To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Douglas Wayne Mallory entitled "Options within Mainstreaming: Inservice, Planning and Resource Programs." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Special Education.

Edward E. Gickling
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Charles H. Hargis

Michael C. Hammum

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

OPTIONS WITHIN MAINSTREAMING: INSERVICE, PLANNING AND RESOURCE PROGRAMS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Douglas Wayne Mallory

August 1975

1265278

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to all the teachers throughout Tennessee who took the time to answer the questionnaires.

To Dr. Edward Gickling, the writer's committee chairman, thanks for many hours of work and for your patience and guidance in completing this study. For their interest and suggestions, thanks also go to Dr. Charles Hargis and Dr. Michael Hannum, the writer's other committee members.

ABSTRACT

The three purposes of this study included: determining teachers' preferred topics and schedules for inservice meetings concerning mainstreaming; determining their preferred method of obtaining cooperative planning time and recommended amounts of planning time; and finally, gauging teachers' opinions on resource teacher's caseload size, categorical versus noncategorical approaches, and itinerant special services.

An open-ended questionnaire was used to obtain teachers' suggestions on these three areas concerning mainstreaming. The suggestions were evaluated in terms of the novelty of the response and the frequency of the response and were used to form the content of a second questionnaire. This questionnaire was then sent to a sampling of 80 regular and special teachers who had voiced a personal committment to mainstreaming. Each teacher was asked to rank all statements related to each question according to an order of personal preference. The percentages for each statement were computed separately for regular and special teachers.

Highlights of the results indicated the following trends:

1. Regular teachers were more concerned with maintaining regular routines than were special teachers.

2. Both special and regular teachers desired active participation in inservice and policy making regarding mainstream programs.

3. Regular teachers were more concerned with curriculum issues than were special teachers.

4. Teachers consistently expressed preference for policy, planning and supportive services which emphasized direct service to exceptional children.

5. Gaining skills in individualizing instruction was seen by all teachers as a means of working more effectively with a wide variety of children.

Elaboration on trends and specific results are contained in the text of this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM UNDER STUDY	1
	Introduction	1
	The Need for This Study	2
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Definition of Terms	3
	Limitations of the Study	4
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	5
	Rationale for Mainstreaming	5
	Hesitancies Voiced about Mainstreaming	6
	Resource Programs	7
	Structures and Mechanics	9
III.	METHOD	13
	Introduction	13
	Instruments	13
	Questionnaire 1	14
	Questionnaire 2	14
	Selection of Sample	15
	Data Treatment	17
IV.	RESULTS	18
	Introduction	18
	Inservice Priorities	18

CHAPTER PAGE

Planning Priorities 24

Resource Program Priorities 28

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION 36

Summary 36

Conclusions 37

Discussion 39

BIBLIOGRAPHY 42

APPENDIXES 46

A. Questionnaire 1 47

B. Questionnaire 2 53

VITA 60

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM UNDER STUDY

Introduction

In the past few years, integrating exceptional children into regular education classrooms, an approach popularly known as "mainstreaming," has increased greatly. This shift from segregated special classes has been prompted primarily by the writings of Johnson (1962), Goldstein, Moss and Jordan (1965), Dunn (1968), Lilly (1970), Christoplos and Renz (1969), and Iano (1974). Although some authors (Kolstoe, 1972; Roos, 1970; Cruickshank, 1974; and Smith and Arkans, 1974) have doubted the wisdom of a shift from special self-contained programs, mainstreaming can definitely be viewed as becoming the primary educational service delivery system for mildly handicapped children throughout most of the United States. In Tennessee, mainstreaming to the maximum extent practicable was mandated via Public Chapter 839, House Bill 2053.

However in implementing mainstreaming, little direct consideration has been given to those persons closest to the educational situation of the child—namely the teachers themselves. Since mainstreaming is now a reality both philosophically and legislatively, Tennesseans would do well

to determine how best to expedite its enactment, particularly at the teaching level where direct involvement with exceptional children occurs. Working at this level of direct teacher involvement, this study has attempted to gather specific recommendations from teachers themselves, and to classify and order those recommendations as a means of declaring their preferences regarding the mechanics used to mainstream exceptional students.

The Need for This Study

The swiftness with which some school systems have begun to mainstream has caused some people to question how carefully the mechanics of the process have been considered. Gickling and Theobald (1975) found that only approximately 13 percent of regular classroom teachers sampled in Tennessee felt that they had the skills necessary to help exceptional students. They also found that, although most regular education teachers said they would welcome special teacher's assistance, communications between regular and special educators were irregular and infrequent.

Most school systems have used some type of resource teaching set-up as a vehicle to facilitate mainstreaming exceptional children. However at the present time, studies on the comparative efficiency of the various types of resource programs have been lacking; we have no gauge as to what

teachers feel is the most effective model. We do not know what caseload size or cooperative planning schedules are the most efficient and economical. This study may serve as an in-road to the answers to these questions. At least the opinions of teachers were sought as a first step; it is with teachers who provide the direct service that the success of a mainstreaming effort lies.

Statement of the Problem

There were three concerns of this study. The first was to determine teachers' preferred topics and schedules for inservice meetings concerning mainstreaming. The second was to determine teachers' preferred method of obtaining cooperative planning time and how much planning time they felt was necessary. Finally, the study sought to gauge teachers' opinions on certain policies relating to the operation of a resource program. Those policies included: caseload size, categorical versus noncategorical services and problems regarding providing itinerant services.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for the purposes of this study:

1. Mainstreaming is a popular term for integration, an educational approach in which exceptional children are taught in the same setting as their nonexceptional peers.

2. A resource room is any instructional setting to which an exceptional child comes for specified periods of time usually on a regularly scheduled basis to receive specific help in readiness or academic tasks (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972).

3. A resource teacher is a special educator who aids the regular teacher in mainstreaming exceptional children. He or she may provide direct services in a resource room or provide indirect service to children by consulting with the child's regular classroom teacher on behalf of the child.

4. An exceptional child is one who deviates from a normal child socially, mentally or physically to such a degree that modification of the regular educational program is necessary to meet the child's educational needs.

Limitations of the Study

1. Only teachers favorable to mainstreaming were asked to respond.

2. The limited sample size may not reflect the preferences of a broader base of regular and special teachers within Tennessee.

3. The questionnaires used may not have been interpreted by the respondents as the experimenter had intended. The solicitation may not have gathered all options.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Rationale for Mainstreaming

Of all the special education institutions, special class placement has generated the most controversy (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972). The argument against its use is that most children placed in the classes do no better academically, emotionally or behaviorally than similar children attending regular classes (Goldstein, Moss and Jordan, 1965; Mayer, 1966; Conner and Muldoon, 1967; Carroll, 1967; Christoplos and Renz, 1969; Flynn and Flynn, 1970; and Hayman, 1971). Brown (1968) further argued that it was mere conjecture whether or not better individualization of instruction occurred in special classes than in regular ones. He pointed out that special curricula did not differ significantly from that used with normal children, and that grouping children according to diagnostic conditions did not represent homogeneous groupings.

In his widely quoted article, Dunn (1968) advocated mainstreaming mildly retarded children. He stated that special classes had come to be viewed "by general educators as administrative devices to relieve problems for which solution escapes the general educator" (p. 68). Following

this lead, other educators expressed a philosophical committment to mainstreaming (Lilly, 1970; Iano, 1974; and Christoplos, 1973). However, as pointed out by Gickling and Theobald (1975), mainstreaming has outraced its research support. In the face of the philosophical committement and mandatory special education legislation, a worthwhile objective would be to determine how best to meet the spirit of mainstreaming.

