

A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles at Five Stages
of Service Delivery

by

Lynne R. Currie

A thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Education

Department of Educational Psychology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) February, 1993



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-315-98961-0

Canada

Name _____

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Special

0529

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0388
Hydrology	0411
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences

Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering

General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451



A SURVEY OF RESOURCE TEACHER ROLES AT
FIVE STAGES OF SERVICE DELIVERY

BY

LYNNE R. CURRIE

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1993

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publications rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

Abstract

The purposes of this study were to describe the perceptions and preferences of urban elementary classroom teachers and resource teachers concerning the role of resource teachers at five stages of service delivery and to report suggestions of classroom teachers and resource teachers for bridging the gap between perceptions of, and preferences for, the role of resource teachers. All resource teachers and a random sample of elementary classroom teachers working in an urban school division were surveyed by mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire contained descriptive statements for each of the five stages in the resource service delivery process: 1) assistance request, 2) assessment, 3) program development, 4) program implementation, and 5) case closure. At each stage, three choices were given. The choices represent three resource teacher roles: 1) expert, 2) consultative collaborative, and 3) extra pair of hands. Subjects filled out the questionnaire twice: first, to indicate their perceptions of actual resource teacher role, and second, to indicate their preference for ideal resource teacher role. Demographic information about grade level taught, grades supported by the resource teacher, years of teaching and/resource experience and gender were collected. Results identified that a majority of classroom and resource teachers perceived that resource teachers were playing a consultative collaborative role at the five stages of service delivery. A large majority of both groups of teachers indicated that their preference was for the resource teacher to play a consultative collaborative role.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor Dr. Gerry Bravi for his time, patience and assistance in helping me complete this project. Also, I would like to recognize my committee members, Dr. Paul Madak and Dr. Tony Riffell, for their work and advice.

I would also like to thank the many classroom and resource teachers with whom I've had the privilege collaborating. I learn from them every day. I appreciate their commitment to children and I am grateful for the support and trust they have given me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	-i-
Acknowledgments	-ii-
Table of Contents.....	-iii-
Tables	-vi-
CHAPTERS	
1. Introduction.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Educational Significance of the Problem.....	6
Questions.....	12
2. Review of the literature.....	14
Definitions.....	14
Collaborative model.....	14
Expert model.....	15
Extra pair of hands model.....	16
Roles and Stages.....	16
Outcome of role practices.....	16
Factors to consider in role selection...	17
Stages and role.....	18
Stages of consultation.....	20
3. Review of Consultation Research: Roles, Roles by Stages	22
Perceived and preferred role for resource teachers.....	22
Role preference for each stage.....	29
Summary of review of research.....	33
4. Method.....	35
Population.....	35
Classroom teacher sample selection.....	35
Selection of resource teachers.....	36
Instrument.....	36
Procedure.....	38
Pre-testing.....	38
Study.....	40
Analysis.....	40

4.	Results and Discussion.....	41
	Demographic Information.....	41
	Question #1 <u>What role do resource teachers</u> <u>perceive they are playing?.....</u>	48
	Question #2 <u>What role do classroom teachers</u> <u>perceive resource teachers are</u> <u>playing.....</u>	56
	Question #3 <u>How do perceptions of resource</u> <u>teachers compare to perceptions</u> <u>of classroom teachers?.....</u>	62
	Question #4 <u>What are resource teachers'</u> <u>preferences for resource teacher</u> <u>role?.....</u>	65
	Question #5 <u>What are classroom teachers'</u> <u>preferences for resource teacher</u> <u>role?.....</u>	68
	Question #6 <u>How do preferences of resource</u> <u>teachers compare to preferences of</u> <u>classroom teachers concerning....</u> <u>the role of resource teachers?.....</u>	74
	Question #7 <u>How do resource teacher perceptions</u> <u>compare to resource teacher</u> <u>preferences?.....</u>	75
	Question #8 <u>How do classroom teacher</u> <u>perceptions compare to classroom</u> <u>teacher preferences?.....</u>	79
	Question #9 <u>What suggestions do resource</u> <u>teachers and classroom teachers</u> <u>have for bridging the gap between</u> <u>perceived role and preferred role</u> <u>of resource teachers or about</u> <u>resource services in general?.....</u>	83
	Conclusion.....	91
	Limitations.....	91
	Recommendations.....	92

Bibliography.....	94
Appendices.....	101
Appendix A- <u>Elementary Resource Teacher Job</u> <u>Description-school division</u>	101
Appendix B- <u>Stages of Resource Service</u> <u>Delivery</u> (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989).....	102
Appendix C- <u>Questionnaire Design</u>	104
Appendix D- <u>A Survey of Resource Teacher</u> <u>Roles at Five Stages of Service</u> <u>Delivery</u>	107
Appendix E- <u>Directions for Questionnaire</u> <u>Pre-test</u>	126
Appendix F- <u>Covering Letter</u>	128
Appendix G- <u>Request Form to Obtain Results</u> .	129
Appendix H- <u>Follow-up Letter</u>	130
Appendix I- <u>Comments from Resource and</u> <u>Classroom Teachers</u>	131

Tables

		Page
Table 1.	Gender Distribution of Classroom Teacher Sample and Population.....	42
Table 2.	Grade Level Served by Classroom Teacher Sample	43
Table 3.	Years of Classroom Teaching Experience of Classroom Sample.....	44
Table 4.	Gender Distribution of Resource Teacher Sample and Population.....	45
Table 5.	Grade Levels Served by Resource Teacher Sample.	45
Table 6.	Years of Classroom Teaching Experience of Resource Teacher Sample.....	46
Table 7.	Years of Resource Teaching Experience of Resource Teacher Sample.....	46
Table 8	Resource Teacher Perceptions of Resource Teacher Role.....	61
Table 9.	Classroom Teacher Perceptions of Resource Teacher Role.....	62
Table 10.	Resource Teacher Preferences of Resource Teacher Role.....	70
Table 11,	Classroom Teacher Preferences of Resource Teacher Role.....	71
Table 12.	Resource Teacher Perceptions of and Preferences for Resource Teacher Role.....	77
Table 13.	Classroom Teacher Perceptions of and Preferences for Resource Teacher Role.....	82
Table 14.	Number of Respondents to Open- Ended Questions..	84
Table 15.	A Categorical and Numerical Summary of Comments from Responses to Open-Ended Questions.....	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The role of resource teachers is considered pivotal in elementary schools in serving the needs of students who have learning difficulties (Cenerini, 1980; Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989; Huefner, 1988). Resource service has evolved, in theory, from the task of tutoring students to consulting and collaborating with teachers, parents and students (Friend, 1988; Wiederholt & Chamberlain, 1981).

The rationale for consultative collaborative services (Idol, 1988), efficacy of consultation (Heron & Kimball, 1988; Medway & Updyke, 1985), curricula for consultant training (Idol & West, 1987) and conceptual models of consultation (West & Idol, 1987) have been reported. The guidelines for establishing, and the steps for implementing consultative collaborative programs in schools have been developed (Phillips & McCullough, 1990; West & Idol, 1990). Despite the existence of a large body of literature about consultation, West & Idol (1987), Pugach & Johnson (1989) and Friend (1988) stated that the quantity and quality of consultation among educators in schools has not been well investigated.

Research that has investigated the role of resource teachers has demonstrated that resource teachers are not consulting to any great extent. Evans (1980) surveyed elementary classroom teachers, resource teachers and principals to assess perceptions of the actual role and preferences for ideal role of resource teachers. All three groups agreed that consultation by resource teachers actually occurred 5% of the

resource teacher's time and ideally should occur 11% of the time; communication comprised 7% of resource teacher's time and ideally should comprise 9% of the resource teacher's time. All three groups agreed on the actual and ideal amount of instructional/tutoring time: 50% of the resource teacher's time. Studies by Sargent (1981), Idol-Maestas & Ritter (1985), Friend & McNutt (1986), and Roberts (1988) have obtained results concerning time utilization by resource teachers. It appears that resource teachers are expected to, and do spend relatively large amounts of time on instruction of students and small amounts of time consulting. This pattern occurs despite the inclusion of consultation in resource teacher written job descriptions (Friend, 1984), classroom teachers' stated desire for more consultation (Evans, 1980; Friend & McNutt, 1986) and a large body of conceptual literature about consultation practice.

The problem of implementation of a consultation program among educators has been investigated. Pryzwansky (1986) and Gresham and Kendall (1987) stated that consultation cannot be conceptualized as a static, unitary activity but is the result of an interaction between numerous factors. Consultant roles in relation to stages of consultation has been noted as one important interaction (Gresham and Kendall 1987; Pryzwansky, 1986; West, 1986).

Block (1981) described the roles available to consultants. Block (1981) stated that all consultants have the choice of using three roles (extra pair of hands, expert, collaborator) in an organization. Bravi (1986) has applied Block's role models to the educational setting and consultation between educators. Both Block (1981) and Bravi (1986) acknowledge that the need may exist for consultants to engage in all

three roles and, for consulting resource teachers, this need appears to be supported by the time utilization studies reported earlier in this paper. While each of the three roles appear to hold a legitimate place in resource programs, the occasions for choosing one role over another are not clear. An investigation of roles performed at different stages of service delivery may clarify the issue of when one role is used, and/or preferred over other roles.

After reviewing ten models of consultation, West & Idol (1987) reported that consultation is a process that typically progresses through stages. The consultation role used by the resource teacher may change as she/he progresses through the stages of service delivery. West (1985) examined classroom and resource teachers' preferences for four consultation roles (collaboration, expert, medical, mental health) at five stages of service delivery. West (1985) found that resource and classroom teachers preferred different consultation roles at different stages, but was not able to determine which role was preferred at each stage.

Purpose of the Study

One purpose of this investigation was to describe resource teachers' and classroom teachers' perceptions of the role being implemented by resource teachers at the different stages of a consultation service model in a large urban Canadian school division. A second purpose was to describe resource teachers' and elementary classroom teachers' preferences for resource teacher role. The third purpose of this study was to collect elementary classroom teachers' and resource teachers' suggestions for closing any gap between their perceptions and their preferences.

While it is recognized that consultation with parents and students is a viable and legitimate role for resource teachers, these populations were not addressed by this study. This study was limited to elementary classroom teachers and resource teachers to keep the study a manageable size. The addition of two more populations (parents and students) would double the size of the study.

The three roles that were presented in the study were: extra pair of hands, expert and consultative collaborative. The extra pair of hands role requires the resource teacher to assume a passive role in the decision making process. The classroom teacher assumes sole responsibility for the educational problem solving and decision making. The classroom teacher directs the resource teacher to implement a program specified by the classroom teacher. In the extra pair of hands role, the resource teacher acts as a teacher's aide (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

The expert role requires the classroom teacher to assume a passive role in the decision making process. The resource teacher assumes sole responsibility for problem solving and decision making. The resource teacher may implement programs or may give the classroom teacher detailed directions for implementing the programs, which the resource teacher has planned and developed (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

The consultative collaborative role requires joint efforts by the resource teacher and classroom teacher in problem solving and decision making. The classroom and resource teacher work together as equals, who bring different expertise to the problem situation. Decisions are made by negotiation and both teachers have responsibility for solving problems (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

The expert, consultative collaborative, and extra pair of hands roles were investigated for five reasons. First, the consultative collaborative role has been adopted in policy and job description by the school division where the study was done (Appendix A). Given that the first role stated is "Diagnosing and programming for students with exceptional needs" (Appendix A), it would be logical to assume that resource teachers are playing a more expert role at the assessment and program development stages. Second, the expert and collaborative roles were included in the West (1985) study of preferences of resource role by stage. Using the collaborative and expert roles in this study provided an opportunity to replicate and possibly to further validate West's (1985) findings. Third, the expert role was included in this study because historically the expert role is the role that has been implemented by consultants in schools (Witt & Martens, 1988). Fourth, the extra pair of hands role was included in this study because it had not been assessed in the educational context to date and might likely be a role for resource teachers. Fifth, the consultative collaborative role for resource teachers has been in place in the school division for four years, and may have been so successful that classroom teachers are able to solve their problems independently and require an extra pair of hands rather than consultative collaboration to assist with the education of students with special needs. One of the stated goals of the consultative-collaborative role is to enable classroom teachers to solve future problems for themselves (West & Idol, 1990). The extra pair of hands role was worth investigating because it might have replaced the consultative collaborative role in some instances.

While resource and classroom teachers' perceptions of resource

teacher role, and preferences for the resource teacher role are important, this study surveyed one additional factor by addressing the issue of role at different stages of service delivery. Resource and classroom teachers' perceptions of resource teacher role, and preferences for the resource teacher role at five stages of service delivery were collected. The stages of service delivery that were described in the survey were: problem identification, assessment, program development, program implementation and case closure (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989).

The Freeze et al. (1989) model of consultative consultation stages was used in the design of the questionnaire for three reasons. First, this stage model is consistent with ten other models of stages of consultation (West & Idol, 1987). Second, the Freeze et al. model of stages is the model that is used in the resource teacher training program that is available to the school division resource teachers (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989). Third, the Freeze et al. model is consistent with the service delivery stages described in the school division resource teacher handbook.

Each stage can be described by fundamental tasks that occur during the stage. During the assistance request stage, the problem must be identified; the objectives, and expectations of the classroom and resource teacher concerning a solution to the problem must be decided. During the assessment stage, further data is collected so that the presenting problem and solutions can be further defined. During the program development stage, methods, materials, strategies and evaluation procedures for solving the problem are decided and tested. During the program implementation stage, the developed solutions are implemented and monitored. During the last stage, case closure,

summative assessments of implemented solutions are reviewed and compared to original stated objectives for solving the problem. Decisions about whether to close the case or return to the first stage, and/or to refer to ancillary services are made during the case closure stage (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989).

Educational Significance of this Study

Research concerning the role of resource teachers is limited in quantity and quality. Relevance and timeliness of this investigation can be evaluated in light of the strong academic and legislative support the consultation role has received. The consultative collaborative role of resource teachers is regarded as a mechanism for the merger of special and general education into one unitary system to provide service for all individuals (Gelheizer, 1987; Jenkins, Pious, & Jewell, 1990; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984a, 1986b, 1987c; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986; Will, 1986). The consultative collaborative role for resource teachers (Resource/Consulting Teacher-R/CT) has been proposed as a way to: (a) prevent learning and behavior problems, (b) remediate learning and behavior problems and, (c) coordinate instructional programs (Gelzheiser, 1987; Idol, West & Lloyd, 1988; Jenkins, Pious, & Jewell, 1990; Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1985; West & Idol, 1990; Will, 1986). Teacher training programs and school divisions are attempting to develop and implement consultation resource programs (Idol & West, 1987; Reisberg & Wolf, 1986).

Within the Manitoba context, legislation has been passed so that funding to school divisions has been contingent upon hiring trained resource teachers (Manitoba Funding of Schools, 1988). Since 1976, the

University of Manitoba has implemented a resource teacher training program, which prepares resource teachers for a collaborative consultative role (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989).

In the school division surveyed in this study, the consultative collaborative role for resource teachers has been articulated in policy and in the job description since 1986. The school division handbook (1986) on the elementary resource teacher delivery model stated:

The emphasis of the resource program in the school division is to provide supports to teachers and their students with exceptional needs so that these students may progress successfully within the mainstream of education. The type of support will vary from each situation but may come from one, or a combination of: consultation, collaboration, direct service.

Where a student requires direct diagnostic and remedial services for an agreed upon period of time, an ongoing sharing of information regarding the coordinated classroom and resource program is required. Dialogue amongst all professionals involved with the student is necessary to ensure a total well-coordinated program (p. 2-1).

The school division handbook went on to state:

The prime purpose of a resource teacher program is to support the classroom teacher in enabling students with learning needs to receive assistance in terms of revised teaching methodology and learning environment so that they may progress personally, socially and educationally, without

being removed from the mainstream of the educational system.

The resource program approach is flexible enough to include assessment teaching and consulting services that are specifically related to classroom program needs. Resource teacher service is to be provided in three ways with fairly equal emphasis on each:

Consultation:

- working with other professionals in discussion, decision-making and in defining goals and expectations
- presenting ideas, program methodology and materials for classroom use.

Collaboration:

- an educational team approach
- joint planning, initiated by resource teacher and/or classroom teacher, regarding instructional strategies for students with learning needs.

Direct Service:

- providing educational diagnosis, prescription, monitoring and/or short-term remediation of learning difficulties on an individual or small group basis, for students with learning difficulties (p. 1-1).

The second significant aspect of this study is that it extends the quantity and quality of empirical knowledge. There has been much discussion and information about consultation but little empirical data exists concerning consultation among educators (Lloyd, Crowley, Kohler & Strain, 1988). Research about implementation comes from the

experience of psychologists consulting with teachers and results may not generalize to the situation of teachers consulting with teachers because of differences inherent in the two situations. For example, psychologists enter the consulting relationship with training that is different from teachers. Also, psychologists generally come into the school from another organization and are external consultants. In comparison, resource teachers have teacher training and are part of the school staff which makes them internal consultants. Conoley & Conoley (1982) stated:

Internal consultants require the same skills as external consultants but have certain advantages and disadvantages with which to contend. The advantages include: (1) a more thorough knowledge of the host system, facilitating accurate problem identification and reducing system-jarring errors; and (2) an already established rapport with consultees. Disadvantages associated with the internal consultant include: (1) a tendency to see problems as do the other members of the system because of the organizational acculturation that takes place in every group; (2) a somewhat diminished status (in contrast to externals) because of the familiarity between the consultant and consultees; and, (3) potential difficulty in establishing new role dimensions in addition to the current role. These include both new consulting functions (e.g., survey research) and new stresses on confidential relationships. (p. 112)

In summary, research about teachers consulting with teachers may have

more generalizability than psychology consultation research.

The third important aspect of this study is the focus on role of resource teachers in actual practice. Role confusion in consultative collaboration is an important and real issue in the schools (Givens-Ogle, Christ & Idol, 1989; Haight, 1984; Friend, 1988) and a source of debate among academics (Pugach & Johnson, 1988; Huefner, 1988). For example, West, (1985) has stated that the degree of congruence between the expectations of resource teachers and classroom teachers concerning resource teacher role is an important factor in the consulting relationship. This study will provide a picture of the expectations of resource teachers and classroom teachers in a setting where a collaborative consultative role has been mandated and resource teachers have been hired based on their university training in that role. The results of this study indicate whether resource teachers and classroom teachers in the school division have different perceptions about the actual and ideal role of resource teachers. In addition, this study describes perceptions and preferences for a role- extra pair of hands which has not been researched but the literature says exists (Evans, 1981; Friend & McNutt, 1986). If classroom teachers think they can solve educational problems independently but need an extra pair of hands to implement solutions, then perhaps fewer resource teachers are needed and more teaching assistants are needed. Ritter (1978) found that after four years of exposure to consultation service from psychologists, rates of teachers' requests for consultation services dropped significantly.

The fourth significant aspect of this study concerns the methodology. In reviews of existing research, authors (Idol & West, 1987;

Przwansky, 1986) stated that definitions of consultation are often unclear. In this study, the roles of resource teachers were operationally defined within the context of Block's (1981) models, Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul's (1989) definitions and the school division's job description.

Past research has most often used student consultants as subjects for the study and the use of student resource teachers may impact on the generalizability of the results to practicing resource teachers (Przwansky, 1986). In this study, the subjects were practicing resource teachers.

Another criticism of past consultation research is that most investigations are about only one dimension of consultation (Gresham & Kendall, 1987; Idol & West, 1987; Przwansky, 1986). This study collected information about two dimensions: the role of the resource teacher and the five stages of service delivery. Also, information was collected about the perceived role of resource teachers as well as the preferred role. Finally, this study provides information about classroom teachers as well as resource teachers.

Questions

The questions examined by this study are:

- 1) What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) do resource teachers perceive they are implementing at each stage of service delivery?
- 2) What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) do classroom teachers perceive resource teachers are implementing at each stage of service delivery?
- 3) How do resource teachers' perceptions compare to classroom teachers' perceptions of actual resource teacher role at each

stage of service delivery?

