

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA**

UMI[®]
800-521-0600

Running Head: Collaborative Teams

Perceptions of the Special Education Teacher's Role in Collaborative Teams:

An Evolutionary Perspective

Marla S. Litvack

Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology

McGill University, Montreal

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
MA in Educational Psychology
Specialization in School/Applied Child Psychology**

© 1998, Marla S. Litvack



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-43905-4

Canada

ABSTRACT

This study explored general and special education teacher satisfaction with special education teacher roles in collaborative teams, whose objective was to include children with disabilities, and the evolutionary stage of the teams according to the integrated model of group development. Thirteen out of 21 targeted teams qualified for the sample. The Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale assessed general and special education teachers' perceptions of special education teachers' current and ideal roles (Cronbach's alpha internal reliability coefficients were .85 and .81). The Team Evolution Questionnaire measured the collaborative teams' developmental stage (Cronbach's alpha was .82). General education teachers were more satisfied with special education teachers' roles than the special education teachers were with themselves ($p < .01$). General education teachers had higher perceptions about how frequently special education teachers performed their roles than special education teachers themselves ($p < .05$). Qualitatively, both groups endorsed several collaborative roles as currently performed most frequently by the special education teachers. Compared to previous literature, these results indicate a shift of priority from noncollaborative to collaborative special education teacher roles. Since all 13 teams were categorized in the most highly evolved stage of group development, a direct comparison between teacher satisfaction and the group's stage of evolution was not possible. Implications of these findings are discussed.

RESUME

Cette étude a exploré la satisfaction des éducateurs généraux et spécialisés avec les rôles des éducateurs spécialisés sur leur équipe collaborative, dont le but était d'intégrer les étudiants avec handicaps, et le niveau de développement des équipes depuis le modèle intégré de développement. Treize de 21 équipes cibles se sont qualifiées pour cette étude. Le "Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale" a évalué les perceptions des éducateurs généraux et spécialisés avec les rôles actuels et idéaux effectués par les éducateurs spécialisés (alpha de Cronbach coefficient de confiance était de .85 et .81). Le "Team Evolution Questionnaire" a mesuré le niveau de développement des équipes collaboratives (alpha de Cronbach était de .82). Les éducateurs généraux ont été plus satisfaits avec les éducateurs spécialisés que ces derniers étaient avec eux-mêmes ($p < .01$). Les éducateurs généraux avaient des perceptions plus élevées que les éducateurs spécialisés au sujet de la fréquence que ces derniers ont performés leurs rôles ($p < .05$). Qualitativement, les deux groupes d'éducateurs ont nommé plusieurs rôles collaboratifs comme les rôles plus fréquemment performés par les éducateurs spécialisés. En comparaison avec la littérature des rôles demandés des éducateurs spécialisés, ces résultats indiquent une évolution de priorité des rôles noncollaboratifs envers l'adoption des rôles collaboratifs. Parce que toutes les équipes ont été catégorisées dans le niveau le plus évolué, une comparaison directe entre satisfaction et le niveau d'évolution des équipes fut impossible. Les implications des résultats sont discutées.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to several individuals whose support and encouragement have been invaluable throughout this project. First, I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. Anastasios Karagiannis, for challenging me to challenge myself. His wisdom, guidance, and critical feedback have enabled me to realize this goal. I am grateful to Anna Sanalitro, my research colleague, for her sense of humour and friendship. I would like to extend my thanks to Dr. Bruce Shore and Litsa Papathanasopoulos for their statistical expertise and to Nancy Marget for helping translate the abstract.

My very special thanks to my family, whose confidence in my abilities kept me going on those long nights in front of the computer. I am also indebted for the personal and professional support I received from my friends; especially Christina Rinaldi, Karen Salem, and Jennifer Hitelman. I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my fiancé, Lorne Daitchman, whose love and understanding inspires me to pursue my goals. Further, I am indebted to the teachers at Preville Elementary School for proofreading the survey package and to Alice Bender for assisting in the location of collaborative teams. Most importantly, I would like to express my appreciation to the principals and teachers of the Western Quebec School Board, without whom this project would not have been realized. I truly admire your devotion to making our schools a place where all children belong.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
RESUME.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1 Introduction.....	1
Research Questions.....	4
Clarifications.....	5
Overview.....	6
CHAPTER 2 Literature Review.....	7
Historical Overview of Special Education Reforms.....	7
Separate Schools.....	7
Separate Classes.....	8
Mainstreaming and Integration.....	8
Inclusion as Special Education Reform.....	9
Systemic Inclusion.....	10
Organizational Restructuring.....	11
Collaborative Teams.....	13
Importance of the General and Special Education Teacher Relationship.....	14
Perceptions of the Special Education Teacher's Role Functions.....	15
Group Evolution.....	26
Foundations of the Group Development Literature.....	26
Bales and Strodtbeck (1951).....	26
Bennis and Shepard (1956).....	27
Tuckman (1965).....	29
Schutz (1966).....	29
Yalom (1975).....	29
Bion (1961).....	30
Lakin and Carson (1964).....	31
Ellis (1979).....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Wheelan's Integrated Theory of Group Development.....	32
Stage one: Dependency and inclusion.....	33
Stage two: Counterdependency and fight.....	34
Stage three: Trust and structure.....	35
Stage four: Work.....	36
Stage five: Termination.....	38
Conclusion.....	38
CHAPTER 3 Method.....	41
Participants.....	41
Apparatus.....	42
School Fact Sheet.....	42
Instruction Sheet.....	42
Background Information Questionnaire.....	42
Team Evolution Questionnaire.....	42
Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale.....	44
Procedure.....	45
CHAPTER 4 Results.....	46
Question 1) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Satisfaction With the Team's Special Education Teacher?.....	46
Questions 2 & 3) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Perceptions of How Frequently Special Education Teachers Currently Perform and Ideally Should Perform Their Role Functions?.....	47
Question 4) What Roles Do General and Special Education Teachers Perceive as Currently Most and Least Frequently Performed by the Team's Special Education Teacher?.....	47
Question 5) What Roles Would General and Special Education Teachers Ideally Prefer the Team's Special Education Teacher to Perform Most and Least Frequently?.....	52
Question 6) Is the Team's Current Developmental Stage Related to General or Special Education Teachers' Satisfaction With the Special Education Teacher?.....	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER 5 Discussion.....	57
Question 1) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Satisfaction With the Team's Special Education Teacher?.....	57
Questions 2 & 3) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Perceptions of How Frequently Special Education Teachers Currently Perform and Ideally Should Perform Their Role Functions?.....	59
Question 4) What Roles Do General and Special Education Teachers Perceive as Currently Most and Least Frequently Performed by the Team's Special Education Teacher?..	60
Question 5) What Roles Would General and Special Education Teachers Ideally Prefer the Team's Special Education Teacher to Perform Most and Least Frequently?.....	62
Question 6) Is the Team's Current Developmental Stage Related to General or Special Education Teachers' Satisfaction With the Special Education Teacher?.....	63
Limitations of the Present Investigation.....	65
Future Directions.....	66
Conclusion.....	67
REFERENCES.....	68
APPENDICES.....	74
Appendix A: The School Fact Sheet.....	74
Appendix B: The Instruction Sheet.....	75
Appendix C: The Background Information Questionnaire.....	76
Appendix D: The Team Evolution Questionnaire.....	77
Appendix E: Characteristics of the Integrated Model of Group Development.....	80

