

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7922398

BOYLES, CAROLYN DALE
AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PERCEPTION OF THE
ROLE OF RESOURCE TEACHERS IN THE EDUCATION OF
EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED AND LEARNING
DISABLED STUDENTS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE OF RESOURCE TEACHERS
IN THE EDUCATION OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED
AND LEARNING DISABLED STUDENTS

by

Carolyn Dale Boyles

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctorate of Education

Greensboro
1979

Approved by



Dissertation Adviser

BOYLES, CAROLYN DALE. An Investigation of the Perception of the Role of Resource Teachers in the Education of Educable Mentally Retarded and Learning Disabled Students. (1979) Directed by: Dr. Roland Nelson. Pp. 118.

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of the role of resource teachers and regular teachers in providing an education for educable mentally retarded students and learning disabled students. The groups whose perceptions were analyzed were resource teachers, regular teachers, college students enrolled in special education training programs and college students enrolled in regular education training programs.

Perceptions of roles from the four groups in the study were collected through the administration of an opinionnaire. Respondents indicated the degree that resource teachers and/or regular teachers should be and are responsible for forty functions that are viewed as important in educating mentally retarded and learning disabled students. The forty functions included in the opinionnaire were selected after a thorough review of pertinent literature, after consultation with a variety of specialists in special education, and after subjecting the opinionnaire to a trial run and editing procedures.

The ten hypotheses utilized for this investigation were tested by analyzing responses among and between groups with a chi square procedure. This procedure indicated whether there were significant differences between responses assigned to the five options for paired groups as well as for the combined four groups. Differences between and within groups were declared significant when an observed chi square would have occurred by chance in fewer than five times in 100 times.

There was considerable variation within each study group-

resource teachers, regular teachers, special education students, and regular education students- in the perceptions of the responsibility that is shared and should be assumed by the resource teacher and regular teachers for functions concerned with the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

There was a general lack of consensus among the four study groups and between paired groups in regard to who should be responsible for important functions concerned with educating special education students. There was more consensus between the resource teachers and the special education students and between the resource teachers and the regular teachers. There was almost a complete lack of consensus between the regular education students and the special education students and the regular education students and the regular teachers relative to who should be responsible for functions related to educating special education students.

There was also a general lack of consensus among the four study groups and between paired groups relative to who is responsible for important functions concerned with educating special education students. There was more agreement between the resource teachers and the special education students than between the two practicing teacher groups. On a large number of functions, there were differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and regular education students, of regular teachers and special education students and regular students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	1
Hypotheses	4
Delimitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	7
Organization of the Study	9
II. ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND THE RESOURCE TEACHER	11
Resource Teacher Concept	12
Role Analysis of Resource Teachers	15
Role Perceptions	15
Functions of the Resource Teacher	18
Assessment and Placement	21
Instruction	23
Social and Emotional Development	24
Parent Involvement	25
III. PROCEDURES	27
Development of Opinionnaire	27
Analysis of Data	31
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	34
Hypothesis 1	37
Hypothesis 2	37
Hypothesis 3	37
Hypothesis 4	37
Hypothesis 5	42
Hypothesis 6	42
Hypothesis 7	42
Hypothesis 8	42
Within Group Analysis	47
Hypothesis 9	47
Hypothesis 10	47
Item by Item Analysis	50
V. SUMMARY	105

	Page
Conclusions	106
Recommendations for Further Study	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY	111
APPENDIX	
Opinionnaire	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Resource Teachers, Regular Teachers, Special Education Students, and Regular Students Who Completed Opinionnaire	32
2. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Resource Teachers and Regular Teachers As To Who Should Be Responsible for Listed Functions	38
3. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Resource Teachers and Regular Teachers As To Who Is Responsible for Listed Functions	39
4. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Resource Teachers and Special Education Students As To Who Is Responsible for Listed Functions	40
5. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Resource Teachers and Special Education Students As To Who Should be Responsible for Listed Functions	41
6. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Regular Education Teachers and Regular Education Students As To Who Is Responsible For Listed Functions	43
7. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Regular Education Teachers and Regular Education Students As To Who Should Be Responsible for Listed Functions	44
8. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Regular Education and Special Education University Students As To Who Is Responsible For Listed Functions	45
9. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Regular Education and Special Education University Students As To Who Should be Responsible For Selected Functions	46
10. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Resource Teachers As To Who Is and Who Should Be Responsible For Selected Functions	48
11. A Comparison of the Perceptions of Regular Teachers As To Who Is and Who Should Be Responsible For Selected Functions	49
12-31. Chi Square Tests To Determine Significant Differences Among The Proportions of Responses Assigned By Four Groups Relative To Who Should Be Responsible For Two Education Functions	51-70

Table

Page

32-51.	Chi Square Tests To Determine Significant Differences Among The Proportions of Responses Assigned By Four Groups Relative To Who Is Responsible For Two Education Functions	51-70
52-65.	Percent of Resource Teachers, Regular Teachers, Special Education Students and Regular Education Students Indicating Who Should Be and Who Is Responsible for Functions Related to Teaching EMR and LD Students	91-104

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Recent legislation and court decisions have affirmed the right of handicapped children to an education, preferably in the regular public school program. These legislative provisions and legal decisions have required that the public schools enroll and educate a variety of students who have not been served by regular education. In order to meet mandated and professional responsibilities associated with serving the handicapped, the public schools have employed a variety of specialists and have initiated new instructional and administrative procedures.

Because of the magnitude and variety of the recent changes in special education and the haste with which these changes have been made, it has been virtually impossible for school systems to clarify and assign proper responsibilities and roles to traditional and new personnel in special education, not to mention the roles of parents, personnel from non-education agencies, and community groups. Obvious results of the lack of role definitions include program omissions and duplications. In short, the lack of clarity in role responsibilities in many instances has resulted in inadequate programs for handicapped students.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to collect information that would assist personnel in the field of special and regular education

to clarify the roles and responsibilities of resource and regular teachers in the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. More specifically, the purpose was to determine the level of role congruance between regular and resource teachers of their perception of responsibilities in mainstreaming, the organizational pattern which enables mildly handicapped students to be enrolled in regular classes.

A secondary purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of regular and special education university students. The analysis of the teachers in training was to determine if differences in opinion or incongruance of role responsibility existed while teachers were in pre-service training.

Recent special education literature indicates that where mainstreaming has failed, little or no attention was given to the substantive nature of the curriculum and teachers were left to do what they could.¹ Reports indicate that entire elements of learning were omitted because they made for problems in scheduling or staff assignments, and because the teachers, both regular and resource did not have a clear understanding of what the other was doing. "Many administrators assumed that all that needed to be done was to rearrange the kids' environments and that all else will follow. It doesn't."²

A common element in the various descriptions of resource

¹Nicholas Hobbs, The Futures of Children (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975), p. 198.

²Ibid.

teachers is that resource teachers are a necessary tool for the mainstreaming of exceptional children.³ And, that mainstreaming by definition ". . . unites the process of regular education and special education so that all children may have equal education opportunity."⁴ This implied cooperative spirit itself indicates a need for an understanding of functions and acceptance of others' expertise and responsibilities. Because of the increasing number of professionals involved in the education of exceptional children,⁵ it seems more important than ever that the functions these professionals serve be delineated in some manner.⁶

In the area of special education, teachers' roles are not often specified. In 1969, an ERIC Clearinghouse search of 33,000 bibliographic items provided no reference to a role investigation related to the teacher of the educable mentally retarded.⁷ A recent CEC-ERIC Clearinghouse search initiated by this author provided only eleven references to a role description of the role of the resource teacher.

³James L. Paul, Ann P. Turnbull, and William M. Cruickshand, Mainstreaming: A Practical Guide (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1977), p. 48.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Lu Christie, A Very Special Education for All Children (Montpelier: Vermont State Department of Education, 1974), pp. 1-7.

⁶Keith E. Beery, "Mainstreaming: A Problem and an Opportunity for General Education," Focus on Exceptional Children, 6 (November 1974), 6.

⁷Richard D. Anderson, "Role and Teacher of Educable Mentally Retarded Elementary Children", The Journal of Special Education 10 (Winter, 1976), 383-391.

When a person is exposed to conflicting sets of legitimate role expectations, it becomes necessary to compromise or reject at least some or all of one set of those expectations. This process of compromising and partial rejecting can lead to differences in perceptions of persons concerning their job performance and that of others.

As defined by Victor A. Thompson in Modern Organizations,⁸ a role is "an organized pattern of behavior in accordance with the expectations of others". This reference to a role as an organized pattern of behavior suggests that people do not behave in a random fashion. Instead, behavior is influenced to a degree by the individual's self-expectations and by those expectations others hold for him. These expectations and demands come from the people with whom a person comes into contact. However, a person may not perceive the job in precisely the same manner as these others.

Role perceptions may also reflect what the person would like the role to be, which may be derived from this personality and basic values. Training and/or pre-service orientation may contribute to an individual's perception of his job or role. The actual behavior or role performance grows out of the reconciliation of all these factors.⁹

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was met through the analysis of data

⁸Victor A. Thompson, Modern Organizations: A General Theory (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 58.

⁹David R. Hampton, Charles E. Summer, and Ross A. Webber, Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973), p. 684.

collected in the testing of the hypotheses which follow:

1. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and regular teachers relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

2. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and regular teachers relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

3. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and special education university students relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

4. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and special education university students relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

5. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular teachers and regular education university students relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

6. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular teachers and regular education university students relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

7. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular education university students and special education students relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

8. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular education university students and special education students relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

9. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of resource teachers as to who is and who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

10. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of regular teachers as to who is and who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

Delimitations of the Study

The respondent sample of teachers for this study was drawn from the teachers employed by the Greensboro Public Schools, Greensboro, North Carolina. The system included 100 resource teachers and 511 regular classroom teachers. The respondent sample of university students was drawn from three universities and colleges in the Greensboro, North Carolina area.

The Greensboro Public Schools have indicated a need for the type of data that was generated by this research project. The Director

of Exceptional Child Services and the Coordinator of Resource Programs have also requested that the results and recommendations from this study be presented to the Department so that action can be taken to improve the delivery of services provided for mildly handicapped students who receive educational services from resource teachers. Therefore the research presented here can be considered an action research project.

The use of a single school district will not allow the research results of this study to be generalized to other school districts. In addition, the use of three universities does not allow generalizations to be made concerning all teacher training programs. However, the results may have implications for a broader population having similar characteristics.¹⁰

Definition of Terms

Several of the more important terms which will be used throughout this study are defined here.

1. Educable mentally retarded - Mental retardation refers to significant average general intellectual functioning manifested during the developmental period and existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior. The subaverage intellectual functioning for educable mentally retarded persons interprets to an intelligence quotient of 69 and below. The developmental period refers to the time between the ages of birth and 18 years old.

¹⁰Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research, An Introduction (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971), p. 115.

2. Function - the action for which a person or thing is specially fitted or used or for which a thing exists.

3. Learning disabled - The child with a learning disability exhibits a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological or physiological processes involved in understanding or in using spoken or written languages. These may be manifested in disorders of listening, thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling or arithmetic. They include, but are not limited to, conditions which have been referred to as perceptual handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and/or developmental aphasia. They do not include learning problems which are due primarily to visual, hearing, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or motor handicaps, or cultural or environmental deprivation.

4. Mainstreaming - An alternative educational program characterized by the retention of the mildly handicapped child in the regular education classroom with supplemental support being provided to the regular classroom teacher. This supplemental support can be direct support to the child or consultative support to the regular teacher. Note: This definition will be expanded in Chapter 2.

5. Resource room - a school room used by a special education teacher to provide individual small group instruction, assessment, and guidance to pupils who come for short periods of time from regular classes for special education. Synonyms are consultation room, learning center, and clinical center.¹¹

¹¹ Jack W. Birch, Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1974), p.15.

6. Resource teacher - a special education teacher who is at least partly responsible for the identification and education of those students who are classified as educable mentally retarded and learning disabled. The resource teacher serves this population by seeing the students for a portion of each day either in a resource room or in the student's regular classroom. In addition, the resource teacher may serve as a consultant to the regular classroom teacher of the students.

7. Role - an organized pattern of behavior in accordance with the expectations of others; a socially expected behavior pattern usually determined by an individual's status in a particular society.

8. Special education - specially designed instruction and related services to meet the unique educational needs of the handicapped.

Organization of the Study

Chapter two contains a review of related literature. This review includes a description of mainstreaming practices as related to the educable mentally retarded and learning disabled student. This section also examines the resource concept historically and the resource teacher component of mainstreaming. In chapter two, role analysis as related to the resource teacher and role theory in general are discussed and the literature relevant to the role of the resource teacher in mainstreaming are reviewed.

Chapter three describes the procedure used to assess the perceptions of resource and regular teachers of the functions of resource teachers. This chapter also describes the sample characteristics, procedures and the statistical treatment used in the study.

Analysis and interpretation of the data are presented in Chapter four.

A summary, conclusions and recommendations for the Greensboro Public Schools and implications for similar school systems comprise chapter five. Chapter five also sets forth recommendations for future research on the functions of special education resource teachers.

CHAPTER II

ROLE PERCEPTIONS AND THE RESOURCE TEACHER

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, the organization and structure of programs for exceptional children was increasingly examined by educators, sociologists, psychologists, the courts and parents of exceptional children. The weaknesses of assessment instruments,¹ the rationale and procedures for placement,² and the quality of evidence of success of special classes³ were challenged. Efficacy studies, many of questionable validity, were used as partial justification for sweeping changes in special education practices.⁴ The system of classifying and placing children in special programs was and is currently being attacked.⁵

The specific practice of placing mildly handicapped children in segregated education facilities received severe criticism during

¹James L. Paul, Ann P. Turnbull, and William M. Cruickshank, Mainstreaming: A Practical Guide (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1977), p. 1.

²Jane R. Mercer, "Psychological Assessment and the Rights of Children," Issues in the Classification of Children, ed. Nicholas Hobbs (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975), p. 130.

³Paul, p. 1.

⁴Herbert J. Prehm, "Special Education Research: Retrospect and Prospect," Exceptional Children, 43 (1976), 13.

⁵Raymond M. Glass and Roy S. Meckler, "Preparing Teachers to Instruct Mildly Handicapped Children in Regular Classrooms: A Summer Workshop," Exceptional Children, 39 (1972), 152.

the 1960's.⁶ Reasons for the disenchantment with special classes and schools have been documented by Dunn,⁷ Christopolos and Renz,⁸ Lilly⁹ and Hammill and Wiederholt.¹⁰ These writers delineate the many weaknesses of segregated special school placement for the mildly handicapped.

The research, writing and attention drawn to special programs set the stage for the changes that began in the 1960's and swept into the 1970's. Legal mandates and interpretations of these mandates influenced the organization and structure of special education throughout the nation.

Resource Teacher Concept

One of the earliest responses to the mandates of the late 1960's was "mainstreaming". Mainstreaming is the term used to refer to a process which provides the most appropriate education for each

⁶Glass and Meckler, p. 152.

⁷Lloyd M. Dunn, "Special Education for the Mildly Handicapped - Is Much of it Justifiable?" Exceptional Children, 35 (1969), 5-22.

⁸F. Christopolos and P. A. Renz, "A Critical Examination of Special Education Programs", Journal of Special Education, (1969), 371-379.

⁹M. S. Lilly, "Special Education: A Teapot in a Tempest," Exceptional Children, 37 (1970), 43-49.

¹⁰Donald Hammill and J. Lee Wiederholt, The Resource Room: Rationale and Implementation (New York: Grune and Stratton, Inc., 1972), p. 1.

child in the setting closest to the regular classroom that is appropriate for the individual student.¹¹ Mainstreaming is further defined as creating alternatives that help regular educators provide help for children with learning or adjustment problems in the regular school setting.¹²

The process of mainstreaming ostensibly unites the tasks of regular education and special education so that all children have equal educational opportunity.¹³ Some of the approaches used to achieve mainstreaming are consulting teachers, and resource teachers.¹⁴ On the continuum of services which serves as the guide for mainstreaming, ". . .the current educational environments for children with mild learning problems consist mainly of resource/consulting teacher programs or some form of self-contained special class."¹⁵

Although the resource concept is not a new idea, resource teacher programs for educable mentally retarded and learning disabled

¹¹"What is Mainstreaming?" Exceptional Children, 42 (1975), 174.