4) What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) would resource teachers prefer to implement at each stage of service delivery?

5) What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) would classroom teachers prefer resource teachers to implement at each stage of service delivery?

6) How do resource teachers' preferences compare to classroom teachers' preferences for resource teacher role at each stage of service delivery?

7) How do resource teachers' perceptions compare to their preferences for resource teacher role at each stage of service delivery?

8) How do classroom teachers' perceptions compare to their preferences for resource teacher role at each stage of service delivery?

9) What suggestions do classroom teachers and resource teachers have for bridging any gap between perceived and preferred resource teacher role?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

DEFINITIONS

The three models of resource teacher role fundamental to this research are: consultative collaborative, expert, extra pair of hands (Bravi, 1986).

Definition of Collaborative Role Model

A. Roles

When a consultant acts in a collaborative role, all concerned staff are responsible for working together to resolve a problem (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986). Specifically, data collection and analysis are joint efforts (Huefner, 1988). In consultative collaboration there are (a) joint approaches to problem identification, (b) the pooling of personal resources to identify and select strategies that will have some probability of solving the problem that has been identified and, (c) shared responsibility in the implementation and evaluation of the program or strategy that has been initiated (Phillips & McCullough, 1990; West & Idol, 1990; Witt & Martens, 1989).

B. Goals

The goals of consultative collaboration are to solve the problem, to work collaboratively and to work toward becoming more competent as individuals (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986). Some examples of improved competency are: learning to use effective teaching methods for classroom management; improving instructional organization (for example-mastery learning; peer and cross-age tutoring; cooperative learning groups); improving teacher presentation; incorporating effective learning strategies and academic strategies in instruction (Reisberg & Wolf, 1987).

C. Relationship

In a consultative collaboration relationship, power structure is non-hierarchical as decision making is bi- or multi-lateral (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986; Graden, 1989; Phillips & McCullough, 1990; Pugach & Johnson, 1988); control issues become matters for discussion and negotiation. Two or more professionals work together with parity and reciprocity to solve problems (West & Idol, 1990).

Definition of Expert Role Model

A. Roles

The expert consultant role has a clear delineation of differentiated responsibilities. The consultee (classroom teacher) elects to play an inactive role with regard to solving the problem. The consultant collects and analyzes the data. The consultee expects the consultant to solve the problem and holds the consultant responsible for results. The consultant accepts the responsibility and feels free to develop and implement action plans (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

B. Goals

The consultant's main goal is to solve the immediate problem. Neither the consultant nor the consultee expect the consultee to develop the skills to solve similar problems in the future (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

C. Relationship

In the expert model, the relationship between the consultant and consultee is hierarchical; the consultant serves as expert and the consultee as the recipient of the expertise. Two-way communication is limited to the consultant giving advice to the consultee. Decisions on

how to proceed are made by the consultant on the basis of his or her "expert" judgment. Control rests with the consultant; collaboration or joint efforts between consultant and consultee are not required. The consultant plans and implements the main events (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986; Witt & Martens, 1988).

Definition of Extra Pair of Hands Role Model

A. Roles

The extra pair of hands role is characterized by the consultant (resource teacher) assuming a passive role. The consultee (classroom teacher) makes the decisions regarding data collection, data analysis and teaching methods (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

B. Goals

The goal of the consultant is to fix the problem the student is having by implementing a program that is assigned by the classroom teacher (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

C. Relationship

Two-way communication is limited to clarification of instructions. Communication is limited and is initiated by the consultee to describe implementation plan or to evaluate the plan (Block, 1981; Bravi, 1986).

ROLES AND STAGES

Outcome of Role Practice

An awareness of role and informed selection of roles is important to the outcome of the resource process. Consistent use of an expert role builds a dependence of classroom teacher on the expertise of the resource teacher to solve the problem (Gelheizer, 1987). The case loads of resource teachers become unmanageably large (Will, 1986) and students' needs are not met in the classroom because the resource

teacher has taken sole responsibility for programming and intervention (Stainback & Stainback, 1984).

Consistent use of the extra pair of hands role eliminates the second point of view that the resource teacher can provide in solving educational problems (Bravi, 1986). Furthermore, the perceived locus of the problem continues to be the student (Bravi, 1986). This orientation to the problem removes responsibility from the classroom teacher to modify classroom programming to try and accommodate the student within the classroom program (Will, 1986).

Use of the collaborative role provides the opportunity for both the classroom teacher and resource teacher to share expertise in solving the problem (Will, 1986). The classroom teacher retains responsibility for meeting the needs of the student in the regular program. The collaborative consultative services of the resource teacher can support and facilitate the classroom teacher's efforts (West & Idol, 1990). Finally, the collaborative role has the potential to empower the classroom teacher to independently solve future problems (West & Idol, 1990).

Factors to Consider in Role Selection

Rigid conformity to one role may be unproductive because of the different demands at each stage in the problem solving process. West (1985) found that classroom and resource teachers preferred different resource teacher roles at different stages in service delivery. Some of the reasons for variability in preference for role across stages may be because of the nature of the problem, the skills of the teachers involved, the composition of the class or time variables. Also, role preference differences may be magnified when the role is not described or is described in a very loose fashion. Another factor that is considered to be

significant is the congruence that exists between the expectations of the resource teacher and classroom teacher (Pryzwansky, 1986). While none of these factors have been shown to be directly related to variability in preference for resource teacher role, it seems reasonable that they would have some impact. West's (1985) finding that variability regarding preferences for role does exist between groups at different stages of service delivery establishes the importance of trying to describe the differences.

Stages and Role

Some examples of variable role preferences in relation to stages of service delivery can be argued. At the assessment stage, resource teachers may prefer to play the expert role so they can use a battery of tests in the seclusion of the resource room. In addition West and Idol (1990) discussed the important role communicative, interactive and problem solving skills play in collaborative consultation. This type of staff development is seldom done (Cannon, West and Idol, 1989). It is conceivable that resource teachers who do not have the necessary consultative collaborative skills perform in an expert role. The implied power of standardized tests can have a kind of seductiveness for consultants who want to play the expert role. The classroom teacher is not likely to openly challenge the validity of expert's assessment because classroom teachers are not typically trained to evaluate and critique the technical features of standardized tests. In fact, classroom teachers often are not familiar with individual standardized tests because they have no opportunity to use them in the classroom setting. While the classroom teacher may be content to allow the resource teacher to play expert in the assessment process because the classroom teacher does

not have the academic arguments to challenge the process, it is also possible that the classroom teacher is also content not to take responsibility for assessment.

Non-involvement in the assessment process can relieve the classroom teacher of responsibility in the program development and program implementation stages. The classroom teacher may feel no commitment to the problem solving process and may want the resource teacher to play the expert role at the assessment stage. Consequently, program development and implementation can become the responsibility of the "expert"- the resource teacher.

On the other hand, involvement of the classroom teacher in assessment, program development and implement stages can be threatening to resource teachers. Collaborating with peers requires a wide range of sophisticated interpersonal skills and technical skills (West & Cannon, 1988). Also, collaborating requires the resource and classroom teachers to give and receive corrective feedback, a process that often is not comfortable for many individuals. The resource teacher may prefer to develop and implement programs in isolation to avoid uncomfortable interaction with the classroom teacher.

These examples of preferences for roles at different stages are not intended to be exhaustive but are intended to illustrate why some preferences for role may exist at different stages in service delivery. The ease of arguing for different roles, the number of arguments for different roles at each stage of service delivery and the intensity of the arguments I have experience as a resource teacher and encountered in educational literature (Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd & Bryan, 1988; Stainback & Stainback, 1984) demonstrates the importance of investigating resource

teacher roles.

Stages of Consultation

After reviewing ten models of consultation, West & Idol (1987) concluded that eight of the ten models have an explicit set of stages within the consultation process. The expert and the collaborative model were among the models with explicit stages. The extra pair of hands model was not part of this review.

West & Idol (1987) stated that the common stages are problem identification, problem analysis, plan implementation and problem evaluation. These four stages represent the stages of the expert model and also occur in the collaborative model. However, the collaborative model has two additional stages: goal/entry and redesign. The goal /entry stage occurs prior to the other four stages (West & Idol, 1990) and the task at this stage is to decide the expectations, objectives of the resource and classroom teacher concerning the referral. The redesign stage occurs last and provides an opportunity to redesign the solution to the problem or close the case.

Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul (1989) have developed a five step model of stages for the resource service delivery process: 1) Assistance RequestPhase, 2) Assessment Phase, 3) Program Development Phase, 4) Program Implementation Phase, and 5) Case Closure Phase.

The school division listed four stages in the elementary resource teacher's hand book. The stages were: 1) referral stage, 2) diagnostic-prescriptive stage, 3) program implementation stage, and 4) evaluation and case closure.

In comparing the school division model of stages , the West & Idol

(1990) model of consultation stages and Freeze et al. (1989) model of resource service delivery stages some differences and similarities are apparent. The models are similar with regard to the stated purpose of each stage. The models differ with regard to number of stages, ways of defining each stage and language used in the definitions. Freeze et al. combined the evaluation and redesign stage so their model has five stages instead of six. The school division model included the program development stage within the diagnostic stage. The description of the program development stage was meagre.

The school division model implied an expert role for the resource teacher at all stages. The Freeze et al. (1989) model listed the tasks at each stage and delineated a collaborative role for the resource teacher and classroom teacher. The West & Idol model (1990) listed the tasks at each stage but did not specify a resource teacher role.

Each stage of the Freeze et al. model and school division model is defined in behavioral terms while the stages in the West & Idol model are defined in descriptive terms. The language used to define each stage of the Freeze et al. model and school division model appears representative of the language of classroom teachers. In contrast, the language used to define the stages of the West & Idol model appears to be language used by academics. In summary, the school division model, the Freeze et al. model and West & Idol model of stages appear to be similar in content and different in form. Finally, the Freeze et al. model of stages is used in the resource teacher training program that is available to the resource teachers in this study.

A summarized version of the Freeze et al. (1989) stage model (Appendix B) was used in designing the questionnaire for this study

because: 1) the definition of the model used behavioral descriptors of each stage, 2) the model gave as much weight to the program development stage as other stages, and 3) the behavioral descriptors focused on collaboration, which is the focus of the provincial and the school division policy regarding resource teacher role.

In their texts about research methods, Converse & Presser (1986), Gay (1981) and Borg & Gall (1989) presented guidelines for developing questionnaires and survey questions. They stated that specific questions are better than general questions; short surveys are better than long surveys, and questions written in common language are better than questions written in academic language. For these reasons, the Freeze et al (1989) model was selected for this study.

REVIEW OF CONSULTATION RESEARCH: ROLES, ROLE BY STAGES, Perceived and Preferred Role for Resource Teachers

Gickling, Murphy & Mallory (1979) developed a questionnaire in two stages to assess classroom teachers and resource teachers preferences for resource services. The first stage questionnaire was an open-ended format and asked respondents to list services which they found helpful in mainstreaming children. Elementary school special education administrators, resource teachers, regular education administrators and classroom teachers in Tennessee completed the questionnaire. The services that were listed were included on the second questionnaire. Resource teachers and classroom teachers who asserted they supported mainstreaming received the second questionnaire. They rank ordered their preferences for services. The priorities of classroom teachers and resource teachers were tallied separately. The totals for

each statement were converted into percentages reflecting the priorities held by each of the two groups of teachers.

Concerning the role of resource teachers results were that:

- 1) 75% of classroom teachers and 73% of resource teachers preferred greater emphasis on direct service (instruction) than on indirect service (consultation) and did not support indirect service role solely; Case load distribution should be 20 children served directly and 10 children served indirectly;
- 2) 80% of classroom teachers and 54% of resource teachers preferred that the resource teacher consult with the classroom teacher on a one to one basis without administrative restrictions.

In this study, the collaborative, expert, and extra pair of hands roles were not examined (Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, 1979). These data may be a historical artifact. Friend (1988) stated that "the typical response to the need for alternative services created through mainstreaming was the resource room model" (p. 8). Friend (1988) also said that "by the 1980's a research base suggesting consultation could be an efficacious model for educating handicapped students had emerged" (p. 9). The Gickling et al (1979) study was done before consultation had become an accepted role for resource teachers. In contrast, the resource room model or expert role had been in place for more than a decade (Friend, 1988). Perhaps the data from the Gickling, Murphy & Mallory, (1979) reflect subjects choosing a role with which they are familiar rather than an unfamiliar role.

Evans (1981) conducted a survey and individual interviews with resource/consulting teachers, elementary classroom teachers and

principals to assess their perceptions of actual and ideal resource teachers' role. Using resource program descriptions in educational literature, Evans developed a survey that listed eight role categories and relevant functions of resource teachers. The role categories were: planning, diagnosis, instruction, assessment, communication, consultation, clerical and miscellaneous (school chores). Resource/consulting teachers, classroom teachers and principals assigned a percentage of time to each duty. The assigned percentage of time represented perceptions of actual time utilization by resource teachers and preferences for ideal time utilization by resource teachers.

An analysis of the differences between and within actual and ideal responses was performed for each of the eight roles 1) for combined responses of all three groups, 2) within groups and 3) between each educator pair.

In the combined response, differences between actual and ideal role for planning, diagnosis, instruction and assessment roles were statistically nonsignificant. The mean percentages of resource room teacher perceived role activity were: planning (8.5%), diagnosis (8.25%), instruction (50.38%) and assessment (7.50%). The mean percentages of resource room teacher preferred role activity were: planning (7.30%), diagnosis (7.18%), instruction (51.43%) and assessment (7.38%). It is important to note that in keeping with the resource room model, both groups of teachers perceived and preferred the resource teacher to spend half the time delivering instruction or playing an expert or extra pair of hands role.

In the combined response, for the communication, consultation, clerical and school duties roles, the difference between actual and ideal

role scores were statistically significant. Results indicated support for more time in the communication and consultation roles and less time in clerical and school duties tasks. The mean percentages of resource room teacher perceived role activity were: communication (6.99%), consultation (5.36%), clerical (9.56%) and school duties (3.81%). The mean percentages of resource room teacher preferred role activity were: communication (8.94%), consultation (10.57%), clerical (4.80%) and school duties (1.95%). While both groups of teachers preferred an increase in communication and consultation, they wanted to see the time for it come out of clerical and school duties rather than from the time the resource teacher spent in direct instruction.

For within group responses, some differences between actual and ideal role were statistically significant. Within the classroom teacher group, there was a significant preference for less resource teacher time spent in the diagnosis role and more time in communication activities. Within the classroom teachers and the resource teachers, both groups expressed support for doubling the time for consultation and halving time spent on clerical tasks and school duties.

While the qualitative nature of the resource teacher role was not explicitly assessed, some of the results may indicate a preference for collaboration compared to expert or extra pair of hands role. For example, the stated preference for more communication may imply a preference for collaboration; less diagnosis by the resource teacher may imply a preference for less expert input; and less clerical and school duties may imply a preference for less of an extra pair of hands role (Evans, 1981). However, the preference by both groups for the resource teacher to spend half the time delivering direct instruction indicates a

preference for the expert role. These data may again be a historical artifact because of the existence of the resource room model and non-existence of a consultative collaborative model.

Haight and Molitor (1983) surveyed all special education resource teachers (SERTs) employed in four school districts in the central to northern area of Lower Michigan. Details of instrument development were not reported. Results were that:

- 1) 29% of SERTs spend less than 5 hours weekly consulting, and 40% of SERTs spend between 5 and 19 hours weekly;
- 2) the majority of service takes the form of direct instruction (Haight & Molitor, 1983).

The role model (expert, collaborative) used by resource teachers during consultation was not apparent in the results of this study (Haight & Molitor, 1983). The direct instruction role implies an expert or extra pair of hands role.

Friend and McNutt (1986) conducted a survey to compare formal and informal role expectations of resource teachers by 97 administrators. Friend et al analyzed 67 job descriptions of resource teachers and identified formal role expectations in four areas: direct instruction, assessment, administration and indirect service. Administrators indicated their perceptions (informal role expectations) of resource teacher responsibilities by examining a list of activities provided in a questionnaire and then indicating whether they thought each activity was a part of resource teachers' jobs.

Results were that almost all administrators expected a direct instruction role. The major emphasis for direct instruction was on basic skills not study skills which may imply an expert or extra pair of hands

role for the resource teacher. Only 9.2% of respondents included the task of resource teachers observing students in regular classroom, which may be an indicator of low expectation for collaboration between resource and classroom teachers. Two other collaborative tasks, Individual Education Plans and meetings were omitted by 50% of administrators as resource teachers' duties. Only 60% of administrators specified work with parents which is a task that lends itself well to collaboration between resource and classroom teachers. Overall, administrators seemed to perceive the role of resource teachers as experts or extra pair of hands rather than as collaborators. Administrators perceptions are important in light of the impact they have on the implementation of a resource program (Heufner, 1988; Idol & Ritter, 1985; Phillips & McCullough, 1990).

Idol (1989) reported a study (Givens-Ogle, L.B., Christ, E., & Idol, L., 1989) which demonstrated the impact of administrators on the role of resource teachers. The investigators trained building based teams to use collaborative solving process and found when the principal was involved in training there was a stronger bond among the teachers, and consultative efforts were more positive and better developed.

Idol (1986) reported a follow-up study of 47 trained resource teachers, who were trained to consult in a collaborative manner, and found that as a group they reported they were spending 50% of their time on teaching directly (expert or extra pair of hands role). Forty-six percent of the consulting resource teachers (R/CT) spent 5% of their time consulting, 23% of R/CTs spent 10% of their time consulting, 15% of R/CTs spent 15-20% of their time consulting and 15% spent 75% of their time. In summary 84% of R/CTs spent 20% or less time consulting.

Idol (1989) conducted a self-report survey in Illinois to assess

resource teachers time on task compared to level of training. The three groups of subjects were Special Education Resource Teachers(SERTs) (1)trained in consultative collaboration model, (2) trained in consultative collaboration model and trained others in model and (3) had no training in consultative collaboration model. The resource teachers were working in urban schools, 27 elementary and 11 junior high. SERTs were monitored for 2 years regarding time utilization. Specifically, investigators defined consultation and developed service profile for SERTs to fill out.

Results were that all three groups spent equivalent average amounts of time in direct instruction. However, the amount of time spent on direct instruction varied greatly between individuals (from 30% to 98% of available time) (Idol, 1989). In roles other than direct instruction, differential group profiles in time use were apparent. Trained SERTs engaged in more consultation than did untrained SERTs. Also, trained SERTs engaged in parent consultation while untrained SERTs did not. Trained SERTs spent less time in placement meetings and more time in problem solving meetings than did untrained SERTs. Between individuals, time spent on consultation varied from 0% to 30% of total time. Untrained SERTs spent more time on clerical tasks (Idol, 1989). Trained SERTS likely have the consultant skills (communication skills, conflict resolution, problem solving and interactive skills) and technical skills (methodology, strategies) necessary for collaborative consultation because these skills are the basis of resource teacher training programs (Idol, 1989). Untrained SERTs are less likely to possess these skills and may account for less collaborative consultation by them. This study appears to demonstrate that consultation training impacts on the

amount of time spent consulting. However, the resource teacher role (collaborative, expert) during consultation is not apparent. This study also appears to demonstrate that even trained SERTs spent the majority of their time delivering direct instruction (expert or extra pair of hands).

Roberts (1988) developed a survey based on California law concerning Least Restrictive Environment requirements for students and related resource teachers' role. The survey was mailed to 38 teachers trained in R/CT to assess activities of trained R/CT in comparison to California law and role description. The resource teachers had taken training via television courses and visiting professors. Results were that resource teachers spent most time in direct instruction and Least Restrictive Environment policy was not being implemented properly because of limited consultation. The resource teacher role, (expert, extra pair of hands) for the direct instruction task was not assessed.