Hesitancies Voiced about Mainstreaming

Mainstreaming has not been viewed favorably by all special educators. It has been called a "new educational bandwagon" (Cruickshank, 1974). Cruickshank further stated that integration presupposes a climate of acceptance and disregards the prejudices of teachers. This criticism is somewhat supported by Payne and Murray (1974), whose survey showed that only approximately 50 percent of urban and suburban school building principals felt that emotionally handicapped or educable mentally retarded students could be successfully mainstreamed. A more acceptable population, according to Payne and Murray, were children who were sensory-impaired or learning disabled. If individual principals are nonsupportive, the chances of developing an integrative program would appear to be diminished.

Gickling and Theobald (1975) also pointed out two major causes for concern regarding mainstreaming. By surveying regular and special educators in Tennessee, they found that under normal conditions the regular teacher felt imposed upon to help exceptional students. They also found that inadequate communication coupled with inconsistent and infrequent follow-through on the part of special educators was quite common, and they suggested that if these continue they may add to the hesitancies voiced by regular educators about the plausibility of mainstreaming.

Resource Programs

Although it has been proposed that the basic responsibility for the mainstreamed child belongs to the regular teacher (Glavin et al., 1971; Reger and Koppman, 1971), resource teaching programs are widely used to aid the regular teacher in this job. In fact, the entire concept of "resource" itself has been seen by both regular and special educators as the vehicle for implementing mainstreaming. This concept has received structure from three types of resource programs, and can be characterized by (1) direct service to the exceptional child, (2) indirect service, and (3) combined direct and indirect service (Hammill and Wiederholt, 1972).

A resource teacher may provide direct service within a classroom or may remove children to a separate classroom or diagnostic center. In providing direct service, the resource teacher assumes much of the actual teaching responsibility for various exceptional children. Indirect services are provided by teacher consultants—resource personnel who advise regular teachers on objectives, behavior management or other problems which may arise with the mainstreamed child. This service is indirect in that the consultant helps the teacher, and the teacher directly works with the child. Teacher consultants are not widely found in the schools, and little information is available concerning the success of this model. Specifics on the number of teachers served, the kind of pupil problems dealt with and the types of materials and methods recommended by teacher consultants has been lacking. Finally, a resource teacher may provide both direct and indirect services. This teacher directly teaches some children for a part of the day, and also consults with teachers on behalf of other students. This last model is the most widely used, and it has generated the most literature concerning its operation.

The question arises: "Do children receiving resource teacher help learn better than those placed in special classes?" Studies by Walker (1974), Glavin, Quay, Annesley and Werry (1971), Sabatino (1971) and Weiner (1969) serve as

examples which have found better academic performance in educable mentally retarded, behavior problem and learning disabled children when placed in resource room models.

Studies such as these have focused on the efficiency of using resource programs to help integrate exceptional children, but little research deals with the structural set-ups or the mechanics of resource programs.

Structures and Mechanics

Guerin and Szatlocky (1974) compared and contrasted four types of integrated programs used in California, which appear to represent the types used throughout the United States. In the first program, children from special classes joined the regular classroom for blocks of time or for certain subjects; secondly, in a contrasting situation, all exceptional children were assigned to regular classes and were seen by a resource teacher for supplementary work. A third type program mainstreamed exceptional children for the entire day into certain classes which had a reduced teacher-pupil ratio. A final type existed in which the school system operated a "learning resource center" for evaluation, prescriptive planning and tutorial assistance. Guerin and Szatlocky found the strongest support among regular teachers for the third plan in which a resource teacher worked within the regular classroom and children were not removed from the

class. They attribute the greater support to three reasons: staffs of these programs had the highest degree of "normal" expectations for their exceptional students; special assistance was more frequently designed to complement the regular classroom instruction rather than parallel it; and the students were seen as fully participating classroom members, whereas partially integrated students were frequently seen as visitors. Specific reference was not paid to the reduced teacher-pupil ratio; so, it would be difficult to tell if this also contributed positively to full integrative programs.

The Guerin and Szatlocky (1974) study described structural arrangements, and did not consider the mechanics—the costs, number of students served or scheduling—of any of the programs. Reger (1973) gave five recommendations in his description of an ideal resource program which did attempt to deal somewhat with the mechanics of resource programs:

1. Resource rooms should be noncategorical. "Resource teachers who attempt to promote child stereotpyes, rather than an understanding of child uniqueness and the interactional nature of child problems, are treading water and sinking" (p. 613).

2. At the elementary level, resource rooms should serve no more than fifteen students directly; in secondary, no more than twenty.

3. If a pupil is in a resource room for more than three hours a day, the pupil's placement is wrong; the child should be in a special class.

4. Children should not be sent to the resource room for misbehavior. The resource teacher is not a behavior problems class teacher, but he or she should apply behavior management continually.

5. Resource programs should not be seen as total replacements for special classes.

According to Reger, the resource teacher should "offer a general sense of direction, demonstrate a new outlook, a different approach"; in his words, a resource teacher works by "example and by subtle persuasion" (p. 609).

Even though much has been said and written about the need for mainstreaming, the dialogue has remained primarily one of philosophy and equal educational opportunity. In looking at the literature for guidelines for implementing mainstreaming and for using special education resource personnel for this endeavor, one soon finds that obtaining specific guidelines is like putting together a puzzle without all its pieces available. No single source is comprehensive enough to cover the broad areas of preparation, planning, initiating and evaluating. Even though some specifics are given (Reger, 1973; Birch, 1974; Deno, 1974) regarding separate types of resource programs, additional research will be necessary to fill in the gaps.

Another problem with the information available was that it represented the conceptualizations of administrators about the "do's" and "don't's" of mainstreaming. There was evidence, however, that the opinions of people who were somewhat distant from the actual teaching situation might not reflect the same attitudes as those who must bear the direct teaching responsibility for implementing mainstreaming on a day-to-day basis (Guerin and Szatlocky, 1974). For this reason it was felt that a meaningful starting point to investigate the mechanics of mainstreaming should be with those closest to the teaching situation, or regular and special teachers themselves. It was also felt that teachers who were philosophically committed to mainstreaming would probably project a more positive approach to the areas under study, and spend more time developing their suggestions. With these ideas in mind, this study proposed to serve as an initial investigation of the preferences of regular and special teachers in Tennessee toward certain guidelines for implementing mainstreaming.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

This chapter dealt with the specific methodology used to conduct the study. It basically contained a description of the survey questionnaires that were developed, the population surveyed and the treatment of the data. Briefly this study was carried out by creating an open-ended questionnaire which could generate ideas relevant to the mechanics involved in mainstreaming exceptional children. These ideas were then converted into a second questionnaire which called for the respondent to rank the various items on each question according to their own order of preference. The data was then organized and tabulated.

Instruments

Two questionnaires were developed for use within this study. One consisted of an open-ended Delphi type questionnaire while the second required a forced choice type of response. The information obtained from the first questionnaire was used to construct the second. The specifics of each are described in the following paragraphs.

Questionnaire 1

This questionnaire had four sections: (1) specific demographic information (i.e., urban or rural, regular or special teacher, etc.), (2) methods used for selecting inservice sessions and for encouraging teacher participation in inservice regarding mainstreaming, (3) scheduling and initiating planning time, and (4) caseload and placement considerations. All questions in the last three sections asked for multiple suggestions on the part of the respondents as to specific guidelines for the implementation of mainstreaming. A copy of the questionnaire, its cover letter and follow-up letter are included in Appendix A.