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Appendix F: The Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale -Adapted Version For General Education Teachers.....	83
Appendix G: The Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale -Adapted Version For Special Education Teachers.....	85
Appendix H: The Consent Form.....	87
Appendix I: Certificate of Ethical Acceptability for Research Involving Human Subjects.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Resource Teacher Role Functions.....	18
Table 2.	Resource Teacher Consulting Roles.....	20
Table 3.	Resource Teacher Roles.....	22
Table 4.	Mean Current and Ideal Special Education Teacher Role Performance Ratings by Survey Item.....	48
Table 5.	Mean General Education Teachers' Rankings of Current Special Education Teacher Roles.....	50
Table 6.	Mean Special Education Teachers' Rankings of Current Special Education Teacher Roles.....	51
Table 7.	Mean General Education Teachers' Rankings of Ideal Special Education Teacher Roles.....	53
Table 8.	Mean Special Education Teachers' Rankings of Ideal Special Education Teacher Roles.....	54

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In recent years, there have been widespread calls for restructuring the general and special education systems to include children with disabilities. One of the recommended changes involves the adoption of adhocratic principles. Adhocracies are based on the collaborative generation of innovative ideas and practices by educators. The exchange of creative ideas between educators is central to adhocracies because the solutions required to effectively include students with special needs in the regular classroom vary according to individual student needs (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995).

The movement toward including students with special needs in regular classrooms challenges many general education teachers to educate students with diverse abilities. To satisfy the needs of all their students, teachers increasingly work on a team with other educators. These teams are primarily composed of general and special education teachers. By pooling their skills and experiences in collaborative teams based on adhocratic principles, general and special education teachers can continually reassess their theories and practices relative to those of their colleagues and the needs of their students.

The success of the inclusion process is largely connected to the accomplishments of collaborative teams (Voltz, 1992). As the professionals with the most student contact, general educators probably have the greatest potential to influence the outcome of inclusion. Evidence suggests that dissatisfied professionals are less likely to work collaboratively and are more easily distracted from team goals (Ostroff, 1992). Therefore, it is vital to the inclusion process that teachers feel satisfied in their relationships with

other professionals on their team, especially the special education teacher.

The relationship between general and special education teachers is a key element of inclusion, since the resource teacher model is the most popular form of special education service delivery in North America (Voltz & Elliot, 1990). However, research suggests that the interactions between these two groups of teachers are often problematic (e.g., Dugoff, Ives, & Shotel, 1985; Speece & Mandel, 1980; Voltz, Elliot, & Cobb, 1994). For example, in a survey of resource teacher roles, general education teachers perceived resource teachers to be placing less emphasis than resource teachers themselves on: (a) providing classroom teachers with strategies and materials; (b) observing students in the regular classroom; (c) consulting with parents; (d) administering standardized tests; (e) profiling students' abilities; and (f) giving small group instruction in the resource room (Dugoff et al., 1985).

The dynamics involved in working as a team may partly account for the discrepant views between general and special education teachers regarding the role functions of the resource teacher. Susan Wheelan delineated a five stage model of group development (Wheelan, 1994; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) that integrates the principal theories of group processes (e.g., Bennis & Shepard, 1956; Bion, 1961; Schutz, 1966; Slater, 1966; Tuckman, 1965; Yalom, 1975). In the first stage, inclusion and dependency, members attempt to define what behaviours are acceptable to the leader and other group members. The second phase, counterdependency and conflict, involves member struggles with authority and roles. The third phase, trust and structure, is marked by the development of trust and open negotiation about the goals, roles, team structure, and

division of labour. In the fourth phase, work, there is an increase in productivity. Groups that have a distinct ending point may undergo a fifth stage, termination, that focuses on reactions to being separated from each other and the expression of positive feelings.

Although many theories support the existence of successive phases in the life of a group, some models reject this idea. These models stress that some groups often stay focused on the same issues without resolving them (Bion, 1961; Stock & Thelen, 1958) or that groups are cyclic, whereby progression might result in regression at various points in the group's existence (Bennis & Shepard, 1956; Bradford, Gibb, & Benne, 1964). However, a review by Cissna (1984) of 13 studies that argue against a developmental approach indicates that these investigations have methodological and conceptual shortcomings.

The purpose of this investigation is to examine general and special education teacher satisfaction with special education teacher roles in collaborative teams whose objective is to include students with disabilities, and the evolutionary stage of these teams according to Wheelan's (1990) integrated model of group development. By including satisfaction in the form of the perceptions of general and special education teachers with the special education teacher's role as a construct, this investigation enriches Wheelan's model. In addition to broadening the study of group development to collaborative educational teams, this investigation aims to link changes in group evolution to fluctuations in member satisfaction.