Role Preferences for each Stage

Babcock and Pryzwansky (1983) investigated educators preferences for model of consultation as offered by school psychologists at each of five stages of the consultation process (Consultation Model Preference Scale). Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of preference for collaborative, expert, medical or mental health model of consultation at each of the following stages: goal setting, problem identification, intervention recommendation, implementation of recommendation, nature/extent of follow-up. The collaborative model was described as an equal partnership between consultant and consultee at each stage. The expert model was described as a relationship in which

the consultee identifies the problem and the consultant worked independently at all other stages. The mental health model was described as a relationship in which the consultant facilitates the consultee in identifying the problem and intervention plans. The consultee implements plans and initiates further consultation. The medical model was described as a relationship in which the consultant identifies the problem and intervention plans. The consultee carries out the plans and the consultant may offer further advice.

On the Consultation Model Preference Scale, subjects received descriptions of each model of consultation. Twenty statements were developed so each model was represented at five stages in the consultation process. Respondents indicated their degree of preference for each model at each stage by marking a 5-point Likert scale. Babcock and Pryzwansky described a hypothetical situation of a student with a learning and behavior problem and asked respondents to use the situation as the context for answering the questionnaire.

A sample of Grade 2 teachers and special education teachers who had worked with psychologists and elementary principals in two counties received the questionnaire.

The three professional groups gave similar ratings to models at each stage so analyses were conducted on combined data from the three groups.

The collaboration approach received the highest mean rating, followed by the medical model, mental health model and expert model. The difference between the collaboration mean and the means of other models was statistically significant (Babcock & Pryzwansky, 1983).

The interaction of model by stage was significant. Collaboration

ratings at each stage when compared to the other three models were significantly higher at four stages (goal setting, problem identification, intervention recommendation(s), implementation of recommendation stages) and at the fifth stage (follow-up) the difference between the ratings of the collaboration and medical model were not significant (Babcock & Pryzwansky, 1983).

Babcock and Pryzwansky (1983) concluded " educational professionals prefer collaboration over other indirect service models in their consultee role vis a vis school psychological consultants. For the most part, this finding holds true across the five stages of consultation" (p. 363).

West (1985) adapted the Consultation Model Preference Scale (Babcock & Pryzwansky, 1983) and surveyed elementary classroom teachers and resource teachers in thirteen Texas school districts to assess their preferences with regard to consultation between classroom teachers and resource teachers. West found:

- 1) both classroom teachers and resource teachers prefer collaborative model of consultation compared to medical, expert and mental health;
- 2) regular classroom and resource teachers may prefer one consultation approach at one stage in the consultation process and another approach at other stages.

Tindal and Taylor-Pendegast (1989) designed a Case Study to develop and field test the Resource Consultant Observational System-a measurement system (self-report log) that documents what consultants do and with whom at each stage of consultation. The single subject design involved a doctoral student with special educator training who

was functioning as a consulting resource teacher (R/CT). The R/CT was involved in the case of a Grade 3 student, who had been referred to the consultant as needing improvement in staying on task during math instruction and in completing math problems on worksheets.

Analysis of resource teacher consultation log data indicated that the consultant spent a large amount of time alone; and most time was spent on problem identification and program evaluation. No time was spent modelling and demonstrating programs. This consultant appeared to play predominantly an expert role (Tindal & Taylor-Pendergast, 1989).

Freeze and Bravi (1987) reported the results of a school division initiated review of services for special needs students, which in part examined the role of resource teachers. A survey was conducted in an urban Canadian school division that had previously adopted the consultative collaborative approach to resource teacher services. Fifteen percent of elementary classroom teachers were surveyed. The teachers used a five point scale to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with a number of statements about resource programs and services.

Ninety percent of classroom teachers supported a consultative collaborative model of service delivery that included some direct service components. Over 50% of classroom teachers recommended increased consultation and resource teacher support as a means to improve program planning and implementation in the classroom; and 94% felt that the programming of students for whom resource assistance had been requested should be a collaborative process between classroom and resource teachers (Freeze & Bravi, 1987).

Bravi (1987) surveyed classroom teachers in a northern Manitoba

school division and found "The vast majority of teachers stressed the need for a resource teacher program that assisted them in gaining additional competence" (p. 2).

As part of an evaluation, Bravi, Madak and Richards (1991) surveyed inner city teachers who had been involved in a project designed to assist Grade One teachers in becoming more effective in working with students who are at-risk of failing to learn literacy skills. The project was designed to provide collaboration between resource and classroom teachers. Bravi, Madak and Richard (1991) found: 1) there was overwhelming support for collaboration, 2) participants felt that collaboration helped to produce the outcomes they desired, and 3) provided them with a partner they could trust.

Summary of Review of Research

Classroom teachers have repeatedly expressed a preference for a consultative collaborative role and some direct service by resource teachers. Classroom teachers and resource teachers seem to prefer consultative collaboration at all stages of the referral process. The expert consultation role is preferred least by classroom teachers (Babcock & Przwansky, 1983; Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989; West, 1985). Preferences for an extra pair of hands role have not been explicitly measured.

In actuality, resource teachers seem to spend most of their time implementing direct instruction or playing an expert role in diagnosis and program planning (Idol, 1986). Whether resource teachers are implementing direct instruction an expert or extra pair of hands role has not been documented.

While significant preferences for role flexibility at different stages in service delivery does exist between classroom and resource teachers (West, 1986), it is not clear what the preferred role at each stage is. This study provides information about one group of elementary classroom and resource teachers' role preferences at different stages of service delivery. Also, this study provides a description of one group of classroom and resource teachers' perceptions of actual resource teacher role at different stages of service delivery. This study shows whether or not differences in perceptions and preferences for resource teacher role exist between classroom and resource teachers and reports classroom teachers' and resource teachers' suggestions for bridging any gap between perceived and preferred role.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Population

For the purpose of this study, two populations were defined. One population, resource teachers, was defined as the teachers who were working in the school division elementary schools and had been assigned the responsibilities defined by the school division resource teacher job description (see Appendix A). There were 69 resource teachers working in elementary schools in the school division. According to the school division list of resource teachers, some resource teachers worked full time in one school and some worked part time in two schools.

The second population, classroom teachers, was defined as teachers who were teaching any grade between 1 and 6 in the school division. Some positions are shared between teachers.

The school division had a variety of different socio-economic characteristics ranging from upper middle class incomes to welfare incomes; suburban housing to inner city housing; stable population to a student population that moves from school to school more than once during several school years.

Classroom Teacher Sample Selection

The sample was from the Grades 1-6 teacher population. The school division employed 1,002 elementary teachers and 115 were included in the sample. The size of the sample was 11% of the classroom teacher population. Gay (1981) recommended that for survey research of a population over 500 that the sample size be at least 10% of the

population.

The researcher assigned an identification number to each elementary teacher. A sample was randomly selected from the entire population by drawing numbers from a hat. Anonymity of subjects was maintained because names were not available to the researcher. When the surveys were mailed to the schools they were addressed to the Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3, Grade 4, Grade 5 or Grade 6 teacher. In situations where more than one teacher taught the same grade at a school, the person who sorted the school mail distributed the questionnaire to one of the grade level teachers. The person who distributed the mail did not know the contents of the envelope.

Selection of Resource Teachers

Because the population of resource teachers was small, a questionnaire was mailed to all elementary resource teachers.

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed based on Block's (1981) definition of roles of consultants (collaborative, expert, extra pair of hands) and Bravi's (1986) application of Block's definition of roles to the role of resource teachers (Appendix C). The Freeze et al. (1989) model of stages in the delivery of resource services (assistance request, assessment, program development, program implementation, case closure) was used to develop the questionnaire (Appendix C). Also, the questionnaire contained questions concerning demographics: grade level presently teaching/supporting, years of teaching and/resource experience, and gender so that the sample group can be described. This description of the subjects assists in defining the scope of the generalizability of the results.

The categories of years of teaching service are based on Professional Stages of Teachers (Peryon, 1982) because the stages represent different development stages of teachers in terms of professional skills and goals. Peryon identified these stages:

- 1) New teachers: (0 to 4 years of experience) They strive to become the ideal and use what they have been taught; they need support, encouragement, and recognition as professionals.
- 2) Teachers with 5 to 10 years of experience: They have confidence and know what works for them, they need to be recognized as competent.
- 3) Middle period of teaching: (11-20 years of experience). They often are rethinking old ideas and analyzing their professional goals for the future, they need to be given a chance to grow and be reinforced for new achievements.
- 4) Mature period of teaching: (more than 20 years of experience). They have reached self-actualization in terms of their careers; they need to be recognized as top professionals and to be needed by others. (p. 72)

Because resource teachers have had two careers in the school, as a classroom teacher and as a resource teacher, information about experience in each career was collected.

The questionnaire contained four parts (Appendix D). The format of the questionnaire included descriptions of each stage of service delivery. Under each description of a stage, there were statements which represented the three roles in this order: expert, collaborative, extra pair

of hands. The statements described the behaviors of the resource teacher and classroom teacher for each role. The roles were not named.

In Part I teachers were asked to report demographic information. From all subjects data were collected about gender, years of classroom teaching experience and grade level served. From resource teachers additional data about years of resource experience were collected.

In Part II, the descriptions of the stages and the role statements are presented and the subjects were directed to choose the actual role of the resource teacher.

In Part III, the stages and role statements are presented and the subjects were directed to choose the ideal role they would like to see the resource teacher implement.

In Part IV, open ended questions were available for subjects' comments. The subjects were directed to consider their perceptions of and preferences for resource teacher role. They were asked to comment on ways they thought any gap between perceived and preferred role could be bridged, or to comment on any other aspect of resource service delivery. The questionnaire was color coded and labelled by group (resource teacher, classroom teacher).

Procedure

Pre-testing

Converse and Presser (1986) stated that a pre-test of the questionnaire is necessary. The purpose of the pre-test is to assess whether the questionnaire asks what it is intended to ask (face validity), the clarity of the directions and the questions, the time required to fill out the questionnaire and respondent interest and attention.

The subjects selected for the pre-test were not included in the study. The pre-test group of teachers were selected for two reasons. First, the pre-test subjects would not have been the best subjects for the actual study because they knew the researcher personally and might have biased the results. While this criticism may also apply to the pre-testing, the professional and personal relationships the researcher had developed with this group was a second reason to use this group. Specifically, the researcher's colleagues may have been more motivated than teachers not known to the researcher to assist in pre-testing the questionnaire. In addition, an open professional dialogue already existed between individuals in the pre-test group and the researcher. There were 25 teachers (Grade 1-6) and 3 teachers who functioned in a resource role in the pre-test group. This group was a convenient, accessible and representative of the population of this study.

The researcher administered the pre-test at the convenience of the pre-test subjects. For example, the subject set the time of the meeting. Also, some subjects chose to meet individually with the researcher, some met in pairs and some met in groups. The purpose of the pre-test and the conceptual basis for the design of the questionnaire was explained to enable subjects in evaluating the face validity of the questionnaire (Appendix E). Specifically, the concepts of stages of service delivery and roles of resource teachers were explained to the pre-test subjects so that the subjects would know what the intended purpose of the questionnaire and the pre-test subjects were ready to judge whether the questionnaire fulfilled the intended purpose. Then, the questionnaire was administered. The subjects were interviewed to ascertain whether the questionnaire asked what it was intended to ask, what suggestions

subjects had to improve face validity, and what vocabulary was confusing or had multiple meanings. The time needed to complete the questionnaire was recorded. Revisions to the questionnaire that clarified the meaning of the questions, and improved the face validity were made based on the pre-test information.

Study

The questionnaire was mailed to the selected sample. A cover letter stating the purpose of the study and ensuring confidentiality accompanied the questionnaire (Appendix F). A stamped, addressed envelope and instructions for returning the questionnaire were sent with the questionnaire. Also, a form which would allow subjects to request the results of the study was provided with the questionnaire (Appendix G).

Follow-up of non-respondents was done three weeks after initial mailing of the questionnaire. A reminder to complete and return the questionnaire was mailed to all subjects (Appendix H). The reminder was sent to all subjects to maintain anonymity and confidentiality of subjects.

Analysis

Demographic data and subjects' responses to Part II and III of the questionnaire were entered into a personal computer and frequency and percentage analysis was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Responses to the open-ended questions were grouped into categories by the researcher. The categories were: problem identification, assessment, program development, program implementation, and case closure. Responses which did not fit into these categories were further categorized around dominant themes. All

responses to the open-ended question were also classified as general comments or suggestions for closing the gap between perceived and preferred resource teacher role.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Information

In total 182 surveys were mailed and 109 surveys were returned. This represents a return rate of 59.9%. Gay (1981) stated, "If your percentage of returns is not at least 70%, the validity of your conclusions will be weak" (p. 164).

A large difference in return rate occurred between groups of subjects. Surveys were mailed to 115 elementary classroom teachers and 58 (50.4%) surveys were returned. It is not known why these subjects did not respond. One reason might be that the non-respondents as a group may have had a bias that contradicted the school division policy concerning the role of resource teachers and may not have wanted to express that bias. Another possibility is that classroom teachers who did not respond may not have used the services of the resource teacher and did not feel the survey was relevant to them. Another reason for non-response may be that the survey was mailed prior to the March holiday and may have been disregarded by classroom teachers because the timing was not opportune. The low response rate limits the generalizability of the results because the respondents may be a biased group and the validity of the conclusions that can be made will be weak (Gay, 1981).

Surveys were mailed to 67 elementary resource teachers and 51

(76.1%) were returned. Although the topic of the survey was pertinent to both groups, it may have been more pertinent to resource teachers and may be one reason for the higher response rate by resource teachers. The large difference in response rate (24.7%) suggests that future studies should be designed to encourage a higher response rate among classroom teachers. Davis (1989) pointed out the extremely limited role regular educators have had in the discussion about merging regular and special education and argued that lack of participation by regular educators will interfere with the success of the merger.

Data about gender of the classroom teacher sample and population are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Gender Distribution of Classroom Teacher Sample and Population

	Classroom* Teacher Sample	Classroom+ Teacher Population
Female	52 (89.7%)	76.2%
Male	6 (10.3%)	23.8%

* N=58
+ N=1,002

Women were over-represented (14.5% over) in the sample and men were under-represented (13.5% under) (Table 1) when compared to the population. This may have occurred for two reasons. First, when the sample was randomly picked, more women than men may have been picked. Second, a grade distribution comparison of the classroom teacher sample to the school division elementary classroom teacher population (Dec., 1990) was done and primary teachers (Grades 1-3) are

over-represented in this study (Table 2).

More women than men traditionally teach in Grades 1-3. The higher percentage of Grades 1-3 teachers may account for the over-representation of women in the sample.

Table 2

Grade Level Served by Classroom Teacher Sample

	Classroom* Teacher Sample	Classroom+ Teacher Population
Grades 1-3	37 (63.8%)	497 (49.6%)
Grades 4-6	19 (32.8%)	434 (43.3%)
Grades 1-6	2 (3.4%)	71 (7.1%)
* N=58		
+ N=1,002		

Teachers working in Grades 1-3 were over represented in this study. Furthermore, teachers working in Grades 4-6 and in Grades 1-6 were under-represented in this study. This distribution in the sample may have occurred because of the random sampling technique may have selected more Grades 1-3 teachers than Grades 4-6 teachers. Another reason for the distribution may be that some uncontrolled factor may have predisposed the Grades 1-3 teachers to respond and predisposed Grades 4-6 teachers to not respond. Another explanation may be that Grade 1-3 teachers use resource services more than Grade 4-6 teachers and consequently Grade 4-6 teachers would not have felt the survey was relevant to them. The over-representation of the Grade 1-3 teachers and under-representation of the Grade 4-6 teachers limits the generalizability of the results of the study.

The classroom teacher sample was compared to provincial data about teaching experience of the Grade 1-6 classroom teacher population for the school division (Manitoba Training and Education, 1992) (Table 3).

Table 3

Years of Classroom Teaching Experience of Classroom Teacher Sample

	Classroom Teachers Sample*	Classroom Teacher Population+
0-5 years	13 (22.4%)	211 (21.0%)
6-10 years	9 (15.5%)	245 (24.5%)
11-20 years	28 (48.3%)	319 (31.8%)
more than 20 years	8 (13.8%)	227 (22.7%)
* N=58		
+ N=1,002		

The classroom teacher sample in this study is slightly under-represented in the 6-10 years (9% under) and more than 20 years (8.9% under) categories, over-represented in the 11-20 years (16.5% over) category and equally represented in the 0-5 years category.

Data about the gender of the resource teacher sample were compared to the school division resource teacher population (Table 4).

Given that 76.1% of the population responded to the survey, it is not surprising that the gender distribution in the sample accurately reflects the distribution in the population.

Grade level served by the resource teacher group is presented in Table 5.

Table 4

Gender Distribution of Resource Teacher Sample and Population

	Resource * Teacher Sample	Resource + Teacher Population
Female	46 (90.2%)	60 (89.9%)
Male	5 (9.8%)	7 (10.1%)
* N=51 + N=67		

Table 5

Grade Levels Served by Resource Teacher Sample

	Resource Teacher Sample
Grades 1-3	11 (21.6%)
Grades 4-6	3 (5.9%)
Grades 1-6	37 (72.5%)
N=51	

A comparison of this distribution of resource teachers to the school division elementary resource teacher staff list (1990-91) was done. Of the resource teachers in the elementary schools, 86.8% are the sole resource teacher in the school and 13.4% resource teachers work in a school with another resource teacher. The sole resource teacher likely serves Grades 1-6 in the school. The resource teacher sample is representative of the population of elementary resource teachers in the school division.

The classroom teaching experience of resource teacher sample is presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Years of Classroom Teaching Experience of Resource Teacher Sample

	Resource Teachers
0-5 years	13 (25.5%)
6-10 years	18 (35.3%)
11-20 years	14 (27.5%)
more than 20 years	6 (11.8%)
+ N=51	

Amount of resource teaching experience is presented in Table 7.
No provincial data or school division data were available for comparison.

Table 7

Years of Resource Teaching Experience of Resource Teacher Sample

	Resource Teachers
0-5 years	27 (52.9%)
6-10 years	13 (25.5%)
11-20 years	10 (19.6%)
more than 20 years	1 (2.0%)

Multiple Choice Questions

The response choices for the ten multiple questions concerning perceived and preferred resource teacher roles at five stages of service delivery were expert role, collaborator role or extra pair of hands role.

Sometimes, subjects selected two responses for a question. For example, subjects made dual selections like expert-collaborator role or collaborator-extra pair of hands role. On six out of 580 occasions or 1.0 % of all responses classroom teachers selected dual roles. On fourteen out of 510 occasions or 2.7% of all responses resource teachers selected dual roles. Dual selections were not offered to all subjects as a category of response. Because all subjects did not have equal opportunity to respond with dual responses, and because of the low incidence of dual responses, the dual responses were treated as non-responses.

Some subjects did not make a selection for some questions. Classroom teachers made no selection in six instances (1.0 %) and resource teachers made no response in five instances (1.0 %). Responses were coded numerically: 1=expert role, 2=collaborator role, 3=extra pair of hands role and 4=no response.

Frequencies and percentages are reported for each survey question for the response of the resource teacher group, and the classroom teacher group. The actual number of responses to each question are reported. The actual number of responses varies from question to question because of no response to the question or because of dual responses which were treated as non-responses. Consequently, the reported sample size will vary from question to question. The frequency data will be presented and discussed for each of the five stages of service delivery:

1. the problem identification stage;
2. the assessment stage;
3. the program development stage;

4. the program implementation stage; and
5. the case closure stage.

Question #1 - Resource Teacher Perceptions of Actual Resource Teacher Role at Each Stage of Service Delivery

Research question #1 asked, "What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) do resource teachers perceive they are implementing at each stage of service delivery?"