The ideas that were generated from this questionnaire were listed by the experimenter for comparative purposes. Specific items which were frequently suggested, as well as items which were novel responses, were chosen to be included in the second questionnaire. A total of 62 suggestions were included in the 14 questions contained within the follow-up survey instrument.

Questionnaire 2

The first section of this questionnaire asked for demographic information. The next three sections paralleled those of the first questionnaire. Specifically, they consisted of 14 questions similar to those contained in the

first questionnaire, each followed by from three to seven suggested items. The respondents were asked to rank all items for each question based upon their own order of preference. For example, in a question having four responses, a teacher would label the first choice, second choice, third choice and fourth choice. A copy of the second questionnaire, its cover letter and follow-up letter are in Appendix B.

Selection of Sample

Initially the names of 20 special education administrators and 15 regular education admnistrators were chosen from the 1974 Tennessee Directory of Public Schools. The basis for their selection was geographic location—a method used to equalize the distribution of the questionnaires throughout the state and to help insure both urban and rural participation.

Five copies of the initial questionnaire were sent to each administrator. Each special education administrator was asked to fill out a copy of the questionnaire and to distribute the other four copies to four special education resource teachers. Regular education administrators were also asked to answer one copy of the questionnaire and to disbribute the other four copies to four regular teachers. All administrators were asked to distribute the

questionnaires only to teachers committed to mainstreaming. After three weeks a follow-up letter was mailed to encourage nonrespondents to participate in the study.

Sixty teachers and administrators responded to the first questionnaire, representing 34 percent of the 175 people surveyed. One-third of this group were from urban school systems and two-thirds were from rural areas; 55 percent were from the eastern part of Tennessee; 28 percent from middle Tennessee and 17 percent were from the western area of the state.

The results obtained in the 60 questionnaires were analyzed, and a second questionnaire was constructed for redistribution. This time the questionnaire was sent only to teachers—first to those who had responded to the first questionnaire, and secondly, to an additional sample pool of regular and special teachers across the state. Twenty regular teachers and 41 special teachers replied to the second questionnaire; this represented 76 percent of the 80 respondents who were chosen to complete the questionnaire. Forty-one percent of this group worked in urban situations, and 59 percent were from rural areas. The respondents were concentrated in eastern Tennessee, 71 percent coming from that area. Sixteen percent were from middle Tennessee, and 13 percent were from the western part of the state.

Data Treatment

In filling out the second questionnaire, each of the 61 participants ranked various statements about each question. These rankings represented an order of personal preference and were recorded as numerical priorities across each statement. The priorities were tallied in terms of the number of teachers who preferred each statement as a first, second, third or fourth choice. Preferences made by regular teachers were tallied separately from those made by special education teachers. The totals were later converted into percentages reflective of the priorities held by each of the two groups. Specific statements which showed the two highest percentages for each of the 14 questions were placed in tables as were the combined percentages for each of the two priority statements per question. The specific questions and their accompanying percentages were discussed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter the results of the study were discussed. The discussion covered the three areas tapped in the questionnaire—inservice, planning and resource programs. The results were reported on three tables corresponding to those three areas. On each table, a question was reported, followed by the two highest priority responses as indicated by the percentage of teachers giving each as a first or second choice. Responses which received less support are not reported in the tables, but are discussed within the text of the chapter.

Inservice Priorities

The first concern of this study was to determine teachers' preferred topics and schedule for inservice meetings concerning mainstreaming. Items which received the highest percentages of choice concerning inservice sessions were recorded in Table 1. General observation of the table showed that regular and special teachers wanted to take an active part in determining the content of inservice meetings on mainstreaming. On the first response regarding the

Table 1

Comparison of Regular and Special Teachers' Priorities Regarding Certain Aspects of Inservice Training on Mainstreaming

Inservice Questions and Response Items	Regular Classroom Teachers' Percentage of Choice by Priority			Special Education Teachers' Percentage of Choice by Priority		
	1st	2nd	Combined	1st	2nd	Combined
1. How can teachers be encouraged to provide input into inservice programs on mainstreaming?						
A. Include teachers on the program committee.	40	40	80	49	24	73
B. Give teachers an active part in the program.	35	35	70	29	54	73
2. What issues need to be discussed during inservice on mainstreaming?						
A. Scope of both the regular and resource teachers' jobs.	35	45	80	61	27	88
B. What should be taught to handicapped children and who should teach it.	30	40	70	7	24	31
3. What procedures, or mechanics for implementing mainstreaming, need to be addressed during inservice sessions?						
A. Demonstrations on how to individualize curriculums for children in need.	70	20	90	61	22	83
B. Time spent developing special materials for the mainstreamed child.	5	40	45	15	34	49
C. Adjusting class schedules for conference with as little disruption to regular classroom programs as possible.	15	40	55	12	34	46
4. What is the most efficient schedule for holding inservice meetings on mainstreaming?						
A. Several at the first of the year with fewer in the middle and at the end.	25	65	90	51	46	97
B. Maintain regularly scheduled intervals between inservice sessions.	65	25	90	49	44	93

question of how can teachers provide input into inservice sessions, 40 percent and 49 percent of the regular and special teachers chose including them on program committees as their first priority. Eighty and 73 percent of the teachers surveyed recorded this response as either their first or second priority. There was also a high percentage of teachers who felt that in addition to serving on program committees that teachers themselves should take an active part in inservice programs with 70 and 73 percent of the two groups of teachers indicating a strong preference for active participation. Fewer than 5 percent of the teachers, however, desired taking full charge of inservice programs. The trend appeared to be one of active involvement rather than having others prepare inservice programs.

In the next questions teachers were asked to rank inservice topics from three areas: (1) issues regarding mainstreaming, (2) mechanics for implementing mainstreaming, and (3) interpersonal considerations. Regarding issues, both groups were concerned that the scope of the regular and resource teachers' jobs be better defined. Table 1, question 2, showed that 61 percent of special teachers and 35 percent of regular teachers felt this was of highest priority; when combining first and second choices, 80 and 88 percent recommended description of one's job scope as a high priority item. These results tend to indicate a preoccupation

with role descriptions and parameters of instructional responsibility, particularly for special teachers, but it is a subject also in the minds of regular teachers. This preoccupation may be justified, though, because of the newness of the resource role and by the need for regular and special teachers to work together in a mainstream capacity. There was a contrast, however, between the percentages received on question 2 for the two groups of respondents. Regular teachers voiced a strong committment to discuss the scope of teaching roles, but they also indicated a strong desire to discuss an issue of more direct curriculum concern—namely what should be taught to handicapped children and who should teach it? While 30 percent of regular teachers gave this as a first choice, only 7 percent of special teachers were so inclined. Even when considering the combined number of first and second choice rankings, a wide discrepancy was noted. Seventy percent of regular teachers chose this as a first or second priority to be discussed compared to only 31 percent of the special educators. Another disparity was noted when comparing the percentages between these two issues. Whereas regular teachers gave combined first and second percentages of 80 and 70 to the two issues of teaching roles and curriculum, special educators were sharply divided. With special teachers, a discussion of the job scope received 57 percent more first or second choice rankings than did the

curriculum issue of what should be taught the handicapped child. These results showed that special teachers did not see curriculum as one of the central issues of mainstreaming, when, in fact, it may well be, as indicated by the responses made by regular classroom teachers.

A less frequently mentioned suggestion for inservice disucssion, or one chosen by 35 percent of regular teachers and 30 percent of special teachers, was that of providing an overview of all types of exceptionalities and their accompanying expectations. This issue could be of critical concern for teachers who have never been exposed to handicapped children.