There are also practical ramifications to this investigation. Information regarding the relationship between teacher satisfaction and group development has implications for

the level of satisfaction teachers can expect to experience at different stages of group development. This might prepare teachers for changes in the satisfaction that they experience as the group evolves. Dips in their satisfaction during the early stages of group development may thus seem less the fault of the special education teacher, and more a function of the natural evolution of groups. This information may ease some of the tension between general and special education teachers who work on teams as well as reducing the likelihood that teachers will divert their attention away from team goals (Ostroff, 1992). Awareness that all teams experience frustration before productivity may encourage both groups of teachers to invest their energy in the group (Shaw & Swerdik, 1995). Knowing that it is normal for teams to experience challenging times and that these difficult periods can be overcome can be a motivating force for teachers. Further, discovering the satisfaction level of teachers with special education teacher roles provides information regarding the evaluation of these roles and potential areas for improvement.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between general education teachers' perceptions of the roles of special education teachers, special education teachers' perceptions of their own roles, and the team's stage of group development. Theoretical arguments and prior empirical evidence lead to the formulation of the following questions:

Question 1) Do general and special education teachers differ in their satisfaction with the team's special education teacher (i.e., differences in their perceptions of the current and ideal roles of the special education teacher)?

Question 2) Do general and special education teachers differ in their perceptions of how frequently special education teachers currently perform their role functions?

Question 3) Do general and special education teachers differ in their perceptions of how frequently special education teachers ideally should perform their role functions?

Question 4) What roles do general and special education teachers perceive as currently most and least frequently performed by the team's special education teacher?

Question 5) What roles would general and special education teachers ideally prefer the team's special education teacher to perform most and least frequently?

Question 6) Is the team's current developmental stage related to general or special education teachers' satisfaction with the special education teacher?

Clarifications

To ensure a common understanding of the nomenclature used in this investigation, the meaning of several terms are clarified. The term *special education teacher* encompasses: (a) resource teachers who provide instruction to included children in a separate classroom, and (b) special education teachers who provide assistance to included children in the regular classroom. The terms special education teacher and resource teacher are used interchangeably. The *general education teacher*, also referred to as the regular classroom teacher, is responsible for teaching one or more content areas to all children in the regular classroom. Finally, the terms *group development* and *group evolution* are used synonymously.

Overview

In Chapter 2, the literature on general and special education teachers' perceptions of the special education teacher's role and the stages of group development are reviewed. In Chapter 3, a description of how the investigation was conducted is given, including information about the participants, apparatus, and procedures. In Chapter 4, the study results are presented. Finally, in Chapter 5, the results and implications of this investigation are discussed.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

In this chapter, the literature related to collaborative teams and group development is examined in five sections. First, the history of the inclusion movement is briefly described, from the emergence of the public school system to systematic inclusion. Second, the importance of collaborative teams to inclusive schools is discussed, emphasizing the general and special education teacher relationship. Third, the theoretical and research foundations of group processes are presented. Fourth, the integrated model of group development (Wheelan, 1994; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) is presented. Finally, the link between the literature on collaborative teams and group development is established with respect to the present investigation.

Historical Overview of Special Education Reforms

Separate Schools

The school system serving children with special needs has evolved tremendously in the United States and Canada since compulsory education was legislated in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. At that time, most children were educated together, irrespective of age or ability. However, several groups of children were excluded from receiving regular education in mainstream schools. For example, students from African and Native American backgrounds were largely schooled in separate educational systems. Further, children with visible disabilities were not served in general public schools prior to 1920. In the 1930's and 1940's, some orthopedically handicapped, visually- and hearing-impaired, and mentally retarded children were accommodated in institutions and

special schools (Lovitt, 1993). There were two primary reasons for excluding disabled students from regular schools. First, it was widely believed that their presence would impede the learning or corrupt the morals of other children. Second, it was also thought that disabled children did not need to learn work skills since they would never be productive members of society (Karagiannis, 1992; Karagiannis, Stainback, & Stainback, 1996).

Separate Classes

After World War II, separate classrooms within regular schools were regarded as the best way of educating disabled children. Although disabled children were often in the same schools as their nondisabled peers, there was little contact between the regular and special education systems. Lovitt (1993) described a series of assumptions that prompted the separation of these children from other students. They were believed to function at lower levels, develop skills at different rates, benefit from different instructional techniques, and require the teaching of different skills and behaviours.

Mainstreaming and Integration

A wave of support for mainstreaming children with special needs into regular classrooms occurred in the 1950's and 1960's, spurred by the civil rights movement. The *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) ruling, stating that separate education for African Americans was not equal to the schooling received by other Americans, led to the movement for the racial desegregation of schools. This decision prompted parents and special education leaders to question exclusionary policies for students with mild disabilities. Advocates asserted that disabled children served in separate classes were not

receiving the same educational and social benefits as other children. While exclusionary policies were also debated in Canada, the mainstreaming movement emerged more slowly since education is under provincial jurisdiction (Stainback, Stainback, & Bunch, 1989). Consequently, mainstreaming legislation occurred in a piecemeal manner.

Pressure by parents, courts, and legislators resulted in The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) in the United States, which was amended by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990 (IDEA) (PL 101-476). According to this law, all children are entitled to receive a free, appropriate public education regardless of their disability. With the goal of ending discrimination and stigmatization of disabled students, this mandate required education in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). The responsibility for mainstreaming disabled children was mainly in the hands of general education teachers. At that time, the primary role of special education personnel was to provide academic assistance in the resource room. Similarly, in the 1970's, several Canadian provinces legislated education in the least restrictive environment (Stainback et al., 1989). Despite these advances, the promise of a mainstream that could work with student diversity remained largely unfulfilled.

Inclusion as Special Education Reform

The Regular Education Initiative (REI) called for educators to coordinate their efforts at providing appropriate educational arrangements for all students (Will, 1986). These efforts envision inclusion as a special education reform, in which special needs students in the general education classroom are provided with academic and social supports. The principal goal of inclusion is to provide a setting in which all children have

"the opportunity to learn from one another, grow to care for one another, and gain the attitudes, skills, and values necessary for our communities to support the inclusion of all citizens" (Vandercook, Fleetham, Sinclair, & Tetlie, 1988, p. 16). However, in practice, special needs children placed in general education classrooms often still do the same "different" tasks from their nondisabled peers as they did in separate classes (Berres, Ferguson, Knoblock, & Woods, 1996).

