of consultation according to the factor analysis. The questions intended to cover the subgroup of materials (items 1 and 2) were also grouped correctly. According to the factor analysis question 3, which the author categorized as equipment, also clustered with the area of materials. The questions dealing with assistance (items 14, 15, and 16) were also grouped correctly. The questions for the subgroups that did not represent categories that were predetermined for this survey were for the subgroup scheduling and the subgroup individualized education programs and testing procedures.

A frequency distribution was completed to sort the data from the computer answer sheets and assisted in determining how the responses

were distributed for each question. This information is provided in Table 1.

Consultation

Teachers indicated a preference for verbal consultations while verbal and written consultations combined, provided the regular education teachers second favorite choice. Written consultations were the least desired type of communication, although 11.4% of the teachers did not have a preference. Teachers felt that consultations with the resource teacher should occur when problems arise, although consulting with the resource teacher once a week was the second most popular response.

When a student is mainstreamed into the regular classroom, the regular education teachers would like the resource teacher to provide suggestions concerning teaching techniques, provide examples of new ideas, discuss the materials to be used, provide background information about the students, and discuss what activities the student is working on in the resource room. During conferences the regular education teachers believed it is important to discuss the student's abilities, progress, goals, discipline problems, and attitudes in the regular classroom.

The most appropriate time periods that regular education teachers found to consult with resource teachers were before school, after school, and during prep periods. Prep periods were considered the most appropriate time for consultations, and recess was chosen as the most inappropriate time for consultations to occur.

Legend

The following table depicts the results from the frequency distribution. The percent of individuals selecting each response are provided for each question on the survey.

Table 1

Percentages of the Responses Obtained from the Survey

	No. Responses (%)					
Item No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	18.6	6.7	14.2	21.4	38.0	
2	18.1	12.9	35.2	2.6	30.2	
3	8.8	11.6	16.0	61.2		
4	26.1	27.9	11.9	28.9	4.1	
5	31.0	46.5	14.7	4.9	2.1	
6	73.1	17.8	3.4	0.5	0.3	
7	2.1	4.9	7.8	4.4	5.2	70.0
8	4.4	6.2	9.6	1.8	2.6	71.6
9	47.8	0.5	39.3	11.4		
10	19.4	15.2	19.6	42.9		
11	2.3	35.4	5.7	14.7	40.1	
12	11.1	2.3	23.8	8.8	51.7	
13	10.3	34.1	30.5	11.9	8.3	4.1
14	4.4	10.1	8.5	9.0	4.9	61.0
15	4.4	18.9	8.0	12.9	51.9	
16	19.4	5.4	0.3	2.1	17.1	53.0
17	7.8	39.8	1.6	6.2	39.5	
18	16.0	2.1	27.6	43.2	4.7	
19	55.8	16.0	2.1	24.3		

Materials

Regular education teachers indicated an interest in learning about a variety of materials that are used by the resource teacher. Regular education teachers were least interested in materials used for fine and gross motor skills, while materials used for helping students labeled learning disabled were rated second for question one. The most common response to question 2 was choice number five, "all of the above." The largest percent of these teachers (35.1%) were most interested in determining how to utilize materials in both the regular classroom and the resource room (question 2).

When using special prothetic equipment for students labeled handicapped, regular education teachers were interested in determining if the students would be restricted from various activities due to the equipment. The regular education teachers were also concerned about helping the students with the devices, and becoming familiar with the devices. The majority of teachers (61.2%) were interested in obtaining information regarding each of the issues listed above.

Various amounts of time were spent by the regular education teachers in planning materials and activities for regular students. The most prevalent response provided by 46.5% of the teachers was 6-10 hours per week, with 31% of the teachers requiring 1-5 hours per week for planning. In comparison, 73.1% of the regular education teachers spent only 1-5 hours per week planning materials and activities for the student with special needs in the regular classroom.

Assistance

Sixty-one percent of the regular education teachers indicated that

assistance for all the choices pertaining to the various areas of academic classwork (question 14) were of importance. The three areas of assistance which were selected as most important by the regular education teachers in order, were (a) having the resource teacher explain the specific learning problems of each student, (b) one-on-one tutoring for the student labeled exceptional, and (c) being provided with special materials which could be used when working with the students labeled exceptional. Fifty-one percent of the regular education teachers indicated that explaining the evaluation process of the student in both the regular classroom and the resource room, providing a grading criteria for the student, and receiving feedback on the student's progress by the resource teacher were significant items. Also 51.7% of the regular education teachers expressed a desire for the resource teacher to observe the students in the regular classroom until both teachers felt the student's progress was acceptable.