The Problem Identification Stage. Forty-three (89.6%) of the 48 resource teachers who responded to this question, reported that they usually played a collaborative role during the problem identification stage of service delivery. Of the remaining five, three (6.3%) reported they usually played the extra pair of hands role and two (4.2%) felt they usually played the expert role (Table 8).

Problem Assessment Stage. Thirty-one (62.0%) of the 50 resource teachers who responded, indicated that they usually played an expert role at the problem assessment stage of service delivery. The remaining nineteen (38.0%) thought they usually played the collaborator role (Table 8).

Program Development Stage. Thirty-four (75.6%) of the 45 resource teachers who responded, reported that they usually played a collaborator role at the program development stage of service delivery. Of the remaining eleven, 10 (22.2%) thought they usually played the expert role and one (2.2%) reported they usually played the extra pair of hands role (Table 8).

Program Implementation Stage. Thirty-nine (79.6%) of the 49 resource teachers who responded reported that they usually played a collaborator role at the program implementation stage of service delivery. The

remaining 10 (20.4%) said they usually played the expert role (Table 8). Case Closure Stage. Forty-four (89.8%) of the 49 resource teachers who responded indicated that they usually played a collaborator role at the case closure stage. Of the remaining five, three (6.1%) reported that they usually played the expert role and two (4.1%) felt they usually played the extra pair of hands role (Table 8).

Summary

The total number of responses for all five stages was 241. Of the 241 responses, 179 (74.2%) of the responses indicated the consultative collaborative role was the actual role played, 56 (23.2%) indicated the expert role and 6 (2.5%) indicated the extra pair of hands role. A large majority of resource teachers perceived that they played a consultative collaborative role at four stages of service delivery: problem identification (89.6%), program development (75.6%), program implementation (79.6%), and case closure (89.8%). At the assessment stage, the majority (62.0%) of resource teachers stated they played an expert role.

The perception of usually playing the collaborator role at the four stages of service delivery suggests that resource teachers are striving to meet the criteria of their job description as defined by the school division (Appendix A). Three other reasons for this finding may be 1) provincial funding for hiring trained resource teachers (Manitoba Funding of Schools, 1988), 2) the province has emphasized the collaborative role and 3) the consultative-collaborative curriculum of the resource teacher training program available to Manitoba teachers (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989). Idol (1989) monitored and evaluated resource teacher time use over two years in 27 elementary and 11 junior high schools. Time use of highly trained, lesser trained and untrained resource

teachers were compared. All groups participated in the same types of activities but differential profiles existed in the qualitative use of time. Highly trained resource teachers prioritized and engaged in collaborative consultation tasks more than lesser trained and untrained teachers. In this study data concerning training were not collected, and it would be useful to collect data in future studies to determine whether training is a factor influencing the role of resource teachers in this school division.

Another possible reason for a large majority of resource teachers' perception of playing the consultative collaborative role may be that resource teachers like and see the value of the role. Thirty-three resource teachers answered the open-ended questions at the end of the survey. Four resource teacher comments (8.1%) supported the consultative collaborative model. One resource teacher said,

"Joint planning would be much better as program is more likely to occur. Unless what I do is a reflection or complement of the classroom teacher's program it has little effect."

Another resource teacher said,

"Only through a feeling of partnership and teaming are the best interest of the child to be met."

The majority of resource teachers perceived they were playing the consultative collaborative role at the program development (75.6%) and program implementation (79.6%) stages but the majority was not as large as at the problem identification (89.6%) and case closure (89.9%) stages. For the program development and program implementation stages, 22.2% and 20.4% of resource teachers selected the expert role.

One explanation for 22.2% of resource teachers stating that they play an expert role at the program development stage may relate to the

process of program development. One process may be that resource teachers design the program and submit it to the classroom teacher for review. Another process may be that resource teachers and classroom teachers verbally collaborate in program development and the resource teacher writes the plan. Resource teachers may draft the plan or do the paperwork part of the program development plan because of lack of time or lack of scheduled time to collaborate.

On the open ended question, eight (16.3%) resource teachers' comments and seven (17.5%) classroom teachers' comments were about the lack of time to collaborate. For example, a resource teacher said,

"For this model to have a better chance of succeeding, there has to be "time" opportunity for the classroom teacher and resource teacher to meet and COLLABORATE. The times need to be set."

Another resource teacher said,

"I think joint planning is most beneficial for students, the only problem is creating the time to meet for each step in the delivery model."

A classroom teacher said,

"The time allowed to meet to plan and take care of everything involved is far too little. You are asked to build something thoughtful and worthwhile in rushed and frustrating conditions. Implementing it this way is just sabotaging the model idea and teachers." In addition, three (6.1%) resource teachers' comments were that class size was too large and too few staff were available to effectively implement collaborative consultation.

One resource teacher stated,

"I feel overwhelmed as a resource teacher by the demands/needs.

I can never fully meet demands/needs of classroom teachers' need for students, all legitimate. Preference: more resource personnel, lower pupil teacher ratio!"

Four (10.0 %) classroom teachers' comments were that class size was too large and too few staff were available to effectively implement collaborative consultation.

A classroom teacher said,

"Very often when there is dissatisfaction with resource teachers- their case loads prevent them from delivering the kind of service teachers and administrators want to see." and "I would prefer smaller numbers in my class and then dealing with special programs would not be such a burden".

Comments about time constraints, class size and number of staff were made about consultative collaboration generally rather than about a specific stage. However, it seems reasonable that time and workload factors would impact on teachers' availability for collaborative consultation at the program development stage. Idol (1988, 1989, 1990) identified lack of adequate time, lack of scheduled time and too large a caseload as barriers to consultative collaboration.

At the program implementation stage 20.4% of resource teachers perceived they are playing an expert role. Classroom teachers' comments on the open-ended question provide information about why this may be happening. Seven (17.5%) of the classroom teachers' comments indicated a desire for a tutoring role for the resource teacher. Three comments which were representative of classroom teacher comments were:

1. "The division needs to provide more funds for resource teachers to

be involved on a one-to-one or small group situation in the classroom-to work with students on skills development for material covered in class."

2. "If a resource program is to be implemented or a teacher's aide is to work with the child, I prefer that the Resource Teacher develop the program and oversee its' implementation".

3. "I would like to see the resource teacher more involved in direct service to the children or setting up someone else to work with needy children on a daily basis".

At the program implementation some stage, some resource teachers may be responding to the expectations of the classroom teachers who want a direct instruction role for the resource teacher. On the open-ended question, seven (14.3%) resource teachers' comments were that classroom teachers expectations influenced the role the resource teacher played. Two representative resource teacher comments were:

1. "With each classroom teacher the resource teacher's role varies. It is hard to generalize your role and compare your actual delivery of services without specifying each classroom that you work with."

2. "I found myself struggling with many of my selections mainly because the Resource Room program is adjusted to meet the needs of the teachers. Many are open to cooperative type methods while other are still in the "test-cure-return to me stage". They're at many stages themselves and require a diverse approach."

Consequently, resource teachers may be accommodating the resistance to consultative collaboration by some classroom teachers and responding to requests from classroom teachers for tutoring by the "expert" (Idol-

Maestas & Ritter, 1985).

However it is important to emphasize that while 17.5% of the classroom teachers' comments reflected a desire for a direct instruction role for resource teachers, eleven (27.5%) classroom teachers' comments were that they preferred a consultative collaborative role. In addition 86.2% of classroom teachers said they preferred a collaborative role at this stage. The result that 79.6% (Table 8) resource teachers said they play a collaborative role at the program implementation stage contrasts sharply with the 20.4% (Table 8) who said they played the expert role.

For the problem assessment stage, most resource teachers believed that they usually played the expert role. This perception may exist because it is true. The nature of assessments resource teachers know how to and are able to do may be new to classroom teachers. As a result, resource teachers may be making the decisions about types of data to collect and the assessment process. The resource teacher may be constrained to an expert role and the classroom teacher to an extra pair of hands role until the classroom teacher becomes familiar with ecological assessments. In the teacher education program at University of Manitoba, resource teachers are required and pre-service classroom teachers are not required to take assessment courses. The resource teacher training program at University of Manitoba targets training in ecological assessments which means resource teachers are trained to assess the learner, teaching methods and materials and contextual variables. Specifically, resource teachers learn how to observe in classrooms, analyze work samples, conduct academic interviews, conduct teacher interviews, and construct curriculum based tests (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989). In summary, resource teachers may

have different expertise than classroom teachers. The concept of expertise is not the same as expert role in consultation.

If resource teachers perceive that expertise and the expert role are the same concept, then the perception of playing an expert role is understandable (Bravi, 1986). Without further investigation of resource teachers' actual role at the assessment stage, it is difficult to determine whether resource teachers are using their expertise collaboratively or are actually playing an expert role.

Another factor which may influence the role is the reason resource teachers are assessing students. Assessment within collaborative consultation paradigm is undertaken to develop and implement instruction in the classroom by the classroom teacher (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989). Assessment within the expert role consists of refer-test-place the students. The refer-test-place paradigm is characterized by labeling the students, making normative comparisons, ascertaining grade equivalency, justifying a placement to meet funding criteria or selecting a canned program (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989). Polsgrove and McNeil (1989) argued that the traditional categorical method of funding special education services conflicts with one of the purposes of collaborative consultation. Under a categorical approach, a school receives funds based on the number of students tested and placed in special education. Successful collaborative consultation reduces the number of students placed in special education and results in less financial support for the school. My experience leads me to believe that resource teachers in some of the schools assess students in traditional ways to maintain numbers of special education students and to protect teaching positions in the school.

Concerning the role of the resource teacher in general, other factors which have been identified as important in the delivery of collaborative consultation services by the resource teacher are: administrative support (Johnson, Pugach & Hammittee, 1988) and consultative collaborative skill (Idol, 1989). Resource and classroom teachers commented on these factors. On the open-ended question three (9.0%) resource and one (2.5%) classroom teacher comments were about administrative expectations as a factor in consultative collaboration. One comment by a resource teacher was,

"It helps a great deal when administrators expect Classroom Teachers to modify plans to meet students' needs-Role for Resource Teacher to work with the Classroom Teacher."

The comment by the classroom teacher was,

"Administrative expectations likely play a role."

On the open-ended question, one (2.0%) resource teacher comment concerned role clarification. Ten (20.4%) resource teacher comments were about consultative collaborative skills of classroom teachers and resource teachers. Comments indicated the need for clear role definition and a variety of interpersonal skills to implement collaborative consultation

Question #2 - Classroom Teacher Perceptions of Actual Resource Teacher Role at Each Stage of Service Delivery

Research question #2 asked, "What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) do classroom teachers perceive resource teachers are implementing at each stage of service delivery?"

The Problem Identification Stage. Forty-three (76.8%) of the 56 classroom teachers who responded reported that resource teachers

usually played a collaborative role at the problem identification stage of service delivery. Of the remaining 13, nine (16.1%) classroom teachers thought resource teachers usually played the extra pair of hands role, and four (7.1%) believed resource teachers usually played the expert role (Table 9).

Problem Assessment Stage. Thirty-one (57.4%) of the 54 classroom teachers who responded indicated that resource teachers usually played a collaborator role at the problem assessment stage. Twenty (37.0%) classroom teachers thought the resource teacher usually played the expert role, and three (5.6%) believed the resource teacher usually played the extra pair of hands role (Table 9).

Program Development Stage. Forty (74.1%) of the 54 classroom teachers who responded believed that resource teachers played a collaborator role at the program development stage. Ten (18.5%) classroom teachers perceived that the resource teacher usually played the expert role, and four (7.4%) believed the resource teacher usually played the extra pair of hands role (Table 9).

Program Implementation Stage. Forty-six (83.6%) of the 55 classroom teachers who responded perceived that resource teachers usually played a collaborator role at the program implementation stage. Eight (14.5%) classroom teachers believed the resource teacher usually played the expert role, and one (1.8%) thought the resource teacher usually played extra pair of hands role (Table 9).

Case Closure Stage. Forty-six (80.7%) of the 57 classroom teachers who responded reported that the resource teacher usually played a collaborator role at the case closure stage. Eight (14.0%) classroom teachers thought the resource teacher usually played the expert role, and

three (5.3%) believed the resource teacher usually played the extra pair of hands role (Table 9).

Summary

The total number of responses for all five stages was 276. Of the 276 responses, 206 (74.6%) of the responses indicated the collaborative role was the actual role played, 50 (18.1%) were for the expert role and 20 (7.2%) were for the extra pair of hands role. A large majority of classroom teachers believed that resource teachers are playing a collaborator role at all five stages of service delivery. This data suggests that collaboration is happening between classroom teachers and resource teachers and that administrative expectations are that staff collaborate.

It is important to note the discrepancy between the numbers for the assessment stage and the numbers for the other four stages. For the assessment stage, a majority of teachers perceived that the resource teacher was playing a collaborative role but the majority was 20% smaller than the number of teachers who indicated this role at the other four stages. The number who selected the expert role at the assessment stage was 20% larger than the number who chose this role for the other four stages. This finding suggests that classroom teachers perceive that resource teachers are playing less of a collaborative role at the assessment stage than at the other four stages and more of an expert role at the assessment stage than at the other four stages. However, the majority of classroom teachers do think resource teachers are playing the consultative collaborative role at the assessment stage.

Mixed perceptions of classroom teachers may exist for several reasons. First, classroom teachers' perceptions may be accurate. The

majority of resource teachers (62.0%) perceive that they are performing an expert role. The data from the resource and classroom teacher perceptions suggest that resource teachers are playing an expert role at least some of the time at the assessment stage.

One reason resource teachers are performing as experts some of the time may be that they are operating within the refer-test-place paradigm to place enough students in special education to protect teaching positions. Block (1981) said that "the realities of most organizations are such that there will be times when the pair-of-hands or expert roles are more appropriate, and other times, when they cannot be avoided." (p.18). If the school division requires extensive documentation from schools to access special education supports, it may be one occasion when resource teachers play the role of expert. It is my experience that this practice happens in this school division. Four (10.0%) of classroom teachers' on the open-ended question were about the assessment stage. One classroom teacher said,

"From past experience, I find that directly working with children is more helpful than assessment and no program. Too much time is spent getting information."

Another classroom teacher said,

"As a classroom teacher requesting Resource services, it is at the point at which I have observed a problem and have a certain amount of evaluation and observation myself. It is most helpful if the Resource teacher does further pertinent testing which is either too time consuming or beyond my qualifications to perform."

The second comment from a classroom teacher seems to indicate that, the classroom teacher perceives that the resource teacher is

performing an expert role because the classroom teacher does not have the assessment expertise of the resource teacher. Classroom teachers may perceive that resource teacher have specialized skills, which classroom teachers do not possess, but one comment from one classroom teacher cannot be taken as the feeling of classroom teachers in general. Despite some perceptions that the resource teacher is playing the expert role, the majority of classroom teachers (57.4%) perceived that resource teachers were playing a consultative collaborative role in assessment.

One reason classroom teachers may perceive that resource teachers are playing a collaborative role at the assessment stage has to do training of resource teachers in classroom based assessment methods at the resource teacher education program available to Manitoba teachers (Freeze, Brave & Rampaul, 1989). Resource teachers are trained to do ecological assessments, which includes curriculum based testing, classroom observations, classroom work samples and dialogue with the classroom teacher. The nature of ecological assessments is conducive to consultative collaboration between resource and classroom teachers. Compared to standardized achievement and ability test data, curriculum based test data is more similar to the knowledge and experiences of classroom teachers. Interpretation of standardized test data tends to be one-way: the tester explaining data to the classroom teacher while an ecological assessment includes the classroom teacher in data collection and analysis. The components of an ecological assessment when compared to traditional assessments may be more familiar to and understood by classroom teachers. Consequently, classroom teachers can communicate on par with resource teachers

about the data relevant to what is happening in the classroom when an ecological assessment is done. Two way communication, equity and parity are characteristics of a collaborative working relationship (Bravi, 1986; Gresham & Kendall, 1987; West & Idol, 1990). While resource teachers may perceive they have skills in ecological assessments that make them expert, classroom teachers apparently perceive resource teachers as collaborators in assessing students.

Table 8

Resource Teacher Perceptions of Actual Resource Teacher Role

STAGE	ROLE		
	Expert	Collaborator	Extra Pair of hands
Problem Identification (N=48)	2 (4.2%)	43 (89.6%)	3 (6.3%)
Problem Assessment (N= 50)	31 (62.0%)	19 (38.0%)	0
Program Development (N=45)	10 (22.2%)	34 (75.6%)	1 (2.2%)
Program Implementation (N=49)	10 (20.4%)	39 (79.6%)	0
Case Closure (N=49)	3 (6.1%)	44 (89.8%)	2 (4.1%)

Table 9
Classroom Teacher Perceptions of Resource Teacher Role Five

STAGE	ROLE		
	Expert	Collaborator	Extra Pair of Hands
Problem Identification (16.1%) (N=56)	4 (7.1%)	43 (76.8%)	9
Problem Assessment (N=54) (5.6%)	0 (37.0%)	31 (57.4%)	3
Program Development (N=54) (7.4%)	10 (18.5%)	40 (74.1%)	4
Program Implementation (N=55) (1.8%)	8 (14.5%)	46 (83.6%)	1
Case Closure (N=57)			

Question #3 - Comparison of Classroom Teacher and Resource Teacher Perceptions of Actual Resource Teacher Role at Each Stage of Service Delivery

Research question #3 asked, "Do resource teachers and classroom teachers have the same perceptions of the role resource teachers usually play at each stage of service delivery?"

Both classroom teachers and resource teachers believed that resource teachers are usually playing a collaborative role at the problem identification, program development, program implementation and case closure stages (Table 8 & 9). The fact that resource teachers' and

classroom teachers' perceptions are so similar suggests that collaboration is occurring in the schools among staff.

A difference in perception between resource teachers and classroom teachers existed regarding the actual role of resource teachers at the assessment stage. Thirty-one (62.0%) of the 50 resource teachers who responded, indicated that they usually played an expert role, but thirty-one (57.4%) of the 54 classroom teachers who responded indicated that resource teachers usually played a collaborator role at the problem assessment stage (Table 8 & 9).

One reason for this difference in perception may be that some resource teachers are playing the role of expert but to a lesser extent than reported. Another reason may be that resource teachers are confusing the concepts of expertise with expert role. In addition, resource teachers may perceive they have a monopoly on curriculum based assessment techniques and have to play the role of expert. However, classroom teachers may not perceive assessment as the domain of experts any longer. A number of changes in general education may be closing the gap between resource teacher and classroom teacher skills in curriculum based assessment techniques. For example, contemporary practices in classroom assessment and programming are equipping classroom teachers to do on-going individual assessments. Some examples of contemporary assessment strategies intended for classroom use are 1) establishing portfolios of student work samples, 2) recording observational data, and 3) interviewing students either through a "talk aloud" procedure or through student notes in a personal learning log. Some contemporary practices in classroom programming which provide classroom teachers with assessment

information about individual students are: 1) a process approach to writing, 2) child centered activity based lessons, 3) problem solving math using manipulatives, 4) an emphasis on strategy learning, and 5) an emphasis on the child's thinking about their own learning.

Contemporary assessment techniques and classroom programming practices provide classroom teachers with multiple opportunities to collect relevant curriculum based data about individual students in collaboration with the resource teacher.

Another reason for the difference in perception may be a difference in understanding the concept of collaborative consultation (Friend, 1988; Pugach & Johnson, 1988). Idol (1989) reported that in initial efforts to measure the impact of consultative services she found "that classroom teachers, resource specialists, and building principals did not always agree on what consultation was" (p. 43). Classroom teachers may view collaboration as any service that is helpful. Testing to place a student in special education, to acquire special education services for the student, to attribute learning problems to student deficits may be perceived as collaboration by classroom teachers (Pugach & Johnson, 1988). In comparison, trained resource teachers may hold a different view. Collaboration has been defined as the process of helping teachers meet the needs of students in the regular program (Freeze, Bravi & Rampaul, 1989). Services that resource teachers see as an expert role may be seen as a collaborative role by classroom teachers.