¹²Maynard C. Reynolds and Malcolm D. Davis, Exceptional Children in Regular Classrooms (Minneapolis: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, 1971), pp. 14-16.

¹³"What is Mainstreaming?" Exceptional Children, 42 (1975), 174.

¹⁴David E. Herr, Robert F. Algozzine and Charles M. Heuchert, "Competencies of Teachers of the Mildly Handicapped," The Journal of Special Education, Spring, 1976, pp. 97-98.

¹⁵Joseph R. Jenkins and William F. Mayhall, "Development and Evaluation of a Resource Teacher Program: Exceptional Children, 43 (1976), 21-22.

students did not become prominent until the 1970's.¹⁶ Resource programs for visually handicapped children and hard-of-hearing children existed in the early 1900's. During the 1950's and 1960's, school systems operated resource programs to help children assigned to the regular classroom overcome difficulties in reading and mathematics.¹⁷ Despite the history of resource programs in both elementary education and special education, they did not become popular until serious questions arose about the effects of segregating handicapped students into special classes or separate schools.

Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown define the resource program as it generally exists now as:

" . . .any school operation in which a person (usually the resource teacher) has the responsibility of providing supportive educationally related services to children and/or to their teachers. The resource teacher may provide the student with direct services in the form of analytic, remedial, developmental, or compensatory teaching and/or behavioral management. Such services may be conducted either in the regular classroom or in a room designated for that purpose, such as the resource room or center. The services offered to the regular teachers may include but are not limited to helping them either to adjust or to select curricula to meet the unique needs of some children, and to manage the classroom behavior of disruptive students. In addition, the resource teacher also discusses with parents the problems evidenced by their children."¹⁸

The specific functions of resource teachers included in the Wiederholt

¹⁶Jenkins and Mayhall, p. 22.

¹⁷J. Lee Wiederholt, Donald D. Hammill and Virginia Brown, The Resource Teacher: A Guide to Effective Practices (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), p. 4.

¹⁸Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, p. 4.

definition are expanded later in this chapter.

Role Analysis of Resource Teachers

The role of the resource teacher is influenced by the perceptions of those with whom he/she works. How his/her role is perceived affects the function the resource teacher chooses to perform or is allowed to perform.¹⁹

Role Perceptions

The use of perceptions in analyzing roles is founded in the study of role theory from the fields of sociology and psychology. Allport,²⁰ Biddle and Thomas,²¹ and Thompson²² suggest that a role is significantly effected by the perceptions and expectations of self and others. Victor J. Thompson in Modern Organizations defines a role as "an organized pattern of behavior in accordance with the expectations of others."²³ Role theory can be viewed as the expectations others hold for the behavior of a person and, in turn, the behavior of the

¹⁹James A. McLaughlin and Corrine Kass, "Resource Teachers: Their Role," Learning Disability Quarterly Winter 1978 , pp.56-60.

²⁰G. Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 43-62.

²¹Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, eds., Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 29.

²²Victor A. Thompson, Modern Organizations: A General Theory (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 58.

²³Thompson, p. 58.

person is influenced by expectations.²⁴

16

A source in an article by Canady and Leyforth summarized the concept of role theory in regard to education in this way:

There is a complex or structure of norms, involving behaviors of teachers, principals, pupils, parents, citizens and others in regard to the formal educational process. The nature of this structure, the kinds of expectations the members of these groups have for themselves and for each other, and extent of agreement among the members of each group and between groups, will have an effect on the relations of the individuals and the effectiveness of the total educational program. . . .²⁵

Gross said "role is a set of expectations, or in terms of our definition of expectations, it is a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position."²⁶

Cortu described a role as:

A socially prescribed way of behavior in particular situations for any person occupying a given social status. A role represents what a person is supposed to do in a given situation by virtue of the social position he holds.²⁶

Cottrell perceived a role as having the factors of being unique and cultural. The cultural role was identified by responses of one which constitutes the culturally expected behavior, and the unique role was the system of responses with which a specific individual

²⁴Biddle and Thomas, pp. 302-310.

²⁵Robert Lynn Canady and John T. Leyforth, "Teacher-Administration Expectations in Defining Roles for Paraprofessional" Education, 92 (1972), 99-102.

²⁶Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 60.

Sargent defined role as:

". . . a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group . . . But never is a role wholly cultural, wholly personal, or wholly situational. A given role, as conceptualized and as enacted, is affected by differing degrees of these components.²⁸

Biddle et.al., commented:

". . . that perhaps the most common definition is that role is the set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be. A careful review of the definitions reveals, however, that there is one nearly universal denominator, namely that the concept pertains to the behaviors of particular persons . . ." ²⁹

A source of conflict with roles and role functions stems from differences in perceptions of the role. Principals, resource teachers, regular teachers and others may consciously or unconsciously disagree about what role responsibilities are, as well as which responsibilities are most important. Richard Anderson, in a recent study, compared the perceptions of teachers of educable mentally retarded students and their principals on basic role activities in order to establish any possible role conflict as a result of differences of perceptions. His findings indicated that misunderstandings and/or

²⁷Leonard S. Cottrell, "The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles" American Sociology Review, 7 (1942), 618-625.

²⁸Stansfeld S. Sargent, "Conceptions of Role and Ego in Contemporary Psychology," Social Psychology at the Crossroads, ed. John H. Rohrer and Muzaffer Sherif (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1951) p. 359.

²⁹Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, editors, Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 29.

differences of opinion often resulted in lack of support to perform the role activities.³⁰

Another aspect of role analysis is the assessment of what people think a role is, as opposed to what they think it should be. In this way, potential problems can be identified across other dimensions. This examination of roles can indicate a lack of congruance by persons performing a role and by persons utilizing or receiving the services of the role function.

Functions of the Resource Teacher

A part of the role of the resource teacher is determined by what others perceive as functions to be performed by the resource teacher. The special education literature contains many references to the resource teacher most of which describe a narrow set of resource teacher functions. Only when the literature is reviewed in its totality is it possible to perceive the wide range of functions the resource teacher is expected to perform. The most salient of these functions are:

A. Assessment and Placement Responsibilities

1. Develop and distribute a referral form for the purpose of referring EMR and LD students.
2. Refer EMR and LD students for special class placement.
3. Observe referred students to gather further information for placement decisions.

³⁰Richard D. Anderson, "Role and Teacher of Educable Mentally Retarded Elementary Children" The Journal of Special Education, 10 (1976), 383-391.

4. Communicate to faculties the total placement procedure.
 5. Determine when and/or if an EMR or LD student should discontinue being served by the resource teacher.
 6. Serve as a leader on the placement and/or assessment committee.
 7. Determine the time of day the special education student will go to the resource room or see the resource teacher.
 8. Determine which diagnostic tests will be used to determine present level of functioning of the special education student.
- B. Instruction of EMR and LD Students and Arrangement for Other Special Services
1. Adapt the regular classroom curriculum to meet the specific strengths and weaknesses of the special education student.
 2. Arrange for speech therapy for special education students when needed.
 3. Adapt the special class curriculum to the specific strengths and weaknesses of the student.
 4. Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in math.
 5. Task analyze skills for EMR and LD students so that skills can be taught in small steps.
 6. Determine the method for remediating weaknesses in handwriting.
 7. Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in reading.
 8. Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in language.
 9. Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught in the resource room.
 10. Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught by the regular classroom teacher.
 11. Determine the curriculum content for each EMR and LD child in all areas.

12. Arrange for peer tutors for the EMR and LD student within the regular classroom.
13. Test different teaching approaches to determine the most appropriate for the EMR and LD student.
14. Provide one-to-one instruction.
15. Make supplementary materials for the EMR and LD student to use in the regular classroom.

C. Social and Emotional Development

1. Counsel students regarding personal problems, i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.
2. Set up a behavior management program in the regular classroom in order to manage the EMR-LD student's behavior.
3. Maintain data on student's behavior for purpose of evaluation.
4. Arrange activities that highlight the abilities and strengths of the special education students.
5. Teach socially appropriate behaviors to students.

D. Parent Involvement

1. Develop an individualized educational plan for each special education student.
2. Seek parental consent for placement.
3. Communicate to parents when the EMR and LD student needs to practice school work at home.
4. Train parents to tutor students using special materials and methods.
5. Determine whether to involve parents in home tutoring.
6. Develop a method of reporting progress/or adapt the report card for work done in the resource room.
7. Communicate to parents what the future placements might be for the special education student.
8. Seek parents' views on curriculum concerns and priorities.
9. Develop a method of reporting progress/or adapt the report card for work done in the regular classroom.

10. Invite parents to visit the school.
11. Ask parents to participate in P.T.A.

A discussion of these functions follows:

Assessment and Placement

Major phases in placement procedures include referral, assessment, and decision-making. The referral process is the step in placement that has the greatest documented involvement by regular classroom teachers. Referral often originates with the regular teacher because students are usually placed in the regular classroom fulltime until specific needs are identified.³¹ The resource teacher's input at this level of the placement procedure is to assist in the coordination of referral and the gathering of information.³²

Resource teachers assume substantial responsibility for assessment activities.³³ Assessment includes determining the current level of achievement and pinpointing learning problems. Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown indicate the significant role of the resource teacher by defining assessment as:

" . . . all activities that resource teachers use to identify and obtain information about children's instructional needs. These activities include administering, scoring, and interpreting both norm and criterion-referenced tests, using various

³¹Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank, p. 56.

³²Bill R. Gearheart and Mel W. Weishahn, The Handicapped Child in the Regular Classroom (St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Company, 1976), p. 89.

³³Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank, p. 57.

analytic teaching techniques, interviewing parents, teachers and/or students, and directly observing children in everyday school situations.³⁴

Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank add to the responsibility of the regular classroom teacher by pointing out that ". . .regular teachers often have more hours of contact with the referred student during the day than any other individual."³⁵ For this reason, regular teachers need to participate with other placement team members in obtaining an accurate and comprehensive assessment of the student's strengths and weaknesses.³⁶

Decision-making for placement is required by law to be a team effort when involving handicapped students. Regular and resource teachers are among those recommended to be members of the special education placement committee.³⁷

Other functions in the placement phase include leadership on the placement team, decision-making as to the student's placement and involvement in the continuous monitoring of the students' progress in the new placement. Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank,³⁸

³⁴Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, p. 13.

³⁵Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank, p. 57.

³⁶Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank, p. 56.

³⁷"Functions of the Placement Committee in Special Education" (Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 1976) pp. 14-16.

³⁸Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank, p. 57.

Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown,³⁹ and Gearheart and Weishahn⁴⁰ all support the contention that there are different levels of involvement by regular and resource teachers in the placement procedures. Communicating to teachers the type of help available through the resource program and explaining the format of the total placement procedure are functions often assumed by resource teachers.

Instruction

The function most cited as the responsibility of the resource teacher in the area of instruction of mainstreamed educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students is to serve as a resource to both the regular teacher and the student.⁴¹ This resource can be consultation to the regular teacher concerning curriculum adaptation to meet the specific strengths and weaknesses of the student. It may also be a resource delivered directly to the EMR and LD student through individualized instruction. Individualized instruction to EMR and LD students is cited by Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank⁴² and Hammill and Wiederholt.⁴³ Jenkins also strongly advocates the function of individualizing instruction

³⁹Wiederholt, Hammill and Brown, pp. 54-56.

⁴⁰Gearheart and Weishahn, pp. 24-25.

⁴¹Resource-Regular Class Programs Serving EMR Pupils (Raleigh, N.C., State Department of Public Instruction, Division for Exceptional Children, 1972).

⁴²Paul, Turnbull and Cruickshank, pp. 60-65.

⁴³Hammill and Wiederholt, pp. 25-27.

for handicapped students by resource teachers.⁴⁴ Jenkins states:

"Referred children have in the past failed to learn with group instruction, indicating that they require more individual personal attention."⁴⁵

Regular teacher involvement is indicated in the areas of individualization that include adapting curriculum goals, tailoring classwork and homework assignment levels, modifying the standard and method of grading and adjusting and/or programming for the standard of classroom behavior for students with behavioral or emotional problems.⁴⁶

Social and Emotional Development

The social and emotional adjustment of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students through individual counseling and determining what social skills are necessary to function in the regular classroom are functions that are indicated as integral to the successful mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students. Anderson, in his study of the role of the teacher of educable mentally retarded students, included counseling children regarding personal problems, such as sibling rivalry and child-parent relations.⁴⁷ The management of behavior through consul-

⁴⁴ Joseph R. Jenkins and William F. Mayhall, "Development and Evaluation of a Resource Teacher Program," Exceptional Children, 43 (1976), 21-29.

⁴⁵ Jenkins and Mayhall, p. 21-29.

⁴⁶ Jenkins and Mayhall, p. 21-29.

⁴⁷ Anderson, pp. 383-391.

tation with classroom teachers and assistance in setting up behavior management systems are additional functions prescribed for the special education resource teacher.

Parent Involvement

Parents of handicapped students must now be involved in educational decision-making and programming because of the requirements of federal and state laws. Several areas of concern under the category of parent involvement in the education of mainstreamed EMR and LD students are located in special education literature. An important teacher responsibility is the reporting of progress or grades to parents regarding the student's performance.⁴⁸ This is often a particularly sensitive area since many handicapped students in regular classes have achieved below grade level in some or all academic areas. The way teachers report grades may significantly contribute, positively or negatively, to building the teacher-parent relationship and may effect the student's self-concept and social adjustment.

Parent input in the development of the individual education program for all special education students is required by federal and state mandates. This input by parents requires parents to be involved in determining instructional priorities and curriculum plans.

⁴⁸ Gilbert R. Guerin and Kathleen Szatlocky, "Integration Programs for the Mildly Retarded", Exceptional Children, 41 (1974), 173-179.

Remedial instruction designed for handicapped students may suggest follow-up practice sessions at home. Training and counseling parents to help them work with their children are responsibilities assumed by regular and resource teachers. Helping parents to accept the limitations of their children and to set realistic expectations for them are tasks that resource teachers should have skill to carry out.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

The procedures used in this investigation included developing an instrument for collecting information, identifying and selecting various types of individuals to respond to the instrument, and analyzing the collected data in order to test the hypotheses proposed for the study. The specific instruments, population samples, and statistical procedures were used to fulfill the purpose of the study.

Development of Opinionnaire

After the general purpose of this study was defined and after tentative hypotheses to be tested were formulated, an opinionnaire (Appendix) was developed to determine the perceptions of the responsibilities of resource teachers and regular education teachers for the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. Development of the opinionnaire included the selection of research advisors to provide guidance and expertise in format and response choices. Functions or responsibilities associated with education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students were identified through a review of the literature. Additionally, administering the opinionnaire on a trial basis and editing and revising it prior to the actual administration were steps in the development of the opinionnaire.

Advisement on the development of the opinionnaire was provided by five special education university instructors, two research specialists and twelve special education teachers and special education supervisors. These individuals were involved in recommending functions to be included in the opinionnaire, in suggesting levels of responsibility that became options for the respondents, and in recommending the format for the opinionnaire. Six of the individuals were also involved in reacting to and editing the instrument at various stages of its development.

Functions that were included in the opinionnaire were collected by reviewing pertinent literature, and by obtaining recommendations from the special education advisors. After an initial list of functions was compiled, the advisors were asked to indicate whether the items represented a legitimate function in educating mentally retarded and learning disabled students (content validity) and were asked to edit items for clarity.

Selected advisors also recommended a format for the opinionnaire and options which would represent varying degrees of responsibility for functions on the part of resource teachers and regular classroom teachers. It was the consensus of the advisors that the format of the instrument should be designed so that the options for who should be responsible, and options for who is responsible should be parallel. Such an arrangement would allow the respondent to read, from left to right, a particular function and assign both "should" and "is" alternatives before reacting to the next function.

The five categories of responsibility selected for resource and regular teachers were as follows:

1. This function should be entirely or ultimately the responsibility of the resource teacher. If it gets done, the resource teacher should be responsible.

2. This function should be the responsibility of the resource teacher, but some input by the regular teacher is needed or useful. It is still mostly the responsibility of the resource teacher.

3. This function should be shared equally between the resource teacher and the regular teacher. The responsibility for this function should rest with both teachers.

4. This function should be the responsibility of the regular teacher, but some input by the resource teacher is needed or useful. It should still mostly be the responsibility of the regular teacher.