Question 3 asked, "What procedures for implementing mainstreaming need to be addressed during inservice meetings?" Demonstrations of how to individualize curriculums for children in need was the overwhelming first choice given by 70 percent of regular teachers and 61 percent of special teachers. Combined first and second choices brought the totals for this suggestion up to 90 and 83 percent indicating the concern all teachers had for acquiring the ability to individualize instruction. Since the questionnaire was administered to teachers who had shown positive support for mainstreaming, the overwhelming preference for inservice training on individualized instruction helped to verify the degree of their committment to work with a greater variety of skills in children.

Two other responses concerning the mechanics for implementing mainstreaming received about equal support from both teacher groups; spending inservice time developing special materials received support from 45 percent of regular teachers and 49 percent of special teachers, while adjusting class schedules to allow teacher conferences with as little disruption to regular classroom programs as possible was listed as a first or second choice by 55 percent and 46 percent of regular and special teachers, respectively.

When scheduling inservice meetings, question 4 showed that 65 percent of regular teachers preferred regular intervals between inservice meetings. This particular response and other responses in following questionnaire items tend to indicate the desire for regularity among regular teachers. This will again be pointed out in regard to providing for planning time. This is contrasted to percentages indicated by special teachers. While 49 percent of the special teachers also indicated regular intervals as their first choice, a slightly higher percentage, 51 percent, preferred having several inservice meetings on mainstreaming at the first of the year with fewer later on in the year. It will also be seen throughout the remainder of the questionnaire that special teachers seem to be less concerned with maintenance of regular and predictable schedules than were regular teachers.

Planning Priorities

The second aspect of this study was determining teachers' preferred method of obtaining cooperative planning time and how much planning time they thought was necessary. Options which received the highest percentages of top ranking concerning planning were recorded in Table 2.

Question 1 on Table 2 asks how teachers can gain more cooperative planning time. Most regular and special teachers, 40 and 37 percent, respectively, gave using aides, volunteers or other school personnel to oversee the classroom activities as their preferred method. A second option of obtaining a "floating" teacher was chosen by 20 percent of regular teachers and 27 percent of special teachers. When the combined percentages for first and second choices were examined, a division between the two teaching groups was noticed. A combined figure of 85 percent of regular teachers preferred obtaining a "floating" teacher compared to 50 percent who preferred using aides and volunteers. This preference is reversed for special teachers where 74 percent favored using aides and volunteers, and 59 percent preferred obtaining a "floating" teacher. Perhaps this is indicative of the availability of aides to special teachers or the fact that regular teachers wanted someone readily available when the need to plan arose. No group, however,

Table 2

Comparison of Regular and Special Teachers' Priorities Regarding Certain Aspects of Cooperative Planning

Planning Questions and Response Items	Regular Classroom Teachers' Percentage of Choice by Priority			Special Education Teachers' Percentage of Choice by Priority		
	1st	2nd	Combined	1st	2nd	Combined
1. How can time be made available to allow regular and resource teachers time to plan together.						
A. Use aids, volunteers or other school personnel to oversee classroom activities during planning sessions.	40	10	50	37	37	74
B. If budgets permit obtain a floating teacher to take classes as needed.	20	65	85	27	32	59
2. What would be the most efficient schedule for cooperative planning between regular and resource teachers?						
A. Have a full-time resource consultant available as the need arises.	45	25	70	24	27	51
B. One hour per week.	30	35	65	34	32	66
C. One hour every two weeks.	25	20	45	24	24	48
3. How can special curriculums be geared to fit within the scope of the regular teacher's program?						
A. Adopting as many materials as possible from the regular teacher's instructional program for the mainstreamed child.	60	25	85	54	10	64
B. Use peer and cross-age tutoring.	10	35	45	7	20	27

appeared to show overwhelming support about having to take extra time to plan as indicated by the general lack of high percentages on any option as first priority—the range of priority was between 20 and 40 percent. Teachers did not appear to like the idea of using their own planning time, meeting before or after school or dismissing school early to gain planning time on top of the planning responsibility they already hold.

As illustrated by the percentages for question 2, Table 2, 70 percent of regular teachers felt that having a full-time resource consultant available was the most efficient and preferred method for cooperative planning; 51 percent of the special teachers felt the same. Special teachers, on the other hand, preferred a one-hour per week planning period over the use of a full time consultant. A combined 70 percent of regular teachers preferred having a full-time consultant to meet as the need arose while only 51 percent of special teachers favored this. Daily planning sessions were not recommended; nor was there a high percentage in favor of meeting less than once a week. This supported the idea that regular teachers did not want anything to disrupt their regular on-going programs. The data indicated a preference for either a full-time resource person to be available to plan as needed or to meet once a week for cooperative planning.

A final question on planning asked how special curriculums could be geared to fit within the scope of regular teachers' on-going programs. Sixty percent of regular teachers and 54 percent of special teachers felt the best way was by adopting as many materials as possible from the regular teacher's program for use with the mainstreamed child. Observation of the combined totals indicated, however, that only two-thirds of the special teachers saw the importance of using regular classroom materials in support of mainstreaming within the regular teacher's program. This represented a 21 percent discrepancy between the views held by regular and special teachers. Again regular teachers appear to be very much concerned about the curriculum problems and less about peer tutoring, aides or media.

The second option of using peer or cross-age tutoring was the first or second choice of 45 percent of the regular educators and 27 percent of the special teachers. Both groups showed limited support for the use of aides or volunteers—about 15 percent of regular teachers and 10 percent of special teachers. No group showed a high priority for the use of hardware such as tapes, films or other media, for providing oral or seat work, or for rewriting difficult reading material—even though this may be the instructional alteration most needed by many exceptional children.

Resource Program Priorities

A final concern of this study was to gauge teachers' opinions on certain policies relating to the operation of a resource program. Those policies included: caseload size, categorical versus noncategorical service and problems related to providing itinerant services.

Assuming that the role of a resource teacher was to provide both direct and indirect services to exceptional children, question 1 on Table 3 asked, "What should be the recommended caseload for a resource teacher?" The preferred ratio for 75 percent of regular teachers and 73 percent of special teachers was 20 children directly served and 10 children served through teacher consultation, or indirectly served. This was the overwhelming first priority choice, again indicating a high degree of concern for the problems of direct teaching. Regular teachers overwhelmingly preferred direct service to 20 exceptional children as opposed to 10; regular teachers appear to want special teachers to teach special children. As indicated by the next option, no group wanted large direct caseloads, and very few (3 percent of special teachers and none of the regular teachers) felt that having solely indirect teacher consultation was desirable.