Systemic Inclusion

Since the late 1980's, there have been widespread criticisms of the general and special education systems. Until recent years, most criticisms of the special education system concerned its practices. However, before practices are questioned, the underlying theories and assumptions of special education need to be debated. Skrtic (1986; 1991; 1995) points out that the assumptions of functionalism, the dominant mode of theorizing in special education for most of the twentieth century, must be scrutinized. The first functionalist assumption is that student disability and school failure are pathological conditions within the individual. While the label "mildly handicapped" is based on the assumption that there is a pathology within the child, many classified students are not pathologically disabled. There are also unidentified children who nevertheless require services. Currently, neither the general nor the special education systems accommodate these children's needs (Keogh, 1988; Wang, Reynolds, & Walberg, 1986).

The second functionalist assumption is that the diagnosis of different disabilities is objective and useful (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995). However, different diagnoses do not result in objective distinctions either between who is and who is not labelled "disabled".

nor between categories of disability (Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Wang et al., 1986).

Further, there are no instructionally relevant reasons for making a distinction between disabled and nondisabled children since all students have unique learning needs, regardless of their ability level (Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984).

The third functionalist assumption is that special programming benefits diagnosed students (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995). Given the weak positive effects of special education instructional practices and the negative consequences of labelling, the resource room may not produce better academic or social outcomes than permitting students to remain unidentified in regular classrooms or providing identified students with in-class support services (e.g., Pugach & Lilly, 1984; Stainback & Stainback, 1984).

The final functionalist assumption is that progress in the general and special education systems is a rational-technical process, in which research leads to improvements to conventional diagnostic and instructional practices (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995). It has been argued that the practices underlying assessment and instruction are largely ineffective. As a result, the practice of diagnosis must be replaced by completely restructuring the special and general education systems (e.g., Pugach & Lilly, 1984; Reynolds et al., 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984).

Organizational Restructuring

According to Skrtic (1986; 1991; 1995), two levels of bureaucracy are maintained by school systems. In the *machine bureaucracy*, the outer structure of the school system, work is viewed as easily broken down into simpler tasks that are done by different workers. In the *professional bureaucracy*, the inner structure of the school system, work

is seen as complex and too ambiguous to be broken apart into simple tasks. Therefore, work is coordinated by standardizing the skills of the workers through intensive education and socialization in professional schools.

School organizations are managed as if they were machine bureaucracies. Due to the complex nature of teaching, this framework is ill-suited to the school organization (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995). By misconceptualizing teaching as simple work that can be broken down into subtasks, "effectiveness declines, people become confused, and work doesn't get done. This seems to be one thing that is wrong with many schools. They are managed with the wrong model in mind" (Weick, 1982, p. 673). To allow the public to believe that schools are standardized, legitimate organizations, while permitting teachers to exercise their personal judgement, schools portray themselves as effective machine bureaucracies. While this outer appearance is largely a myth and has little to do with how the work is actually done, the overt conformity with regulations leads to decreased professional thought (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995).

Machine and professional bureaucracies are both performance organizations that try to perfect existing practices rather than create new practices to meet students' diverse needs. Public demands for school change are typically dealt with by building symbols or ceremonies in the machine bureaucracy and by creating separate subunits in the professional bureaucracy such as special classrooms or resource rooms. With these superficial changes, the public perceives that real changes have been made in the school system, relieving the pressure for substantial organizational change (Skrtic, 1986; 1991, 1995).

Skrtic (1986; 1991; 1995) asserts that school organizations should be reconstructed on *adhocratic* rather than bureaucratic principles. Adhocracies, founded on the principles of innovation and problem-solving, are organizational forms that configure themselves around work that is so ambiguous and uncertain that neither standard programs nor skills for doing it are known. The uncertainty provided by student variability is considered an asset in this system because it forces educators to engage in creative problem-solving. Professionals from diverse specialties work collaboratively and assume joint responsibility for the team's work. By revising their theories and practices after communicating with their colleagues, team members achieve a common interest in the well-being of the school organization.

Collaborative Teams

Generating creative and innovative ideas within a collaborative team via an adhocratic system appears to be the wave of the future for catering to students' individual needs. Increasing numbers of general education teachers collaborate with special education teachers, child care workers, school psychologists, and other professionals (Harris, 1990; Karagiannis et al., 1996). The focus of this study is on the relationship between general and special education teachers in collaborative teams. Collaborative school consultation is defined as:

An interactive process that enables people with diverse experience to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems. The outcome is enhanced, altered, and produces solutions that are different from those that the individual team members would produce independently. The major outcome of collaborative

consultation is to provide comprehensive and effective programs for students with special needs within the most appropriate context, thereby enabling them to achieve maximum constructive interaction with their non-handicapped peers.

(Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb, & Nevin, 1986, p. 1)

Several concepts have been incorporated as part of the defining characteristics of collaboration (Cook & Friend, 1991). First, collaboration between professionals is a choice, not a style that is mandated by the administration. Second, collaborating professionals must share specific goals for their activities. Third, collaborating professionals must believe that they have knowledge to contribute to the team and that their input is valued by other members. Fourth, members must share responsibility for the process and outcomes of decision-making. Finally, all members must contribute resources such as time, skills, and materials to the team.

By working together collaboratively, a team of school personnel can profit from the diverse experiences and abilities of its members. Their combined efforts may lead to gains for students, their parents, and professionals such as: improved diagnosis and treatment for the child, increased parental satisfaction, enhanced teacher skills, and staff harmony (Dettmer, Dyck, & Thurston, 1996; Heron & Kimball, 1988; Idol, 1988).