Regular educators (53%) indicated that they desired assistance in all the areas listed under social skills and behavioral characteristics (question 16). The regular educators indicated an interest in joint counseling with the resource teacher and the student if behavior problems arise. The regular educators also desired information on the kind(s) of behavior(s) which may be exhibited by the student who is mainstreamed while he or she is in the regular classroom.

Individualized education program

An individualized education program is developed for each student in special education. In order for the individualized education program to be effective regular education teachers revealed that they would like to be provided information on the goals and objectives which

are specific to their subject area for the student who is mainstreamed. The teachers also would like information on evaluating students, the forms and materials used for writing the individualized education program (IEP), and the whole process associated with staffings and the writing of an individualized education program.

Teachers felt the most important change which should occur in staffings was for more communication to occur between all those involved in the staffing. The second change, as expressed by the regular education teachers, was for psychologists to use input from all the teachers not just from psychological tests.

The final method of analysis involved cross tabulations. From the information, conclusions can be drawn concerning what variables or questions were most important to each group of individuals. Cross tabulations were computed based on the grade level taught by the regular educators, the highest level of education achieved by the regular educators, and the sex of the respondents.

The grade level of the participants did not show significance ($p > .05$) for the responses the individuals provided for the majority of questions on the survey. However, significance ($p < .001$) was shown for question 1. Regular educators of grades kindergarten, 1, 2, 3, and 4 were interested in learning about all of the responses provided for question 1, while regular educators of fifth grade through high school provided more specific responses. Fifth grade teachers and seventh grade teachers were interested in high interest/ low level reading materials, while sixth grade teachers, eighth grade teachers, and high school teachers indicated more interest in materials used to enhance language skills and materials used with

students labeled learning disabled.

Question 10 indicated significance for the grade level taught by the educators at the .05 level. Teachers of grades kindergarten through six scored "all of the above" most often when determining the participants of an effective consultation. Seventh grade, eighth grade, and high school teachers also scored "all of the above" often. However, seventh grade teachers indicated that small group consultations which occurred with other teachers who were working with the student labeled exceptional, were equally as important. Eighth grade teachers felt consultations between the regular classroom teacher and the resource teacher were most effective, and high school teachers indicated that consultations involving the classroom teacher, the special education teacher, and the parents, and consultations between the classroom teacher and the resource teacher were most important.

The level of education achieved by the respondents indicated significance ($p < .05$) for question numbers 3, 7, and 14. Respondents with specialist degrees and doctorate degrees were more interested in becoming familiar with prothetic devices and whether restrictions would be placed on the students activities because of the devices, while the respondents with bachelor's degrees and master's degrees were also interested in helping the student manage the equipment. Respondents with bachelor's degrees and master's degrees selected the response "all of the above" most often for question 7 while respondents with specialist degrees were interested in having the resource teacher discuss with them what he or she was working on with the student in the resource room. The respondent with the doctorate degree was most interested in obtaining an overall view of the student's attitudes

and behaviors concerning school. Question 14 followed the pattern previously established in questions 3 and 7. Individuals with bachelor's degrees and master's degrees selected "all of the above" most often when determining the types of assistance they were interested in for academic class work of students who were mainstreamed. Individuals with higher degrees of education were interested in explanations of the student's specific learning problems and being provided with special materials.

The sex of the respondents revealed significance ($p < .05$) for question numbers 2, 3, 8, 13, and 18. In question 2, 20% of the male respondents were most interested in determining what subject areas special materials could be used in while only 10% of the female respondents felt this was most important, and male respondents selected the response "all of the above" for question 2 less frequently than female respondents. Males (26%) indicated more interest in the restrictions placed on students using prothetic devices than females (13%) for question 3. When scheduling conferences with the resource teacher (question 8), males (11%) felt it was more important to discuss the student's academic progress in the regular classroom than females (5%). However, 76% of the females selected "all of the above" for question 8 while only 58% of the males selected the response "all of the above." Female respondents were more interested in specific inservice training sessions (question 13) while males indicated being much less interested in the topics provided in the survey than females. A significant number of male respondents (question 18) believed that more communication should occur between all individuals involved in staffings while female respondents indicated that psychologists should

use teacher input and psychological tests when placing students labeled exceptional.