While a small difference in perception existed at the assessment stage, both groups of teachers expressed similar perceptions with regard to resource teacher role at the other four stages. The large majority of both classroom and resource teachers perceived that consultative

collaboration was the role the resource teacher usually played and this suggests that much collaboration really is occurring between resource teachers and classroom teachers. One classroom teacher commented,

"The resource role and service delivery in our school is very strong at least this has been my personal experience. The resource teacher has, and continues to work in a very professional, collaborative way with classroom teacher (giving full respect to the teacher's observations, testing, opinion and joint-decision making)."

Another classroom teacher said,

"I believe the resource teacher and classroom teacher should work together to help the child. Fortunately, we have a resource teacher at our school who does consult with the classroom teacher to set up a program."

A resource teacher commented,

"I am fortunate in that I basically work in my "preferred mode" No. 2-in your survey I.E. joint work.

Question #4 - Resource Teacher Preferences for Ideal Resource Teacher Role at Each Stage of Service Delivery

Research question #4 asked, "What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) would resource teachers prefer to implement at each stage of service delivery?"

Problem Identification Stage. Forty-seven (94.0%) of the 50 resource teachers who responded selected the collaborator role. Of the remaining respondents, two (4.0%) selected the extra pair of hands role, one (2.0%) selected the expert role (Table 10).

Problem Assessment Stage. Forty-one (83.7%) of the 49 resource

teachers who responded selected the collaborator role. The remaining eight (16.3%) selected the expert role (Table 10).

Program Development Stage. Forty-nine (98.0%) of the 50 resource teachers who responded selected the collaborator role. One (2.0%) selected the expert role (Table 10).

Program Implement Stage. Fifty-one (100.0%) of the 51 resource teachers who responded selected the collaborator role (Table 10).

Case Closure Stage. Forty-nine (98.0%) of the 50 resource teachers who responded selected the collaborator role. One resource teacher (2.0%) selected the extra pair of hands role (Table 10).

Summary

The total number of responses for all five stages was 250. Of the 250 responses, 237 (94.8%) of the responses were for the collaborative role, 10 (4.0%) were for the expert role and 3 (1.2%) were for the extra pair of hands role. At each of the five stages, resource teachers said they would prefer to play the collaborative role. The large amount of support the collaborative role received at each stage is notable. Resource teacher preference for the collaborative role in assessment was 43% greater than their perception of playing the collaborative role.

The collaborative model has been articulated and emphasized by both the school division and the province. The resource teacher training program at University of Manitoba has also emphasized the collaborative role. This emphasis is likely one of the reasons for the impressive support given the model by resource teachers.

In the open-ended question, resource teachers said what they are doing must be a reflection of the classroom program to have an effect. Consequently, classroom based data would very important to the

resource teacher. A tenet of the consultative collaborative model is that a merging of the expertise of the individuals occurs during consultative collaboration (Bravi, 1986). Classroom teachers can bring much expertise to the consultation process. For example, classroom teachers have classroom based data in the form of observations, work samples, and criterion referenced tests. Classroom teachers observations may be more reliable because they are made over a long period of time and are made during a variety of learning tasks. Classroom teachers' data may be more valid because the data are collected in the natural learning environment and are often compared to the classroom norm which are in essence local norms of behavior.

In addition, classroom teachers are able to provide information unique to the classroom situation. Specifically, classroom teachers can comment on interpersonal and social skills, attention and distractibility of the student. Classroom teachers may bring quantitatively and qualitatively as much knowledge to the assessment of problems as do resource teachers. Classroom teacher participation in decision making and data collection is fundamental to collaboration (Bravi, 1986). In summary, consultative collaboration is a vehicle for much classroom teacher participation in the stages of resource service.

Another reason for strong support for the collaborative role may be a realization by resource teachers of the inadequacies of the expert model. Resource teachers accept that 1) segregated settings are not beneficial for a large majority of students (Stainback, Stainback, Courtnage & Jaben 1985; Wang & Walberg, 1988; Will 1986), 2) serious problems exist in the labeling and classification of students (West & Idol, 1990), 3) some students who have learning needs, cannot be classified

and consequently "fall between the cracks" in terms of service (Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987) and 4) classroom instruction needs to be modified to accommodate a wider range of individual differences (Gelheizer, 1987). Resource teachers apparently are realizing the need for services that prevent learning and behavior problems (Conoley, 1986; Huefner, 1988).

The large numbers of students needing assistance limit the direct service resource teachers can provide and the need for relevant programming which ensures a high rate of success during the entire school day are propelling the movement for systemic changes in special and regular education (Chalfant & Pysh, 1989; Gelzheiser, 1987; Gersten & Woodward, 1990; Jenkins, Pious & Jewell, 1990; Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Will, 1986). This type of programming is more likely to occur when the resource teacher is collaborating with the classroom teacher to design and implement classroom programming than when the resource teacher is playing an expert or extra pair of hands role (Bravi, 1986; Heron & Kimball, 1988).

Another explanation for resource teacher preference for the collaboration model may be that they have experienced success with it and feel encouraged by that success. In this study, resource teachers' perceptions were that they were collaborating to a large degree. It is logical that to continue with this model and to increase it at some stages, resource teachers need to have seen some benefits.

Question #5 - Classroom Teacher Preferences for Ideal Resource Teacher Role at Each Stage of Service Delivery

Research question #5 asked, "What role (extra pair of hands, expert or collaborative) would classroom teachers prefer resource

teachers to implement at each stage of service delivery?"

Problem identification stage Fifty-one (87.9%) of the 58 classroom teachers who responded indicated that they preferred the resource teacher to play the collaborator role. Six (10.3%) selected the extra pair of hands role and one (1.7%) selected the expert role (Table 11).

Problem assessment stage. Forty (69.0%) of the 58 classroom teachers who responded said they preferred that the resource teacher play the collaborator role. The remaining 18 (31.0%) classroom teachers selected the expert role (Table 11).

Program development stage. Fifty-one (87.9%) of the classroom teachers who responded said they preferred that the resource teacher play the collaborator role. Seven (12.1%) classroom teachers selected the expert role (Table 11).

Program implementation stage Fifty (86.2%) of the classroom teachers who responded said they preferred that the resource teacher play the collaborator role. Five (8.6%) selected the expert role and three (5.2%) selected the extra pair of hands role (Table 11).

Case closure stage. Fifty five (94.8%) of the 58 classroom teachers who responded said they preferred that the resource teacher play the collaborator role. Two (3.4%) selected the expert role and one (1.7%) selected the extra pair of hands role (Table 11).

Summary

The total number of responses for all five stages was 290. Of the 290 responses, 247 (85.2%) of the responses were for the collaborative role, 33 (11.4%) were for the expert role and 10 (3.4%) were for the extra pair of hands role. Most classroom teachers (85.2%) indicated that they preferred the resource teacher to play a collaborator role at all stages of

service delivery. Eleven (27.5%) of classroom teachers' comments supported a preference for the consultative collaborative role. One classroom teacher said,

"....resource teachers should have a much broader role by lending their expertise in the classroom--actually do small group or whole group demonstration lessons as such to reinforce a skill, or show strategies for behavior modification etc."

Table 10

Resource Teacher Preferences for Resource Teacher Role

STAGE	ROLE		
	Expert	Collaborator	Extra Pair of Hands
Problem Identification (N=50)	1 (2.0%)	47 (94.0%)	(4.0%)
Problem Assessment (N=49)	8 (16.3%)	41 (83.7%)	0
Program Development (N=50)	1 (2.0%)	49 (98.0%)	0
Program Implementation N=51)	0	51(100.0%)	0
Case Closure (N=50)	0	49 (98.0%)	1(2.0%)

Table 11

Classroom Teacher Preferences of Resource Teacher Role

STAGE	ROLE		
	Expert	Collaborator	Extra Pair of Hands
Problem Identification (N=58)	1 (1.7%)	51 (87.9%)	6 (10.3%)
Problem Assessment (N= 58)	18 (31.0%)	40 (69.0%)	0
Program Development (N=58)	7 (12.1%)	51 (87.9%)	
Program Implementation (N=58)	5 (8.6%)	50 (86.2%)	3 (5.2%)
Case Closure (N=58)	2 (3.4%)	55 (94.8%)	1 (1.7%)

Another classroom teacher said,

"Ideally the resource teacher acts more as a "resource", less as a remedial teacher. His or her role is not to identify and correct "problems", but to work with classroom teachers so that classrooms can be places of learning for all of the children, regardless of their strengths or weaknesses. This may mean working with children who do not have "problems"-with heterogeneous groups or children with common needs groups, depending on the individual children involved and the classroom they find themselves in."

Another teacher said,

"...I don't personally believe in the validity of "pull out" academic resource (at any level!). The child is dis-serviced at two levels-

1. "He or she misses classroom work and 2. he or she feels "singled out" in a negative fashion."

The finding that classroom teachers prefer the consultative collaborative role is consistent with other survey studies (Bravi, 1987; Bravi, Madak & Richards, 1991; Evans, 1981; Freeze & Bravi, 1987; West 1985). West (1985) found that given a choice of five different consultative roles, classroom teachers preferred the collaborative role at all stages of service delivery. Bravi (1987) surveyed classroom teachers in a northern Manitoba school division and found "The vast majority of teachers stressed the need for a resource teacher program that assisted them in gaining additional competence" (p. 2). As part of an evaluation, Bravi, Madak & Richards (1991) surveyed inner city teachers who had been involved in a project designed to assist Grade One teachers in becoming more effective in working with students who are at-risk of failing to learn literacy skills. The project was designed to provide collaboration between resource and classroom teachers. Bravi, Madak & Richards (1991) found: 1) there was overwhelming support for collaboration, 2) participants felt that collaboration helped to produce the outcomes they desired, and 3) provided them with a partner they could trust. In a survey of suburban elementary classroom teachers, Freeze & Bravi (1987) found: 1) 94% of teachers agreed that classroom teachers and resource teachers should share program planning responsibilities for individual students, and 2) 82% of classroom teachers agreed that classroom teachers should be able to implement modified individual programs in their classrooms.

Two reasons teachers are receptive to this support may be the diversity and number of student needs in classrooms and the efficacy of

collaboration. In the United States, Will (1986) estimated that 30% of the children in a classroom require some kind of modified program. Freeze & Bravi (1987) found 50% of teachers recommended increased consultation and resource teacher support to improve program planning and program implementation in classrooms.

West & Idol (1990) discussed two consequences of classroom teachers working in isolation: 1) limited codification of successful practices, and 2) a tendency for teachers to treat uncertainties inherent in the teaching role as being due to personal problems rather than to collective problems. Perhaps classroom teachers prefer collaborative consultation because the role reduces the isolation of classroom teachers. Collaborative consultation is a process based on mutual trust, open communication, pooling of personal and professional skills and knowledge and shared responsibility. It was the perception of the classroom teachers in this study that resource teachers usually worked collaboratively. Perhaps classroom teachers are experiencing and appreciating the decreased consequences of isolation.

One teacher stated,

"...Resource and I confer, observe and work together on a daily basis with the entire class-me implementing my program (LA), she backing me up with resources-i.e. books, strategies to use, but most importantly of all, supports me with her experience and knowledge as a teacher, and enriches the learning experience for myself and the children."

It is important to note that almost one third (31.0%) of the classroom teachers said they preferred that the resource teacher play an expert role at the assessment stage. This preference may exist because

some classroom teachers believe resource teachers have specialized skills (Bravi, 1986). In addition, assessment is very closely linked to program development and program implementation. Comments by seven (17.5%) classroom teachers reflected a desire for a tutoring role for the resource teacher. Perhaps some classroom teachers have expressed a preference for the expert role because they are resistant to taking responsibility for the learning needs of the student (Bravi, 1986; Idol & Ritter, 1985).

Another factor which may influence this perception is the experience classroom teachers have with assessments by consultants. Historically, psychologists, speech language pathologists, occupational therapists, social workers and resource teachers have played an expert role (Friend, 1988; Pugach & Johnson, 1988; Witt & Martens, 1988). Preference for the expert role may persist because of lack of experience and skill in the collaborative role.

It is important to view the preferences of classroom teachers in the context of the sample. One characteristic of the classroom teacher sample was that 63.8% were primary teachers (Grades 1-3). The sample was skewed towards primary teachers.

Question # 6 - Comparison of Classroom Teacher and Resource Teacher Preferences

Research question #6 asked, "Do resource teachers and classroom teachers have the same preferences for resource teacher role at five stages of service delivery?"

In this survey, both classroom teachers and resource teachers indicated a preference for the collaborative role as the ideal resource teacher role at each stage of service delivery (Table 10 & 11).

The finding is consistent with the findings of other studies

(Babcock & Pryzwansky, 1983; Bravi, Madak & Richards, 1991; Bravi, 1987; Freeze & Bravi, 1987; West, 1985).

The amount of support given for the collaborative role was large. The collaborative role was preferred by at least 86% of all subjects at four of the five stages (problem identification, program development, program implementation, case closure). For the assessment stage, at least 69% of all subjects favored the collaborative resource teacher role. Resource teachers consistently favored collaboration by a slightly larger number than classroom teachers.

Question #7 -A Comparison of Resource Teacher Perceptions and Preferences

Research question #7 asked, "Are resource teacher perceptions of the resource teacher role the same as their preferences for resource teacher role (extra pair of hands, expert, collaborative) at five stages of service delivery?"

Problem Identification Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 89.6% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 94.0% of resource teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 4.2% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 2.0% of resource teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 6.3% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 4.1% of resource teachers (Table 12).

Problem Assessment Stage Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 38.0% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 83.7% of resource teachers. The expert

role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 62.0% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by only 16.3% of resource teachers (Table 12).

Program Development Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 75.6% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 98.0% of resource teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 22.2% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 2.0% of resource teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 2.2% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by none of the resource teachers (Table 12).

Program Implementation Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 79.6% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 100.0% of resource teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 20.4% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by none of resource teachers (Table 12).

Case Closure Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 89.8% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 98.0% of resource teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 6.1% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by none of resource teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 4.1% of resource teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 2.0%

of resource teachers (Table 12).

Table 12

Resource Teacher Perceptions of and Preferences for Resource Teacher Role

STAGE	ROLE		
	Expert	Collaborator	Extra Pair of Hands
<u>Problem Identification</u> ROLE PERCEPTION (N=48)	2 (4.2%)	43 (89.6%)	3 (6.3%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=50)	1 (2.0%)	47 (94.0%)	2 (4.0%)
<u>Problem Assessment</u> ROLE PERCEPTION (N= 50)	31 (62.0%)	19 (38.0%)	0
ROLE PREFERENCE (N= 49)	8 (16.3%)	41 (83.7%)	0
<u>Program Development</u> ROLE PERCEPTION (N=45)	10 (22.2%)	34 (75.6%)	1 (2.2%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=50)	1 (2.0%)	49 (98.0%)	0
<u>Program Implementation</u> ROLE PERCEPTION (N=49)	10 (0.4%)	39 (79.6%)	0
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=51)	0	51 (100.0%)	0
<u>Case Closure</u> ROLE PERCEPTION (N=49)	3 (6.1%)	44 (89.8%)	2 (4.1%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=50)			

Pagination problem-Text is not missing.

Summary

For each of the five stages a difference existed between perceptions of resource teachers and preferences of resource teachers concerning their role. At each stage resource teachers indicated a preference for an increase in the collaborative role and a decrease in all other roles. This is an important finding as it suggests that resource teachers are experiencing the benefits of and seeing success with collaboration. This finding also suggests that factors which contribute to collaboration should be appraised in the school division to determine whether factors such as adequate time, scheduled time, consultative collaborative skill and appropriate caseload sizes exist in schools.

At the assessment stage, numerical differences between perception and preference were very large. Forty-three percent more resource teachers preferred the collaborative role compared to the number who perceived they were playing the collaborative role. In the comments to the open-ended question, resource teachers stated that classroom teacher participation in program development was critical to gaining classroom teacher participation in program implementation.

Program development hinges on accurately assessing what is needed (West & Idol, 1987). Perhaps resource teachers are realizing the importance of collaborative assessment as a precursor to collaboration at other stages in the resource process. The collaborating partners need to agree on the problem(s) before they can agree on solutions.

Question #8 -A Comparison of Classroom Teacher Perceptions and Preferences

Research question #8 asked, "Are the perceptions of classroom teachers the same as their preferences for resource teacher role (extra pair of

hands, expert, collaborative) at five stages of service delivery?

Problem Identification Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 76.8% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 87.9% of classroom teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 7.1% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 1.7% of classroom teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 16.1% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 10.3% of classroom teachers (Table 13).

Problem Assessment Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 57.4% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 69.0% of classroom teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 37.0% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 31.0% of classroom teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 5.6% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by none of classroom teachers (Table 13).

Program Development Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 74.1% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 87.9% of classroom teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 18.5% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 12.1% of classroom teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 7.4% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher

role by none of classroom teachers (Table 13).

Program Implement Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 83.6% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 86.2% of classroom teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 14.5% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 8.6% of classroom teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 1.8% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 5.2% of classroom teachers (Table 13).

Case Closure Stage

Collaboration was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 80.7% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 94.8% of classroom teachers. The expert role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 14.0% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 3.4% of classroom teachers. The extra pair of hands role was selected as the actual resource teacher role by 5.3% of classroom teachers and selected as the ideal resource teacher role by 1.7% of classroom teachers (Table 13).

Summary

In the comparison of classroom teachers' perceptions of actual resource teacher role and preferences for ideal teacher role, a pattern existed in the data. For the five stages, classroom teachers indicated a preference for an increase in the collaborative role of resource teachers

Table 13

Classroom Teacher Perceptions of and Preferences for Resource Teacher Role

STAGE	ROLE		
	Expert	Collaborator	Extra Pair of Hands
<u>Problem Identification</u>			
ROLE PERCEPTION (N=56)	4 (7.1%)	43 (76.8%)	9 (16.1%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=58)	1 (1.7%)	51 (87.9%)	6 (10.3%)
<u>Problem Assessment</u>			
ROLE PERCEPTION (N= 54)	20 (37.0%)	31 (57.4%)	3 (5.6%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N= 58)	18 (31.0%)	40 (69.0%)	0
<u>Program Development</u>			
ROLE PERCEPTION (N=54)	10 (18.5%)	40 (74.1%)	4 (7.4%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=58)	7 (12.1%)	51 (87.9%)	0
<u>Program Implementation</u>			
ROLE PERCEPTION (N=55)	8 (14.5%)	46 (83.6%)	1 (1.8%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=58)	5 (8.6%)	50 (86.2%)	3 (5.2%)
<u>Case Closure</u>			
ROLE PERCEPTION (N=57)	8 (14.0%)	46 (80.7%)	3 (5.3%)
ROLE PREFERENCE (N=58)	2 (3.4%)	55 (94.8%)	1 (1.7%)

and a decrease in other roles. The data suggest that classroom teachers

are experiencing the benefits of the collaborative role in the educational management of their students.

Question #9- Addressing the Gap Between the Actual and the Ideal

Research question #9 asked, "What suggestions do classroom teachers and resource teachers have for bridging any perceived gap between actual and ideal role of resource teachers?"

The following statement appeared at the end of the questionnaire:

When you completed the questionnaire, you may have noticed a difference in your answers concerning the actual delivery of resource services as compared to your preference for service delivery. If you have some suggestions for closing the gap between actual service delivery and your preference, or would like to comment on resource services in some other way, please include your comments in the space below.

Comments were analyzed by group. Analysis was done by sorting comments according to the stage mentioned and according to factors which impact on collaborative consultation. Responses in each category were sorted into two sub-groups: general comments and suggestions to bridge the gap between perception and preference. Twenty-eight (48.3%) of classroom teachers and 33 (64.7%) of resource teachers made comments. The 33 resource teachers generated 49 comments and the 28 classroom teachers generated 40 comments (Table 14).