Importance of the General and Special Education Teacher Relationship

If the inclusion of children with special needs into regular classrooms is to be successful, collaboration between general and special educators is crucial (Friend & Cook, 1990; Voltz, 1992; Voltz, Elliot, & Harris, 1995). The experiences of general education teachers are of paramount importance because they have the most student contact and the

primary responsibility for inclusion. Research suggests that dissatisfied professionals are less likely to collaborate and may divert their attention away from team goals (Ostroff, 1992). In the case of a team working to include a child with special needs, general education teachers who are dissatisfied with the special education teacher may not strive to meet the group's aims or opt out of the team. Consequently, general education teachers' satisfaction is integral to the team's success.

Special education teachers can play a substantial role in easing the pressures that general education teachers experience. In the "excellence versus equity" trap, today's general education teachers see the pressure to improve the overall academic performance levels of their students as conflicting with the movement to accommodate students with special needs in their classes (Sapon-Shevin, 1987; Shepherd, 1987). It has been documented that general education teachers teaching students with learning difficulties experience decreased job satisfaction, especially for teachers who are not trained to work with this population (Lobosco & Newman, 1992). If special education teachers can provide services, training, and support to teachers, perhaps general education teachers' attitudes toward instructing children with special needs, job satisfaction, and teaching effectiveness will increase.

Perceptions of the Special Education Teacher's Role Functions

Despite the widespread acknowledgement of the importance of collaboration, the quality of collaboration in actual practice is questionable. On a qualitative note, resource teachers have been perceived by some general education teachers as: the "invisible woman" who seldom ventures out of her room; the "new fellow on the block" who is

perceived as an expensive extra providing no visible help to others; and "Mr. or Mrs. Wizard" who is expected to work magic and fix children (Keller, 1981). Unfortunately, the relationship between general and special education teachers appears to be far from ideal. Due to the importance of these individuals to the success of inclusion, greater attention should be heeded to understanding and improving the relationship between these two professionals. In this section, some of the major investigations of general and special education teachers' perceptions regarding the roles of special education teachers are reviewed (e.g., Dugoff et al., 1985; Speece & Mandel, 1980; Voltz & Elliot, 1990; Voltz et al., 1994).

Speece and Mandel (1980) investigated special education teacher roles in the delivery of support services. In this survey of 228 general education teachers involved in mainstreaming students with learning disabilities, over 50% of the respondents rated the following roles as very important or vital: (a) attending parent conferences; (b) meeting informally to discuss student progress; (c) providing remedial instruction in the resource room; (d) providing information on behavioral characteristics; (e) providing academic assessment data; (f) scheduling meetings to evaluate student progress; (g) providing materials for classroom use; (h) suggesting materials for classroom use; and (i) providing written reports of students' activities and progress. Of these services, the majority of general education teachers indicated that resource teachers provided only informal student progress and remedial instruction on a regular basis.

In another study, an inventory of the special education resource room teacher's role functions, known as the Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher

Interaction Scale (SET-GETIS) was developed to assess the categories of instruction, assessment, and consultation (Dugoff et al., 1985). The 18 resource room teacher role functions displayed in Table 1 were selected through a review of the literature, interviews, and discussions with special education personnel. General education and resource teachers were asked to describe the degree of emphasis the resource teacher placed on each of these role functions in performing their job.

On six out of the eighteen role functions, general education teachers rated the emphasis currently placed on these functions by the resource teachers significantly lower than the ratings given by the resource teachers themselves (Dugoff et al., 1985). These items included three assessment statements (administering standardized tests; profiling student abilities; and observing students in the regular classroom), two consultation items (consulting with parents; providing classroom teachers with strategies and materials), and one instructional item (providing small group instruction in the resource room). These findings are not surprising considering that individuals tend to rate their own responsibilities more highly than those of others (Foskett, 1967). Further, it is understandable that three of the six discrepant functions concerned assessment. Many schools require special education teachers to continually assess students' needs. General education teachers may be unaware of the time involved in administering assessments, preparing assessment reports, and planning programs based on the diagnostic information generated by the evaluation.

When the mean ratings of the role functions were ranked for both groups, the same three items emerged as most important for the resource room teachers and classroom

Table 1

Resource Teacher Role Functions (Dugoff et al., 1985)

Function

1. Developing objectives jointly
 2. Presenting formal inservice sessions
 3. Giving small group instruction in the regular classroom
 4. Providing classroom teachers with strategies and materials
 5. Team teaching in the regular classroom
 6. Observing student in regular classroom
 7. Consulting with parents
 8. Administering standardized tests
 9. Profiling student's abilities
 10. Providing peer tutoring
 11. Coordinating materials
 12. Instructing teachers to administer and use standardized tests
 13. Giving small group instruction in the resource room
 14. Developing cooperative relationships with classroom teachers
 15. Aiding classroom teachers in identifying handicapped students
 16. Helping classroom teachers foster positive student attitudes
 17. Providing supplementary pre-post testing
 18. Providing classroom teachers with professional books/information
-

teachers (Dugoff et al., 1985). These functions were: (a) administering standardized tests; (b) giving small group instruction in the resource room; and (c) consulting with parents. Both groups of teachers ranked the following four items as being the least frequently performed by the special education teacher: (a) teaching classroom teachers to administer and use standardized tests; (b) team teaching in the regular classroom, (c) providing peer tutoring; (d) providing teachers with professional books and information. Both professionals agreed that the administration of standardized tests was the exclusive domain of the resource teacher. Neither group was particularly interested in having the resource teacher become involved in team teaching. While Dugoff et al. (1985) did not suggest a reason for the low interest in team teaching, perhaps it is due to the time that successful team teaching requires. For example, in a series of interviews with special educators, one resource teacher noted that team teaching places limitations on her work with other children. She stated that she is required to schedule all of her "resource students during the periods I'm not in collaborative classes ... my resource classes are bigger than they were [before collaboration]" (Nowacek, 1992, p. 273).

Friend (1984) surveyed resource teachers, general education teachers, and principals to identify the proficiency of the consulting skills they expect resource teachers to possess. To gather information regarding the consultation skills and activities that might be considered appropriate for resource teachers, 17 statements were generated from a review of the literature and a preliminary study of resource teachers' perceptions of their consultative duties (see Table 2).