5. This function should be entirely or ultimately the responsibility of the regular teacher. If it gets done, the regular teacher should be responsible. The options were coded one (1) through five (5) in both the "should" and "is" columns for the purpose of key punching and identification on computer printouts. The magnitude of the coded option did not indicate the desirability of a choice in that a number 5 option was not necessarily considered a better choice than an option with a lower number. The accumulation or averaging of the coded numbers was inappropriate. Interpretation consisted of obtaining frequencies for the various options prior to using statistical procedures. This method provided a means for contrasting the proportion of responses between and among the four groups which participated in the investigation.

A draft of the opinionnaire was administered to fifteen class-

room teachers. The teachers were requested to complete the instrument by circling appropriate options for each function and to record on the opinionnaire suggestions about the instructions, the stated functions, the responsibility options, and the format. The responses to the trial run of the opinionnaire were recorded and summarized. Comments from the teachers about various components of the opinionnaire were considered in the development of the opinionnaire. (Appendix).

In keeping with the objectives of this investigation, 198 persons were selected to participate in this study. The groups included 50 resource teachers who worked with educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students, 50 regular classroom teachers, 52 college students enrolled in special education training programs, and 46 college students enrolled in regular education training programs. Participants in the two teacher groups were selected at random from the total number of resource teachers and regular teachers employed during the 1977-78 school year in the Greensboro Public Schools, Greensboro, North Carolina. All of the teachers participating in this study have direct contact with educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. These students have been mainstreamed in the Greensboro Public Schools for the past seven years. Both resource teachers and regular education teachers have been responsible for the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students during these past seven years of mainstreaming. The students in the two student categories were selected from senior level classes in special education and regular education courses that were in session during the 1978 Spring and

Summer Sessions at Agricultural and Technical State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and Greensboro College in Greensboro, North Carolina.

The number of resource teachers and regular teachers employed in the Greensboro City Schools during 1977-78 and the number of teachers and students who responded to the opinionnaire are shown in Table 1. Of the 198 total participants, 50 were resource teachers, 50 were regular teachers, 52 were special education students, and 46 were regular education students.

Analysis of Data

Since the data that were collected in this investigation are non-continuous variables, it was necessary to obtain frequencies for various response alternatives. For example, there was no logic in assigning numerical values, except for coding purposes, to the four categories of respondents. Likewise, it was inappropriate to assign continuous numerical values to the five responsibility alternatives that the respondent chose, since the five alternatives could not be ranked in terms of importance or desirability.

The appropriate statistical procedure for testing hypotheses with non-continuous variables is the chi square test. This test determines whether there are significant differences between and among the proportion of responses assigned to the five responsibility levels for various functions by the four categories of respondents. This statistical technique was used to determine: (1) whether there were significant differences between and among the perceptions of groups relative to who is responsible for functions, (2) whether there were significant differences between and among the perceptions of groups

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS,
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS WHO COMPLETED OPINIONNAIRE

Groups	Total Population	Number Participating	Percent Participating
Resource Teachers	82	50	60
Regular Teachers	511	50	10
Special Education Students	NA*	52	NA
Regular Education Students	NA	46	NA

*Not available

relative to who should be responsible for functions, and (3) whether there were significant differences between the perceptions within each group relative to who should be responsible and who is responsible for various functions.

For the purpose of this study, differences between and among groups were considered significant when the observed chi squares were of such magnitude that they would be expected to occur by chance in five or fewer times in 100 times. (.05 confidence level).

In addition to indicating whether proportions of responses between and among groups are significantly different, chi square analysis indicates the number and percent of responses assigned to each responsibility alternative by each category of respondents. The degree that each group favors each responsibility option, thus, can be observed.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data collected in this investigation were analyzed to test the ten hypotheses that follow:

1. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and regular teachers relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

2. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and regular teachers relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

3. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and special education university students relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

4. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and special education university students relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

5. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular teachers and regular education university students relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

6. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular teachers and regular education university students relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

7. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular education university students and special education students relative to who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

8. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of regular education university students and special education students relative to who is responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

9. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of resource teachers as to who is and who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

10. There are no significant differences among the perceptions of regular teachers as to who is and who should be responsible for forty selected functions concerned with teaching educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

Chi square analyses were made to determine whether there were significant differences among and between the proportion of responses assigned to the five responsibility alternatives for each of forty selected functions by the four different groups. For each function, an analyses was made to test significant differences among resource

teachers, regular teachers, college students enrolled in special education and college students enrolled in regular education courses. Also, for each function an analyses was made between each of the groups and each of the other groups. The .05 level of confidence was used for determining whether the observed differences between and among the proportions of responses were significant.

When chi squares were calculated between paired groups for the forty functions, it was observed that the proportion of responses between the resource teachers and the regular teachers were significantly different on 25 or 62 percent of the forty functions; between the regular teachers and the regular education student on 37 or 92 percent of the functions; and between the special education student and the regular education student, 38 or 95 percent of the forty functions.

Tables 2-11 have been set up to indicate the specific items that teachers and students agreed on and lists the items for which there was a significant difference of opinion. The items or functions from the opinionnaire (Appendix) have been abbreviated on the tables. The number at the end of each item indicates its position on the opinionnaire.

In addition to the information presented here in tables 2-11, tables 12-66 provide an item by item analysis of the functions in the opinionnaire. These tables also cross compare each group with each other on an item by item basis. These tables provide a reference for a more in-depth examination of the responses of the teachers and students on the opinionnaire.

Hypothesis 1

The functions on which there was consensus or no significant differences between responses for the resource teachers and regular teachers is reported in Table 2. Table 2 indicates that there was consensus as to who resource teachers and regular teacher perceived as should be responsible on 15 items. There were significant differences or disagreements on 25 of the 40 selected items.

Hypothesis 2

Table 3 indicates the items of consensus and items of differences as to who resource teachers and regular teachers perceive is responsible for 40 selected items. There was consensus on 15 items and significant differences between the two teacher groups on 25 items.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis #3 deals with the perceptions of resource teachers and special education university students. The perceptions of these two groups as to who is responsible for the 40 items on the opinionnaire are outlined in Table 4. This table indicates that there was consensus on 23 items and significant differences on 17 items as to who is responsible for the items.

Hypothesis 4

Table 5 shows the level of agreement and disagreement between resource teachers and special education students as to who should be responsible for the opinionnaire items. This table indicates 28 items of consensus and 12 items in which there were significant differences in the perceptions of resource teachers and special education univer-

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESOURCE TEACHERS
AND REGULAR TEACHERS AS TO WHO SHOULD BE
RESPONSIBLE FOR LISTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Develop individualized educational plan.(4)
3. Determine reading method.(5)
4. Determine language method.(8)
5. Develop referral form.(10)
6. Observe referred students.(11)
7. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
8. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
9. Counsel students.(17)
10. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
11. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
12. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
13. Teach social behaviors.(32)
14. Determine curriculum content.(34)
15. Determine regular class sequence of skills.(39)

Items in which there were significant differences

1. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
2. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
3. Determine handwriting method.(6)
4. Determine math method.(7)
5. Task analyze skills.(9)
6. Refer students for placement.(12)
7. Placement committee leader.(13)
8. Set time of day for resource.(16)
9. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
10. Seek parental consent.(19)
11. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
12. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
13. Communicate future placements.(24)
14. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
15. Invite parents to school.(26)
16. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
17. Set up behavioral program.(28)
18. Ask parents to PTA.(29)
19. Locate reference materials.(31)
20. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
21. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
22. Make supplementary materials.(36)
23. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
24. Determine resource sequence of skills.(38)
25. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESOURCE TEACHERS
AND REGULAR TEACHERS AS TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE
FOR LISTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Task analyze skills.(9)
2. Develop referral form.(10)
3. Observe referred students.(11)
4. Placement committee leader.(13)
5. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
6. Counsel students.(17)
7. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
8. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
9. Communicate future placements.(24)
10. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
11. Teach social behaviors.(32)
12. Determine curriculum content.(34)
13. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
14. Determine resource sequence of skills.(38)
15. Determine regular class sequence of skills.(39)

Items in which there were significant differences

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
4. Develop individualized educational plan.(4)
5. Determine reading method.(5)
6. Determine handwriting method.(6)
7. Determine math method.(7)
8. Determine language method.(8)
9. Refer students for placement.(12)
10. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
11. Set time of day for resource.(16)
12. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
13. Seek parental consent.(19)
14. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
15. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
16. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
17. Invite parents to school.(26)
18. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
19. Set up behavior program.(28)
20. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
21. Locate reference materials.(31)
22. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
23. Make supplementary materials.(36)
24. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
25. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

A COMPARISON OF THE PRECEPTIONS OF RESOURCE TEACHERS
AND SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AS TO WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR LISTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
2. Develop individualized educational plan.(4)
3. Determine reading method.(5)
4. Determine handwriting method.(6)
5. Determine math method.(7)
6. Task analyze skills.(9)
7. Placement committee leader.(13)
8. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
9. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
10. Seek parental consent.(19)
11. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
12. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
13. Communicate future placements.(24)
14. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
15. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
16. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
17. Locate reference materials.(31)
18. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
19. Make supplementary materials.(36)
20. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
21. Determine resource requence of skills.(38)
22. Determine regular class sequence of skills.(39)
23. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

Items in which there were significant differences

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Determine language method.(8)
4. Develop referral form.(10)
5. Observe referred students.(11)
6. Refer students for placement.(12)
7. Set time of day for resource.(16)
8. Counsel students.(17)
9. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
10. Communicate to paretns-homework.(20)
11. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
12. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
13. Invite parents to school.(26)
14. Set up behavior program.(28)
15. Teach social behaviors.(32)
16. Determine curriculum content.(34)
17. Arrange peer tutors.(35)

A COMPARISON OF THE PRECEPTIONS OF RESOURCE TEACHERS
AND SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AS TO WHO SHOULD
BE RESPONSIBLE FOR LISTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Determine reading method.(5)
4. Determine math method.(7)
5. Determine language method.(8)
6. Task analyze skill.(9)
7. Observe referred students.(11)
8. Refer students for placement.(12)
9. Counsel students.(17)
10. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
11. Seek parental consent.(19)
12. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
13. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
14. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
15. Communicate future placement.(24)
16. Train parents for tutorings.(25)
17. Invite parents to school.(26)
18. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
19. Maintain behavioral date.(30)
20. Locate reference materails.(31)
21. Teach social behaviors.(32)1
22. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
23. Determine curriculum content.(34)
24. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
25. Make supplementary materials.(36)
26. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
27. Determine resource sequence of skill.(38)
28. Determine regular class sequence of skills.(39)

Items in which there were significant differences

1. Adapt special class curriculums.(3)
2. Develop individualized educational plan.(4)
3. Determine handwriting method.(6)
4. Develop referral form.(10)
5. Placement committee leader.(13)
6. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
7. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
8. Set time of day for resource.(16)
9. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
10. Set up behavior program.(28)
11. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
12. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

sity students.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis #5 is concerned with the perceptions of regular teachers and regular education university students. The perceptions of these two groups as to who is responsible for the 40 items are indicated on Table 6. This table lists the six items for which there was consensus between these two groups and the thirty-four items on which there were significant differences.

Hypothesis 6

The level of consensus and the level of differences between regular teachers and regular education students as to who should be responsible for items listed on the opinionnaire are delineated on Table 7. There were 3 items of consensus and 37 items for which there were significant differences or opinion between these 2 groups.

Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis #7 deals with a comparison of the perceptions of the two university student groups in this study. The perceptions of the regular education students and special education students as to who is responsible for the functions listed are reported in Table 8. This table shows agreement or consensus on four items and significant disagreement on 36 items.

Hypothesis 8

Table 9 shows the level of agreement and differences between the two groups of students as to who should be responsible for the items on the opinionnaire. There were only two items on which the

TABLE 6

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF REGULAR EDUCATION
TEACHERS AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS AS TO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR LISTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
2. Develop individualized education plan.(4)
3. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
4. Set up behavior program.(28)
5. Determine regular class sequence of skill.(39)
6. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

Items in which there were significant differences

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Determine reading method.(5)
4. Determine handwriting methods.(6)
5. Determine math method.(7)
6. Determine language method.(8)
7. Task analyze skills.(9)
8. Develop referral form.(10)
9. Observe referred students.(11)
10. Refer students for placement.(12)
11. Placement committee leader.(13)
12. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
13. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
14. Set time of day for resource.(16)
15. Counsel students.(17)
16. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
17. Seek parental consent.(19)
18. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
19. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
20. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
21. Communicate future placements.(24)
22. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
23. Invite parents to school.(26)
24. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
25. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
26. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
27. Locate reference materials.(31)
28. Teach social behaviors.(32)
29. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
30. Determine curriculum content.(34)
31. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
32. Make supplementary materials.(36)
33. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
34. Determine resource sequence os skills.(38)

TABLE 7

A COMPARISON OF THE PRECEPTIONS OF REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS AS TO WHO SHOULD BE
RESPONSIBLE FOR LISTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
2. Determine language method.(8)
3. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)

Items of which there were significant differences

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
3. Develop individual education program.(4)
4. Determine reading method.(5)
5. Determine handwriting method.(6)
6. Determine math method.(7)
7. Task analyze skills.(9)
8. Develop referral form.(10)
9. Observe referred students.(11)
10. Refer students for placement.(12)
11. Placement committee leader.(13)
12. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
13. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
14. Set time of day for resource.(16)
15. Counsel students.(17)
16. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
17. Seek parental consent.(19)
18. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
19. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
20. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
21. Communicate future placements.(24)
22. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
23. Invite parents to school.(26)
24. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
25. Set up behavior program.(28)
26. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
27. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
28. Locate reference materials.(31)
29. Teach social behaviors.(32)
30. Highlight abilities of students(33)
31. Determine curriculum content.(34)
32. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
33. Make supplementary materials.(36)
34. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
35. Determine resource sequence of skills.(38)
36. Determine regular class sequence of skills.(39)
37. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF REGULAR EDUCATION AND
SPECIAL EDUCATION UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AS TO WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR SELECTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Refer students for placement.(12)
2. Set time of day for resource.(16)
3. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
4. Determine resource sequence of skills.(38)

Items of which there were significant differences

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
4. Develop individual education plan.(4)
5. Determine reading method.(5)
6. Determine handwriting method.(6)
7. Determine math method.(7)
8. Determine language method.(8)
9. Task analyze skills.(9)
10. Develop referral form.(10)
11. Observe referred students.(11)
12. Placement committee leader.(13)
13. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
14. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
15. Counsel students.(17)
16. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
17. Seek parental consent.(19)
18. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
19. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
20. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
21. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
22. Communicate future placements.(24)
23. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
24. Invite parents to school.(26)
25. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
26. Set up behavior program.(28)
27. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
28. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
29. Locate reference materials.(31)
30. Teach social behaviors.(32)
31. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
32. Determine curriculum content.(34)
33. Make supplementary materials.(36)
34. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
35. Determine resource sequence of skills.(38)
36. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

TABLE 9

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF REGULAR EDUCATION AND
SPECIAL EDUCATION UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AS TO WHO
SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR SELECTED FUNCTIONS

Items of Consensus

1. Refer students for placements.(12)
2. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)

Items of which there were significant differences

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
4. Develop individual educational plan.(4)
5. Determine reading method.(5)
6. Determine handwriting method.(6)
7. Determine math method.(7)
8. Determine language method.(8)
9. Develop referral form.(10)
10. Observe referred student.(11)
11. Placement committee leader.(13)
12. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
13. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
14. Set time of day of resource.(16)
15. Counsel students.(17)
16. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
17. Seek parental consent.(19)
18. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
19. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
20. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
21. Communicate future placements.(24)
22. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
23. Invite parents to school.(26)
24. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
25. Set up behavior program.(28)
26. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
27. Maintain behavioral data.(30)
28. Locate reference materials.(31)
29. Teach social behaviors.(32)
30. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
31. Determine curriculum content.(34)
32. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
33. Make supplementary materials.(36)
34. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
35. Determine resource sequence of skills.(38)
36. Determine regular class sequence of skills, (39)
37. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

student groups agreed. Thirty-eight items are listed on which there were significant differences between the two groups.

Within Group Analysis

In addition to an analysis of the data to determine differences between groups on how they perceived levels of responsibilities selected from the literature, an analysis was made within the two teacher groups. This analysis was made to determine the differences in how each group perceived the status of how things are so opposed to how they think they should be.

Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis #9 is concerned with the differences within the resource teacher group as to who is responsible and who should be responsible for the functions listed on the opinionnaire. Table 10 shows the items for which there were no significant differences between who is and who should be responsible. There are seven items which fall into this category. Also on this table are listed the thirty-three items for which there were significant differences in opinion within the resource teacher group.

Hypothesis 10

Within the regular teacher group participating in this study, there were differences in how the groups perceived who is responsible and who should be responsible for the listed items considered important in the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. Table 11 illustrates the eight items for which there was agreement. There were thirty-two items for which there was significant disagreement.

TABLE 10

A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESOURCE TEACHERS
AS TO WHO IS AND WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE
FOR SELECTED FUNCTIONS

Items for which there were no significant differences between who is and who should be responsible.

1. Determine math method. (7)
2. Develop referral form (10)
3. Observe referred students. (11)
4. Determine diagnostic tests. (18)
5. Determine reading method. (5)
6. Train parents for tutoring. (25)
7. Ask parents to P.T.A. (29)

Items for which there were significant differences between who is and who should be responsible

1. Arrange speech therapy. (1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum. (2)
3. Adapt special class curriculum. (3)
4. Develop individual educational plan. (4)
5. Determine reading method. (5)
6. Determine handwriting method. (6)
7. Determine language method. (8)
8. Task analyze skills. (9)
9. Refer students for placement. (12)
10. Placement committee leader. (13)
11. Communicate placement procedure. (14)
12. Determine EMR and LD exit. (15)
13. Set time of day for resource. (16)
14. Counsel students. (17)
15. Seek parental consent. (19)
16. Communicate to parents— homework. (20)
17. Develop resource reporting technique. (22)
18. Develop regular reporting technique. (23)
19. Communicate future placements. (24)
20. Invite parents to school. (26)
21. Seek parents'view on curriculum. (27)
22. Set up behavior program. (28)
23. Maintain behavioral data. (30)
24. Locate reference materials. (31)
25. Teach social behaviors. (32)
26. Highlight abilities of students. (33)
27. Determine curriculum content. (34)
28. Arrange peer tutors. (35)
29. Make supplementary materials. (36)
30. Test different teaching approaches. (37)
31. Determine resource sequence of skills. (38)
32. Determine regular class sequence of skills. (39)
33. Provide one-to-one instruction. (40)

TABLE 11

A COMPARISON OF THE PRECEPTIONS OF REGULAR TEACHERS
AS TO WHO IS AND WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE
FOR SELECTED FUNCTIONS

Items for which there were no significant differences between who is and who should be responsible.

1. Seek parental consent.(19)
2. Communicate to parents-homework.(20)
3. Develop resource reporting technique.(22)
4. Develop regular reporting technique.(23)
5. Communicate future placements.(24)
6. Train parents for tutoring.(25)
7. Seek parents view on curriculum.(27)
8. Maintain behavioral data.(30)

Items for which there were significant differences between who is and who should be responsible.

1. Arrange speech therapy.(1)
2. Adapt regular class curriculum.(2)
3. Adapt special class curriculum.(3)
4. Develop individual educational plan.(4)
5. Determine reading method.(5)
6. Determine handwriting method.(6)
7. Determine math method.(7)
8. Determine language method.(8)
9. Task analyze skills.(9)
10. Develop referral form.(10)
11. Observe referred students.(11)
12. Refer students for placement.(12)
13. Placement committee leader.(13)
14. Communicate placement procedure.(14)
15. Determine EMR and LD exit.(15)
16. Set time of day for resource.(16)
17. Counsel students.(17)
18. Determine diagnostic tests.(18)
19. Determine parent involvement in tutoring.(21)
20. Invite parents to school.(26)
21. Set up behavior program.(28)
22. Ask parents to P.T.A.(29)
23. Locate reference materials.(31)
24. Teach social behaviors.(32)
25. Highlight abilities of students.(33)
26. Determine curriculum content.(34)
27. Arrange peer tutors.(35)
28. Make supplementary materials.(36)
29. Test different teaching approaches.(37)
30. Determine resource sequences of skills.(38)
31. Determine regular class sequence of skills.(39)
32. Provide one to one instruction.(40)

Item by Item Analysis

Tables 12-65 illustrate the agreements and differences of the perceptions of the two teacher groups and the two university student groups on an item by item basis. The tables indicate the number of responses and the corresponding percentages for each choice of response for each item on the opinionnaire. The tables also provide the chi square value and significance level for each group as compared to each other group.

Table 12

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Arrange for speech therapy for special education students when needed.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	14	28	2	4	4	9	25	13
Mostly Resource	9	18	0	0	13	25	9	20	31	16
Equally Shared	27	55	31	62	35	67	22	48	115	58
Mostly Regular	6	12	5	10	2	4	9	20	22	11
Entirely Regular	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	2
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=36.21 p=.0003
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=15.62 p=.0036
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.96 p= .1379
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 1.13 p= .8899
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=23.50 P=.0001
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=19.09 P=.0008
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=10.49 P=.0330

Function: Adapting the regular classroom curriculum to meet the specific strengths and weaknesses of the special education student.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	8	16	8	16	7	13	7	15	30	15
Mostly Resource	25	50	27	54	13	25	2	4	67	34
Equally Shared	17	34	15	30	29	56	19	41	80	40
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	33	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	5	3
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=78.49 p=.0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 0.20 P=.9040
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.95 P=.0413
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=37.67 P=.001
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=12.39 P=.0147
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=39.99 P=.0001
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.32 P=.0002

Table 13

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Adapt the special class curriculum to the specific strengths and weaknesses of the student.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	19	38	11	22	18	35	10	22	58	29
Mostly Resource	25	50	13	26	12	23	7	15	57	29
Equally Shared	5	10	21	42	20	38	9	20	55	28
Mostly Regular	1	2	5	10	2	4	18	39	26	13
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=66.46 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=18.44 p=.0004

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=13.89 p=.0031

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=31.16 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.00 p=.3914

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.86 p=.0032

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.29 p=.0002

Function: Developing an individualized educational plan for each special education student.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	8	16	8	16	7	13	7	15	30	15
Mostly Resource	25	50	27	54	13	25	2	4	67	34
Equally Shared	17	34	15	30	29	56	19	41	80	40
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	33	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	5	3
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=78.49 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 0.20 p=.9040

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.95 p=.0413

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=37.67 p=.001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=12.39 p=.0147

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=39.99 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.32 p=.0002

Table 14

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in reading.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	14	6	12	2	4	3	7	18	9
Mostly Resource	16	33	21	41	18	35	4	9	59	30
Equally Shared	25	51	22	42	30	58	25	56	102	52
Mostly Regular	1	2	2	4	2	4	11	24	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1
Totals	49		51		52		45		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=40.25 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 1.24 p= .7439

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.60 p= .3084

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 19.00 p= .0008

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.45 P= .3270

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=20.69 p= .0004

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 17.38 P= .0016

Function: Determine the method for remediating weaknesses in handwriting.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	6	12	1	2	2	5	14	7
Mostly Resource	19	39	13	25	18	35	3	7	53	27
Equally Shared	25	51	24	47	27	52	18	42	94	48
Mostly Regular	0	0	8	16	6	12	16	37	30	15
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	2
Totals	49		51		52		43		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=50.59 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 9.20 p=.0267

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.69 p=.0337

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=33.81 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.83 p=.1846

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.20 p=.0043

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=20.73 p=.0004

Table 15

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in math.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	14	6	12	2	4	2	4	17	9
Mostly Resource	21	42	13	25	20	38	4	9	58	29
Equally Shared	22	44	26	51	28	54	23	51	99	50
Mostly Regular	0	0	6	12	2	4	14	31	22	11
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1
Totals	50		51		52		45		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=47.04 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 8.28 p=.0405

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.49 p=.1395

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=30.18 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.55 p=.1357

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 11.82 p=.0187

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 0.47 p=.0002

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in language.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	6	12	7	14	2	4	2	4	17	8
Mostly Resource	18	37	14	27	20	38	6	13	58	29
Equally Shared	25	51	24	47	28	54	27	60	104	53
Mostly Regular	0	0	6	12	2	4	10	22	18	9
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	49		51		52		45		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=26.62 p=.0016

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=6.56 p=.0873

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=4.19 p=.2417

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=17.94 p=.0005

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.14 p=.1052

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 6.81 p=.0784

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=12.45 p=.0060

Table 16

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Task analyze skills for EMR and LD students so that skills
can be taught in small steps.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	11	22	24	47	10	19	8	18	53	27
Mostly Resource	25	50	20	39	18	35	10	22	73	37
Equally Shared	14	28	7	14	20	38	11	24	52	26
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	4	8	15	33	19	9
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
Totals	50		51		52		45		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=61.66 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 7.71 p= .0212

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.12 p= .1019

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=23.06 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 16.12 P=.0011

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=27.96 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 12.05 P=.0170

Function: Develop and distribute a referral form for the purpose of
referring EMR and LD students.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	30	61	32	63	13	25	7	16	82	42
Mostly Resource	5	10	8	16	12	23	7	16	32	16
Equally Shared	11	22	11	22	21	40	13	29	56	28
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	6	12	13	29	19	10
Entirely Regular	3	6	0	0	0	0	5	11	8	4
Totals	30		30		30		30		120	

Among all groups: Chi Square=64.81 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 3.72 p=.2935

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=21.66 p=.0002

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=28.18 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=17.94 P=.0005

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=34.02 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=12.14 P=.0164

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Observe referred students to gather further for placement decisions.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	11	22	20	39	11	21	6	13	48	24
Mostly Resource	13	26	7	14	17	33	8	18	45	23
Equally Shared	26	52	23	45	20	38	15	33	84	42
Mostly Regular	0	0	1	2	4	8	10	22	15	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	6	13
Totals	50		51		52		45		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 53.34 p= .0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 5.59 p=.1335
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.28 p=.1525
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=21.41 p=.0003
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.78 p= .0324
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 22.37 p= .0002
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 13.56 p= .0088

Function: Refer EMR and LD students for special class placement.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	1	2	8	16	2	4	1	2	12	6
Mostly Resource	4	8	6	12	1	2	6	13	17	9
Equally Shared	25	51	20	39	24	47	20	44	89	45
Mostly Regular	14	29	5	10	19	37	14	31	52	27
Entirely Regular	5	10	12	24	5	10	4	9	26	13
Totals	49		51		51		45		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=29.17 p=.0037
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=13.51 p=.0090
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 2.87 p=.5794
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 0.90 p=.9248
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=18.58 p=.0009
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=13.89 p=.0095
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 4.78 p=.3105

Table 13

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Serve as a leader on the placement and/or assessment committee.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	15	30	32	63	5	10	8	18	60	31
Mostly Resource	15	30	6	12	11	22	9	20	41	21
Equally Shared	20	40	13	25	31	62	14	31	78	40
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	29	2	1
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	1
Totals	50		51		50		45		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=77.56 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 11.48 P=.0032

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 10.99 P=.0267

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 11.48 P=.0010

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 31.53 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 28.77 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 15.16 P=.0044

Function: Communicate to faculties the total placement procedure.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	24	49	31	61	9	18	15	33	79	41
Mostly Resource	14	29	10	20	18	36	2	4	44	23
Equally Shared	11	22	10	20	21	42	9	20	51	26
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	29	15	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	6	13
Totals	49		51		50		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=85.80 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 1.57 p=.4571

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=12.43 p=.0060

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=30.16 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=20.28 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=29.69 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=33.00 p=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine when and/or if an EMR and LD student should discontinue being served by the resource teacher.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	6	12	9	18	7	13	9	20	31	16
Mostly Resource	17	34	10	20	3	6	1	2	31	16
Equally Shared	27	54	28	55	40	77	17	38	112	57
Mostly Regular	0	0	4	8	2	4	16	36	22	11
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1
Totals	50		51		52		45		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 67.16 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 6.42 P=.0927

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 14.37 P=.0024

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 34.93 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.79 P=.0787

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 18.95 P=.0008

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 23.03 P=.0001

Function: Determine the time of day the special education student will go to the resource room or see the resource teacher.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	9	18	22	43	5	10	2	4	38	19
Mostly Resource	15	30	3	6	5	8	1	2	23	12
Equally Shared	26	52	26	51	39	75	18	40	109	55
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	4	8	20	44	24	12
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	2
Totals	50		51		52		45		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=14.28 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=13.44 P=.0012

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=14.08 P=.0028

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 4.20 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=17.44 P=.0006

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=42.91 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=25.12 P=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Counsel students regarding personal problems, i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	2	4	9	18	2	4	1	2	14	7
Mostly Resource	3	6	1	2	3	8	2	4	9	5
Equally Shared	45	90	41	80	45	87	24	53	155	78
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	31	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	2
Totals	50		51		52		45		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 69.54 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 5.63 P=.0599

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 1.96 P=.5804

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 24.73 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.63 P= .0543

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 28.92 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 19.52 P= .0006

Function: Determine which diagnostic tests will be used to determine present level of functioning of the special student.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	15	30	27	53	19	37	12	26	73	37
Mostly Resource	17	34	20	39	21	40	11	24	69	35
Equally Shared	18	36	4	8	10	19	9	20	41	21
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	30	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square=55.83 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=12.57 P=.0019

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.14 P=.1618

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=18.48 P=.0003

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.98 P=.1127

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=24.11 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=13.44 P=.0038

Table 21

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Seek parental consent for placement.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	13	26	23	45	8	15	5	11	49	25
Mostly Resource	6	12	17	33	8	15	2	4	33	17
Equally Shared	28	56	9	18	32	62	20	43	89	45
Mostly Regular	3	6	0	0	2	4	17	37	22	11
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	2	4	2	4	6	3
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square=79.79 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=22.79 P=.0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.91 P=.4190

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=18.55 P=.0010

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=25.39 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=44.45 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=1861 P=.0009

Function: Communicate to parents when the EMR and LD student needs to practice school work at home.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	14	16	31	3	6	1	2	27	14
Mostly Resource	6	12	0	0	11	21	8	17	25	13
Equally Shared	35	70	29	57	43	65	18	39	116	58
Mostly Regular	2	4	4	8	2	4	16	35	24	12
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	7	7	4
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square=62.55 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=12.74 P=.0126

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.05 P=.2824

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=24.00 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=20.95 P=.0003

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=31.03 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=17.18 P=.0018

Table 22

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine whether to involve parents in home tutoring.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	3	6	16	31	3	6	4	9	26	13
Mostly Resource	2	4	0	0	12	23	2	4	16	8
Equally Shared	41	84	29	57	35	67	18	39	123	62
Mostly Regular	3	6	4	8	2	4	17	37	26	13
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	0	0	5	11	7	4
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=82.79 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=15.06 P= .0046

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.73 P= .0518

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=23.84 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=24.12 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=20.91 P= .0003

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=29.32 P= .0001

Function: Develop a method of reporting progress or adapt the report card for work done in the resource room.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	19	39	29	57	13	25	8	17	69	35
Mostly Resource	19	39	10	20	14	27	8	17	51	26
Equally Shared	10	20	10	20	23	44	15	33	58	29
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	24	13	7
Entirely Regular	1	2	2	4	0	0	4	9	7	4
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 58.99 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 5.17 P= .1596

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.92 P= .0417

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.69 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 15.88 P=.0032

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 24.62 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 14.43 P=.0060

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Develop a method of reporting progress or adapting the report card for work done in the regular classroom.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	5	10	0	0	2	4	12	6
Mostly Resource	0	0	3	6	3	6	4	9	10	5
Equally Shared	21	42	19	37	23	44	18	39	81	41
Mostly Regular	13	26	14	27	16	31	14	30	57	29
Entirely Regular	11	22	10	20	10	19	8	17	39	20
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square=10.64 P= .5597

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 3.18 P= .5290

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.41 P= .0776

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 5.87 P= .2090

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.51 P= .2393

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 1.42 P= .8400

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 2.75 P= .6003

Function: Communicate to parents about the future placements of the special education student.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	14	16	31	5	10	2	4	30	15
Mostly Resource	10	20	15	29	12	23	12	26	49	25
Equally Shared	31	63	18	35	31	60	15	33	95	48
Mostly Regular	1	2	0	0	2	4	14	30	17	9
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	7	7	4
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 58.90 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 10.94 p= .0273