The amount of teaching time needed to provide for a positive educational effort for a child needed to be

Table 3

Comparison of Regular and Special Teachers' Priorities Regarding Certain Aspects of Resource Programs

Resource Teacher Questions and Response Items	Regular Classroom Teachers' Percentage of Choice by Priority			Special Education Teachers' Percentage of Choice by Priority		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
1. What should the recommended caseload for a resource teacher be?						
A. 20 directly served and 10 served through teacher consultation.	75	10	85	73	15	88
B. 10 directly served and 20 served through teacher consultation.	20	55	75	22	61	87
2. How much instructional time should be devoted to mainstreamed children in order to provide for a positive educational experience?						
A. One hour per day.	50	30	80	44	41	85
B. Two hours per day.	25	45	70	41	27	68
3. What alternative methods of assigning resource teachers are preferred?						
A. Set a maximum caseload and hire enough teachers to meet the number of identified students.	85	10	95	54	29	83
B. Have one resource room teacher and one teacher consultant per school.	15	45	60	15	27	42
4. What are the problems related to itinerant services?						
A. All schools will present enough problems for a full time resource teacher.	35	10	45	37	12	49
B. Valuable teaching time is lost in travel.	22	20	40	34	15	49
5. How would you prefer to implement a mainstream program through the use of resource personnel?						
A. It would be the job of the resource teacher to work with the regular teacher on a one-to-one basis without administrative restrictions.	80	5	85	54	24	79
B. Mainstreaming procedures are to be developed by local school building staff.	10	75	85	17	54	71
6. What factors should be considered in speaking of categorical or noncategorical programs.						
A. Teachers who individualize can teach a variety of students with varying problems.	75	25	100	59	29	88
B. Noncategorical services reduce harmful effects of labels.	60	30	90	46	32	78

considered when determining caseload size. Question 2 on Table 3 reports the percentages obtained for two options concerning the amount of teacher time. One hour daily was the preferred amount chosen by 50 percent of regular teachers and 44 percent of special teachers. A substantial number of special teachers, 41 percent, also chose two hours per day as their first choice compared to 25 percent of regular teachers favoring a two hour daily schedule. Both of these options received about equal priority by the two teaching groups through combined percentages of 80 and 70 percent for regular teachers compared to 85 and 68 percent for special teachers. Very little support was indicated to options which provided for less than daily sessions. Less than daily sessions were interpreted as being disruptive to regular routines and schedules especially for regular teachers, and they could amount to little more than tutoring sessions for the special teachers. No teachers preferred one two-hour session per week, and only 5 percent of special teachers and 2 percent of regular teachers listed three one-hour sessions per week as their preferred choice. They appeared to be saying to teach daily or the teacher's time was being spent fruitlessly.

A third question concerned alternate methods of assigning resource teachers. The preferred method indicated by both groups was to set a maximum caseload size and hire

enough teachers to meet the number of identified special students. This method was chosen by 85 percent of regular teachers and 54 percent of special teachers for their first choice. The greater percentage of regular teachers giving this option as their first choice indicated that regular teachers operated more from a caseload set than did special teachers. It may also indicate that special teachers do not have a viable idea of optimal caseload parameters. Another option given by 60 percent of regular teachers as a first or second choice was to have one resource room teacher and one teacher consultant per school; this option was also given as a first or second choice by 42 percent of special teachers. By observing percentages of first choices, this could clearly be seen as a second choice; the first choice was caseload assignment. Other choices received little support; having one resource teacher per school was chosen by only 10 percent of the special teachers and by no regular teachers. A novel response of having one resource teacher for every 200 public school students was selected as a first or second choice by 20 percent of the regular teachers and by 30 percent of the special teachers.

On the first questionnaire used in this study, only two respondents thought that itinerant service—one teacher serving more than one school—was desirable. For that reason, the second questionnaire asked teachers to rank problems

which made itinerant service undesirable. Question 4 on Table 3, page 29, lists the two problems that teachers considered to be the most important arguments against itinerant services. Thirty-seven percent of special teachers and 35 percent of regular teachers said that all schools will present enough problems to justify a full-time resource teacher; 45 and 49 percent gave this idea a first or second ranking. This idea was given even more support considering that, in the previous question, 60 percent of regular teachers and 42 percent of special teachers thought all schools could use two special education teachers. The second highest percentages were divided. Thirty-four percent of special teachers said valuable teaching time was lost in travel; 20 percent of regular teachers agreed with this. Twenty-five percent of regular teachers saw itinerant service as being an obstacle to being a part of a faculty whereas only 5 percent of special teachers rated this as an important point. The difficulties involved in scheduling and in transporting materials were also seen as less important considerations.

Question 5 on Table 3 asked teachers, "How would you prefer to implement a mainstream program through the use of resource personnel?" Both groups of teachers preferred letting resource teachers work on a one-to-one basis with regular teachers, without administrative restrictions, to

effectuate mainstreaming. Eighty percent of the regular teachers voiced this preference compared to 54 percent of the special teachers. By combining the percentages of teachers who listed it as either a first or second choice, the percentages increased to 85 and 79 percent, respectively. This was interpreted again to mean that regular teachers desired a strong committment for direct service with as little procedural red tape and disruption of regular routines as possible.

A second choice was to allow the local school building staff to work out their own problems regarding mainstreaming. This was clearly a second choice though as seen by the percentages of first choice preferences voiced by both groups of teachers when comparing items A and B on this question. The data further indicated that teachers preferred to work out the problems of mainstreaming as a building staff effort rather than using outside or central office support. These figures illustrated again the desire of teachers for active participation on building staff decisions.

The final question and responses reported on Table 3, page 29, concerned factors related to providing categorical or noncategorical services. High percentages on two points for question six gave evidence that teachers were committed to providing noncategorical service. Teachers, in general, felt that noncategorical service reduced the harmful effects

of labels. Combined first and second choices for item B showed that 90 and 78 percent of the regular and special teachers supported this claim.

Regardless of a categorical or a noncategorical orientation, both groups expressed confidence that the major teaching consideration was individualization. Seventy-five percent of regular teachers and 59 percent of special teachers voiced a first priority in the statement that "Teachers who individualize can teach a variety of students with varying types of problems." This indicated that teachers were more concerned about the delivery of instruction in teaching than about structural or labeling issues. However, the ability to individualize more effectively and to reach more children who display wide ranges of skill differences could certainly facilitate a noncategorical approach.

Other items were voiced as possible obstacles to noncategorical service, but they were seen as less important. They included categorical approaches to teacher training, funding patterns for special services and homogeneous grouping geared to categories for instructional purposes. These items, however, were not viewed by teachers as items of major concern. Teachers appeared to be most concerned with developing teaching skills in fostering individualization

of instruction and in maintaining predictable routines to facilitate the amount of direct service provided to the child.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Summary

This past year in Tennessee saw the enactment of legislation which called for exceptional children to be mainstreamed to the maximum extent practicable. This led to the speeded expansion of special education programs throughout the state. Resource programs have been set up within almost all school systems to help the regular teacher in the task of mainstreaming. In implementing mainstreaming, little consideration has been given to the people who must perform the job of integrating the exceptional child into the regular class—the teachers. This study attempted to ascertain recommendations and preferences of both regular and special teachers on how best to handle mainstreaming as a positive effort.

An open-ended questionnaire was created to solicit ideas from regular and special teachers on inservice, planning and resource programs. The ideas generated were used to construct a second questionnaire which asked teachers to rank the suggested answers in order to gauge their priorities. The data was tabulated and analyzed. The overall results were reported in the conclusions section of this chapter.

Conclusions

From an analysis of the data, the following conclusions were made:

1. Both regular and special teachers desired input into the content of inservice programs on mainstreaming.

2. The two issues that teachers most often felt needed to be discussed during inservice sessions were: (1) What is the scope of both the regular and resource teachers' jobs in regard to mainstreaming?, and (2) How can a teacher individualize instruction more effectively? Regular teachers also felt that "What should be taught the handicapped child and who should teach it?" was a worthwhile topic for inservice programs, but special teachers were much less concerned with this issue.

3. Regular teachers generally preferred having inservice meetings on mainstreaming scheduled at regular intervals throughout the year, but a great many special educators preferred having several at the first of the year with fewer later on.

4. Special teachers were less concerned with maintaining regular and predictable schedules in the areas of planning, inservice and day-to-day resource instruction than were regular teachers who preferred consistency and as little interuption of their daily ongoing program as possible.

5. Special teachers thought the best way of gaining planning time was through the use of aides, but regular teachers preferred the use of a "floating" teacher to allow planning as needed.