Table 14

Number of Respondents to Open-Ended Questions

	Resource Teachers	Classroom Teachers
Number who responded to question	33	28
Number who responded to question as a percentage of sample	64.7%	48.2%
Number of Comments	49	40

A summary of the categories, sub-categories and number of responses is presented in Table 15.

Table 15

A Categorical and Numerical Summary of Comments from Responses to Open-ended Questions

	Resource Teachers' Comments N=49	Classroom Teachers' Comments N=40	Classroom Combined Groups Comments N=89
Problem Identification Stage	0	0	0
Assessment Stage Total	1 (2%)	4 (10.0%)	5 (5.6%)
General Comments	1	3	4
Suggestions	0	1	1
Program Development Stage			
General Comments	2	0	2
Suggestions	0	3	3
Program Implementation Stage	1 (2.0%)	7 (17.5%)	8 (9.0%)
General Comments	1	0	1
Suggestions	0	7	7

Table 15 (Continued)

Case Closure			
Stage	2 (4.0%)	0	2 (2.2%)
General Comments	1	0	1
Suggestions	1	0	1
Administrative			
Factors	3 (6.1%)	1 (2.5%)	4 (4.5%)
General Comments	2	1	3
Suggestions	1	0	1
Workload	3 (6.1%)	4 (10.0%)	7 (7.9%)
General Comments	2	1	3
Suggestions	1	3	4
Time	8 (16.3%)	7 (17.5%)	15(16.9%)
General Comments	0	0	0
Suggestions	8	7	15
Consultative			
Collaborative Skill	10 (20.4%)	0	10(11.2%)
General Comments	5	0	5
Suggestions	0	0	0
Differences	7(15.2)	2 (5.0%)	9 (7.9%)
General Comments	7	2	9
Suggestions	0	0	0
Opinions About			
Consultative			
Collaboration	7(14.2%)	11 (27.5%)	18 (20.2%)
General Comments	5	8	13
Suggestions	2	3	5
Implementation of			
Consultative			
Collaboration	4 (8.1%)	0	4 (4.5%)
General Comments	2	0	2
Suggestions	2	0	
Role Definition	1 (2.0%)	0	1
General Comments	0	0	0
Suggestions	1	0	1
Questionnaire	2 (4.0%)	0	2 (2.2%)
General Comments	2	0	2
Suggestions	0	0	0

Problem Identification Stage

No resource or classroom teachers commented or offered suggestions about this stage.

Comments About Assessment Stage

Of the five comments about the assessment stage, one was a resource teacher's comment and four were classroom teachers' comments. There was no pattern or common theme among the responses . (Appendix I)

Comments About Program Development Stage

Of the five comments about program development, three were from classroom teachers and two were resource teachers' comments. There was no pattern or common theme among the responses. (Appendix I)

Comments About Program Implementation Stage

Of the eight comments about program implementation, seven were classroom teachers' comments and one was a resource teacher's comment (Appendix I)

Two themes were apparent in the seven classroom teachers' comments. First, the classroom teachers wanted the resource teacher to provide some tutoring for students. Second, classroom teachers were concerned about the beginning of program implementation and the duration of some programs. Specifically, classroom teachers were concerned about children who had been identified and for whom programs had been developed but did begin those programs immediately at the beginning of September of the next year. One classroom teacher said that some students required a program that could be implemented for the full school year rather than for a time limited period.

Case Closure Stage

Resource teachers made the only comments (two) about this stage and no theme was apparent (Appendix I)

Comments About Factors Which Impact on Collaborative Consultation

Comments about factors which impact on collaborative consultation formed four categories: administration, time, workload, and consultative collaborative skills.

Administration

Three of the four comments were made by resource teachers and one comment was made by a classroom teacher. No themes were apparent in the comments . (Appendix I)

Work Load

Of the seven comments made about work load, three comments were made by resource teachers and four were made by classroom teachers. (Appendix I)

Both classroom and resource teachers suggested that smaller class size and increasing numbers of resource staff would make consultative collaborative a more viable role for resource teachers and classroom teachers.

Idol (1990) suggested ideal caseload size for resource teacher who are consulting and for resource teachers are tutoring as well as consulting. However, workload data should include size of caseload plus number of classroom teacher clients, number of teaching assistants and volunteers supervised by the resource teacher, list of tasks expected of the resource teacher, level of authority and control given to the resource teacher and type and amount of administrative support received by the resource teacher.

Time

Of the fifteen comments about time constraints, eight were made by resource teachers and seven were made by classroom teachers. (Appendix I). Lack of adequate meeting time (12 comments) and the importance of scheduled meeting time (3 comments) were the two main themes in the comments. If teachers are expected to collaborate, a system support for that enterprise must exist in schools. Timetable patterns, work assignments and school calendars need to be examined and created to provide meeting times. Within school mechanisms must be instituted to provide classroom teachers and resource teachers with meeting times. The efficacy of the different mechanisms should be monitored.

West & Idol (1990) reported a variety of solutions they have observed in schools: 1) regularly bringing large groups of student together for special types of school experiences with fewer staff supervising; 2) Principal or other support staff teach a period a day on a regularly scheduled basis, 3) clustering large groups of students who are working on an independent study, 4) hiring a permanent "floating" substitute, 5) altering the school day to provide staff collaboration time without students (e.g. last Friday afternoon of each month, 6) utilizing student teachers, 7) the principal setting aside 1 day per grading period as "Collaboration day", and/or 8) the staff voting to extend their instructional day to bank time for early dismissal to allow for collaborative consultation.

Collaborative Consultative Skill

All ten of the comments about consultative collaborative skills were made by resource teachers (Appendix I).

Five resource teachers commented generally that interpersonal factors are important in a collaborative consultative relationship and four suggested training about the consultative collaborative model is necessary for classroom teachers and administration.

Assessment of staff and staff development in consultative collaborative skills may be needed in some places in the school division. West & Idol (1990) discussed the importance of assessing and developing staff communicative, interactive, and problem solving skills, as well as, competencies in providing technical interventions. This type of staff development is seldom done (Cannon, West & Idol, 1989; Johnson, Pugach & Hammittee, 1988; Pugach & Johnson, 1988; West & Cannon, 1988).

General Comments About Consultative Collaboration

Comments were made about: 1) individual differences among teachers, 2) the consultative collaborative model in general, 3) implementation of the consultative collaborative model and the questionnaire.

Individual Differences Among Teachers

Of the nine comments made, seven were made by resource teachers and two by classroom teachers (Appendix I).

Seven resource teachers believed that individual differences among classroom teachers are important factors in the consultative collaborative model. These individual differences as described by resource teachers sounded like resistance or partial acceptance by classroom teachers of consultative collaboration.

Opinions About Consultative Collaborative Model

Seven resource teachers and eleven classroom teachers commented on the role in general (Appendix I).

The common theme in the comments of both groups was about the need for and the benefits of the model. Resource and classroom teachers said classroom-based interventions were important to "develop positive learning environments" for all children in the classroom environment rather than on a withdrawal basis. They stated that they wanted the resource teacher to be a support and resource for the classroom teacher as well as for the students. They said the collaborative consultative model benefitted many types of students and teachers and did not "single out" any student in a negative fashion.

Implementation of Consultative Collaborative Model

All four comments about implementation were made by resource teachers (Appendix I).

No themes were apparent in the comments.

Role Definition

One comment about role definition was made by a resource teacher (Appendix I).

Questionnaire

Both comments about the questionnaire were made by resource teachers (Appendix I). No themes were apparent in the comments.

CONCLUSION

The data from this survey of resource and classroom teachers allow for several tentative conclusions. First, it appears that elementary classroom teachers and elementary resource teachers perceive that resource teachers in elementary schools in the school division work in a collaborative role at five stages of service delivery. Second, elementary classroom and resource teachers in the school division report a preference for increasing the collaborative role rather than increasing the expert or extra pair of hands role at five stages of service delivery. Third, teachers reported some factors that have an impact on working in a collaborative role. Lack of time and unscheduled meeting time were identified as barriers to consultative collaboration. Interpersonal and communication skills were identified as necessary for consultative collaboration.

Limitations

Conclusions from the results of this survey are difficult to generalize to the classroom teaching population because of the low response rate by classroom teachers. Fifty percent of the classroom teacher sample did not respond to the survey.

The study might have provided more information if the non-respondents had been interviewed. For example, if the subjects who did not respond are biased in a similar way about the role of the resource teacher, this information might have been gathered in interviews.

In light of 1) the small classroom teacher sample, 2) the predominantly primary grade level representation of the classroom teacher sample and 3) no data concerning non-respondents, conclusions about the results of this study must be made with caution.

Conclusions for a sample with similar characteristics could be made with greater confidence than conclusions about the entire population.

Conclusions concerning resource teachers' perceptions and preferences can be made with more confidence because of the higher response rate (76%).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations can be made about the direction of future investigations of resource teacher role and about the practice of resource teachers in the school division. Future investigations should focus on 1) classroom teachers at different stages in their professional careers, 2) classroom teachers at the Grades 4-6 level, Junior High School and High School, and preferences for service for students with mild, moderate and severe disabilities.

The desire of a large number of resource teachers to decrease their expert role and increase their collaborative role has implications for the professional development support and administrative support needed by resource teachers. Some of the necessary supports are:

- 1) clear role definition, supervision, and advocacy for the role by their administrators,
- 2) on-going education of classroom and resource teachers concerning the collaborative consultation role,
- 3) training resource and classroom teachers in the fundamentals of collaborative consultation (teaming skills, communication skills, and problem solving skills),
- 4) timetables that provide time for classroom and resource teachers to meet,
- 5) a mechanism/support group for resource teachers to consult with

other resource teachers to assist with problem solving, conflict resolution and to develop communication and interactive skills,

6) classroom teacher assessment training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babcock, N.L., & Pryzwansky, W.B. (1983). Models of consultation: Preferences of educational professionals at five stages of service. Journal of School Psychology, 21(4), 359-366.
- Block, P. (1981). Flawless Consulting. Austin: Learning Concepts.
- Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction. (5th ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Braaten, S., Kauffman, J.M., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, M.C. (1988). The Regular Education Initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. Exceptional Children, 55(1), 21-27.
- Bravi, G. (1986). Support Personnel as Consultants. University of Manitoba, Dept. of Educational Psychology, Winnipeg, MB: Author.
- Bravi, G. (1987). Norway House Education Policy Studies the Special Education Program. University of Manitoba, Department of Educational Psychology, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Bravi, G., Madak, P. & Richards, D. (1991). Reading/ Writing Immersion: A decision Making Literacy Development Project: Teacher Interviews-Year Two. University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Bruininks, R.H., Wolman, C., & Thurlow, M.L. (1990), Considerations in designing studies and follow-up systems for special education service programs. Remedial and Special Education, 11(2), 7-46.
- Carroll, M.E. (1986). The human demension of consultation. In C. Warger & L. Aldinger (Eds.), Preparing Special Educators for Teacher Consultationx. Unpublished manuscript, Toledo University, College of Education and Allied Professions, Toledo, Ohio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 135)
- Cenerini, N.J. (1980). Special Education in Manitoba. In M. Csapo & L. Goguen (Eds.). Special Education Across Canada. Vancouver: Center for Human Development and Research.
- Chalfant, J.C., & Pysh, M. (1989). Teacher Assistance Teams: Five descriptive studies on 96 teams. Remedial and Special Education, 10(6), 49-58.
- Coates, R.D. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative and opinions of regular classroom teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22(9), 532-536.

- Conoley, J.C. (1986). Serving special children through teacher consultation. In C. Warger & L. Aldinger (Eds.), Preparing Special Educators for Teacher Consultation (pp. 1-17). Unpublished manuscript, Toledo University, College of Education and Allied Professions, Toledo, Ohio. ED 279 135
- Conoley, J.C., & Conoley, C.W. (1982). School Consultation: A guide to practice and training. Willowdale: Pergamon Press.
- Conoley, J.C., & Conoley, C.W. (1988). Useful theories in school-based consultation. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 14-20.
- Converse, J.M., & Presser, S. (1986) Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- 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.
- Freeze, D.R. & Bravi, G. (1987) In Challenging Every Child: The Report of the Special Needs Review Committee. Winnipeg, Manitoba; River East School Division.
- Freeze, D.R., Bravi, G., & Rampaul, W. (1989). Special education in Manitoba: A consultative-collaborative service delivery model. In M. Csapo & L. Goguen (Eds.). Special Education Across Canada: Issues and Concerns for the 90's. Vancouver: Center for Human Development and Research.
- Friend, M. (1984). Consultation skills for resource teachers. Learning Disability Quarterly, 7(3), 246-250.
- Friend, M. (1988). Putting consultation into context: Historical and contemporary perspectives. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 7-13.
- Friend, M., & McNutt, G. (1986). A comparative study of resource teacher job descriptions and perceptions of research teacher responsibilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 224-228.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L., Bahr, M. Reeder, P., Gilman, S., Fernstrom, P., & Roberts, H. (1990). Prereferral intervention to increase attention and work productivity among difficult-to-teach pupils. Focus on Exceptional Children, 22(6), 1-8.
- Gay, L.R. (1981). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (2nd ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Gelheiser, L.M. (1987). Reducing the number of students identified as learning disabled: A question of practice, philosophy, or policy? Exceptional Children, 54 (2), 145-150.

- Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1990). Rethinking the Regular Education Initiative: Focus on the classroom teacher. Remedial and Special Education, 11(3), 7-16.
- Gickling, E.E., Murphy, L.C., & Mallory, D.W. (1979). Teachers' preferences for resource services. Exceptional Children, 45, 442-449.
- Graden, J.L. (1989). Redefining "Prereferral" intervention as intervention assistance: Collaboration between general and special education. Exceptional Children, 56(3), 227-231.
- Gresham, F.M., & Kendall, G.K. (1987). School consultation research: Methodological critique and future research implications. School Psychology Review, 16, 306-316.
- Haight, S.L. (1984). Special education teacher consultant: Idealism versus realism. Exceptional Children, 50, 507-515.
- Haight, S.L., & Molitor, D. I. (1983). A survey of special education teacher consultants. Exceptional Children, 49, 550-552.
- Hallahan, D.P., Keller, C.E., McKinney, J.D., Lloyd, J.W., & Bryan, T. (1988). Examining the research base of the Regular Education Initiative: Efficacy studies and the Adaptive Learning Environments Model. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 29-35.
- Heller, H.W., & Schilit, J. (1987). The Regular Education Initiative: A concerned response. Focus on Exceptional Children, 20(3), 1-6.
- Heron, T.E., & Harris, K.C. (1987). The Educational Consultant (2nd ed.). Austin, Texas: Pro-ed, Inc.
- Heron, T.E., & Kimball, W.H. (1988). Gaining perspective with educational consultation research base: Ecological considerations and further recommendations. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 21-28.
- Huefner, D. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54 (5), 403-414.
- Idol, L. (1983). Special Educator's Consultation Handbook. Austin, Texas: Pro-ed, Inc.
- Idol, L. (1988). A rationale and guidelines for establishing special education consultation programs. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 48-58.
- Idol, L. (1989). The Resource/Consulting Teacher: An integrated model of service delivery. Remedial and Special Education, 10(6), 38-48.

- Idol, L., & West, J.F. (1987). Consultation in special education (Part II): Training and practice. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 20, 474-494.
- Idol, L., Paolucci-Whitcomb, Nevin, A. (1987). Collaborative Consultation. Austin, Texas: Pro-ed, Inc.
- Idol, L., West, F.J., & Lloyd, S.R. (1988). Organizing and implementing specialized reading programs: A collaborative approach involving classroom, remedial, and special education teachers. Remedial and Special Education, 9(2), 54-61.
- Idol-Maestas, L. & Ritter, S. (1985). A follow-up study of resource/consulting teachers: Factors that facilitate and inhibit teacher consultation. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8, 121-131.
- Idol-Maestas, L. (1986) Setting the stage for successful school consultation. In C. Warger & L. Aldinger (Eds.), Preparing Special Educators for Teacher Consultation (pp. 19-35). Unpublished manuscript, Toledo University, College of Education and Allied Professions, Toledo, Ohio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 135)
- Jenkins, J.R., & Heinen, A. (1989). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. Exceptional children, 55(6), 516-523.
- Jenkins, J.R., Pious, C.G., & Jewell, M. (1990). Special education and the Regular Education Initiative: Basic assumptions. Exceptional Children, 56(6), 479-491.
- Johnson, L.J., Pugach, M.C., & Hammittee, D.J. (1988). Barriers to effective special education consultation. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 41-47.
- Kaufmann, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the Regular Education Initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 6-11.
- Lloyd, J.W., Crowley, E.P., Kohler, F.W., & Strain, P.S. (1988). Redefining the applied research agenda: Cooperative learning, prereferral, teacher consultation, and peer-mediated interventions. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 43-52.
- Manitoba Department of Education, (1988). Manitoba Funding of Schools, Winipeg: Author.
- McKinney, J.D., & Hocutt, A.M. (1988). The need for policy analysis in evaluating the Regular Education Initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 12-18.

- Medway, F.J. & Updyke, J.F. (1985). Meta-analysis of consultation outcome studies. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 489-505.
- Menlo, A. (1986). Consultant beliefs which make a significant difference in consultation. In C. Warger & L. Aldinger (Eds.), Preparing Special Educators for Teacher Consultation. Unpublished manuscript, Toledo University, College of Education and Allied Professions, Toledo, Ohio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 135)
- Miller, T.L., & Sabitino, D.A. (1978). An evaluation of the teacher consultant model as an approach to mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 45, 86-91.
- Peryon, C. D. (1982). Systematic development of special educators as facilitators of mainstreaming, Journal of Special Education Technology, 5(3), 31-36.
- Phillips, V., & McCullough, L. (1990). Consultation based programming: Instituting the collaborative ethic in schools. Exceptional Children, 56(4), 291-304.
- Polsgrove, L., & McNeil, M. (1989). The consultation process: Research and practice. Remedial and Special Education, 10(1), 6-13.
- Pryzwansky, W. B. (1986). Indirect service delivery: Considerations for future research in consultation. School Psychology Review, 15, 479-488.
- Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (1988). Rethinking the relationship between consultation and collaborative problem solving. Focus on Exceptional Children, 21(4), 1-8.
- Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (1989a). Prereferral interventions: Progress, problems, and challenges. Exceptional Children, 56(3), 217-226.
- Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (1989b). The challenge of implementing collaboration between general and special education. Exceptional Children, 56(3), 232-235.
- Reisberg, L., & Wolf, R. (1988). Instructional strategies for special education consultants. Remedial and Special Education, 9(6), 29-40.
- Reynolds, M.C., Wang, M.C. & Walberg, H.J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education.
- Ritter, S. (1978). Effects of school consultation program on referral patterns of teachers. Psychology in the Schools. 15, 239-243.
- River East School Division. (1987). Challenging Every Child: The Report of the Special Needs Review Committee. Winnipeg, MB: Author.