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 2.76 p= .5984

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 22.72 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=11.54 p=.0212

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=25.51 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.74 p=.0034

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Train parents to tutor students using special materials and methods.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	15	30	39	10	19	11	24	58	29
Mostly Resource	21	44	12	24	22	42	8	17	63	32
Equally Shared	18	38	7	14	18	35	15	33	58	29
Mostly Regular	2	4	0	0	2	4	10	22	14	7
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	0	0	2	4	4	2
Totals	48		51		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 57.84 p= .0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 25.52 p= .0001
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 0.39 p= .9416
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 14.29 p= .0064
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 21.77 p= .0002
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 22.32 p= .0002
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 13.87 p= .0077

Function: Invite parents to visit the school.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	1	2	3	6	4	8	0	0	8	4
Mostly Resource	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1
Equally Shared	45	92	42	82	45	87	23	50	155	78
Mostly Regular	3	6	0	0	2	4	14	30	19	10
Entirely Regular	0	0	6	12	0	0	9	20	15	8
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=59.37 p=.0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 10.07 p= .0180
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 2.91 p= .4052
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 24.17 p= .0001
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.24 p=.0554
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.96 p=.0001
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=29.86 p=.0001

Table 25

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Seek parents' views on curriculum concerns and priorities.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	0	0	15	29	2	4	2	4	19	10
Mostly Resource	3	6	0	0	3	6	2	4	8	4
Equally Shared	42	86	30	59	44	85	24	52	140	71
Mostly Regular	4	8	0	0	3	6	12	26	19	10
Entirely Regular	0	0	6	12	0	0	6	13	12	6
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 69.29 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 29.97 P= .0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 2.10 P= .5515

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 17.03 P= .0019

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 24.58 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 24.42 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 17.18 P= .0018

Function: Set up a behavior management program in the regular classroom
in order to manage the EMR and LD students' behavior.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	2	4	7	14	5	10	0	0	14	7
Mostly Resource	1	2	0	0	7	13	3	7	11	6
Equally Shared	42	86	30	59	33	63	26	57	131	66
Mostly Regular	0	0	11	22	7	13	11	24	29	15
Entirely Regular	4	8	3	6	0	0	6	13	13	7
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=39.52 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=16.89 P=.0020

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=17.79 P=.0014

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=18.09 P=.0012

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=11.36 P=.0228

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=11.06 P=.0259

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=14.01 P=.0073

Table 26

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Ask parents to participate in P.T.A.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	1	2	3	6	2	4	0	0	6	3
Mostly Resource	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equally Shared	31	63	42	82	45	87	17	37	135	68
Mostly Regular	8	16	0	0	3	6	17	37	28	15
Entirely Regular	9	18	6	12	2	4	12	26	29	15
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 49.75 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 11.22 p= .0106

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.56 p= .0227

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 8.67 p= .0341

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.29 p= .1515

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=32.42 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=31.34 p= .0001

Function: Maintain data on students' behavior for purpose of evaluation.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	3	6	3	6	2	4	0	0	8	4
Mostly Resource	2	4	4	8	4	8	5	11	15	8
Equally Shared	41	84	43	86	46	88	27	59	157	80
Mostly Regular	3	6	0	0	0	0	12	26	15	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 42.79 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 3.71 p= .2952

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.07 p= .0059

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square =14.49 p= .0059

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 0.26 p= .8772

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=20.64 p= .0004

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=20.77 p= .0004

Table 27

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Locate books and films of a reference or human interest nature that might increase the positive understanding of special students by their classmates.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	4	8	7	14	9	17	2	4	22	11
Mostly Resource	13	27	4	8	5	10	5	11	27	14
Equally Shared	27	56	39	78	33	63	16	35	115	59
Mostly Regular	3	6	0	0	4	8	18	39	25	13
Entirely Regular	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	7	4
Totals	48		50		52		46		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=64.02 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 11.73 P= .0195

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.07 P= .1939

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 20.38 P= .0004

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.82 P= .2127

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 35.40 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 21.64 P= .0002

Function: Teach socially appropriate behaviors to students.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	1	2	3	6	1	2	0	0	5	3
Mostly Resource	1	2	1	2	4	8	2	4	8	4
Equally Shared	46	92	46	92	45	87	23	50	160	81
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	24	13	7
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	24	13	7
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 67.03 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 3.00 P= .3916

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.77 P= .2167

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 25.21 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.77 P= .1891

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 31.89 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 24.74 P= .0001

Table 28

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Arrange activities that highlight the abilities and strengths of the special education students.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	3	6	16	31	6	12	3	7	28	14
Mostly Resource	16	32	4	8	10	19	10	22	40	20
Equally Shared	31	62	30	60	34	65	17	37	112	57
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	26	14	7
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	2
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=71.75 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 16.11 P= .0003

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.49 P= .2136

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=21.34 P= .0003

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.33 P= .0252

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=30.95 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=17.51 P= .0015

Function: Determine the curriculum content for each EMR and LD student in all areas.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	12	24	5	10	4	9	26	13
Mostly Resource	6	12	2	4	16	31	5	11	29	15
Equally Shared	38	76	34	68	28	54	23	50	123	62
Mostly Regular	1	2	2	4	3	6	12	26	2	1
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	1
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 49.37 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 5.44 P=.1424

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.02 P=.0711

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.06 P=.0046

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=14.52 P=.0023

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=16.41 P=.0025

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=13.45 P=.0093

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Arrange for peer tutors for the EMR and LD students within the regular classroom.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	2	4	11	22	1	2	0	0	14	7
Mostly Resource	3	6	1	2	5	10	6	13	15	8
Equally Shared	27	55	17	34	37	71	19	41	100	51
Mostly Regular	12	24	10	20	7	13	19	41	48	24
Entirely Regular	5	10	11	22	2	4	2	4	20	10
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 52.58 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 11.93 P= .0179

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.91 P= .2964

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 7.17 P= .1272

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 24.14 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 23.58 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 12.09 P= .0167

Function: Make supplementary materials for the EMR and LD student to use in the regular classroom.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	3	6	11	22	2	4	4	9	20	10
Mostly Resource	5	10	10	20	8	15	15	33	38	19
Equally Shared	33	67	22	44	35	67	12	26	102	52
Mostly Regular	8	16	5	10	7	13	13	28	33	17
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	0	0	2	4	4	2
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 37.31 P=.0002

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 11.12 P= .0252

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 0.93 P= .8183

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 18.06 P= .0012

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=11.72 P=.0196

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=10.62 P=.0312

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=17.55 P=.0015

Table 30

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Test different teaching approaches to determine the most appropriate for the EMR and LD student.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	6	12	15	30	8	15	8	17	37	19
Mostly Resource	15	31	0	0	14	27	6	13	35	18
Equally Shared	26	53	35	70	28	54	17	37	106	54
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	28	15	8
Entirely Regular	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	2
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 64.73 P= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 22.41 P= .0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.31 P= .3658

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 18.95 P= .0008

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 18.88 P= .0003

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 29.25 P= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 15.65 P= .0035

Function: Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught in the resource room.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	18	36	20	40	16	31	18	39	72	36
Mostly Resource	22	44	10	20	20	38	7	15	59	30
Equally Shared	10	20	18	36	14	27	7	15	49	25
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	28	15	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	2
Totals	50		50		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=53.34 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 8.89 p= .0308

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 2.84 p= .4167

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 22.16 p= .0002

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.24 p=.0831

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=18.67 p=.0009

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=17.48 p=.0016

Table 31

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught by the regular classroom teacher.

Responsibility Should be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	2	4	3	6	3	6	0	0	8	4
Mostly Resource	4	8	0	0	4	8	0	0	8	4
Equally Shared	16	33	23	46	30	58	10	22	79	40
Mostly Regular	18	37	10	20	12	23	24	52	64	32
Entirely Regular	9	18	14	28	3	6	12	26	38	19
Totals										

Among all groups: Chi Square= 36.91 F= .0002

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 8.82 P= .0658

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.58 P= .0725

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 8.58 P= .0724

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 12.19 P= .0160

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 13.90 P= .0030

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 26.13 P= .0001

Function: Provide one-to one instruction.

Responsibility Should Be	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	21	43	26	52	9	17	4	9	60	30
Mostly Resource	10	20	1	2	10	19	10	22	31	16
Equally Shared	18	37	22	44	30	58	16	35	86	44
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	22	13	7
Entirely Regular	0	0	1	2	0	0	6	13	7	4
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=70.20 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 9.29 P= .0257

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 10.72 P= .0133

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 27.61 P= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=20.82 P=.0003

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=37.92 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.65 P=.0035

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Arrange for speech therapy for special education students when needed.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	2	4	3	6	18	35	4	9	27	14
Mostly Resource	14	29	0	0	24	47	12	26	50	26
Equally Shared	20	42	28	56	4	8	15	33	67	34
Mostly Regular	12	25	19	38	3	6	11	24	45	23
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	9	6	3
Totals	48		50		51		46		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=82.82 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=17.08 p=.0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=33.44 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=5.54 p=.2364

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=66.35 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.08 P=.0002

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=24.32 P=.0001

Function: Adapt the regular classroom curriculum to meet the specific strengths and weaknesses of the special education student.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	2	4	1	2	6	12	0	0	9	5
Mostly Resource	6	13	0	0	26	50	4	9	36	18
Equally Shared	9	19	23	47	9	17	14	30	55	28
Mostly Regular	26	54	21	43	5	10	16	35	68	35
Entirely Regular	5	10	4	8	6	12	12	26	27	14
Totals	48		49		52		46		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=80.75 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=13.09 p=.0108

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=28.70 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=8.71 p=.0687

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=45.89 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=11.78 p=.0190

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=30.73 p=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Adapt the special class curriculum to the specific strengths and weaknesses of the special education student.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	34	71	10	20	26	50	18	39	88	45
Mostly Resource	12	25	7	14	19	37	7	15	45	23
Equally Shared	0	0	20	40	3	6	13	28	36	18
Mostly Regular	1	2	13	26	2	4	6	13	22	11
Entirely Regular	1	2	0	0	2	4	2	4	5	3
Totals	48		50		52		46		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=68.65 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=45.67 p=.0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.16 p=.1872

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=23.11 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=35.26 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 8.20 p=.0846

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=14.93 p=.0048

Function: Develop an individualized educational plan for each special education student.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	26	52	8	16	26	50	4	9	64	32
Mostly Resource	19	39	12	24	19	37	16	35	55	34
Equally Shared	4	8	15	30	2	4	13	28	34	17
Mostly Regular	0	0	15	30	2	4	11	24	28	14
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	4	5	3
Totals	49		50		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=60.06 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 32.47 p=.0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 5.58 p=.2326

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 34.09 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=33.97 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 4.50 p=.3421

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=30.64 p=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in reading.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	10	20	0	20	17	33	0	0	37	19
Mostly Resource	28	56	10	20	24	47	7	16	69	35
Equally Shared	8	16	22	43	4	8	12	27	46	23
Mostly Regular	4	8	6	12	2	4	18	40	30	15
Entirely Regular	0	0	3	6	4	8	8	18	15	8
Totals	50		51		51		45		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=80.80 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=18.45 p=.0010

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.11 p=.0875

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 40.16 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 22.18 p=.0002

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 21.45 p=.0003

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 44.25 p=.0001

Function: Determine the method for remediating weaknesses in handwriting.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	8	17	6	12	10	20	0	0	24	12
Mostly Resource	20	42	7	14	23	45	6	14	56	29
Equally Shared	15	31	27	53	8	16	11	26	61	32
Mostly Regular	5	10	6	12	19	20	14	33	35	18
Entirely Regular	0	0	5	10	0	0	12	28	17	9
Totals	48		51		51		43		193	

Among all groups: Chi Square=69.06 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=14.99 p=.0047

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.14 p=.2466

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=32.24 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=25.85 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=18.35 p=.0011

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=32.66 p=.0001

Table 35

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in math.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	10	10	6	12	14	27	0	0	30	15
Mostly Resource	24	49	6	12	27	53	7	16	64	33
Equally Shared	14	29	26	51	5	10	12	27	57	29
Mostly Regular	1	2	9	18	3	6	14	31	27	14
Entirely Regular	0	0	4	8	2	4	12	27	18	9
Totals	49		51		51		45		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=88.04 p=.001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=25.77 p=.0001
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.07 p=.0891
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=42.65 p=.0001
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=34.46 p=.0001
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=16.01 p=.0030
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=42.70 p=.0001

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in language.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	6	12	6	12	14	28	0	0	26	13
Mostly Resource	22	44	6	12	25	59	8	18	61	31
Equally Shared	20	40	26	51	7	14	16	36	69	35
Mostly Regular	2	4	9	18	2	4	11	24	24	12
Entirely Regular	0	0	4	8	2	4	10	22	16	8
Totals	50		51		51		45		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 70.01 p=.0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 18.37 p=.0010
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 11.65 p=.0201
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 29.03 p=.0001
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 30.90 p=.0001
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 11.11 p=.0254
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 37.69 p=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Task analyze skills for EMR and LD students so that skills can be taught in small steps.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	25	52	26	51	26	52	7	16	84	43
Mostly Resource	17	35	11	22	12	24	2	4	42	22
Equally Shared	6	13	7	14	6	12	19	42	38	20
Mostly Regular	0	0	4	8	6	12	13	29	23	12
Entirely Regular	0	0	3	6	0	0	4	9	7	4
Totals	48		51		50		45		194	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 61.41 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 8.30 p= .0812

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.84 p= .0770

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 45.68 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.51 p= .4762

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 27.35 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 31.25 p= .0001

Function: Develop and distribute a referral form for the purpose of referring EMR and LD students.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	29	60	39	76	27	54	8	18	103	53
Mostly Resource	4	8	7	14	12	24	9	20	32	16
Equally Shared	10	21	3	5	3	6	13	29	29	15
Mostly Regular	2	4	0	0	8	16	10	22	20	10
Entirely Regular	3	6	2	4	0	0	5	11	10	5
Totals	48		51		50		45		194	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 53.69 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 8.18 p= .0854

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 14.41 p= .0061

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 19.99 p= .0005

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 13.49 p= .0091

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 38.01 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 22.01 p= .0002

Table 37

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Observe referred students to gather further information for placement decisions.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	13	27	12	24	24	47	2	4	51	26
Mostly Resource	13	27	11	22	16	31	15	33	55	28
Equally Shared	20	42	23	45	5	10	14	31	62	32
Mostly Regular	0	0	3	6	4	8	10	22	17	9
Entirely Regular	2	4	2	4	2	4	4	9	10	5
Totals	48		51		51		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=46.00 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 3.33 p=.5045

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=16.51 p=.0024

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=19.86 p=.0005

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=16.64 p=.0023

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=14.06 p=.0071

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=25.88 p=.0001

Function: Refer EMR and LD students for special class placement.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	6	13	0	0	4	8	0	0	10	5
Mostly Resource	1	2	2	4	4	8	5	11	12	6
Equally Shared	26	54	21	41	11	22	8	18	66	34
Mostly Regular	9	19	11	22	19	39	23	51	62	32
Entirely Regular	6	13	17	33	11	22	9	20	43	22
Totals	48		51		49		45		193	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 41.54 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 12.25 p= .0156

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 13.31 p= .0098

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 24.85 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 11.18 p= .0247

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 13.49 p= .0037

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 5.01 p= .2868

Table 38

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Serve as a leader on the placement and/or assessment committee.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	18	37	22	44	12	24	12	27	64	33
Mostly Resource	17	35	9	18	18	36	8	18	52	27
Equally Shared	12	24	19	38	17	34	13	29	61	31
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	22	11	6
Entirely Regular	2	4	0	0	2	4	2	4	6	3
Totals	49		50		50		45		194	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 41.62 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 6.43 p= .0924

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.08 p= .5444

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 14.34 p= .0063

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.05 p= .0598

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 15.91 p= .0031

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 11.51 p= .0214

Function: Communicate to faculties the total placement procedure.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	27	54	32	63	21	45	10	22	90	47
Mostly Resource	14	28	15	29	15	32	7	16	51	26
Equally Shared	9	18	4	8	8	17	16	36	37	19
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	16	8	4
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	-	2	4	5	11	7	4
Totals	50		51		47		45		193	

Among all groups: Chi Square=51.29 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 2.37 p= .3055