6. Although extra planning time was not seen as desirable, special teachers felt the most efficient schedule would be one hour per week, and regular teachers preferred having a full-time resource consultant available as needed.

7. A preferred maximum caseload for a resource teacher was 20 students directly served and 10 students served through teacher consultation. Neither group of teachers gave much support to direct caseloads greater than 20 students or for totally indirect, or teacher consultant types of caseloads.

8. Teachers did not feel that itinerant service was a viable approach; the main reasons were time loss through travel and the fact that any school presented enough problems to justify a full-time resource teacher.

9. Noncategorical service was thought to be possible through individualization and desirable because it would reduce the harmful effects of labels. The major hindrances to a move toward noncategorical service were that funding and teacher training were both geared to categories.

10. Regular teachers were more concerned with curriculum issues than were special educators. This could

be seen by regular teachers' priority for curriculum oriented inservice topics and their concern for direct teaching considerations rather than hardware, classroom structure variations or extra personnel.

11. Individualization of instruction was a prime concern of all teachers as a procedure to allow them to work with a wider variety of children. Both groups saw it as a number one instructional priority.

Discussion

By looking at the data and the conclusions drawn from it, certain trends may be seen.

First, regular teachers were especially concerned with direct service. An important topic for inservice programs chosen by regular teachers was "What should be taught the handicapped child and who should teach it?" Special educators, however, indicated that this issue was of little importance. Both groups preferred direct caseloads of 20 students, indicating that regular teachers wanted special teachers to teach special children—a responsibility that special teachers favored. Fewer special teachers saw the importance of adopting the regular teacher's materials for the mainstreamed child as compared to a preference expressed by regular teachers. Common materials would appear to be a direct service consideration that would expedite the goal of

of integrating the exceptional child into regular classroom activities rather than allowing the child to stand out because he operates in materials totally different from those his classmates use.

Direct service was also seen as a direct committment for individualized instruction. For this survey sample, the ability to individualize was seen as their number one teaching concern. The acquisition of this skill was seen as a way of reaching more students more effectively. Individualized instruction was felt to be a necessary criterion for a successful mainstreaming program.

Secondly, regular teachers were more concerned with the maintenance of regular and predictable schedules than were special teachers. They preferred regular intervals between inservice sessions on mainstreaming; they preferred to have a full-time resource consultant available for planning as individual needs arose; and they thought the use of a "floating" teacher was the best way to allow more planning time. Regular teachers thought daily planning sessions were excessive, but daily resource instruction was vital. Less than daily instruction was viewed as disrupting the regular teacher's ongoing sequence of activities and was not a recommended schedule for delivering direct teaching.

Finally, both groups of teachers expressed a desire for active involvement. They wanted to serve on inservice

program committees or to take an active part in inservice programs rather than just accepting programs devised by outside personnel. They preferred allowing a resource teacher to bear the responsibility for implementing a resource program on a one-to-one basis in preference to adopting procedures enacted by the local building staff or district office staff.

These results would appear to warrant continued answers to questions on teacher effectiveness and efficiency. Are the opinions of teachers being considered as a vital force for making program intervention decisions? Is it feasible to include teacher ideas about effectiveness and efficiency? What can be done administratively to promote a greater orientation toward direct service and individualized instructional training? These are a few of the questions that need to be answered, or at least considered, before making arbitrary procedural committments on inservice, scheduling and program planning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamson, Gary and van Etten, Glen. Zero-reject revisited: a workable alternative. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 735-738.

Birch, Jack W. Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1974.

Brown, Louis F. The special class: some aspects for special educators to ponder. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1968, 3, 11-16.

Carroll, A. W. The effects of segregated and partially integrated school programs on self-concept and academic achievement of educable mentally retarded. Exceptional Children, 1967, 34, 93-96.

Christoplos, Florence. Keeping exceptional children in regular classes. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 569-572.

Christoplos, Florence and Renz, P. A critical examination of special education programs. Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 371-379.

Conner, E. M. and Muldoon, J. F. Resource programming for emotionally disturbed teenagers. Exceptional Children, 1967, 34, 261-269.

Cruickshank, William M. The false hope of integration. The Slow Learning Child, 1974, 21, 67-83.

Deno, Evelyn. Instructional Alternatives for Exceptional Children. Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Dunn, Lloyd M. Special education for the mildly retarded—is much of it justified? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-22.

Flynn, T. and Flynn, L. Effects of a part-time special education program on adjustment of EMR students. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 680-681.

Gickling, Edward and Theobald, John. Mainstreaming: affect or effect. The Journal of Special Education, in press, September, 1975.

Glavin, John P., Quay, Herbert, Annesley, Frederick, and Werry, John. An experimental resource room for behavior problem children. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 131-137.

Hayman, D. J. Special classes—helpful or harmful? The Crisis, 1971, January-February, 5-6.

Goldstein, H., Moss, J. and Jordan, L. The efficacy of special class training on the development of mentally retarded children. U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Program, Project 619. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, 1965.

Guerin, Gilbert R. and Szatlocky, Kathleen. Integration programs for the mildly retarded. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, 173-179.

Hammill, Donald and Wiederhold, J. Lee. The Resource Room: Rationale and Implementation. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1972.

Iano, R. Shall we disband special classes. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 6, 167-177.

Johnson, G. O. Special education forthe mentally retarded—a paradox. Exceptional Children, 1962, 29, 62-69.

Kolstoe, Oliver P. Programs for the mildly retarded: a reply to the critics. Exceptional Children, 1972, 39, 55.

Lilly, Stephen. Special education: a teapot in a tempest. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 43-49.

Mayer, L. The relationship of early special class placement and the self-concepts of mentally handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1966, 33, 77-80.

Payne, Reed and Murray, Charles. Principals' attitudes toward integration of the handicapped. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, 123-125.

Reger, Roger. What is a resource room program? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1973, 6, 609-614.

Reger, Roger and Koppman, Marion. The child oriented resource room. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 460-462.

Roos, P. Trends and issues in special education for the mentally retarded. Education and Training for the Mentally Retarded, 1970, 5, 51-61.

Sabatino, D. A. An evaluation of resource rooms for children with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1971, 4, 84-93.

Smith, James O. and Arkans, Joan. Now more than ever: a case for the special class. Exceptional Children, 1974, 40, 497.

Tennessee Directory of Public Schools. Nashville: Tennessee Department of Education, 1974.

Walker, Valadia Smith. The efficacy of the resource room for educating retarded children. Exceptional Children, 1974, 40, 288.

Weiner, Lawrence H. An investigation of the effectiveness of resource rooms for children with specific learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1969, 2, 223-229.

Weldon, Williams, Hill, Lawson and Engstrom. Tennessee Public Chapter 839, House Bill 2053, 1972.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE 1

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37916

Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation

January 7, 1974

Dear Sir:

Your help would be appreciated in filling out and distributing the enclosed questionnaires to certain teachers in your school system. These questionnaires are being sent to both regular and special education administrators. We are asking you to please take the time to fill out one of the questionnaires; in addition we ask those of you who are special education administrators to select and distribute four questionnaires to four of your best resource teachers. We are also asking regular education-administrators to distribute four questionnaires to four general education-teachers whom they feel have positive attitudes toward mainstreaming of handicapped children. Please list the names and addresses of all participants (including your own) and return the list directly to us in order that results and further correspondence may be shared with both teachers and participating administrators alike. We are enclosing five questionnaires, stamped self-addressed envelopes, and a numbered list to use in recording the names and addresses of teachers and administrators filling in the questionnaires.