- Roberts, L. (1988) A three year follow-up study of resource specialist teachers in northeastern California. *Alternative Futures for Rural Special Education-Proceedings of the Annual ACRES (American Council on Rural Special Education)*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 736)
- Sargent, L. R. (1981) Resource teacher time utilization: An observational study. *Exceptional Children*, 47 (6), 420-425.
- Skrtic, T.M. (1986). The crisis in special education knowledge: perspective on perspective. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 18(7)
- Stainback, K.S., & Stainback, W. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education, *Exceptional Children*, 51, 102-111.
- Stainback, S. & Stainback, W. (1987). Integration versus cooperation: A commentary on "Educating Children with Learning Problems: A Shared Responsibility". *Exceptional Children*, 54 (1), 66-68.
- Stainback, S., Stainback, W., Courtnage, L. & Jaben, T. (1985). Facilitating Mainstreaming by Modifying the Mainstream. *Exceptional Children*, 52 (2), 144-152.
- Tindal, G.A., & Taylor-Pendergast, S.J. (1989). A taxonomy for objectively analyzing the consultation process. *Remedial and Special Education*, 10(2), 6-16.
- Wang, M.C., & Zollers, N.J. (1990). Adaptive instruction: An alternative service delivery approach. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(1), 7-21.
- Wang, M.C., Reynolds, M. & Walberg, H.J. (1986). Rethinking Special Education. *Educational Leadership*, Sept., 26-31.
- West, F.J. (1985). Regular and special educators' preferences for school based consultation models: A statewide study. (Technical Report No. 101). Austin, TX: Texas University, Dept. of Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 230).
- West, J.F., & Cannon, G.S. (1988). Essential collaborative consultation competencies for regular and special educators. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 21(1), 56-63.
- West, J.F., & Idol, L. (1987). School consultation (Part I): An interdisciplinary perspective on theory, models and research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20, 388-408.
- West, J.F., & Idol, L. (1990). Collaborative consultation in the education of mildly handicapped and at-risk students. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(1), 22-31.
- Wiederholt, J.L., & Chamberlain, S.P. (1989) A critical analysis of resource programs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 10(6), 15-37.

- Will, M.C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52 (5), 411-415.
- Witt, J.C., & Martens, B.K. (1988). Problems with problem-solving consultation: A re-analysis of assumptions, methods and goals. School Psychology Review, 17, 211-226.

Appendix A
Elementary Resource Teacher
Job Description

The specific duties of the resource teacher shall include:

1. Diagnosing and programming for students with exceptional needs;
2. Consulting with classroom teacher(s) to provide ideas, information, programs, teaching strategies and the selection, ordering and maintaining of materials related to children with exceptional needs;
3. Collaborating with the classroom teacher(s) regarding programs, materials and teaching strategies (which may include classroom demonstrations) to meet the requirements of children with exceptional needs;
4. Participating in the Early Identification Program by collaborating with the classroom teacher and other appropriate personnel in identifying exceptional children through observation and screening, assisting individual students as required, monitoring the program on an ongoing basis and coordinating the motor skills program;
5. Assisting the principal and classroom teacher with referrals, follow-up programming, evaluation and/or placement of specific children. (e.g. Child Guidance Clinic, Special Education, English as a Second Language Program, Diagnostic Learning Centre, Low Incidence Funding).

School Division (1986)

Appendix B

Stages in Resource Service Delivery Process

Assistance Request Phase:

- Classroom teacher initiates request for assistance.
- Classroom teacher collects and supplies (i) student work samples, (ii) instructional materials, (iii) observational data from classroom (if available), (iv) teacher and student schedules, and (v) a completed assistance request form.
- Resource teacher analyzes these materials.
- Resource teacher reviews historical information from student's school file.
- Resource teacher contacts former teachers or specialists who have worked with the child.
- Resource teacher reviews curricular guidelines.
- Resource teacher gives the classroom teacher a brochure outlining the stages of the collaborative consultation process.
- Resource teacher and classroom teacher meet for assistance request conference. At this conference, the resource teacher reviews the stages of the collaborative consultation process and the roles of the classroom and resource teacher. Additional goals of the assistance request conference are to:
 - specify as clearly as possible the academic performances and/or behaviors that lead to the request for assistance
 - specify the conditions under which the specified academic performances and/or behaviors occurred
 - specify criteria for success at the academic performances and/or behaviors specified by the teacher
 - review relevant historical information
 - establish purposes and select procedures for classroom observations
 - schedule classroom observations
 - explore possible instructional goals
 - explore possible behavior goals
 - select appropriate assessment procedures
 - discuss possible need to schedule academic assessment interviews or tests
 - arrange for the collection of work samples
 - set a date for the assessment conference

Assessment Phase

- Resource teacher observes student in classroom to collect data about factors agreed upon in the assistance request conference.
- Resource teacher analyzes student performance.
- Resource teacher analyzes instructional materials and methods.

Appendix B (continued)

- Resource and classroom teacher meet for the assessment conference. The goals of the conference are to:
 - synthesize and prioritize assessment information
 - verify, modify, or discount the teacher's version of student performances or behavior
 - determine if ancillary assessment services are necessary
 - agree on general purpose and approach to modified instruction
 - agree on specific behavioral and instructional objectives for a modified program
 - suggest instructional methods and materials or behavior management strategies
 - set criteria for meeting behavioral and instructional objectives
 - timetable program development and implementation phases
 - determine personnel resources for program development and implementation phases
 - make arrangements for contacting parents

Program Development Phase

- Resource teacher develops methods, materials, strategies and evaluation procedures.
- Resource teacher designates personnel and material resources.
- Resource teacher does diagnostic/analytic teaching in classroom or other setting.
- Resource and classroom teacher meet for program implementation conference. The goals of the conference are to:
 - schedule modified program
 - set up logistical supports
 - verify case closure criteria
 - inform and involve parents and students

Program Implementation Phase

- Classroom teacher implements modified program in classroom.
- Resource teacher may provide assistance to classroom teacher (consultation, coaching, demonstration, team teaching, provide materials, train ancillary personnel, short-term tutoring).
- Classroom and resource teachers monitor program.
- Classroom and resource teachers conduct formative assessment of program.

Case Closure Phase

- Classroom and resource teachers conduct summative assessments of the objectives of the modified program.
- Classroom and resource teachers meet for case closure conference. Goals of the conference are to:
 - review summative assessments
 - decide to close case or return to prior phase
 - decide whether to refer to ancillary services
 - inform parents

Appendix C

Questionnaire Design

RESOURCE TEACHER ROLE

STAGES

EXPERT

I.
PROBLEM
CLARIFICATION

RT decides the parameters of the problem and decides how the case will proceed. CT supports RT.

II.
ASSESSMENT

RT collects further data. CT uninvolved.

III.
PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT

RT develops methods, materials and evaluation strategies to solve the problem. CT uninvolved.

IV.
PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION

RT implements solution or provides CT with detailed instructions for implementation by CT.

V.
CASE CLOSURE

RT makes decisions about success of implemented solution and case closure. CT is uninvolved.

Appendix C
Questionnaire Design

RESOURCE TEACHER ROLE

STAGES

EXTRA PAIR OF HANDS

I.
PROBLEM
CLARIFICATION

CT decides the parameters of the problem and decides how the case will proceed. RT uninvolved.

II.
ASSESSMENT

CT makes assessment decisions for RT to carry out.

III.
PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT

CT develops methods, materials and evaluation strategies to solve the problem. RT uninvolved.

IV.
PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION

RT implements solution as directed by the CT.

V.
CASE CLOSURE

CT makes decisions about success of implemented solution and case closure. RT is uninvolved.

Appendix C

Questionnaire Design

RESOURCE TEACHER ROLES

STAGES

COLLABORATIVE

I.
PROBLEM
CLARIFICATION

RT and CT jointly decide the parameters of the problem and decide how the case will proceed.

II.
ASSESSMENT

RT and CT jointly decide on assessment procedures and collect further data.

III.
PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT

RT and CT jointly develop methods, materials and evaluation strategies to solve the problem.

IV.
PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION

RT and CT jointly responsible.

V.
CASE CLOSURE

RT and CT jointly make decisions about success of implemented solution and case closure.

Appendix D

A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles at Five Stages of Service Delivery

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire has four parts:

Part I contains questions about the demographics of the respondents;

Part II is a survey of actual role of the Resource Teacher at each of the five stages of delivering resource services;

Part III is a survey of your preference of role for the Resource Teacher at each of the five stages of delivering resource services;

Part IV is a space for your comments.

Return the completed survey in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

The purpose of this project is to study what role resource teachers actually play at each stage in the delivery of resource services and, what teachers think is the ideal role for resource teachers to play at each stage.

This survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. For clarification contact: Lynne Currie

Upon completion of the study, the Principal at each elementary school will receive a summary of the results of the study for posting. Results can also be obtained by returning the enclosed request form or by phoning Lynne Currie

**A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles at Five Stages
of Service Delivery**

Classroom Teacher Survey

PART I:

I. What grade group best represents the class you register and teach? Circle the appropriate number.

1. Primary (Gr. 1-3)
2. Intermediate (Gr. 4-6)

II. How many years have you been teaching? Circle the appropriate number.

1. between 0 and 5 years completed
2. between 6 and 10 years completed
3. between 11 and 20 years completed
4. more than 20 years completed

III. What is your gender? Circle the appropriate number.

1. Female
2. Male

PART II: For each question, choose the situation that **best represents** how the described task is **actually** accomplished in your school this year (1990-1991). Indicate your choice by circling the appropriate number.

- A. Resource service delivery usually begins with identification of the problem. At this stage, the nature of the problem is described and defined. For example, the specifics of the problem, goals concerning a solution to the problem, and expectations with regard to solutions are defined. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Classroom Teacher adopts the decision of the Resource Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly define the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution.
 3. The Classroom Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Resource Teacher adopts the decision of the Classroom Teacher.

- B. During the assessment stage, additional information is gathered and analyzed. For example, classroom observations, testing or work samples may be required. Then, the problem is further defined. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Resource Teacher provides the Classroom Teacher with the information.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher do additional assessment and problem definition. They pool and discuss their findings.
 3. The Classroom Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Classroom Teacher provides the Resource Teacher with the information.
- C. During the program development stage, solutions to the problem are selected and tried out. Solutions may involve changes in methods, materials, or strategies. Some examples of solutions are an individualized program, tutoring, peer assistance, modified assignments, self-monitoring programs and daily report cards. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Classroom Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make program decisions and jointly develop the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Resource Teacher.

- D. During the program implementation stage, the selected solutions to the problem are implemented, monitored and evaluated daily. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher implements the program or instructs the Classroom Teacher about how to implement the program.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make decisions about their respective individual responsibilities and jointly implement the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher instructs the Resource Teacher about what and how to implement solutions and the Resource Teacher implements the program.
- E. The final or case closure stage occurs so that the implemented solution(s) can be evaluated and decisions are made about the case. For example, one decision may be to try other solutions or close the case. Another decision may be to request other services such as speech pathology, psychology or social work. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to close the case or to try new solution(s), and/or to request other services.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly evaluate the implemented solution(s). They decide whether to try other solution(s) or close the case and/or to request other services.
 3. The Classroom Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to try new solution(s) or to close the case and/or to request other services.

PART III: For each question, choose the situation that **best represents your preference** for accomplishing the task described at each stage of resource service delivery. Indicate your choice by circling the appropriate number.

- A. Resource service delivery usually begins with identification of the problem. At this stage, the nature of the problem is described and defined. For example, the specifics of the problem, goals concerning a solution to the problem, and expectations with regard to solutions are defined. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Classroom Teacher adopts the decision of the Resource Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly define the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution.
 3. The Classroom Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Resource Teacher adopts the decision of the Classroom Teacher.

- B. During the assessment stage, additional information is gathered and analyzed. For example, classroom observations, testing or work samples may be required. Then, the problem is further defined. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Resource Teacher provides the Classroom Teacher with the information.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher do additional assessment and problem definition. They pool and discuss their findings.
 3. The Classroom Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Classroom Teacher provides the Resource Teacher with the information.
- C. During the program development stage, solutions to the problem are selected and tried out. Solutions may involve changes in methods, materials, or strategies. Some examples of solutions are an individualized program, tutoring, peer assistance, modified assignments, self-monitoring programs and daily report cards. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Classroom Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make program decisions and jointly develop the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Resource Teacher.

- D. During the program implementation stage, the selected solutions to the problem are implemented, monitored and evaluated daily. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher implements the program or instructs the Classroom Teacher about how to implement the program.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make decisions about their respective individual responsibilities and jointly implement the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher instructs the Resource Teacher about what and how to implement solutions and the Resource Teacher implements the program.
- E. The final or case closure stage occurs so that the implemented solution(s) can be evaluated and decisions are made about the case. For example, one decision may be to try other solutions or close the case. Another decision may be to request other services such as speech pathology, psychology or social work. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to close the case or to try new solution(s), and/or to request other services.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly evaluate the implemented solution(s). They decide whether to try other solution(s) or close the case and/or to request other services.
 3. The Classroom Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to try new solution(s) or to close the case and/or to request other services.

Part IV: When you completed the questionnaire, you may have noticed a difference in your answers concerning the **actual** delivery of resource services as compared to your **preference** for service delivery. If you have some suggestions for closing the gap between actual service delivery and your preference, or would like to comment on resource services in some other way, please include your comments in the space below.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE! Please return survey to:
Lynne R. Currie

Use the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

Appendix D

A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles at Five Stages of Service Delivery

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire has four parts:

Part I contains questions about the demographics of the respondents;

Part II is a survey of actual role of the Resource Teacher at each of the five stages of delivering resource services;

Part III is a survey of your preference of role for the Resource Teacher at each of the five stages of delivering resource services;

Part IV is a space for your comments.

Return the completed survey in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

The purpose of this project is to study what role resource teachers actually play at each stage in the delivery of resource services and, what teachers think is the ideal role for resource teachers to play at each stage.

This survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. For clarification contact: Lynne Currie

Upon completion of the study, the Principal at each elementary school will receive a summary of the results of the study for posting. Results can also be obtained by returning the enclosed request form or by phoning Lynne Currie

**A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles at Five Stages
of Service Delivery**

Classroom Teacher Survey

PART I:

I. What grade group best represents the class you register and teach? Circle the appropriate number.

1. Primary (Gr. 1-3)
2. Intermediate (Gr. 4-6)

II. How many years have you been teaching? Circle the appropriate number.

1. between 0 and 5 years completed
2. between 6 and 10 years completed
3. between 11 and 20 years completed
4. more than 20 years completed

III. What is your gender? Circle the appropriate number.

1. Female
2. Male

PART II: For each question, choose the situation that **best represents** how the described task is **actually** accomplished in your school this year (1990-1991). Indicate your choice by circling the appropriate number.

- A. Resource service delivery usually begins with identification of the problem. At this stage, the nature of the problem is described and defined. For example, the specifics of the problem, goals concerning a solution to the problem, and expectations with regard to solutions are defined. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Classroom Teacher adopts the decision of the Resource Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly define the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution.
 3. The Classroom Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Resource Teacher adopts the decision of the Classroom Teacher.

- B. During the assessment stage, additional information is gathered and analyzed. For example, classroom observations, testing or work samples may be required. Then, the problem is further defined. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Resource Teacher provides the Classroom Teacher with the information.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher do additional assessment and problem definition. They pool and discuss their findings.
 3. The Classroom Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Classroom Teacher provides the Resource Teacher with the information.
- C. During the program development stage, solutions to the problem are selected and tried out. Solutions may involve changes in methods, materials, or strategies. Some examples of solutions are an individualized program, tutoring, peer assistance, modified assignments, self-monitoring programs and daily report cards. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Classroom Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make program decisions and jointly develop the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Resource Teacher.

- D. During the program implementation stage, the selected solutions to the problem are implemented, monitored and evaluated daily. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher implements the program or instructs the Classroom Teacher about how to implement the program.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make decisions about their respective individual responsibilities and jointly implement the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher instructs the Resource Teacher about what and how to implement solutions and the Resource Teacher implements the program.
- E. The final or case closure stage occurs so that the implemented solution(s) can be evaluated and decisions are made about the case. For example, one decision may be to try other solutions or close the case. Another decision may be to request other services such as speech pathology, psychology or social work. Choose the description that best represents **how this stage is implemented** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to close the case or to try new solution(s), and/or to request other services.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly evaluate the implemented solution(s). They decide whether to try other solution(s) or close the case and/or to request other services.
 3. The Classroom Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to try new solution(s) or to close the case and/or to request other services.

PART III: For each question, choose the situation that **best represents your preference** for accomplishing the task described at each stage of resource service delivery. Indicate your choice by circling the appropriate number.

- A. Resource service delivery usually begins with identification of the problem. At this stage, the nature of the problem is described and defined. For example, the specifics of the problem, goals concerning a solution to the problem, and expectations with regard to solutions are defined. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Classroom Teacher adopts the decision of the Resource Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly define the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution.
 3. The Classroom Teacher defines the specifics of the problem, and goals and expectations concerning a solution. The Resource Teacher adopts the decision of the Classroom Teacher.

- B. During the assessment stage, additional information is gathered and analyzed. For example, classroom observations, testing or work samples may be required. Then, the problem is further defined. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Resource Teacher provides the Classroom Teacher with the information.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher do additional assessment and problem definition. They pool and discuss their findings.
 3. The Classroom Teacher does additional assessment and problem definition. The Classroom Teacher provides the Resource Teacher with the information.
- C. During the program development stage, solutions to the problem are selected and tried out. Solutions may involve changes in methods, materials, or strategies. Some examples of solutions are an individualized program, tutoring, peer assistance, modified assignments, self-monitoring programs and daily report cards. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Classroom Teacher.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make program decisions and jointly develop the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher develops the program and provides the information to the Resource Teacher.

- D. During the program implementation stage, the selected solutions to the problem are implemented, monitored and evaluated daily. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher implements the program or instructs the Classroom Teacher about how to implement the program.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher make decisions about their respective individual responsibilities and jointly implement the program.
 3. The Classroom Teacher instructs the Resource Teacher about what and how to implement solutions and the Resource Teacher implements the program.
- E. The final or case closure stage occurs so that the implemented solution(s) can be evaluated and decisions are made about the case. For example, one decision may be to try other solutions or close the case. Another decision may be to request other services such as speech pathology, psychology or social work. Choose the description that best represents what **you would like to see occur** in your school.
1. The Resource Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to close the case or to try new solution(s), and/or to request other services.
 2. The Resource Teacher and the Classroom Teacher jointly evaluate the implemented solution(s). They decide whether to try other solution(s) or close the case and/or to request other services.
 3. The Classroom Teacher evaluates the implemented solution(s) and decides whether to try new solution(s) or to close the case and/or to request other services.

Part IV: When you completed the questionnaire, you may have noticed a difference in your answers concerning the **actual** delivery of resource services as compared to your **preference** for service delivery. If you have some suggestions for closing the gap between actual service delivery and your preference, or would like to comment on resource services in some other way, please include your comments in the space below.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE! Please return survey to:
Lynne R. Currie

Use the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

**A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles at Five Stages
of Service Delivery**

Resource Teacher Survey

PART I:

I. What grade group best represents the group you provide resource services? Circle the appropriate number.

1. Primary (Gr. 1-3)
2. Intermediate (Gr. 4-6)
3. Primary and Intermediate (Gr. 1-6)

II. How many years of classroom teaching experience do you have? Circle the appropriate number.

1. between 0 and 5 years completed
2. between 6 and 10 years completed
3. between 11 and 20 years completed
4. more than 20 years completed

III. How many years have you been a resource teacher? Circle the appropriate number.

1. between 0 and 5 years completed
2. between 6 and 10 years completed
3. between 11 and 20 years completed
4. more than 20 years completed

What is your gender? Circle the appropriate number.

1. Female
2. Male

Appendix E

Questionnaire PreTest Directions

Purpose of the Pre-test

Researcher said:

The purpose of this pre-test is to find out whether:

- 1) the questionnaire asks what it was intended to ask, and
- 2) there are some confusing or offensive words or language constructions in the questions.

Also, the purpose is to find out how much time it takes to complete the questionnaire and your interest in completing the questionnaire.

Your reaction to the cover letter and follow-up letter would also be appreciated.

Procedure

Researcher said:

First, I will explain the concepts the questionnaire is designed to question. Then, take as much time as you need to read your questionnaire.

You may write on your copy of the questionnaire. While you are reading, ask yourself whether the questionnaire is asking what it was intended to ask and what words are unclear or offensive.

When you are finished reading, jot down your comments about the content of the questionnaire, your interest in it and any other comments you would like to share. Also, record the amount of time you needed to read the questionnaire.

Explanation of intended content of the questionnaire

Researcher said:

Resource services are usually delivered in stages. The stages are: problem identification, assessment, program development, program implementation and case closure. Each stage is described in the questionnaire.