Question numbers 4 and 7 revealed significance at the .001 level. Female respondents indicated that the most appropriate time to talk to the resource teacher (question 4) was after school while male respondents indicated that prep periods were the most appropriate time to consult with the resource teacher. When a student is mainstreamed into the regular classroom (question 7) male respondents indicated that being provided with an overall view of the student's attitudes and behaviors by the resource teacher was very important but this was not as important to the female respondents. Female respondents (75%) indicated that all of the responses for question 7 were of importance while fewer male respondents (57%) indicated that all of the responses were of importance.

Discussion

For educational research to occur, volunteer subjects are needed. The return rate of 24% represents a moderate return for this survey. It has been noted that individuals who volunteer for survey research represent a "biased sample of the target population since volunteers have been found in many studies to differ from nonvolunteers" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 251). Various characteristics have been associated with volunteer subjects. When volunteers are not required to meet with the researcher, volunteers are likely to be more highly educated than nonvolunteers, and females respond more to survey research than do males (Borg & Gall, 1983). Almost 75% of the respondents to this survey were female but this would appear logical since the majority of educators in the public schools are female.

The response rate of surveys can be improved by employing various tactics. Volunteers often fear that they will be evaluated based on the information they provide to the researcher (Borg & Gall, 1983). The cover letter of this survey explicitly stated that the survey contained no information which could be used to identify the respondent. The researcher should also state the importance of the research (Borg & Gall, 1983). The cover letter of the survey indicated, in the second paragraph, the purpose of the study, but a more indepth appeal for completing the survey might have generated more responses.

Borg and Gall (1983) suggested that volunteers should be informed of the relevance of their participation in the research and how the research can benefit others. The researcher should also try to find a person who is familiar to the individuals participating in the sample so that person can make a direct appeal for volunteers (Borg & Gall, 1983). The researcher could contact each principal personally and explain the content of the survey and the importance of a substantial return rate. By having each principal make a personal appeal to the teachers in his or her building, the researcher may receive more replies.

This survey was mailed to the teachers during the last month of the school year. Because teachers are busy evaluating students, finishing classwork, and preparing grades during this time, this may not have been the most appropriate time to conduct this research. A higher return rate may have occurred if the survey had been sent at an earlier time during the school year.

"Volunteers tend to be better educated than nonvolunteers" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 252) but the responses of this survey indicated that regular educators feel a need to acquire more information on

materials, activities, and instructional techniques which can be used with the students labeled exceptional. Inservice training sessions which cover these topics could be incorporated into teacher workshop days, and "make-it-and-take-it" workshops presented by creative teachers may be useful. The resource teacher in each school should have in his or her possession an abundance of resource materials and references which can be helpful in explaining where assistance can be found. By making products and information accessible to the regular education teacher, the overall awareness of special education may increase.

The majority of regular educators stated that they spend between 1 and 10 hours per week planning lessons for students in the regular classroom while the majority of teachers spend only 1 to 5 hours planning lessons for the student who is mainstreamed in their classes. One would assume, since the student labeled exceptional is placed in the regular classroom, the same amount of planning time or more would be necessary by the regular education teachers.

It is important to know why these teachers spend less time planning for the student who has been mainstreamed. This time difference may be an indication of regular education teachers attitudes toward students labeled exceptional. If this is the case, it may be helpful for teacher training institutes to increase students awareness during undergraduate and graduate training toward students labeled exceptional. Regular education teachers may believe the resource teacher is supplementing the regular education program to such an extent that additional planning is not necessary by the regular education teacher. For this reason, resource teachers must consult with the regular education teachers regularly to determine what assistance is needed.

It may be simply helping the regular education teacher adapt materials for use by the student who is mainstreamed.

Teachers indicated a preference for verbal consultations over written consultations. This contradicts the idea that educators are known for writing notes to other teachers and slipping them into their mailboxes or on their desks without any verbal contact. Resource teachers should make a conscious effort to meet with teachers on a regular basis and answer all requests in person. This not only will provide for more communication, but it will show the regular education teachers that their thoughts, opinions, and ideas are of value to the resource teacher. The information from the study has been utilized to develop a suggested communication tool which will help the resource teacher communicate more effectively with the regular education teacher. The communication tool provides topics and information which regular education teachers indicated as being most important when completing the survey. Included in the study is a copy of the communication tool (see Appendix C).