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.75 p= .4403

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 23.91 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.46 p= .1671

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 33.39 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.23 p= .0043

Table 39

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine when and/or if an EMR and LD student should discontinue being served by the resource teacher.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	10	20	26	51	13	25	6	13	55	28
Mostly Resource	19	39	14	27	22	43	9	20	64	33
Equally Shared	18	37	11	22	10	20	17	38	56	29
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	24	15	8
Entirely Regular	2	4	0	0	2	4	2	4	6	3
Totals	49		51		51		45		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=50.23 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=11.52 p=.0092

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.86 p=.1435

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=15.46 p=.0038

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=12.16 p=.0162

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=27.61 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=12.79 p=.0124

Function: Determine the time of day the special education student will go to the resource room or see the resource teacher.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	32	63	6	12	10	22	53	27
Mostly Resource	17	35	7	14	4	8	3	7	31	16
Equally Shared	24	59	12	24	17	33	11	24	64	32
Mostly Regular	3	6	0	0	21	40	16	36	40	20
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	11	9	5
Totals	49				52		45		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 97.02 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 30.84 p= .0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 26.77 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 30.07 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 44.46 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 33.93 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 2.72 p= .6050

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Counsel students regarding personal problems, i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	4	8	5	12	6	12	2	4	18	9
Mostly Resource	7	14	4	8	17	33	3	7	31	16
Equally Shared	35	71	38	75	20	38	11	24	104	53
Mostly Regular	3	6	3	6	5	10	19	42	30	15
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	4	8	19	22	14	7
Totals	49		51		52		45		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=82.24 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 1.30 P=.7287

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=13.08 P=.0109

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=36.32 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=18.13 P=.0012

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=38.43 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=24.78 P=.0001

Function: Determine which diagnostic tests will be used to determine present level of functioning of the special student.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	20	41	37	73	24	48	8	18	89	46
Mostly Resource	13	27	14	27	18	36	5	11	50	26
Equally Shared	16	33	0	0	5	10	14	31	35	18
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	29	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	5	3
Totals	49		51		50		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 91.73 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=21.08 p= .0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.92 p= .0192

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 26.71 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 11.26 p= .0104

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=54.79 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=30.68 p=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Seek parental consent for placement.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	23	48	27	53	18	35	2	4	70	36
Mostly Resource	6	13	17	33	12	24	5	11	40	21
Equally Shared	16	33	6	12	12	24	16	36	50	26
Mostly Regular	3	6	1	2	7	14	12	27	23	12
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	22	12	6
Totals	48		51		51		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=72.39 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=11.05 P=.0115

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.70 P=.1528

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=33.07 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=11.16 P=.0248

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=51.78 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=22.62 p=.0002

Function: Communicate to parents when the EMR and LD student needs to
practice school work at home.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	15	24	47	13	25	0	0	44	23
Mostly Resource	2	4	0	0	16	31	9	20	27	14
Equally Shared	30	63	20	39	16	31	9	20	75	38
Mostly Regular	9	19	5	10	6	12	19	42	39	20
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	0	0	8	18	10	5
Totals	48		51		51		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=94.78 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=16.39 p=.0025

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=17.48 p=.0006

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 34.27 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=21.81 P=.0002

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=48.76 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=31.43 P=.0001

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine whether to involve parents in home tutoring.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	23	45	10	20	2	4	40	21
Mostly Resource	5	10	1	2	16	31	4	9	26	13
Equally Shared	34	71	18	35	17	33	14	31	83	43
Mostly Regular	4	8	7	14	8	16	15	33	34	17
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	0	0	10	22	12	6
Totals	48		51		51		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square=88.20 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=21.91 P=.0002

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=14.35 P=.0025

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=26.03 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=20.45 P=.0004

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=27.92 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=24.68 P=.0001

Function: Develop a method of reporting progress or adapt the report card for work done in the resource room.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	27	59	30	59	19	37	12	26	88	45
Mostly Resource	8	17	5	10	15	29	5	11	33	17
Equally Shared	8	17	13	25	6	12	11	24	38	20
Mostly Regular	2	4	1	2	10	20	15	33	28	14
Entirely Regular	1	2	2	4	1	2	3	7	7	4
Totals	46		51		51		46		194	

Among all groups: Chi Square=40.55 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 2.46 p=.6525

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.91 p=.0635

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 17.88 p=.0013

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=17.75 p=.0014

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=20.13 p=.0005

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 9.82 p=.0436

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Develop a method of reporting progress or adapt the report card for work done in the regular classroom.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	4	8	2	4	3	6	0	0	9	5
Mostly Resource	2	4	3	6	2	4	3	7	10	5
Equally Shared	11	23	16	31	4	8	17	37	48	24
Mostly Regular	12	25	16	31	22	43	15	33	65	33
Entirely Regular	19	40	14	27	20	39	11	24	64	33
Totals	48		51		51		46		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 19.43 P= .0788

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 3.03 P= .5522

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.29 P= .1784

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 7.91 P= .0948

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.61 P= .0476

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 2.17 P= .7044

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 14.97 P= .0048

Function: Communicate to parents about the future placements for the special education student.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	16	32	19	37	14	27	6	13	55	28
Mostly Resource	13	26	17	33	18	35	4	9	52	26
Equally Shared	18	36	12	24	13	25	11	24	54	27
Mostly Regular	2	4	1	2	6	12	21	46	30	15
Entirely Regular	1	2	2	4	1	2	4	9	8	4
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 57.78 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 2.65 p= .6184

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 3.71 p= .4469

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 28.38 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.72 p= .3171

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 33.53 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 22.13 p= .0002

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE
PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Train parents to tutor students using special materials and methods.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	15	28	56	22	45	8	17	65	34
Mostly Resource	19	41	9	18	10	20	2	4	40	21
Equally Shared	16	35	12	24	7	14	14	30	49	26
Mostly Regular	4	9	0	0	10	20	19	41	33	17
Entirely Regular	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	7	4	2
Totals	46		50		49		46		191	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 69.66 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 21.61 p= .0002

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 16.57 p= .0009

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 26.75 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 13.08 p= .0109

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 35.62 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 19.92 p= .0005

Function: Invite parents to visit the school.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	5	10	0	0	3	6	2	4	10	5
Mostly Resource	1	2	0	0	7	13	2	4	10	5
Equally Shared	39	80	48	94	31	60	16	35	134	68
Mostly Regular	4	8	1	2	8	15	12	26	25	13
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	3	6	14	30	19	10
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 70.49 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 10.70 p= .0302

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 10.17 p= .0377

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 29.17 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 19.30 p= .0007

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 38.15 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 15.37 p= .0040

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Seek parents' views on curriculum concerns and priorities.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	15	9	18	6	12	2	4	24	12
Mostly Resource	3	6	0	0	9	18	5	11	17	9
Equally Shared	35	73	33	67	28	55	13	28	109	56
Mostly Regular	2	4	0	0	7	14	16	35	25	13
Entirely Regular	1	2	7	14	1	2	10	22	19	10
Totals	48		49		51		46		194	

Among all groups: Chi Square=63.48 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 9.80 P=.1618

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.55 p=.0439

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=31.59 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 21.48 p=.0003

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 34.62 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 19.31 P=.0007

Function: Set up a behavior management program in the regular classroom in order to manage the EMR and LD students' behavior.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	11	22	6	12	11	21	3	7	31	16
Mostly Resource	5	10	0	0	14	27	1	2	20	10
Equally Shared	27	55	20	39	8	15	17	37	72	36
Mostly Regular	2	4	17	33	19	37	18	39	56	28
Entirely Regular	4	8	8	16	0	0	7	15	19	10
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=61.47 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=20.66 P=.0004

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=32.28 P=.0001

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 23.06 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=28.72 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 2.09 P=.7199

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=25.84 P=.0001

Table 46

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Ask parents to participate in P.T.A.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	1	2	0	0	2	4	2	4	5	3
Mostly Resource	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	2	4	2
Equally Shared	29	58	35	69	29	56	12	26	105	53
Mostly Regular	4	8	5	10	10	19	11	24	30	15
Entirely Regular	16	32	11	22	8	15	20	43	55	28
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 30.60 p= .0023

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 2.59 p= .4593

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.54 p= .0738

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 11.95 p= .0177

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.69 p= .1035

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 18.91 p= .0008

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 12.92 p= .0117

Function: Maintain data on student's behavior for purpose of evaluation.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	8	16	2	4	4	8	0	0	14	7
Mostly Resource	12	24	5	10	18	35	8	17	43	22
Equally Shared	30	60	44	86	26	50	17	37	117	59
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	33	17	9
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	13	8	4
Totals	50		51		52		46		199	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 83.07 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 9.12 p= .0105

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.78 p= .1478

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 33.29 p= .0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 16.64 p= .0023

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 35.48 p= .0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 21.38 p= .0003

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSIBILITIES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Locate books and films of a reference or human interest nature that might increase the positive understanding of special education students by their classmates.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	19	40	2	4	20	38	2	4	43	22
Mostly Resource	9	19	7	14	18	35	8	18	42	21
Equally Shared	12	26	38	75	7	13	8	17	65	33
Mostly Regular	3	6	0	0	4	8	17	37	24	12
Entirely Regular	4	9	4	8	3	6	11	24	22	11
Totals	47		51		52		46		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 11.76 P= .0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 30.42 P= .0001
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.39 P= .3563
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 27.68 P= .0001
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 45.06 P= .0001
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 39.75 P= .0001
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 31.01 P= .0001

Function: Teach socially appropriate behaviors to students.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	3	6	2	4	4	8	2	4	11	6
Mostly Resource	3	6	0	0	13	25	3	7	19	10
Equally Shared	41	84	45	88	29	56	14	30	129	65
Mostly Regular	2	4	4	8	5	10	11	24	22	11
Entirely Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	35	17	9
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 93.21 p=.0001
 Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 4.01 p= .2599
 Resource vs. special student: Chi Square=10.66 p= .0307
 Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 35.63 p= .0001
 Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 18.23 p=.0001
 Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 38.40 p=.0001
 Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 27.37 p=.0001

Table 48

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Arrange activities that highlight the abilities and strengths of the special education students.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	7	14	11	22	19	37	8	17	45	23
Mostly Resource	20	41	2	4	20	39	2	4	44	22
Equally Shared	20	41	34	67	10	20	9	20	73	37
Mostly Regular	1	2	3	6	1	2	14	30	19	10
Entirely Regular	1	2	1	2	1	2	13	28	16	8
Totals	49		51		51		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 112.88 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=20.21 P=.0005

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.84 P=.0653

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=40.46 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=30.95 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=32.24 P=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=40.66 P=.0001

Function: Determine the curriculum content for each EMR and LD student in all areas.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	8	16	7	14	19	37	4	9	38	19
Mostly Resource	8	16	3	6	11	21	7	15	29	15
Equally Shared	22	45	33	65	17	33	17	37	89	45
Mostly Regular	10	20	8	16	3	6	14	30	35	18
Entirely Regular	1	2	0	0	2	4	4	9	7	4
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 37.22 p= .0002

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 5.72 P=.2207

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 9.62 P=.0474

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 4.42 P=.3525

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=19.50 P=.0006

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=12.95 P=.0115

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=18.16 P=.0012

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Arrange for peer tutors for the EMR and LD student within the regular classroom.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	0	0	3	6	4	8	4	9	11	6
Mostly Resource	3	6	2	4	13	25	10	22	28	14
Equally Shared	21	45	13	25	19	37	11	24	64	33
Mostly Regular	13	28	14	27	14	27	14	30	55	28
Entirely Regular	10	21	19	37	2	4	7	15	38	19
Totals	47		51		52		46		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 35.38 F= .0004

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 7.76 P=.1007

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 15.51 P=.0038

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 11.45 P=.0219

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=23.09 P=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=10.95 P=.0271

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 4.95 P=.2921

Function: Make supplementary materials for the EMR and LD student to use in the regular classroom.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	12	26	3	6	14	27	4	9	39	20
Mostly Resource	8	17	9	18	14	27	8	18	39	20
Equally Shared	19	40	16	31	14	27	11	24	60	31
Mostly Regular	8	17	10	20	5	10	17	38	40	21
Entirely Regular	0	0	13	25	5	10	5	11	23	12
Totals	47		51		52		45		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 38.22 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 18.81 p= .0009

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 8.01 p=.0913

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 14.34 p=.0063

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 13.55 p=.0089

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 6.15 p=.1884

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 13.66 p=.0085

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Test different teaching approaches to determine the most appropriate for the EMR and LD student.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	15	31	15	29	18	35	8	17	56	28
Mostly Resource	17	35	0	0	20	38	4	9	41	21
Equally Shared	14	29	30	59	7	13	12	26	63	32
Mostly Regular	0	0	6	12	5	10	18	39	29	15
Entirely Regular	2	4	0	0	2	4	4	9	8	4
Totals	48		51		52		46		197	

Among all groups: Chi Square=78.49 p=.0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=30.76 p=.0001

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.70 p=.1031

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square=28.97 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square=36.66 p=.0001

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=23.65 p=.0001

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=23.56 p=.0001

Function: Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught in the resource room.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	32	65	31	61	25	48	18	39	106	54
Mostly Resource	12	24	13	25	20	38	9	20	54	27
Equally Shared	5	10	5	10	3	8	5	11	18	9
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	22	12	6
Entirely Regular	0	0	2	4	2	4	4	9	8	4
Totals	49		51		52		46		198	

Among all groups: Chi Square=37.91 p=.0002

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 2.02 p=.5690

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.28 p=.1220

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 18.27 p=.0011

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 4.62 P=.3287

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square=14.62 P=.0055

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square=11.49 P=.0216

CHI SQUARE TESTS TO DETERMINE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG THE PROPORTIONS OF RESPONSES ASSIGNED BY FOUR GROUPS RELATIVE TO WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TWO EDUCATION FUNCTIONS

Function: Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught by the regular classroom teacher.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	3	7	4	8	5	10	2	4	14	7
Mostly Resource	3	7	0	0	4	8	1	2	8	4
Equally Shared	5	11	14	27	7	13	14	30	40	21
Mostly Regular	18	39	16	31	20	9	13	28	67	34
Entirely Regular	17	37	17	33	16	31	16	35	66	34
Totals	46		51		52		46		195	

Among all groups: Chi Square= 14.03 P= .2985

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square= 7.29 P=.1216

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.75 P=.0954

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square= 6.30 P=.1778

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 6.91 P=.1407

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 1.75 P=.7808

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 6.56 P=.1610

Function: Provide one-to-one instruction.