Table 2

Resource Teacher Consulting Roles (Friend, 1984)**Function**

1. Systematically evaluating interventions to determine effectiveness
2. Establishing a climate of mutual trust
3. Explaining resource teacher perception of a problem to a regular education teacher
4. Defining the problems resource and regular education teachers address
5. Interviewing regular education teachers to obtain information about a student
6. "Brainstorming" to generate possible solutions to a child's academic/social problems
7. Assisting regular education teachers in identifying potential intervention consequences
8. Regularly scheduling conferences with regular education teachers to discuss students
9. Functioning as a resource link between regular education teachers & other individuals
10. Including regular education teachers as partners in planning & implementing programs
11. Resolving conflicts by using strategies that minimize "hard feelings"
12. Using a planned sequence for problem solving with regular education teachers
13. Probing to identify factors contributing to a child's problem including those involving the regular education teacher
14. Observing mainstreamed learners in regular education classrooms & other settings
15. Using strategies to facilitate communication with regular education teachers
16. Paraphrasing to confirm the meaning of regular education teachers' communications
17. Conducting inservice training for regular education teachers

Note. Statements are shortened versions of those presented in the original questionnaire

Overall, resource teachers were rated as moderately skilled as consultants (Friend, 1984). The author concluded that general educators' expectations of resource teachers' consultation skills were very high. With current time constraints, it is questionable whether this "tremendous range of tasks can be successfully managed by a single professional" (Friend, 1984, p. 249). Given the high standards expected by general education teachers, it is not surprising that resource teachers experience a high level of stress and burn out (Friend, 1984). Considering the breadth of these roles, collaboration with the resource teacher might be a more effective and efficient way of getting services and support needed to meet the diverse needs of their students. Rather than being disappointed that the special education teacher cannot unilaterally meet all their needs, perhaps general and special education teachers can problem-solve as a team. By collaborating, all team members and the child concerned may benefit.

Another study investigated the resource teacher's role in encouraging positive interactions with regular educators (Voltz & Elliot, 1990). This 22 item survey (see Table 3) is based on Dugoff et al.'s (1985) SET-GETIS. General education and resource teachers rated the frequency with which resource teachers currently performed the listed role functions. The majority of both groups agreed that resource teachers often or always (a) provided input into grades and promotion decisions and (b) provided small group instruction in the resource room. Both groups indicated that (a) team teaching and (b) setting up a peer tutoring program were rarely performed in the regular classroom.

When asked to rate the items based on the frequency with which they wanted the resource teacher to perform them, the majority of general and resource educators cited 16

Table 3

Resource Teacher Roles (Voltz & Elliot, 1990; Voltz et al., 1994)**Function**

-
1. Developing objectives used on IEP jointly
 2. Meeting to develop and coordinate instructional plans
 3. Coordinating instructional material used in the special education setting
 4. Exchanging student progress information
 5. Sharing diagnostic testing information
 6. Working with general educators to help students develop coping strategies
 7. Providing input into grades and retention/promoting strategies
 8. Conducting joint parent conferences
 9. Participating in joint problem solving
 10. Observing student with disabilities in general education classes
 11. Suggesting effective materials and strategies
 12. Supplying specialized learning materials
 13. Providing instruction in the special education setting on a daily basis
 14. Directing small-group/individual instruction in the general education class
 15. Team teaching in the general education class
 16. Setting up a peer tutoring program
 17. Planning for transfer of skills from the special to the general education setting
 18. Pre/postteaching general education lessons
-

Table 3 (Continued)

Resource Teacher Roles (Voltz & Elliot, 1990; Voltz et al., 1994)

Function

-
19. Making inservice presentations
 20. Providing assistance to general educators regarding administration/interpretation of diagnostic tests
 21. Sharing checklist to aid in identifying special needs students
 22. Providing professional literature regarding disabilities
-

Note. Statements are shortened versions of those presented in the original questionnaire

out of the 22 roles as those the resource teacher should perform frequently (Voltz & Elliot, 1990). The only roles not cited by the special education teachers as those that should be performed often or always were: (a) directing small group instruction in the general education classroom; (b) team teaching in the regular classroom; (c) setting up a peer tutoring program; and (d) making inservice presentations. Similar to the results of Dugoff et al. (1985), general educators reported all but one role, team teaching, as those that should be performed by resource teachers often or always. No role was cited by either group as one that should be performed seldom or never.

Further, regular education teachers reported that resource teachers performed the 22 role functions less frequently than resource teachers felt they performed these functions (Voltz & Elliot, 1990). These findings support the results of previous research that many demands are placed on the resource teachers. Finally, both groups of teachers assigned lower ratings to roles involving the physical presence of special education teachers in general education classes (Voltz & Elliot, 1990). This is not surprising, considering that visits by other professionals to the general education teacher's classroom often create "more feelings of anxiety and defensiveness than support and collegiality" (Dettmer et al., 1996, p. 5).

To learn about differences between general and resource teachers' perceptions of the roles resource teachers currently provide and those they would ideally perform, satisfaction indices were computed (Voltz & Elliot, 1990). The satisfaction indices obtained by subtracting the total score on the ideal scale from the total score on the current scale for each group, resulted in scores of -23.05 for resource teachers and -28.55

for general education teachers. While these figures denote elevated levels of dissatisfaction for both groups, a one-way analysis of variance did not reveal any significant differences between the two groups ($p > .05$) (Voltz & Elliot, 1990).

Voltz et al. (1994) conducted a national study of general and resource education teachers in the United States using the questionnaire in Table 3. While the majority of the resource teachers indicated that they performed 5 out of the 22 roles often or always, most general education teachers indicated that resource teachers did not perform any of the 22 roles often or always. The general education teachers reported that special education teachers seldom or never performed 14 out of the 22 role functions, whereas only 4 functions were reported in this category by the resource teacher. Most resource teachers reported that 18 out of the 22 roles should be performed often or always whereas general education teachers stated that resource teachers should perform all except for the role of team teaching frequently. Neither group reported that any of the roles should seldom or never be performed by the resource teacher.