Observing in the regular classroom is a task that very few resource teachers can fit into a busy schedule. However, over 50% of the regular education teachers expressed a desire for the resource teacher to observe the student who is mainstreamed, in the regular classroom until both teachers feel the student's progress is satisfactory. By observing in the regular classroom the resource teacher can acquire a better understanding of the learning style of the student and the teaching style of the instructor. The resource teacher may notice problems which can be remedied fast and efficiently. Often an outside person or an observer can find a solution to a problem that an

individual who is close to a situation will overlook.

Regular classroom teachers are often unaware of the evaluation process employed for students labeled exceptional. School districts have different rules governing the issuance of report cards and progress reports for the students in special education programs. Educators need to try various ways of evaluating to determine which method is most successful. Some school systems provide letter grades for students while other school systems provide written narratives of the progress achieved by the students. Regular education teachers and resource teachers should become familiar with the policy of their school and provide feedback to each other when completing progress reports for the students labeled exceptional.

Federal law mandates that an individualized education program (IEP) be developed for each student in special education. In order for each teacher to fulfill the requirements established for completing the individualized education program, the teachers must understand the process. Resource teachers should make an effort to enlighten regular education teachers on this subject. Prepare the regular education teachers for the events which will occur during a staffing and supply terminology which may be used by various individuals who are present at the staffing. After the staffing, the resource teacher should inquire if the regular education teachers have any questions concerning what was discussed or decided at the staffing. The resource teacher should help the regular education teacher determine which goals and objectives are specific to his or her content area and then provide follow-up assistance when necessary.

Changes which should occur during staffings were selected by the

regular education teachers. Regular educators felt that more communication should occur between individuals involved in the staffings, and psychologists should also utilize information which is provided by the teachers instead of relying solely on the results obtained from assessments. These responses may signify that regular educators do not believe enough input is provided by the teachers for determining appropriate placements for the students. If teachers feel that their opinions are not important during staffing procedures, they may develop negative attitudes toward the whole mainstreaming concept. Resource teachers should urge regular education teachers to contribute information and become an integral part in the placement of students labeled exceptional.

The present study covers only a small portion of the information needed to determine what communication services and support services should be provided to the regular education teachers by the resource teacher. Additional research concerning topics presented in this study may be warranted. By looking at each area separately, for example, materials, more information can be obtained and analyzed. If students who are mainstreamed are to receive the maximum benefits from the educational system, the resource teacher must provide the regular education teacher with the support that is necessary for effective teaching.

References

Adams, G. L. (1982). The reliance on resource room placement by future teachers. Education, 102, 343-347.

Adamson, D. R. (1983). Linking two worlds: Serving resource students at the secondary level. Teaching Exceptional Children, 15, 70-76.

Bauer, H. (1975). The resource teacher-ateacher consultant.. Academic Therapy, 10, 299-304.

Borg, W. S., & Call, M. D. (1983). Educational research (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Carberry, H., Waxman, B., & McClain, D. (1981). An inservice workshop model for regular class teachers concerning mainstreaming of the learning disabled child. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14, 26-28.

Cierian, M. (1968). Some aspects of a learning resource room. In J. I. Arena (Ed.). Successful programming: Many points of view (pp. 202-208). Pittsburgh, PA: Association for Children with Learning Disbilities.

Cohen, S. B., & Safran, J. (1981). A conference training model for learning disbilities resource teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly, 4, 302-307.

D'Alonzo, B. J., D'Alonzo, R. L., & Mauser, A. J. (1979). Developing resource rooms for the handicapped. Teaching Exceptional Children, 11, 91-96.

Davis, W. E. (1982). Should none-handicapped pupils be served. Education, 103, 30-32.

Davis, W. E. (1983). Competencies and skills required to be an effective resource teacher. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 16, 596-598.

Evans, S. (1980). The consultant role of the resource teacher. Exceptional Children, 46, 402-404.

Evans, S. (1981). PErceptions of classroom teachers, principals, and resource room teachers of the actual and desired roles of the resource teacher. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14, 600-603.

Gickling, E. E., & Theobald, J. T. (1975). Mainstreaming: Affect or effect. Journal of Special Education, 9, 317-328.

Graham, S., Burdg, N. B., Hudson, F., & Carpenter, D. (1980). Educational personnel's perceptions of mainstreaming and resource room effectiveness. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 128-133.

Hammill, D. (1972). The resource-room model in special education. Journal of Special Education, 6, 349-354.

Harris, W. J., & Mahar, C. (1975). Problems in implementing resource programs in rural schools. Exceptional Children, 42, 95-99.

Hayes, M. L. (1981). Giving handicapped students the least restrictive alternative. Educational Horizons, 59, 119-123.