Responsibility Is	Resource		Regular		S.Student		R.Student		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Entirely Resource	29	62	19	37	19	37	14	30	81	41
Mostly Resource	8	17	4	8	15	29	2	4	29	15
Equally Shared	10	21	19	37	15	29	19	41	63	32
Mostly Regular	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	16	8
Entirely Regular	0	0	9	18	2	4	5	11	16	8
Totals	47		51		52		46		196	

Among all groups: Chi Square=48.72 p= .0001

Resource vs. regular teacher: Chi Square=15.07 P= .0018

Resource vs. special student: Chi Square= 7.98 P= .0923

Resource vs. regular student: Chi Square 22.62 P= .0002

Regular teacher vs. special student: Chi Square= 12.29 P=.0154

Regular teacher vs. regular student: Chi Square= 8.33 P=.0802

Special student vs. regular student: Chi Square= 15.72 P=.0034

TABLE 52

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Arrange for speech therapy for special education students
when needed.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	10	18	55	23	4	15.45
N= 50	Is	4	29	42	25	0	.01
Regular	Should	28	0	62	10	0	30.87
N= 50	Is	6	0	56	38	0	.0001
S.Student	Should	4	25	67	4	0	82.18
N= 52	Is	35	47	8	6	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	9	20	48	20	4	5.85
N=46	Is	9	26	33	24	9	.05

Function: Adapt the regular classroom curriculum to meet the specific
strengths and weaknesses of the special education student.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	4	2	64	26	4	44.84
N= 50	Is	4	13	19	54	10	.0001
Regular	Should	12	0	40	36	12	9.13
N= 50	Is	2	0	47	43	8	.05
S.Student	Should	6	12	67	13	2	62.58
N= 52	Is	12	50	17	10	12	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	4	46	35	15	8.25
N= 46	Is	0	9	30	35	26	.05

Function: Adapt the special class curriculum to the specific strengths
and weaknesses of the student.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	38	50	10	2	0	30.32
N= 50	Is	71	25	0	2	2	.0001
Regular	Should	22	26	42	10	0	10.86
N= 50	Is	20	14	40	26	0	.05
S.Student	Should	35	23	38	4	0	33.18
N= 52	Is	50	37	6	4	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	22	15	20	39	4	19.07
N= 46	Is	39	15	28	13	4	.0001

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Develop an individualized educational plan for each special education student.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	16	50	34	0	0	37.30
N= 50	Is	53	39	8	0	0	.0001
Regular	Should	16	54	30	0	0	41.54
N= 50	Is	16	24	30	30	0	.0001
S.Student	Should	13	25	56	2	4	70.18
N= 52	Is	50	37	4	4	6	.0001
R.Student	Should	15	4	41	33	7	30.83
N=46	Is	9	35	28	24	4	.0001

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in reading.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	14	33	51	2	0	28.89
N= 50	Is	20	56	16	8	0	.0001
Regular	Should	12	41	43	4	0	19.22
N= 50	Is	20	20	43	12	6	.0001
S.Student	Should	4	35	58	4	0	70.36
N= 52	Is	33	47	8	4	8	.0001
R.Student	Should	7	9	56	24	4	32.00
N= 46	Is	0	16	27	40	18	.0001

Function: Determine the method for remediating weaknesses in handwriting.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	10	39	51	0	0	16.80
N= 50	Is	17	42	31	10	0	.0001
Regular	Should	12	25	47	16	0	14.03
N= 50	Is	12	14	53	12	10	.01
S.Student	Should	2	35	52	12	0	37.04
N= 52	Is	20	45	16	20	0	.0001
R.Student	Should	5	7	42	37	9	21.08
N= 46	Is	0	14	26	33	28	.0001

TABLE 54

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in
math.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	14	42	44	0	0	6.68
	Is	20	49	29	2	0	.05
Regular N= 50	Should	12	25	51	12	0	13.76
	Is	12	12	51	18	8	.01
S.Student N= 52	Should	4	38	54	4	0	15.19
	Is	27	53	10	6	4	.01
R.Student N=46	Should	4	9	51	31	4	30.39
	Is	0	16	27	31	27	.0001

Function: Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in
language.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	12	37	51	0	0	5.93
	Is	12	44	40	4	0	.05
Regular N= 50	Should	14	27	47	12	0	15.28
	Is	12	12	51	18	8	.01
S.Student N= 52	Should	4	38	54	4	0	47.17
	Is	28	50	14	4	4	.0001
R.Student N= 46	Should	4	13	60	22	0	32.89
	Is	0	18	36	24	22	.0001

Function: Task analyze skills for EMR and LD students so that skills can
be taught in small steps.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	22	50	28	0	0	20.30
	Is	52	35	13	0	0	.0002
Regular N= 50	Should	47	39	14	0	0	18.90
	Is	51	22	14	8	6	.001
S.Student N= 52	Should	19	35	38	8	0	31.71
	Is	52	24	12	12	0	.0001
R.Student N= 46	Should	18	22	24	33	2	22.20
	Is	16	4	42	29	9	.001

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Develop and distribute a referral form for the purpose of referring EMR and LD students.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	61	10	22	0	6	4.25
	Is	60	8	21	4	6	.05
Regular N= 50	Should	63	16	22	0	0	14.49
	Is	76	14	6	0	4	.01
S.Student N= 52	Should	25	23	40	12	0	36.37
	Is	54	24	6	16	0	.0001
R.Student N=46	Should	16	16	29	29	11	1.52
	Is	18	20	29	22	11	.05

Function: Observe referred students to gather further information for placement decisions.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	22	26	52	0	0	5.59
	Is	27	27	42	0	4	.05
Regular N= 50	Should	39	14	45	2	0	11.34
	Is	24	22	45	6	4	.01
S.Student N= 52	Should	21	33	38	8	0	30.34
	Is	47	31	10	8	4	.0001
R.Student N= 46	Should	13	18	33	22	13	9.97
	Is	4	33	31	22	9	.05

Function: Refer EMR and LD students for special class placement.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	2	8	51	29	10	14.22
	Is	13	2	54	19	13	.01
Regular N= 50	Should	16	12	39	10	24	25.97
	Is	0	4	41	22	33	.0001
S.Student N= 52	Should	4	2	47	37	10	18.54
	Is	8	8	22	39	22	.0001
R.Student N= 46	Should	2	13	44	31	9	22.12
	Is	0	11	18	51	20	.001

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Serve as a leader on the placement and/or assessment committee.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	30	30	40	0	0	9.12
N= 50	Is	37	35	24	0	4	.05
Regular	Should	63	12	25	0	0	7.26
N= 50	Is	44	18	38	0	0	.05
S.Student	Should	10	22	62	4	2	18.64
N= 52	Is	24	36	34	2	4	.001
R.Student	Should	18	20	31	29	2	3.60
N=46	Is	27	18	29	22	4	.05

Function: Communicate to faculties the total placement procedure.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	49	29	22	0	0	66.03
N= 50	Is	54	28	18	0	0	.0001
Regular	Should	61	20	20	0	0	6.82
N= 50	Is	63	29	8	0	0	.05
S.Student	Should	18	36	42	4	0	27.07
N= 52	Is	45	32	17	2	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	33	4	20	29	13	17.88
N= 46	Is	22	16	35	16	11	.01

Function: Determine when and/or if an EMR and LD student should discontinue
being served by the resource teacher.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	12	34	54	0	0	9.52
N= 50	Is	20	39	37	0	4	.05
Regular	Should	18	20	55	8	0	38.96
N= 50	Is	51	27	22	0	0	.0001
S.Student	Should	13	6	77	4	0	70.56
N= 52	Is	25	43	20	8	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	20	2	38	36	4	18.61
N= 46	Is	13	20	38	24	4	.001

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Determine the time of day the special student will go to the
resource room or see the resource teacher.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	18	30	52	0	0	8.76
	Is	10	35	49	6	0	.05
Regular N= 50	Should	43	6	51	0	0	16.69
	Is	63	14	24	0	0	.001
S.Student N= 52	Should	10	8	75	8	0	45.85
	Is	12	8	33	40	8	.0001
R.Student N=46	Should	4	2	40	44	9	20.23
	Is	22	7	24	36	11	.001

Function: Counsel students regarding personal problems, i.e., sibling rival-
ry, child-parent relations.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	4	6	90	0	0	12.77
	Is	8	14	71	6	0	.01
Regular N= 50	Should	18	2	80	0	0	10.96
	Is	12	8	75	6	0	.05
S.Student N= 52	Should	4	8	87	4	0	49.01
	Is	12	33	38	10	8	.0001
R.Student N= 46	Should	2	4	53	31	9	19.51
	Is	4	7	24	42	22	.001

Function: Determine which diagnostic tests will be used to determine present
level of function of the special education student.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource N= 50	Should	30	34	35	0	0	2.63
	Is	41	27	33	0	0	.05
Regular N= 50	Should	53	39	8	0	0	13.36
	Is	73	27	0	0	0	.01
S.Student N= 52	Should	37	40	19	4	0	4.83
	Is	48	36	10	6	0	.05
R.Student N= 46	Should	26	24	20	30	0	19.67
	Is	18	11	31	29	11	.001

TABLE 58

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Seek parental consent for placement.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	26	12	56	6	0	57.05
N= 50	Is	48	53	35	4	36	.0001
Regular	Should	45	33	18	0	4	7.85
N= 50	Is	53	33	12	2	0	.05
S.Student	Should	15	15	62	4	4	32.42
N= 52	Is	35	24	24	14	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	11	4	43	37	4	21.17
N=46	Is	4	11	36	27	22	.001

Function: Communicate to parents when the EMR and LD student needs to practice school work at home.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	14	12	70	4	0	14.18
N= 50	Is	15	4	63	19	0	.01
Regular	Should	31	0	57	8	4	6.83
N= 50	Is	47	0	39	10	4	.05
S.Student	Should	6	21	65	4	4	33.61
N= 52	Is	25	31	31	12	0	.0001
R.Student	Should	2	17	39	35	7	13.84
N= 46	Is	0	20	20	42	18	.01

Function: Determine whether to involve parents in home tutoring.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	6	4	84	6	0	4.94
N= 50	Is	10	10	71	8	0	.05
Regular	Should	31	0	57	8	4	11.48
N= 50	Is	45	2	35	14	4	.05
S.Student	Should	6	23	67	4	0	27.48
N= 52	Is	20	31	33	16	0	.0001
R.Student	Should	9	4	39	37	11	8.65
N= 46	Is	4	9	31	33	22	.05

TABLE 59

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Develop a method of reporting progress or adapt the report card for work done in the resource room.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	39	39	20	0	2	16.96
N= 50	Is	59	17	17	4	2	.01
Regular	Should	57	20	20	0	4	5.92
N= 50	Is	59	10	25	2	4	.05
S.Student	Should	25	27	44	4	0	33.35
N= 52	Is	37	29	12	20	2	.0001
R.Student	Should	17	17	33	24	9	6.26
N=46	Is	26	11	24	33	7	.05

Function: Develop a method of reporting progress or adapt the report card for work done in the regular classroom.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	10	0	42	26	22	15.02
N= 50	Is	8	4	23	25	40	.01
Regular	Should	10	6	37	27	20	4.41
N= 50	Is	4	6	31	31	27	.05
S.Student	Should	0	6	44	31	19	40.17
N= 52	Is	6	4	8	30	39	.0001
R.Student	Should	4	9	39	33	17	5.62
N= 46	Is	0	7	37	43	24	.05

Function: Communicate to parents about what future placements might be for the special education student.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	14	20	63	2	0	17.85
N= 50	Is	32	26	36	4	2	.01
Regular	Should	31	29	35	0	4	4.83
N= 50	Is	37	33	24	2	4	.05
S.Student	Should	10	23	60	4	4	29.37
N= 52	Is	27	35	25	12	2	.0001
R.Student	Should	4	26	33	30	7	18.06
N= 46	Is	13	9	24	46	9	.001

TABLE 60

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Train parents to tutor students using special materials and methods.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	15	44	38	4	0	2.15
N= 50	Is	15	41	35	9	0	.05
Regular	Should	59	24	14	0	4	4.23
N= 50	Is	56	18	24	0	2	.05
S.Student	Should	19	42	35	4	0	38.03
N= 52	Is	45	20	14	20	0	.0001
R.Student	Should	24	17	33	22	4	15.93
N=46	Is	17	4	30	41	7	.01

Function: Invite parents to visit the school.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	2	0	92	6	0	8.46
N= 50	Is	10	2	80	8	0	.05
Regular	Should	6	0	82	0	12	12.82
N= 50	Is	0	0	94	2	4	.01
S.Student	Should	8	2	87	4	0	25.68
N= 52	Is	6	13	60	15	6	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	0	50	30	20	12.93
N= 46	Is	4	4	35	26	30	.05

Function: Seek parents' views on curriculum concerns and priorities.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	0	6	86	8	0	19.40
N= 50	Is	15	6	73	4	2	.001
Regular	Should	29	0	59	0	12	3.23
N= 50	Is	18	0	67	0	14	.05
S.Student	Should	4	6	85	6	0	21.63
N= 52	Is	12	18	55	14	2	.001
R.Student	Should	4	4	52	26	13	14.10
N= 46	Is	4	11	28	35	22	.01

TABLE 61

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Set up a behavior management program in the regular classroom in order to manage the EMR and LD students' behavior.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	4	2	86	0	8	28.61
N= 50	Is	22	10	55	4	8	.0001
Regular	Should	14	0	59	22	6	10.98
N= 50	Is	12	0	39	33	16	.05
S.Student	Should	10	13	63	13	0	49.86
N= 52	Is	21	27	15	37	0	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	7	57	24	13	17.74
N=46	Is	7	2	37	39	15	.01

Function: Ask parents to participate in P.T.A.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	2	0	63	16	18	6.79
N= 50	Is	2	0	58	8	32	.05
Regular	Should	6	0	82	0	12	20.06
N= 50	Is	0	0	69	10	22	.001
S.Student	Should	4	0	87	6	4	25.84
N= 52	Is	4	6	56	19	15	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	0	37	37	26	14.87
N= 46	Is	4	2	26	24	43	.01

Function: Maintain data on students' behavior for purpose of evaluation.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	6	4	84	6	0	28.83
N= 50	Is	16	24	60	0	0	.0001
Regular	Should	6	8	86	0	0	.62
N= 50	Is	4	10	86	0	0	.05
S.Student	Should	4	8	88	0	4	36.75
N= 52	Is	8	35	50	4	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	11	59	26	13	11.92
N= 46	Is	0	17	37	33		.01

TABLE 62

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Locate books and films that might increase the positive understanding of special education students by their classmates.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	8	27	56	6	2	38.15
N= 50	Is	40	19	26	6	9	.0001
Regular	Should	14	8	78	0	0	15.25
N= 50	Is	4	14	75	0	8	.01
S.Student	Should	17	10	63	8	2	56.80
N= 52	Is	38	35	13	8	6	.0001
R.Student	Should	4	11	35	39	11	12.80
N=46	Is	4	18	17	37	24	.05

Function: Teach socially appropriate behaviors to students.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	2	2	92	0	4	12.36
N= 50	Is	6	6	84	4	0	.05
Regular	Should	6	2	92	0	0	10.49
N= 50	Is	4	0	88	8	0	.05
S.Student	Should	2	8	87	4	0	23.65
N= 52	Is	8	25	56	10	2	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	4	50	24	22	12.78
N= 46	Is	4	7	30	24	35	.05

Function: Arrange activities that highlight the abilities and strengths of the special education students.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	6	32	62	0	0	12.26
N= 50	Is	14	41	41	2	2	.05
Regular	Should	32	8	60	0	0	11.57
N= 50	Is	22	4	67	6	2	.05
S.Student	Should	12	19	65	4	0	46.14
N= 52	Is	37	39	20	2	2	.0001
R.Student	Should	7	22	37	26	9	31.72
N= 46	Is	17	4	20	30	28	.0001

TABLE 63

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Determine the curriculum content for each EMR and LD student
in all areas.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	10	12	76	2	0	26.62
N= 50	Is	16	16	45	20	2	.0001
Regular	Should	24	4	63	4	0	10.29
N= 50	Is	14	6	65	16	0	.05
S.Student	Should	10	31	54	6	0	26.50
N= 52	Is	37	21	33	6	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	9	11	50	26	4	4.77
N=46	Is	9	15	37	30	9	.05

Function: Arrange for peer tutors for the EMR and LD student within the
regular classroom.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	4	6	55	24	10	9.21
N= 50	Is	0	6	45	28	21	.05
Regular	Should	22	2	34	20	22	16.03
N= 50	Is	6	4	25	27	37	.01
S.Student	Should	2	10	71	13	4	25.63
N= 52	Is	8	25	37	27	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	13	41	41	4	23.83
N= 46	Is	9	22	24	30	15	.0001

Function: Make supplementary materials for the EMR and LD student to use
in the regular classroom.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	6	10	67	16	0	21.15
N= 50	Is	26	17	40	17	0	.0001
Regular	Should	22	20	44	10	4	30.04
N= 50	Is	6	18	31	20	25	.0001
S.Student	Should	4	15	67	13	0	47.89
N= 52	Is	27	27	27	10	10	.0001
R.Student	Should	9	33	26	28	4	9.27
N= 46	Is	9	18	24	38	11	.05

TABLE 64

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Test different teaching approaches to determine the most appropriate for the EMR and LD student.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	12	31	53	0	4	15.66
N= 50	Is	31	35	29	0	4	.01
Regular	Should	30	0	70	0	0	12.95
N= 50	Is	29	0	59	12	0	.01
S.Student	Should	15	27	54	4	0	41.52
N= 52	Is	35	38	13	10	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	17	13	37	28	4	6.37
N=46	Is	17	9	26	39	9	.05

Function: Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught in the resource room.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	36	44	20	0	0	17.54
N= 50	Is	65	24	10	0	0	.0001
Regular	Should	40	20	36	0	4	19.62
N= 50	Is	61	25	10	0	4	.001
S.Student	Should	31	38	27	4	0	17.95
N= 52	Is	48	38	8	4	4	.01
R.Student	Should	39	15	15	28	2	6.48
N= 46	Is	39	20	11	22	9	.05

Function: Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught by the regular classroom teacher.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	4	8	33	37	18	18.50
N= 50	Is	7	7	11	39	37	.001
Regular	Should	6	0	46	20	28	8.01
N= 50	Is	8	0	27	31	33	.05
S.Student	Should	6	8	58	23	6	50.54
N= 52	Is	10	8	13	39	31	.0001
R.Student	Should	0	0	22	52	26	15.75
N= 46	Is	4	2	30	28	35	.01

TABLE 65

PERCENT OF RESOURCE TEACHERS, REGULAR TEACHERS, SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS
AND REGULAR EDUCATION STUDENTS INDICATING WHO SHOULD BE AND WHO IS
RESPONSIBLE FOR FUNCTIONS RELATED TO TEACHING EMR AND LD STUDENTS

Function: Provide one-to-one instruction.