In order to mainstream handicapped children into a regular classroom, many school systems are using a resource teaching model. The purpose of this questionnaire is to allow teachers and administrators a chance to speak out concerning the mechanics of this model. Please take the time to reflect on these questions. Your personal insights and suggestions may help you & your colleagues to more efficiently implement the mainstreaming process. Collectively we are looking for a few good practical ideas on how to go about implementing mainstreaming that we can share back with you. Please give each of these items serious attention. Thank you for your interest & cooperation. Feel free to elaborate on all items

which you personally feel critical to the success of mainstreaming. We hope this questionnaire will benefit all those who participate.

Any questions that you or your staff have regarding this questionnaire should be directed to Dr. Ed Gickling at the University of Tennessee, ph. 974-2321. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Edward Gickling

/s/ Douglas Mallory

Edward Gickling, Ph.D.
Douglas Mallory

Questionnaire-Options within Mainstreaming

I. Descriptive Information

Name_____ Address_____

School_____ _____

Position_____ _____

Years of Service_____ Rural_____ Urban_____

II. In-service Procedures

1. How frequently are inservice sessions concerning mainstreaming handicapped children held in your school:
   a. for all teachers?_____
   b. for only special education teachers?_____
   c. what would be an ideal number of inservice sessions for all teachers per school year?_____
   d. what would be an ideal number for only special education teachers?_____

2. How are topics chosen for in-service sessions? (For Example: (a) chosen by principal or supervisors, (b) selected by teachers.)
   1.
   2.

3. How can teachers be encouraged to provide input into the content of inservice programs on mainstreaming the handicapped? (For Example: (a) solicit topics from teacher, (b) have teachers take total charge of inservice program.)
   1.
   2.

4. What do you personally feel needs to be discussed during inservice sessions on mainstreaming? (For Example: (a) ratio of handicapped to nonhandicapped in regular classrooms, (b) differences in curriculum philosophy between regular and resource teachers, (c) requiring all teachers to mainstream, (d) a discussion of teacher's individual rights and thoughts.)
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.

5. What do you feel would be the most cost/effective schedule to use in holding inservice sessions on mainstreaming?

(Cost in terms of both time and money required; efficient in terms of providing quality training so that regular and special teachers know how to work together.) For Example: (a) separate two hour sessions held once every two months, (b) several sessions at the first of the year with few in the middle and end of the year.
1.
2.

III. Planning Procedures

6. How is time made available within your school to allow a regular teacher and a special teacher to plan together? (For Example: (a) when the students are scheduled for other classes like art of P.E., (b) arrange for parents to act as teacher aides when time is scheduled for regular/resource teacher to plan together.)
1.
2.
3.
4.

7. Teachers are legally liable for the safety and welfare of their students. What arrangements can be made to allow a regular teacher the time to plan with a special teacher without being considered negligent in case of accident? (For Example: (a) having a substitute take over the class, (b) have student-peer teaching while the regular teacher of the resource teachers plan together in the back of the classroom.)
1.
2.

8. What do you feel would be the most cost/effective schedule to use in holding regular one-to-one planning sessions? (For Example: (a) one hour weekly at a given time each week, (b) twice a month.)
1.
2.

9. How can special curriculum materials & educational concepts be better geared to fit within the scope of the regular classroom curriculum program? (For Example: Allowing a child with a reading handicap to be read to by a fellow student & to take oral quizes.)
1.
2.
3.
4.

IV. Resource Teachers

10. How many students do you feel a resource teacher should carry on a case load? How many should she actually teach? How many additional students should she act as a consultant for?

Maximum Number Directly Taught	Additional Number Receiving Support Resource Consultation
1._____	1._____
2._____	2._____
3._____	3._____

11. For those students whose needs cannot be met through consultation with the regular teacher, What is the minimum amount of time the resource teacher must provide by directly teaching the child in order to have a positive educational effect on the child? (For Example: 30 total students divided into groups of six with each group receiving from 1-2 hours of direct instruction three times per week.)
    1.
    2.

12. What other alternative schedules or formulas could be used for assigning resource teachers? (For Example: Assigning 1 per every 200 public school students.)
    1.
    2.

13. Should a resource teacher be assigned to more than one school?
    Yes_____ No_____. Why?
    1.
    2.

14. Should resource teachers work with children with only one disability, such as learning disabilities while others work only on social adjustment, & others with slow learners, etc.?
    Yes_____ No_____. Why?
    1.
    2.

15. What additional comments or considerations do you feel need to be voiced concerning differences in personality, philosophy, or curriculum ideas between regular and special education teachers?
    1.
    2.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37916

Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation

Dear

Recently we mailed five questionnaires on mainstreaming to you and asked that you fill out one of them and ask four of your teachers to do likewise. Please accept our apologies if you felt imposed upon or if you felt the first letter appeared to disregard the demands upon your own time. In our haste to circulate the questionnaire, we may have inadvertently failed to recognize your own professional demands and at the same time failed to convey the urgent need to gather and share information pertinent to making mainstreaming a positive experience. We want to thank you for your previous cooperation. A few questionnaires, however, have not been returned.

Since many new ideas on devising planning time and assigning resource teachers are needed, we encourage you to ask those who haven't completed their questionnaire to do so by March 21. A complete set of the results will be mailed to those who reply.

We feel that your ideas can indicate methods of improving procedures for mainstreaming. Your ideas can show us means of using resource teaching to facilitate the education of exceptional learners instead of allowing resource rooms to become only part-time special classes.

Enclosed are copies of the questionnaire and self-addressed, stamped envelopes. Again, thank you for your cooperation. We hope to hear from you by March 21.

Sincerely,

/s/ Edward Gickling

Edward E. Gickling
Assistant Professor

/s/ Douglas Mallory

Douglas Mallory
Graduate Assistant

EG/DM/pm
Enclosures

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37916

Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation

You and your colleagues recently completed a questionnaire suggesting ways in which planning, inservice training, and role assignments could be improved to facilitate mainstreaming handicapped children. We appreciate the time each of you spent in providing you own personal insights and suggestions regarding how the mechanics for mainstreaming could be improved.

As a followup and sharing procedure we have attempted to compile the various suggestions that were made into a second questionnaire. We are enclosing this questionnaire to allow you to evaluate the various ideas given by you and your professional colleagues. The questionnaire only requires that you rank the various topic suggestions according to your own order of preference. Please take the few minutes needed to fill out the questionnaire and return it to us. This represents a chance for you in the professional field to be heard and hopefully to see your preferences become part of the necessary mechanics to better facilitate mainstreaming.

We hope that these combined suggestions may direct you to areas that deserve more discussion and to ways of improving the mainstreaming effort within your school system. Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed envelope by May 16. Thank you.

Sincerely,

/s/ Edward E. Gickling

Edward E. Gickling, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

/s/ Douglas Mallory

Douglas Mallory
Graduate Assistant

EEG/DM/A
Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE

The Field Worker's Evaluation

Section I. Demographics:

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

SCHOOL AFFILIATE_____

TYPE OF POSITION: PLEASE CHECK

_____ Regular Teacher _____ Spec. Educ. Resource Teacher

_____ Rural School _____ Urban School

Below each of the following questions or statements are a list of various types of responses. These responses represent the opinions given by you and your colleagues on a prior questionnaire and were selected for one of two reasons to be included in this followup questionnaire (1) either they were frequently cited, or (2) they were ideas which were considered novel and worthy of report. Please rank the response to the various questions and statements in the blanks at the left of the responses. Please rank the response based upon your opinion of their order of importance. Consider efficienty, cost, and practicality. A rating of 1 (one) should be given to a response that you consider most important; a 2 (two) should be given to the second best choice; and so on until all responses are numbered from 1, 2, 3, to . . .