Idol-Maestas, L. (1981). A teacher training model: The resource/ consulting teacher. Behavioral Disorders, 6, 108-121.

Jenkins, J. R., & Mayhall, W. F. (1973). Describing resource teacher programs. Exceptional Children, 40, 35-36.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1980). Integrating handicapped students into the mainstream. Exceptional Children, 47, 90-98.

Jones, R. L., Gottlieb, J., Guskin, S., & Yoshida, R. K. (1978). Evaluating mainstreaming programs: Models, caveats, considerations, and guidelines. Exceptional Children, 44, 588-601.

Kazdin, A. E. (1982). Single-case research designs: Methods for clinical and applied settings. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leviton, H. (1978). The resource room: An alternative (2). Academic Therapy, 13, 589-599.

Lilly, S. M. (1971). A training based model for special education. Exceptional Children, 37, 745-749.

Lilly, S. M., & Givens-Ogle, L. B. (1981). Teacher consultation: Present, past, and future. Behavioral Disorders, 6, 73-77.

McLoughlin, J. A., & Kelly, D. (1982). Issues facing the resource teacher. Learning Disability Quarterly, 5, 58-64.

Miller, T. L., & Sabatino, D. A. (1978). An evaluation of the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 45, 86-91.

Montgomery, M. D. (1978). The special educator as consultant: Some strategies. Teaching Exceptional CHildren, 10, 110-112.

Morrill, L. T. (1979). S.C.A.P.E. from stigma: Will your middle school be ready for p.l. 94-142? The CLearing House, 52, 456-457.

Neel, R. S. (1981). How to put the consultant to work in consulting teaching. Behavioral Disorders, 6, 78-81.

Nelson, C. M., & Stevens, K. B. (1981). An accountable consultation model for mainstreaming behaviorally disordered children. Behavioral Disorders, 6, 82-91.

Newcomer, P. L. (1977). Special education services for the mildly handicapped: Beyond a diagnosis and remedial model. Journal of Special Education, 2, 153-165.

Ozer, M. N. (1978). The assessment of children with learning problems: A planning process involving the teacher. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 11, 422-426.

Padfield, C. A. F. (1981). Why school boards should have consultant development programs. Education Canada, 21, 38-41.

Powell, T. H. (1981). Mainstreaming: A case for the consulting teacher. Journal for Special Educators, 17, 183-188.

Reger, R. (1972). Resource rooms: Change agents or guardians of the status quo? Journal of Special Education, 6, 355-462.

Reynolds, M. C. (1978). Basic issues in restructuring teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 29, 25-29.

Rust, J. O., Miller, L. S., & Wilson, W. H. (1978). Using a control group to evaluate a resource room program. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 503-506.

Sabatino, D. A. (1972). Resource rooms: The renaissance in special education. Journal of SPecial Education, 16, 335-347.

Safran, S. P. (1982). Resource consultant communication and teacher expectations of behaviorally disordered children. Behavioral Disorders, 8, 25-31.

Safran, S. P., & Barcikowski, R. S. (1984). Ld consultant information in mainstreaming: Help or hindrance? Learning Disability Quarterly, 7, 102-107.

Sargent, L. R. (1981). Resource teacher time utilization: An observational study. Exceptional Children, 47, 420-425.

Sindelar, P. T., & Deno, S. L. (1978). The effectiveness of resource programming. Journal of Special Education, 12, 17-27.

Speece, D. L., & Mandell, C. J. (1980). Resource room support services for regular teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly, 3, 49-53.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of

special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.

Vance, H. R. (1979). Thoughts on the ld teacher. Academic Therapy, 14, 279-283.

Vandivier, S. S., & Vandivier, P. L. (1979). To sink or swim in the mainstream. The Clearing House, 52, 277-279.

Weisgerber, R. A., Dahl, P. R., & Appleby, J. A. (1981). Training the handicapped for productive employment. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems Corporation.

Wixson, S. E. (1980). Two resource room models for serving learning and behavior disordered pupils. Behavioral Disorders, 5, 116-125.

White, G. W., & Pryzwansky, W. B. (1982). Consultation outcome as a result of in-service resource teacher training. Psychology in the Schools, 19, 495-502.

Appendix A

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS 61920

Department Of Special Education
(217) 581-5316

May 7, 1985

Memo: To the Principal

As you know, since the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, special education has become a major area in our educational system. One of the main concepts of this law includes serving students with special needs in the least restrictive environment. One way in which this has been accomplished is by "mainstreaming" these students into the regular classrooms. Research has shown however, that for mainstreaming to be effective, adequate communication must exist between the regular education teachers and the special education teachers.