In sum, studies exploring teacher perceptions of the special education teacher's role revealed several common results. First, general education teachers stated that resource teachers currently perform fewer roles and with lower frequency than the resource teachers themselves reported. Some of the most highly valued special education teacher role functions include: (a) attending parent conferences; (b) providing remedial instruction in the resource room; and (c) administering standardized tests. Interestingly, there was agreement between special and general educators regarding resource teacher roles that were performed infrequently: (a) team teaching; (b) peer tutoring in the regular

class; and (c) providing instruction in the regular classroom. Overall, both professionals had high expectations of what they would like the resource teachers to perform. To accomplish all of the role functions that both groups would like special education teachers to perform, it is suggested that resource and general education teachers work together to pool their diverse expertise.

Group Evolution

Foundations of The Group Development Literature

Individuals develop according to a set of predictable phases over the course of their lives, including infancy, toddlerhood, childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Similarly, it has been suggested that groups proceed through a series of stages. While the existence of groups is important to individuals and organizations, research on group dynamics has waxed and waned over the years (Back, 1979). Only recently has there been a resurgence of interest in small group research. In this section, theoretical and applied contributions that lead to Wheelan's integrated theory of group development are outlined, including the work of the following individuals: Bales and Strodtbeck (1951), Bennis and Shepard (1956), Schutz (1966), Tuckman (1965), and Yalom (1975). In addition, several investigations disputing the existence of predictable and successive stages of group development are critically presented.

Bales and Strodtbeck (1951). In Bales and Strodtbeck's study on phases of group development, twenty-two problem-solving groups who met on one occasion were studied. The investigators concluded that these groups underwent several stages when they made decisions. At first, there is a period of *orientation*, during which information pertaining to

decision-making is shared between members. This is followed by an *evaluation* phase, marked by differences in opinion, values, interpretation of facts, and suggestions.

Subsequently, the *control* phase deals with how the group sets limits on the behaviour of its members and the task at hand in order to reach a decision. Based upon a system they developed to code interaction patterns, the results revealed that 47 percent of the interaction in the first phase concerned orientation; 36 percent in the second phase related to evaluation, and 40 percent in the third period involved control. According to this investigation, groups undergo a developmental process even within one session.

Bennis and Shepard (1956). Further investigations provided evidence that group development proceeds in groups that meet for more than one session. Bennis and Shepard focused on T-groups, whose primary objective is to help individuals understand group dynamics through participation. The leader acts as a facilitator, commenting on the dynamics of the group without attempting to control its direction. Bennis and Shepard envisioned group development in T-groups as involving "the overcoming of obstacles to valid communication among the members" (1956, p. 415).

Two phases exist in T-groups. The first phase, *dependency*, is comprised of three subphases. During the *dependency/flight* subphase, members are anxious and turn to the leader for guidance. Rather than focusing on the group's work, members are preoccupied with gaining the approval of the leader and feeling comfortable in the new situation. Throughout the *counterdependency/fight* subphase, the facilitator frustrates members due to their inability to satisfy the group's needs. Consequently, two opposing subgroups develop: (a) dependents, who support the group leader's neutral stance and (b)

counterdependents, who are angry with the leader's apparent lack of responsibility for group functioning. During the third subphase, *resolution and catharsis*, the group discovers that this animosity has staved off effective group functioning. This realization is aided by the emergence of a third subgroup, (c) the independents, who mediate between the dependents and the counterdependents. Goals, group structure, and norms are developed at this time. Members are less angry with the leader because they have taken responsibility for the progress of the group.

The second phase, *interdependence*, is also composed of three subphases. The first, *enchantment/flight*, is highlighted by cohesion and cooperation. After the turmoil of the first phase, members try to preserve the peace. Since cooperation is highly valued, there is a great deal of pressure to conform. Members think: "Nothing must be allowed to disturb our harmony in the future; we must avoid the mistakes of the painful past" (Bennis & Shepard, 1956, p. 429). As the result of encouraging members to present a unified front, group tension mounts. During the second subphase, *disenchantment/fight*, the group divides into two subgroups: the overpersonals, who want relationships to be intimate and the underpersonals, who seek to keep distance between members. There is difficulty between these groups in deciding how to relate to each other. The emergence of another subgroup, the independents, reconciles an acceptable level of expressed emotion. The final subphase, *resolution/catharsis*, results in the formation of norms that allow for the expression of members' emotions and divergent opinions.

According to Bennis and Shepard (1956), not all groups proceed through all subphases. Groups may get stuck along the way and may not develop any further.

Similarly, some groups may regress to a previous stage and experience difficulty evolving.

Tuckman (1965). A framework of group development that is characteristic of a variety of groups was proposed by Tuckman (1965). The first phase, forming, involves the development of attraction bonds, exchange of information, and dependency. Interactions among members are polite and tentative. The storming phase, is marked by dissatisfaction, competitiveness, and disagreements between members. Phase three, norming, involves the establishment of group rules, structure, and roles. As the group resolves conflict, cohesiveness and harmony increase. Consequently, the group establishes norms, decides upon leadership, and settles on communication patterns. During the performing phase, the group works to achieve the goals that motivated the group's formation. The adjourning phase involves the termination of duties, decreased dependency on fellow members and task completion.

Schutz (1966). A theory founded on team members' needs at various times in the group's evolution was advanced by Schutz (1966). When a group first forms, it enters the inclusion phase. Members feel anxious, leading to "individual-centered behaviour" (Schutz, 1966, p. 169) such as withdrawal, exhibitionism, or excessive talking. Each member decides what level of commitment to devote to the group. In the control phase, members try to work out issues of power and control. Struggles over decision-making methods, leadership, and group rules may ensue. Lastly, there is an affection stage, during which members attempt to achieve a comfortable level of positive social interaction.