EXAMPLE: Question

3 Statement A

1 Statement B

2 Statement C

Section II. Inservice

1. How can all teachers be encouraged to provide input into the content of inservice programs regarding mainstreaming?

_____ Assign a teacher to take full charge.

_____ Use a questionnaire to solicit teachers' ideas.

_____ Include teachers on a program committee with supervisors.

_____ Give teachers an active part in the program.

2. What issues and questions need to be discussed in inservice sessions on mainstreaming, regarding policies (set courses of action based upon given conditions)?

_____ What is the scope of both the regular and resource teachers' jobs in regard to mainstreaming? (This implies what they should and should not do.)

_____ How should the mildly handicapped be graded (A, B, C, etc.) in a regular class?
_____ What should be taught to the handicapped child and who should teach it?
_____ Should an overview of each type of handicapping condition precede mainstreaming to help regular teachers have more realistic expectations about each particular handicapped child?

3. What feelings, personal expectations and personality or prejudicial differences need to be discussed during inservice sessions on mainstreaming?

_____ How can regular teachers help the midly handicapped to interact with their nonhandicapped classmates?
_____ Should the acceptance of the mildly handicapped into regular classrooms be left up to regular teachers?

Comment:

4. What procedures, or mechanics for implementing mainstreaming, need to be disucssed during inservice sessions?

_____ Inservices should be spent developing materials to be used with the mainstreamed children.
_____ Inservices should be spent demonstrating for regular teachers how to individualize curriculums for handicapped and nonhandicapped youngsters who may need this type of programming.
_____ Inservices should be devoted to adjusting class schedules to allow for regular and resource teachers to work together for the child with as little regular classroom disruption as possible.
_____ State funding and placement guidelines should be discussed so all teachers know the restrictions on resource teachers.

5. What is the most efficient schedule for holding inservice meetings on mainstreaming?

_____ Have several at the first of the year with fewer at the middle and end.
_____ Inservice only at the beginning of the year.
_____ Have a regularly scheduled interval between meetings; for example, every sixth Friday.

Section III. Planning

6. How can time be made available to allow regular and resource teachers to plan together?

_____ Use aides, volunteers, or other school personnel to oversee classroom activities while regular and resource teachers plan together.

_____ Use before and after school time for planning.
_____ If the budget permits, obtain a floating teacher, i.e., a qualified teacher who can be scheduled to take over classes whenever needed.
_____ Use teacher planning time (time when students are in other classes) for cooperative planning.
_____ Dismiss school one-half hour early one day each week to create planning time.

7. What would be the most efficient schedule for cooperative planning between regular and resource teachers for children who have been mainstreamed?

_____ One hour/twice a month.
_____ One hour/each week.
_____ Have a full-time consultant to meet as a need arises.
_____ Daily.

8. How can special curriculums be geared to fit within the scope of the regular teacher's on-going program?

_____ Use tapes and other media extensively.
_____ Provide more oral and seat work for the handicapped child.
_____ Use group assignments.
_____ Use peer and cross-age tutoring.
_____ Aides and volunteers can help to provide individual attention where necessary.
_____ Rewrite materials on lower reading levels.
_____ Adopting as many materials as possible from the regular teachers program to be used in teaching the handicapped child.

Section IV. The Resource Teacher

9. What should the maximum caseload (number of students) for a resource teacher be? List the preferred ratio between number of students actually taught by the resource teacher and the number of students served indirectly through resource teachers consulting with regular teachers and not working directly with the children.

_____ 20 directly served and 10 served through teacher consultation
_____ 10 directly served and 30 served through teacher consultation
_____ 35 directly served and 0 served through teacher consultation
_____ 0 directly served and the entire school population served through teacher consultation

10. For those students who need direct teaching by a special resource person, what is the minimum amount of teaching time necessary to provide for a positive educational effort for the child?

_____ One hour daily.
_____ Two hours daily.

_____ One-half hour daily.
_____ Three times per week—one hour per day.
_____ 2-hour session once a week.

11. What alternative methods of assigning resource teachers are preferred?

_____ One teacher for every 200 public school students.
_____ One per school, regardless of school's size.
_____ Set a maximum caseload and hire enough teachers to meet the number of identified special students (Give number for caseload size _____).
_____ Have one noncategorical special class teacher and one resource consultant for each school.
_____ Let one member of each team-teaching situation be a special educator.

12. Rank these problems related to providing itinerant services by their order of importance; a rank of 1 is given to the most important consideration, and a rank of 5 for the least significant problem. (Intinerant services refer to one teacher working with children in more than one school.)

_____ Valuable teaching time is lost in travel.
_____ Any teacher needs to be a part of a faculty.
_____ All schools will present enough problems for a full time resource teacher.
_____ It is difficult to transport and to keep track of materials.
_____ Scheduling is more difficult for an itinerant teacher.

13. How would you prefer to implement a mainstreaming program through the use of resource personnel? (Objective, scheduling, and proceudres.)

_____ School staff implements procedures outlined by central office staff.
_____ Mainstreatming procedures are developed by local school building staff.
_____ The job of the resource teacher would be to develop a means of working with regular teachers on a one to one basis without restrictions by the local and central office staff. (Local and central office staff would oversee the programs but the resource teacher would be responsible for developing her own procedures.)

14. Rank each statement regarding categorical and noncategorical services for special students according to your conception of its importance. (Categorical service refers to providing one teacher for children labeled EMR, another for children labeled learning disabled, etc.; noncategorical service refers to one special educator working with children with various labels together.)

1 - a very important point;
2 - somewhat important;
3 - of little concern; and,
4 - rating represents no importance.

1	2	3	4	
___	___	___	___	Categories make funding, instruction and placement easier.
___	___	___	___	Teacher training is geared to categories.
___	___	___	___	Categorization goes against the philosophy of mainstreaming.
___	___	___	___	Teachers who individualize can teach a variety of students with a variety of problems.
___	___	___	___	Pupil placement by categories requires more faculty per school.
___	___	___	___	It is too difficult to teach children from a number of categories (i.e., ED, LD, EMR) together.
___	___	___	___	Noncategorical service reduces the harmful effects of labels.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37916

Department of Special Education
and Rehabilitation

May 23, 1975

Dear

We are using this letter to remind you of the questionnaire we recently mailed you. Would you please take the few minutes necessary to rank the suggested answers to the questions, and return it to us as soon as possible.

Perhaps these suggestions can point out ways of improving mainstreaming in the coming second year of mainstreaming in Tennessee.

We are enclosing another copy of the questionnaire for your convenience.

Sincerely,

/s/ Edward Gickling

Edward E. Gickling, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

/s/ Douglas Mallory

Douglas Mallory
Graduate Assistant

sh

Enclosure

VITA

Douglas Wayne Mallory was born April 26, 1952, in Greeneville, Tennessee. He grew up in Pressmen's Home and Rogersville, Tennessee, where he attended Rogersville High School. Mr. and Mrs. Hayden Mallory are his parents.

He entered the University of Tennessee in Fall, 1970. He was a member of several social and professional organizations, and he graduated in 1974 with a B.S. in education of the emotionally disturbed. After working during the summer as a teacher's aide at Riverbend School, he started graduate school in Special Education. While in graduate school, he worked as a graduate assistant in the Special Education Department. He received his M.S. in Special Education in August, 1975.

Douglas Mallory is currently employed by the Tennessee Department of Mental Health.