Groups		Entirely Resource	Mostly Resource	Shared	Mostly Regular	Entirely Regular	Chi Square Probability
Resource	Should	43	20	37	0	0	8.10
N= 50	Is	62	17	21	0	0	.05
Regular	Should	52	2	44	0	2	19.53
N= 50	Is	37	8	37	0	18	.001
S.Student	Should	17	19	58	6	0	25.15
N= 52	Is	37	29	29	2	4	.0001
R.Student	Should	9	22	35	22	13	26.71
N=46	Is	30	4	41	13	11	.0001

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of the role of resource teachers and regular teachers in providing an education for educable mentally retarded students and learning disabled students. The groups whose perceptions were analyzed were resource teachers, regular teachers, college students enrolled in special education training programs and college students enrolled in regular education training programs. Ten hypotheses were used to test the purpose of this study.

Perceptions of roles from the four groups in the study were collected through the administration of an opinionnaire. Respondents indicated the degree that resource teachers and/or regular teachers should be and are responsible for forty functions that are viewed as important in educating mentally retarded and learning disabled students. The forty functions included in the opinionnaire were selected after a thorough review of pertinent literature, after consultation with a variety of specialists in special education, and after subjecting the opinionnaire to a trial run and editing procedures.

The various hypotheses accepted for this investigation were tested by analyzing responses among and between groups with a chi square procedure. This procedure indicated whether there were significant differences between responses assigned to the five options for paired groups as well as for the combined four groups. Differences between and within groups were declared significant when an observed chi square

would have occurred by chance in fewer than five times in 100 times (.05 confidence level).

The comparison between and within groups that either support or repudiate the ten hypotheses of this study are presented in Chapter 4 in Tables 2-11. Further analysis of responses are presented in Tables 12-66.

There was considerable variation between the proportions of responses that any one of the study groups assigned to the five responsibility alternatives. For example, the percentages of responses for a particular function within one of the groups might be distributed relatively evenly over all five options. Such distributions indicate a lack of consensus on many functions within the resource teacher group, the regular teacher group, the special education student group, and the regular education student group.

There was also considerable variation within each participating group relative to the proportion of responses that were assigned to the five responsibility alternatives. For example, it was not uncommon for under 50 percent of a particular group to check one of the five options for one of the educational functions.

Conclusions

The findings of this study warrant the conclusions which follow:

1. There was considerable variation within each study group — resource teachers, regular teachers, special education students, and regular education students — in the perceptions of the responsibility that is shared and should be assumed by the resource teacher and reg-

ular teacher for functions concerned with the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students.

2. There was a general lack of consensus among the four study groups and between paired groups in regard to who should be responsible for important functions concerned with educating special education students. There was more consensus between the resource teachers and the special education students and between the resource teachers and the regular teachers. There was almost a complete lack of consensus between the regular education students and the special education students and the regular education students and the regular teachers relative to who should be responsible for functions related to educating special education students.

3. There was also a general lack of consensus among the four study groups and between paired groups relative to who is responsible for important functions concerned with educating special education students. There was more agreement between the resource teachers and the special education students than between the two practicing teacher groups. On a large number of functions, there were differences between the perceptions of resource teachers and regular education students, of regular teachers and special students, of regular teachers and regular students, and special education students and regular students.

4. Despite the fact that there was considerable disagreement among and between the study groups relative to who is and should be responsible for the educational functions, there was a tendency for resource teachers, regular teachers, and special education students to state that most of the responsibility does rest and should rest with the resource teacher or be equally shared by the resource teacher and

regular teacher. There was a tendency, however, for the regular education students to perceive that the regular teacher has and should have more responsibility. Also, there was a tendency for the participants to assign responsibility roles to the resource teachers for functions that are technical in nature or need specialized training.

5. There were considerable differences on the part of the participants from each of the study groups between perceptions of who is responsible and who should be responsible for the educational functions. This was especially true for the special education students whose perceptions of who is and who should be responsible were significantly different on 39 of the 40 functions.

6. Generally, the participants thought that more of the responsibility for the educational functions should be equally shared between the resource teacher and the regular teacher than was currently in existence. This concept was more prevalent for resource teachers, and special education students than for regular teachers and regular education students.

Recommendations for Further Study

The study was limited to the analyses of the perceptions of resource teachers, regular teachers, special education college students, and regular education students relative to who is and who should be responsible for education functions that are important in educating educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. The obvious lack of consensus among these groups on such an important program strongly suggests the need for additional study.

One productive study might center around discovering and clarifying the perceptions of those who directly influence teachers who are

responsible for working with special education students. For example, a study could be conducted to determine the perceptions of administrators, supervisors, schoolboard members, and college professors relative to who should be responsible for educational functions. If there is disagreement among and between policymakers, administrators, and trainers, confusion as to role perceptions between teachers and prospective teachers can better be understood.

Another productive study might be directed at measuring changes in the perceptions of teachers as a result of cooperative involvement between resource and regular teachers in order to define and clarify roles. Coupled with this effort could be an evolution in the change in attitude and performance of both groups.

The opinionnaire developed for this study provided a tool for soliciting the information presented in this study. Further uses of the instrument may be of value in continuing to examine and define the roles of those persons responsible for the education of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. The responses of public school administrators and university teacher trainers should provide insight into the perceptions of persons who provide leadership and structure to teachers and university students. The instrument could also be utilized in in-service sessions with regular and resource teachers as a method of developing awareness of each group's perception of its own role.

Additional research might be conducted that would relate the degree of consensus that exists among administrators, resource teachers and regular teachers and the measured performance of educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students. In the last analysis, it is

important to know how perceptions and actions on the part of teachers influence student behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Allport, G. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1961.
- Biddle, Bruce J., and Edwin J. Thomas, eds. Role Theory: Concepts, and Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Birch, Jack W. Mainstreaming: Educable Mentally Retarded Children in Regular Classes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1974.
- Borg, Walter R., and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research, An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.
- Christie, Lu. A Very Special Education for All Children. Montpelier; Vermont State Department of Education, 1974.
- Function of the Placement Committee in Special Education. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 1976.
- Gearheart, Bill R., and Mel W. Weishahn. The Handicapped Child in the Regular Classroom. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1976.
- Gross, Neal, Ward L. Macon, and Alexander W. McEachrin. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Hampton, David R., Charles E. Summer, and Ross A. Webber. Organizational Behavior and the Practice. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1973.
- Hammill, Donald and J. Lee Wiederholt. The Resource Room: Rationale and Implementation. New York: Gruen and Stratton, Inc., 1972.
- Hobbs, Nicholas, ed. Issues in the Classification of Children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1975.
- Hobbs, Nicholas. The Futures of Children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers. 1975.
- Paul, James L., Ann P. Turnbull, and William M. Cruickshank. Mainstreaming: A Practical Guide. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1977.
- Resource-Regular Class Programs Serving EMR Pupils. Raleigh: State Department of Public Instruction, 1972.

- Reynolds, Maynard C., and Malcolm D. Davis. Exceptional Children. Minneapolis: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, 1971.
- Rohrer, John H. and Muzaffer Sherif, eds. Social Psychology at the Crossroads. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1951.
- Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organizations: A General Theory. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Wiederholt, J. Lee, Donald D. Hammill and Virginia Brown. The Resource Teacher: A Guide to Effective Practices. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

B. PERIODICALS

- Anderson, Richard D. "Role and Teacher of Educable Mentally Retarded Children," Journal of Special Education, 10 (Winter, 1976), 383-391.
- Beery, Keith E. "Mainstreaming: A Problem and an Opportunity for General Education," Focus on Exceptional Children, 6(November, 1974), 1-7.
- Canady, Robert Lynn, and John T. Seyforth. "Teacher Administration Expectations in Defining Roles for Paraprofessionals," Education, 92 (February, 1972), 99-102.
- Christopolos, F., and P.A. Renz. "A Critical Examination of Special Education Programs,:" Journal of Special Education, (1969), 371-379.
- Cottrell, Leonard L. "The Adjustment of the Individual to His Age and Sex Roles," American Sociology Review, 7 (June, 1942), 618-625.
- Dunn, Lloyd M. "Special Education for the Mildly Handicapped: Is Much of It Justifiable?" Exceptional Children 35 (1969), 5-22.
- Glass, Raymond M., and Roy L. Meckler. "Preparing Teachers to Instruct Mildly Handicapped Children in Regular Classrooms: A Summer Workshop," Exceptional Children, October 1972, pp. 152-156.
- Guerin, Gilbert, and Kathleen Szatlocky. "Integrating Programs for the Mildly Retarded," Exceptional Children, 41 (November, 1974), 173-179.
- Herr, David E., Robert F. Algozzine, and Charles M. Heuchert. "Competencies of Teachers of the Mildly Handicapped," Journal of Special Education, Spring 1976, pp. 97-106.
- Lilly, M.L. "Special Education: A Teapot in a Tempest," Exceptional Children 37 (1970), 43-49.
- McLaughlin, James A., and Corrine Kass, "Resource Teachers: Their Role," Learning Disability Quarterly, 1:1 (Winter, 1978), 56-62.

Prehm, Herbert J. "Special Education Research: Retrospect and Prospect,"
Exceptional Children, September 1976, pp. 10-19.

"What Is Mainstreaming?" Exceptional Children, November 1975, p. 174.

APPENDIX

PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. Resource Teacher 2. Regular Teacher 3. Special Education Student 4. Regular Education Student

The purpose of this opinionnaire is to assess your opinion about the function of the EMR and LD resource teacher in the school. The resource teacher in this opinionnaire is the special educator who works with educable mentally retarded and learning disabled students either in a resource room or the regular classroom for periods of each day. Whenever an item mentions special education students, this will mean the educable mentally retarded (EMR) or learning disabled (LD) students.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please select one response from the SHOULD column and one response from the IS column for each item on the Opinionnaire. Your response in the SHOULD column will indicate how you think things should be and your response in the IS column will indicate how you perceive things as they are in your situation or generally.

The choices for the SHOULD column are as follows:

1. This function should be entirely or ultimately the responsibility of the resource teacher. If it gets done, the resource teacher should be responsible.
2. This function should be the responsibility of the resource teacher but some input by the regular teacher is needed or useful. It is still mostly the responsibility of the resource teacher.
3. This function should be shared equally between the resource teacher and the regular teacher. The responsibility for this function should rest with both teachers.
4. This function should be the responsibility of the regular teacher but some input by the resource teacher is needed or useful. It should still mostly be the responsibility of the regular teacher.
5. This function should be entirely or ultimately the responsibility of the regular teacher. If it gets done, the regular teacher should be responsible.

The choices for the IS column are as follows:

1. This function is entirely or ultimately the responsibility of the resource teacher. If it gets done, the resource teacher does it.
2. This function is the responsibility of the resource teacher, but some input by the regular teacher is needed or useful. It is still mostly the responsibility of the resource teacher.
3. This function is shared equally between the resource teacher and the regular teacher. The responsibility for this function rests with both teachers.
4. This function is the responsibility of the regular teacher but some input by the resource teacher is needed or useful. It is still mostly the responsibility of the regular teacher.
5. This function is entirely or ultimately the responsibility of the regular teacher. If it gets done, the regular teacher is responsible.

BE HONEST AND FRANK IN YOUR RESPONSES. BE SURE TO MARK ONE RESPONSE FROM EACH COLUMN. SELECT THE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM THAT MOST CLOSELY MATCHES YOUR OPINION.

CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FROM EACH SIDE. MARK ONE ANSWER IN THE SHOULD COLUMN AND ONE RESPONSE FROM THE IS COLUMN.

		<u>SHOULD</u>	<u>IS</u>
1. Arrange for speech therapy for special education students when needed.	1	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher	1 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher
	2	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher	2 <u>Is</u> mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher
	3	<u>Should</u> be equally shared responsibility	3 <u>Is</u> an equally shared responsibility
	4	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Regular Teacher	4 <u>Is</u> mostly the responsibility of Regular Teacher
	5	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher	5 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher
2. Adapt the regular classroom curriculum to meet the specific strengths and weaknesses of the special education student.	1	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher	1 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher
	2	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher	2 <u>Is</u> mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher
	3	<u>Should</u> be equally shared responsibility	3 <u>Is</u> an equally shared responsibility
	4	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Regular Teacher	4 <u>Is</u> mostly the responsibility of Regular Teacher
	5	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher	5 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher
3. Adapt the special class curriculum to the specific strengths and weaknesses of the student.	1	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher	1 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher
	2	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher	2 <u>Is</u> mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher
	3	<u>Should</u> be equally shared responsibility	3 <u>Is</u> an equally shared responsibility
	4	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Regular Teacher	4 <u>Is</u> mostly the responsibility of Regular Teacher
	5	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher	5 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher
4. Develop an individualized educational plan for each special education student.	1	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher	1 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Resource Teacher
	2	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher	2 <u>Is</u> mostly responsibility of Resource Teacher
	3	<u>Should</u> be equally shared responsibility	3 <u>Is</u> an equally shared responsibility
	4	<u>Should</u> be mostly responsibility of Regular Teacher	4 <u>Is</u> mostly the responsibility of Regular Teacher
	5	<u>Should</u> be entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher	5 <u>Is</u> entirely responsibility of Regular Teacher

	<u>SHOULD</u>					<u>IS</u>				
5. Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. Determine the method for remediating weaknesses in handwriting.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in math.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. Determine the teaching method for remediating weaknesses in language.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Task analyze skills for EMR and LD students so that skills can be taught in small steps.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Develop and distribute a referral form for the purpose of referring EMR and LD students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. Observe referred students to gather further information for placement decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. Refer EMR and LD students for special class placement.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. Serve as a leader on the placement and/or assessment committee.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14. Communicate to faculties the total placement procedure.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
15. Determine when and/or if an EMR or LD student should discontinue being served by the resource teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16. Determine the time of day the special education student will go to the resource room or see the resource teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17. Counsel students regarding personal problems, i.e., sibling rivalry, child-parent relations.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SHOULD</u>					<u>IS</u>				
18. Determine which diagnostic tests will be used to determine present level of functioning of the special education student.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19. Seek parental consent for placement.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
20. Communicate to parents when the EMR and LD student needs to practice school work at home.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
21. Determine whether to involve parents in home tutoring.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22. Develop a method of reporting progress/or adapt the report card for work done in the <u>resource</u> room.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23. Develop a method of reporting progress/or adapt the report card for work done in the <u>regular</u> classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
24. Communicate to parents about the future placements might be for the special education student.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25. Train parents to tutor students using special materials and methods.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
26. Invite parents to visit the school.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
27. Seek parents' views on curriculum concerns and priorities.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
28. Set up a behavior management program in the regular classroom in order to manage the EMR-LD students' behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
29. Ask parents to participate in P.T.A.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>SHOULD</u>					<u>IS</u>				
30. Maintain data on student's behavior for purpose of evaluation.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
31. Locate books and films of a reference or human interest nature that might increase the positive understanding of special education students by their classmates.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
32. Teach socially appropriate behaviors to students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
33. Arrange activities that highlight the abilities and strengths of the special education students.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
34. Determine the curriculum content for each EMR and LD child in all areas.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
35. Arrange for peer tutors for the EMR and LD student within the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
36. Make supplementary materials for the EMR and LD student to use in the regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
37. Test different teaching approaches to determine the most appropriate for the EMR and LD student.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
38. Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught in the resource room.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
39. Determine the order or priority of skills to be taught by the regular classroom teacher.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
40. Provide one-to-one instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5