As a graduate student at Eastern Illinois University, I am trying to determine what information the regular education teachers should receive from the special education teachers to make mainstreaming more effective. Your cooperation in distributing the following surveys can help in determining this information.

Please place one survey and computer answer sheet in each teachers mailbox (excluding the special education teachers). It would be helpful if the surveys could be returned to the school office and sent to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope which I have provided.

Please accept my thanks in advance for taking your time to help me with my thesis and in determining how to make mainstreaming more effective. Please mail the surveys from your office no later than May 23, 1985.

Very truly yours,

Jacqueline Holt

Jacqueline Holt

Appendix B

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS 61920

Department Of Special Education
(217) 581-5316

April 30, 1985

Dear Colleague:

As you know, since the passage of Public Law 94-142, the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, special education has become a major area in our educational system. One of the main concepts of this law includes serving students with special needs in the least restrictive environment. One way in which this has been accomplished is by "mainstreaming" these students into the regular classrooms. Research has shown however, that for mainstreaming to be effective, adequate communication must exist between the regular education teachers and the special education teachers.

As a graduate student at Eastern Illinois University, I am trying to determine what information the regular education teachers should receive from the special education teachers to make mainstreaming more effective. Your response to the following survey can help in determining this information.

The following survey neither contains nor asks for any information that would identify you personally. These replies will become part of my masters thesis, and by returning your survey to your school office, it is not necessary for you to pay any postage.

Please accept my thanks in advance for taking your time to help me with my thesis and in determining how to make mainstreaming more effective. Please return your surveys as soon as possible, but no later than May 24, 1985.

Very truly yours,

Jacqueline Holt

Jacqueline Holt

Please complete the following information in the CODES section of the computer answer sheet with a no. 2 pencil.

column A: The major subject area which you are presently teaching:

0--Elementary, Kindergarten-grade 6
1--Math
2--Science
3--Reading/English/Foreign Language
4--Social Studies/History
5--Physical Education
6--Vocational Education
7--Business Education
8--Art/Music/Band
9--Other

column B: The grade level which you are presently teaching:

0--Kindergarten
1--1st grade
2--2nd grade
3--3rd grade
4--4th grade
5--5th grade
6--6th grade
7--7th grade
8--8th grade
9--High School

column C and D: Years of teaching experience (e.g., 3 years of teaching experience would be coded 03. 11 years of teaching experience would be coded 11.)

column E: Sex: 0--Female 1--Male

column F: Highest level of education achieved:

0--Bachelor
1--Masters
2--Masters +
3--Specialist
4--Doctorate

1. Teachers in the resource room sometimes use special materials. I am most interested in learning about:

    1. high interest/low level reading materials.
    2. materials used for fine and gross motor skills.
    3. materials used to enhance language skills.
    4. materials which are useful for helping students who are labeled learning disabled.
    5. all of the above.

2. When considering special materials, I am most interested in determining:

    1. the purpose of the special materials and a demonstration of their use.
    2. what subject areas the special materials can be used in.
    3. how to coordinate the use of these materials in both the regular classroom and the special education classroom.
    4. what testing materials are available.
    5. all of the above.

3. Students in special education sometimes use special equipment (e.g., prothetic devices, hearing aids, etc.). My main concern is:

    1. becoming familiar with these devices.
    2. how to help the student manage his or her equipment.
    3. whether there are restrictions on activities because of the device.
    4. all of the above.

4. The time of the day which is most appropriate for me to talk to the resource room teacher about the students who are mainstreamed is:

    1. before school
    2. after school
    3. lunch hours
    4. prep periods
    5. recess

5. The amount of time (per week) I usually spend in planning materials/activities for the regular student in my classroom is:

    1. 1-5 hours/week
    2. 6-10 hours/week
    3. 11-15 hours/week
    4. 16-20 hours/week
    5. more than 21 hours/week

6. The amount of time (per week) I usually spend in planning materials/activities for the student with special needs in my classroom is:

1. 1-5 hours/week
2. 6-10 hours/week
3. 11-15 hours/week
4. 16-20 hours/week
5. more than 21 hours/week

7. When a student with special needs is mainstreamed into my classroom, I would like the resource teacher to:

   1. provide suggestions for improving my teaching technique (method).
   2. inform me of new materials or strategies which may be helpful to the student and when to use these techniques.
   3. discuss with me what he or she is working on with the student in the resource room.
   4. provide me with an overall view of the student's attitudes and behaviors concerning school.
   5. discuss the levels of materials which should be used.
   6. all of the above.