Resource teachers have the choice of playing three roles. The roles are: expert, collaborative, extra pair of hands.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to ask resource and classroom

teachers what role the resource teacher in their school actually plays at each stage in the process of service delivery. A second purpose is to ask resource and classroom teachers what role they would most prefer resource teachers to play at each stage of service delivery. Finally, teachers will be asked to comment on the actual role and ideal role of resource teachers or any other aspect of service delivery that they care to comment on.

Now, take as much time as you need to read your questionnaire. You may write on your copy of the questionnaire. While you are reading, ask yourself whether the questionnaire is asking what it was intended to ask and what words are unclear or offensive.

Your reaction to the cover letter and follow-up letter would also be appreciated.

Appendix F

April 4, 1991.

Dear Colleague;

I am writing to request your participation in a research project which studies the role of resource teachers in elementary schools. I am carrying out this survey in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Usually, there are five stages in the delivery of resource services. The purpose of this study is to determine what role resource teachers actually play at each stage and what teachers think is the ideal role for resource teachers to play at each stage.

Most classroom teachers will have the need for assistance in solving problems in their classrooms. The role of the resource teacher is considered pivotal in assisting classroom teachers to solve problems. However, very little is known about the role resource teachers are playing at each stage in the delivery of services. Furthermore, little is known about what role classroom teachers would prefer resource teachers to play. Your responses and comments will contribute significantly to the limited, existing body of knowledge on this topic.

Also, I am carrying out this survey in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education. In reporting results, only numerical summaries of the group responses will be given. The identity of individual respondents will not be revealed and individual responses will remain confidential. All resource teachers and 10% of classroom teachers (Gr. 1-6) in the school division will receive a survey. Teachers were randomly selected for this study. This survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete and can be returned in the addressed, stamped envelope provided.

If you have any questions about the survey, feel free to contact me at Results of the study can be obtained by returning the enclosed request form or by phoning me. Also, the Principal will receive the results for posting in your school.

Your assistance in this project is greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Lynne R. Currie

Appendix G

Results Request Form

To obtain a copy of the results of the study A Survey of Resource Teacher Roles At Five Stages of Service Delivery, complete and return this form in the addressed, stamped envelope provided.

(PLEASE PRINT)

Name: _____

School: _____

OR

Home Address:

Street: _____

Postal Code: _____

Appendix H

Dear Colleague;

Three weeks ago I sent you a survey concerning the role of resource teachers in schools. If you have returned your completed survey, thank you very much for your time and consideration.

If you have not completed and returned your survey, please take time to comment on this important educational issue. Additional copies of the survey, questions and requests for a report of the results can be made at 774-9357.

Thank you for giving this your attention.

Yours truly,

Lynne R. Currie

APPENDIX I

Comments from Resource and Classroom TeachersComments About Assessment StageResource Teachers' General Comments

Some teachers still want testing only so they can modify programming in the classroom.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

At present the classroom teacher does the assessment, identifies the problem and then collaborates with the resource teacher in further testing, problem identification, program development and assessment. However, if a child transfers into the school, the resource teacher may be the first one to alert the classroom teacher of any problems based on any records sent and/or direct communication with the former school. I would like to see some pre-assessment of a child, by the resource teacher, before the child is placed in a classroom, especially in cases where records lag far behind the presence of the child. I am generally happy with the collaboration given the classroom teacher after the problem is identified by the classroom teacher or records sent.

Often it is much more convenient for the resource person to do most of the assessment in terms of further testing and evaluation as not often is the teacher totally free to work 1 on 1 for an extended time with one student, but otherwise I feel there should be lots of communication between resource teacher and student and teacher.

As a classroom teacher requesting Resource services, it is at the point at which I have observed a problem and have done a certain amount of evaluation and observation myself. It is most helpful if the Resource teacher does further pertinent testing which is either too time consuming or beyond my qualifications to perform myself. I appreciate information as to the child's specific learning styles so that I may be aware of gearing classroom work to the suit the child's learning style.

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

From past experience, I find that directly working with children is more helpful than assessment and no program. Too much time is spent in getting information.

Comments About Program Development StageResource Teachers' General Comments

Joint planning would be much better as program is more likely to occur. Unless what I do is a reflection or complement of the classroom teacher's program it has little effect.

Each case is unique. Different solutions often result. In one case I may follow quite a different plan than in another. I adapt my methods to those of the teacher. Some teachers provide more input than others.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

None given

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

Parents should be conferenced by the end of September to review first weeks progress and re-commit the family's help, support, interest and assistance in home activity from Resource Delivery Service-not regular classroom "homework".

New students who seem very weak (almost a year behind) are easily identified. The classroom teacher is capable of doing a quick informal assessment and problem identification. These students should receive program development immediately then the resource teacher gets a better idea of that student's needs (Blocks of time every other day for 2-3 students per period). The formal assessment can then be done later. The resource teacher can set up blocks of time during the day e.g. 2:30-3:30 for formal assessment only.

I often find I need more specific activities/lessons to hone in on the problem or problems the child has. It is sometimes very difficult finding the time to do this. I feel it would be very beneficial for Resource Teachers to have particular problem areas matched with a variety of lessons. If a teacher had this list at the beginning of the year we might be tackling the problems sooner. Also signs of problems could be added to this list.

Comments About Program Implementation Stage

Resource Teachers' General Comments

This year we have had some very fine volunteers so teachers have begun to ask that the volunteers be specifically trained to teach children sight words, do paired reading with children, review content words prior to instruction etc.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

None Given

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

I would like to see the resource teacher more involved in direct service to the children or setting up someone else to work with needy children on a daily basis.

At the beginning of the year-children receiving Resource Delivery Service (RDS) need to start the first week (not the second month) receiving a continuation of the program left in June (after final assessments set up this for Sept.) With classroom work samples and learning behavior note and a mid Sept. Team Conference.

Any learning behavior difficulties or changes needed -require a RDS plan that works for the full school year. Limits of expectation and responsibility of parents need to be understood-i.e. when parents assume responsibility for child's behavior problems and help work out a solution so RDS can be done!-not Behavior Management.

I am not pleased with the assistance provided by the resource staff. Once a student is recognized as having problems a referral is put into the resource team. Assessment is usually done and information given back to the classroom teachers as what they see the problems to be. Any implementation of program never seems to be carried out on a regular basis. The child is ultimately your responsibility, problems and all and at times it seems easier and more effective to deal with the student yourself.

The division needs to provide more funds for resource teachers to be involved on a one-to-one or small group situation in the classroom. To work with students on skills development for material covered in class.

I feel far too much paper work is involved and not enough time spent with the child and his needs.

Special placement students already identified through "WIPS" should automatically continue to receive resource services from the beginning of the year, that is, at the program implementation stage.

If a resource program is to be implemented or a teacher's aide is to work with the child, I prefer that the Resource teacher develop the program and oversee its' implementation.

Comments About Case Closure Stage

Resource Teachers' General Comments

Many of mine don't reach closure. We re-evaluate and I continue doing a

direct service role by providing one/one or small group instruction.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

Although there were not great gaps in my responses to both sets of questions, I do have many reservations about how we "do the model". Oftentimes the methods, outcomes and evaluations are so hastily done, or not done at all, in some cases.

Classroom Teachers

No comments.

Comments About Administration

Resource Teachers' General Comments

In our program, the Resource teacher is assigned to work with each classroom teacher, in the classroom for a 6-week block of time. This naturally sets up a collaborative situation where teacher and resource teacher plan together what needs to be done and who will do it. Evaluation and follow-up are similarly collaborative.

It helps a great deal when administrators expect Classroom Teachers to modify programs to meet students' needs.-> Role for Resource Teacher to work with Classroom Teacher.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

Additional in servicing at the administration level (principals, VPs)

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

Administration's expectations likely also play a role.

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Comments About Workload

Resource Teachers' General Comments

We actually use more of a "Support Team" approach which means being a "jack of all trades", but we only work with 2 grade levels in order to prevent countless different support staff walking in & out day after day.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

Classroom teachers are overburdened as it is and to have too many adults working collaboratively in a classroom can tend to be overwhelming. We need to work with the best methods that will not intimidate/overwhelm our classroom teachers.

I feel overwhelmed as a resource teacher by the demands/needs. I can never fully meet demands/needs of classroom teachers needs of students, all legitimate. Preference: more resource personnel: lower pupil teacher ratio!

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

I am very pleased with our resource services. I am concerned with cutbacks in our division. As it is, it is already a stretch to properly assist all of our needy children. I would not like to see any further cutbacks in these very necessary services.

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

Very often when there is dissatisfaction with resource teachers their case loads prevent them from delivering the kind of service teachers and administrators want to see.

I would prefer smaller numbers in my class and then dealing with special programs would not be such a burden.

Resource teachers and classroom teachers are too overloaded with students in need of intense resource services. Every year, these students are identified quite early by the classroom teacher, yet they're not "screened" until months later.

Comments About Time

Resource Teachers' General Comments

None given

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

The time allocated to Resource is not adequate to provide assistance to those children who need help. With budget restraints, this time allocation may further be strained.

Class and resource teachers need more preparation time to work together

For this model to have a better chance of succeeding, there has to be "time" opportunity for the classroom teacher and resource teacher to meet and COLLABORATE. The times need to be set.

Teachers need time to meet with RTs to plan.

It's really important for Resource Teacher to meet with Classroom Teachers on a regular basis to discuss needs and ways of meeting them.

I think "joint" planning is most beneficial for students, the only problem is creating the time to meet for each step in the delivery model.

Collab/Consult Model (ideally) has the classroom teacher & res. teacher jointly doing it all. However, time does not allow this to happen! It is all a matter of time i.e. lack of it.

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

None give

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

The time allowed to meet to plan and take care of everything involved is far too little. You are asked to build something thoughtful and worthwhile in rushed and frustrating conditions. Implementing it this way is just sabotaging the model idea and teachers.

The delivery of resources and my preference for service delivery were the same. I think this is due to the excellent resource team at my school as well as the meeting time that we schedule regularly.

"Time" to discuss and evaluate are not available. That is critical if the best possible situation is to exist in schools.

Coordination between the classroom teacher and the resource teacher is imperative though nearly impossible due to time restraints (and personality differences). Maybe the best that could be done is smaller class size.

Resource teachers need to find time and discuss the child: problems, solutions and things to implement. There has to be a 2 way street.

Planning time with the grade teachers and the resource teacher would enable us to have groups of children with common needs across the grades.

The only problem is creating the time to meet for each step in the delivery model.

Comments About Consultative Collaborative Skill

Resource Teachers' General Comments

This is not a model that will be readily adopted. I think it is a slow process of educating teachers, developing relationships etc. in order to gradually integrate the model.

The Resource Teacher must tolerate many idiosyncrasies exhibited by people. We are in contact with so many people. Resourcing is a

challenging job-there is never a dull moment!

It takes time to develop trusting relationships with each other.

Trust needs to be built up.

I have noticed that it takes a lot of communication skills to be a Resource teacher. All discussions with teachers must be non-confrontational and non-judgmental. The teacher must be made to feel that the child in his/her room is his/her responsibility. However, if they choose Resource help as a solution it is an intervention strategy-then the teacher must be open to another point of view. It is extremely important that some sort of joint ownership be felt between the teacher and Resource. This can't be expected from everyone on staff. The Resource teacher must be open to everyone but realistically work with those teachers who solicit their help.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

In order to completely adopt a consultative/collaborative model, there needs to be some education of the teaching staff.

For this model to succeed there has to be "training" for teachers about the model.

Accountability needs to be demonstrated between teacher and RT.

Cooperative teaching is a must!!

The Bachelor of Education degree should be extended from 4 years to 5 years. Required courses would include those in diagnosing and programming and spec. ed. Classroom teachers may then be more open to accepting spec. needs children in their classroom. They would also be better equipped to try different teaching methods, strategies, materials etc. before they request additional service. At present, the majority of classroom teachers are not adequately prepared to deal with more and more exceptional children entering the mainstream. This situation leads to frustration, anxiety, resistance, resentment and burn-out to name just a few problems.

All staff, including administration should receive several days of in-services per year on teaching methods, strategies etc. need to work effectively with exceptional children, information on the role of the resource teacher and other support staff should be presented as well as the CC model. Inservicing should include some theory but more importantly activities that require small groups to work through the CC model using case studies.

Classroom Teachers

No comments.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

I find the questions difficult to answer because our resource team provides a variety of consultative cooperative work models depending on individual teachers and students.

I feel very fortunate to be working with a dedicated, totally professional resource teacher this year. This has not always been the case. Every resource teacher has a unique style regardless of what the resource manual says their job should be.

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Comments About Individual Differences

Resource Teachers' General Comments

With each classroom teacher the resource teacher's role varies. It is hard to generalize your role and compare your actual delivery of services without specifying each classroom that you work with.

There is a great variety as to what is meant by classroom teacher input. Some teachers provide minimal or next to no input and ownership..others almost completely.

Part II-responses represent the most common process. Some teachers are very independent and make own decisions while others rely heavily on advice.

In the school I am in now all of the teachers are very "seasoned" teachers. They seem very adept at taking the children where they are, except for 2 individual teachers. These 2 teachers still expect their children to attempt the work of the grade--and make very little adjustments.

I find my service delivery varies with classroom teachers and with situations. Many of mine don't reach closure. We re-evaluate and I continue doing a direct service role by providing one/one or small group instruction.

I found myself struggling with many of my selections mainly because the Resource Room program is adjusted to meet the needs of the teachers. Many are open to cooperative type methods while others are still in the "test-cure-return to me stage". They're at many stages themselves and require a diverse approach. Many times I took the middle road when answering questions.

Differences may be due to varying personalities and philosophies of the teachers involved. I tend to work within each situation in a way which will best benefit the child; so the way in which services are provided vary

from one situation to another.

Opinions About Consultative Collaborative Model

Resource Teachers' General Comments

Flexibility is the key-trying to look at alternatives for adult responsibility rather than always looking at children responsibility.

This approach towards Resource is one model. I see another approach than this deficit model approach. I do see however the need for the Resource Teacher and Classroom Teacher to work in a collaborative arrangement in the classroom. Unfortunately with a deficit model approach this is not easy. We need to look at working with teachers in classrooms developing positive environments with children. This is at times difficult.

I think "joint" planning is most beneficial for students.

Also, some students need to be withdrawn from the classroom setting if only to give the classroom teacher a break. Flexibility is the key not the implementation of extreme delivery models at the expense of our credibility as support personnel.

We may be seeking more consultative and collaborative models, but it seems that most teachers prefer direct service for their students rather than modified program implementation in their classrooms. With less and less supports provided for mainstreamed children, and those requiring remedial programming we are building more frustration into our system-hopefully collaboration on program planning can be done with RT and CT but with more support for CT to implement the programs in the classroom (i.e. aide time, volunteers etc.)

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

Classroom teachers must view the position of Resource Teacher, not as a threat to their teaching style etc., but rather as an important team member. Only through a feeling of partnership and teaming are the best interests of the child to be met.

Teachers need to see the RT as a team player "in the game of teaching" and not a referee or cheerleader at the game.

Classroom Teachers' General Comments

My preference for the teacher and resource teacher to work together sounds great and I believe is the ideal situation.

Each "case" involving resource is different. For example, a special education child at our school is more the responsibility of the resource teacher because she has more expertise in that area. I have answered this questionnaire with the delivery of "general" resource services in mind.

I think the actual service delivery in our school is the best model.

However, when working jointly, depending on the two people involved, the reality is that one person handles a greater share.

I believe that the resource teacher and class room teacher should work together to help the child. Fortunately, we have a resource teacher at our school who does consult with the classroom teacher to set up a program.

I am obviously very happy with the system at our school. Our school has some components to our system that precedes intervention by the resource teacher. When a classroom teacher identifies a problem, s/he discusses it with her/his team first. The team consists of other close-grade teachers, our "shared" teacher assistant and our "shared" support person which could be an ELDNS teacher or special needs teacher. If we can't deal with or help each other, our next step is referral to resource.

I have to say that we don't use the resource teacher's service too much at the elementary level. First of all, her time is taken up by the primary level-but perhaps more importantly, I don't personally believe in the validity of "pull out" academic resource (at any level!) The child is disserved at two levels- 1. He or she misses classroom work and 2. he or she feels "singled out" in a negative fashion.

The resource role and service delivery in our school is very strong-at least this has been my personal experience. The resource teacher has, and continues to work in a very professional, collaborative way with classroom teachers (giving full respect to the teacher's observations, testing, opinion and joint decision-making). I am also a special education teacher-now back into the regular classroom. The resource supports are in place.

I think it is important for the resource teacher and classroom teacher to work together. In this way, the resource program can be effective in meeting the needs of the student. I use the resource program in my school and find the needs of my students are met. I also find that assistance with new students entering my class during the year usually see resource at the beginning, if they are weak students, and this makes it easier for the new student to adjust to a new classroom.

Classroom Teachers' Suggestions

Also resource teachers should have a much broader role by lending their expertise in the classroom-actually do small group or whole group demonstration lessons as such to reinforce a skill, or show strategies for behavior modification, etc. Not strictly assessment continually!

Ideally the resource teacher acts more as a "resource", less as a remedial teacher. His or her role is not to identify and correct "problems", but to work with classroom teachers so that classrooms can be places of learning for all of the children, regardless of their strengths or weaknesses. This may mean working with children who do not have "problems"- with heterogeneous groups or children with common needs groups, depending on the individual children involved and the classroom they find themselves in.

I do not work with my resource teacher as specifically a problem-solving device as your questionnaire seems to imply is the role she is supposed to have. In certain specific cases we have pooled our observations and knowledge about particular children and taken steps to implement a course of action, i.e. speech pathology, guidance, or general directions to take with a child. Resource and I confer, observe and work together on a daily basis with the entire class- me implementing my program (LA), she backing me up with resources-i.e. books, strategies to use, but most importantly of all, supports me with her experience and knowledge as a teacher, and enriches the learning experience for myself and the children. The role you describe here sounds isolated and technical. Not for me, thanks.

Comments About Implementing Consultative Collaboration

Resource Teachers' General Comments

In some schools teachers appear to prefer the withdrawal system and are happy to let the "expert" correct their problem. It takes time to change expectations of many years and to develop sufficient trust to have teachers ask the RT to be involved in -class assessment and to be willing to take responsibility themselves for assessment and program development and evaluation in collaboration with the RT.

As mentioned on the previous page, we've made some progress this year. For this last session of referrals, the children were seen by Resource/TA without a conference with the classroom teacher. (Only 2 people were uncomfortable/threatened/upset with this procedure). Of course, there are some staff members involved in the total process-but the classroom teachers' time is also limited.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

I think that one has to be flexible in implementing the type of resource service delivery model. Some teachers &/or clients do not respond to the collaborative/consultative delivery model.

I am fortunate in that I basically work in my "preferred mode" No.2- in your survey IE joint work- However 2-3 things could improve matters. 1)classroom teacher in B-2 could provide more assessment/work samples before asking me to assess. 2) C-2 classroom teachers frequently "resist"modifying a program for a student although it is evident a student is unable to handle "regular work" presented. But I am not "blaming" teachers.

Classroom Teachers

No comments.

Comments About Role Definition

Resource Teachers' General comments

None given

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

Roles are not always defined well enough. Expectations of RTs need to be defined: 1) What does the School Board expect 2) What does the principal expect 3) what does the classroom teacher expect?

Classroom Teachers

No comments.

Comments About the Questionnaire

Resource Teachers' General Comments

My responses reflect more of a "sometimes" answer than always..but the questionnaire left no room for this kind of response. It is somewhat deceiving because it looks as though I'm completely satisfied with the process we have in our school, when really many times I am not.

I feel that this questionnaire is very valuable in spelling out what is the process of delivery for the School Division Resource Model. It has made me aware of times when I could have shared decision making more or insisted on being involved in important decisions rather than finding out later what decisions have been made.

Resource Teachers' Suggestions

None given

Classroom Teachers

No comments.