8. When scheduling conferences with the resource teacher, I felt it is <u>most</u> important to discuss:

   1. the strengths and weaknesses of the student.
   2. the student's academic performance (progress) in the regular classroom.
   3. the objectives and goals which should be worked on.
   4. the behavior problems (discipline) of the student with special needs in the regular classroom.
   5. specific activities which are being worked on in the regular classroom.
   6. all of the above.

9. The type of consultation I prefer is:

   1. verbal
   2. written
   3. verbal and written
   4. I do not have a preference.

10. The <u>most</u> important type of consultation occurs:

    1. between the classroom teacher and the resource teacher.
    2. in small groups, with other teachers who are working with the student with special needs.
    3. between the classroom teacher, the special education teacher, and the parents.
    4. all of the above.

11. I would like consultations with the resource teacher:

    1. daily
    2. once a week
    3. two times a week
    4. once a month
    5. when problems arise

12. I would like the special education teacher to observe the student who is mainstreamed into my classroom:

    1. once a week
    2. two times a week
    3. once a month
    4. never
    5. until both teachers feel comfortable with the progress the student with special needs is making in the regular classroom.

13. The type of inservice training session I would be most interested in to help me work more effectively with the students who are mainstreamed would be:

    1. behavior management techniques
    2. instructional techniques used for teaching students with special needs.
    3. how to adapt materials and create motivating activities for the classroom.
    4. inservices dealing with a specific handicapping condition or label (e.g., visually impaired, hearing impaired, learning disabled, educable mentally handicapped).
    5. acceptance of the student with special needs by his or her peers.
    6. none of the above are of interest to me.

14. Assistance I would like the resource teacher to provide pertaining to the academic classwork of the student(s) who is mainstreamed include:

    1. explaining techniques or procedures I could include as teaching strategies.
    2. explaining the student's specific learning problem(s).
    3. providing me with special materials (e.g., lower level reading materials, adaptive materials, etc.).
    4. one-on-one tutoring for the student with specials needs.
    5. providing assistance in specific academic areas (e.g., reading, writing).
    6. all of the above.

15. I would also like the resource teacher to assist me by:

    1. explaining how the student is evaluated in the resource room.
    2. providing me with suggestions on how to evaluate the student while he or she is in the regular classroom.
    3. helping me determine how the student's performance should be recorded on his or her report card.
    4. providing me with feedback on the progress of the student.
    5. all of the above.

16. Assistance I would like the resource teacher to provide pertaining to the social skills and behavioral characteristics of the student(s) who is mainstreamed include:

    1. providing me with information on the kind(s) of behavior(s) to expect from the student while he or she is in the regular classroom.
    2. helping the student fit in with his or her peers.
    3. implementing a behavior modification program in the classroom.
    4. a list of ideas or rewards which may be reinforcing to the student.
    5. joint counseling if behavior problems arise.

17. An Individualized Education Program (IEP) is developed for each student in special education. I would like information about:

    1. the evaluation of the student (tests used).
    2. the goals and objectives which are specific to my subject area.
    3. the forms and materials used for writing an IEP.
    4. the whole process of determining and writing the information which is necessary for an IEP.
    5. all of the above.

18. I would like to see this change occur in IEPs and staffing:

    1. all teachers who have the student should be required to attend.
    2. the attitudes of the individuals attending the staffing.
    3. the psychologists should use input from all the teachers not just psychological tests.
    4. more communication should occur between all those involved.
    5. staffings should occur more often.

19. I feel it is important that:

1. students have input but not be present at the staffings.
2. students have input and be present at the staffings.
3. students have no input but be present at the staffings.
4. students have no input and should not be present at the staffings.

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return only the computer answer sheet to your school office.

Appendix C

Suggested communication guidelines

This communication tool, developed for use by the resource teacher, provides suggestions for topics which should be discussed during verbal consultations with the regular education teacher concerning students who have been mainstreamed. The communication tool is divided into the four areas of (a) consultation, (b) materials, (c) assistance, and (d) miscellaneous items. The suggested topics listed under each heading are ranked in order, according to the responses provided for the study.

Consultation

1. A student has been mainstreamed into the regular classroom. The resource teacher should:

    a. inform the regular education teacher of the activities the student is working on in the resource room.

    b. discuss with the regular education teacher the levels of materials that are most appropriate for the student.

    c. provide the regular education teacher with new materials and strategies which may help the student.

    d. provide the regular education teacher with information regarding the student's attitude toward school and behavior in school. This information should be provided in a positive manner.

    e. other

2. During conferences with the regular education teacher, the resource teacher should:

    a. discuss the objectives and goals of the student's individualized education program (IEP).

    b. discuss the student's academic and behavioral progress in the regular classroom.

    c. discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the student.

    d. discuss the various activities which the student is working on in the regular classroom.

    e. other

3. When scheduling conferences, the resource teacher should try (in order of importance as ranked by the survey):

    a. to have the regular classroom teacher and the parents attend.

    b. to meet one-on-one with the classroom teacher.

    c. to meet in small groups, with other teachers who are working with the student.

    d. other

4. The resource teacher should determine if the regular education teacher would like to meet for consultation:

    a. when problems arise.

4. (continued)

   b. once a week.

   c. once a month.

   d. other

5. The resource teacher should determine the time periods which are most appropriate for the regular education teacher to meet for consultations:

   a. prep periods.

   b. after school.

   c. before school.

   d. other

Materials

1. Regular education teachers may need help selecting materials which can be used with the students who are mainstreamed into their classes. Materials which the resource teacher may provide include:

   a. materials used with students labeled learning disabled.

   b. high interest/low level reading materials.

   c. materials used to enhance language skills.

   d. other

2. The resource teacher should assist the regular education teacher in:

   a. coordinating materials for use in both the regular classroom and the special education classroom.

   b. determining the purpose of the materials and demonstrating their use.

   c. determining what subject areas the materials can be used in.

   d. other

3. Students in special education may use special equipment such as prothetic devices and hearing aids. The resource teacher should:

   a. discuss with the regular education teacher any restrictions and/or problems the student may experience because of the

3. (continued)

   a. (continued) equipment.

   b. demonstrate the equipment for the regular education teacher so he or she will be able to assist the student with his or her equipment.

   c. other

Assistance

1. Students in special education often have academic problems. The resource teacher can be of assistance to the regular education teacher by:

   a. explaining the student's specific learning problem(s).

   b. providing one-on-one tutoring for the student with special needs.

   c. providing special materials such as high interest/low level reading materials and adaptive materials.

   d. providing assistance in specific academic areas.

   e. other

2. Students is special education often have behavior problems and problems with social skills. The resource teacher can be of assistance to the regular education teacher by:

   a. providing information on the kind(s) of behavior(s) the student may exhibit while in the regular classroom.

   b. providing joint counseling if behavior problems arise.

   c. developing and implementing a program to help the student become socially accepted by his or her peers.

   d. other

3. The evaluation of students labeled exceptional may differ from the evaluation of other students in a school district. The resource teacher should determine the differences and:

   a. provide the regular education teacher with suggestions on how to evaluate the student labeled exceptional while he or she is in the regular classroom.

   b. provide the regular education teacher with information on

3. (continued)

   b. (continued) the progress of the student.

   c. help the regular education teacher record the student's performance on his or her report card, narrative, and/or student file.

   d. other

Miscellaneous

1. The resource teacher can determine a great deal of information about a student by observing the student in the regular classroom setting. The resource teacher should determine if he or she can observe in the regular classroom:

   a. until both teachers feel comfortable with the progress the student with special needs is making in the regular classroom.

   b. once a month.

   c. once a week.

   d. other

2. An individualized education program (IEP) is developed for each student in special education. Before a staffing the resource teacher should determine if the regular education teacher is:

   a. knowledgeable of the referral process.

   b. aware of the individuals who will be present at the staffing.

   c. familiar with the terminology which may be used during the staffing.

   d. other

3. The regular education teacher may need information concerning:

   a. the goals and objectives on the individualized education program (IEP) which are specific to his or her subject area.

   b. the tests used when evaluating the student labeled exceptional.

   c. the whole process of determining and writing the information which is necessary for an individualized education program (IEP).

   d. other

4. Inservice training sessions which can be provided by the resource teacher may help the regular education teachers work more effectively with the students who are mainstreamed. The types of inservice training sessions which may be helpful are:

   a. those which provide instructional techniques to be used for teaching students with special needs.

   b. those which help regular education teachers adapt and create motivating activities for the classroom.

   c. those which deal with specific handicapping conditions or labels.

   d. those which provide regular education teachers with instructions for behavior management techniques.

   e. other