Yalom (1975). Yalom (1975) observed that therapy groups undergo several phases. During the orientation phase, members determine a method for reaching their

goals and focus on the interpersonal relationships between themselves and other members. Concurrently, members explore the meaning of therapy, "size up" members of the group (Yalom, 1975, p. 233), search for their role, and seek approval. During the second stage, conflict, dominance, and rebellion, there is conflict between members, or between members and the therapist. According to Yalom (1975), the leader must learn to differentiate between an attack on his character and an attack on his role since it is essential for the group to confront the therapist. The third stage, cohesiveness, is concerned with intimacy and closeness. Although there is greater freedom to disclose one's feelings, pressure to suppress negative affect exists in order to preserve group unity. Eventually, member affect is allowed to be expressed. Only when this occurs can work be accomplished.

In contrast to the successive stage models of group development just described, several theorists posit cyclic models. Rather than viewing groups as developing through a series of stages, these models emphasize the absorption of groups with issues and stress that the resolution of these issues is only temporary.

Bion (1961). Bion presented the idea that at any one time, a group is either: working on the task of the group or behaving as if it cannot work on the task because of the emotional tone of the group. Work refers to the notion that group interaction is directly related to goal achievement. Group emotionality is expressed as dependency, fight/flight, or pairing. Dependency and fight/flight are defined similarly to the Bennis and Shepard (1956) approach whereas pairing concerns the formation and dissolution of subgroups. Bion rejected the notion of smooth developmental patterns. He supposed that

these dynamics could occur in any order at any time, not following a linear trend. This theory is similar to group development theories because it asserts that groups go through stages, yet differs because it maintains that there is no fixed order to these phases.

Lakin and Carson (1964). In a review of investigations claiming to disconfirm the existence of developmental stages, Cissna (1984) argues that these studies have important methodological or conceptual flaws. For example, Lakin and Carson (1964) studied four human relations training groups, consisting of role plays, lectures, and discussion groups that met on sixteen occasions. Participants were asked to rate each meeting (on a scale of 0 to 9) on the intensity of group concern for eleven variables. Results suggest a decline in "competitiveness" and an increase in "cooperation", noting that the groups differ in the points at which and the degree to which "competitiveness" decreases and "cooperation" increases. They concluded that their findings do not support the existence of developmental stages. Cissna (1984) stresses that the changes in competition and cooperation might be related to the group's developmental stage. No theory of group development says that different groups work at the same speed. One group may move more rapidly through some processes and more slowly through others. As a result, it is logical that groups do not reach similar points at the same time. If analogous points are reached in similar sequence, the group development concept would be supported. Further, the lectures and role-playing exercises that were the backbone of these human relations training groups might have influenced the natural process of group development that would occur in unstructured groups.

Ellis (1979). Further problematic evidence against the developmental nature of

groups was provided in an examination of group processes in two decision-making and two women's consciousness-raising groups (Ellis, 1979). The decision-making groups were composed of students who met weekly over a two-month period. The consciousness-raising groups met on several occasions over a three month period. While the total history of the former groups was analyzed, only four sessions were studied for the latter. The group interactions were coded according to five relational positions (strong up, weak up, equivalence, deference, and submission). The results suggest that the two decision-making groups developed similarly, following a four-stage pattern. The consciousness-raising groups were dissimilar from each other and were stationary over time. According to Cissna (1984), the developmental pattern may not have been identifiable in the consciousness raising groups because Ellis analyzed only four sessions, without specifying how these sessions were chosen or which sessions they were. Thus, it is understandable that developmental processes did not appear. It is also possible that the three month period was not adequate time for developmental changes to occur. Cissna (1984) concluded that the studies arguing against developmental phases are not persuasive.

Wheelan's Integrated Theory of Group Development

Based on this rich history of group development, Wheelan (1994; 1996) proposed an integrated model of group development. This model consists of five stages: dependency and inclusion, counterdependency and fight, trust and structure, work, and termination. In this section, the characteristics of each stage are described.

Stage one: Dependency and inclusion. During stage one, members are dependent on the leader and are concerned about being accepted by the group. Anxiety levels are high, due to the novelty of the situation. Members turn to the leader for protection and structure. If there is no designated leader, members are even more uneasy. Members do not rely on each other, nor break into smaller working groups because they have not interacted enough to establish relationships.

The group's communication structure-- the medium for discussing team goals, values, norms, and beliefs-- is established during stage one. The type of communication structure adopted remains quite stable throughout the stages of group development. Communication is centralized and discussion occurs through the leader. In addition, the communication structure is decided upon during a stage in which members suppress their true feelings and are overly polite. As a result, group decisions reached at this stage are often based on inaccurate information. These are not ideal circumstances for developing the communication structure that will best help the group meet its needs.

Although the goals of the group are not clear to stage one team members, clarification is not sought. Members are so concerned about fitting in that they overlook the importance of having clearly defined goals. There are very few overt disagreements among members about the vague goals that do exist. It is assumed that consensus concerning group goals exists. In the same vein, members are uncertain of their roles and responsibilities. Role assignments are based on first impressions and status upon arrival in the group, not member skills. Partly due to the mismatch of roles and abilities, the stage one group is rarely productive.

Stage two: Counterdependency and fight. The hallmark of this stage is the conflict that occurs amongst group members and between members and the leader. The group struggles with how it will operate and on what the most effective roles are for its members. Members start to express their true feelings about how the group should function and try to liberate themselves from the influence of the leader. Consequently, members voice their dissatisfaction with the roles and tasks assigned during stage one and challenge the ideas of the leader. Increased role clarity is sought by members.

Subgroup and coalition formation are a sign of increasing group organization and maturation. Subgrouping occurs when two or more members develop a relationship on the basis of a common understanding. Coalitions involve the collaboration of at least two people who join forces against at least one other person. In stage two, the larger group is intolerant of the developing subgroups and coalitions. Although subgroups and coalitions are threatening, they are integral to group development. To meet their emotional and professional needs, individuals develop different relationships with other members. Conflict between subgroups provides the impetus for the group to develop and clarify its social structure.

During this stage, members often disagree with one another and challenge group decisions. Members begin to express how they feel, even if their views are contrary to the prevailing ideas of the group. While the ensuing conflict may be painful, the successful resolution of disagreements increases trust and cohesion. Being able to disagree with other members or subgroups without fear of abandonment fosters the development of trust and security. Without the communication that allows for the discussion of different member

values, goals, and strategies, member alienation and resentment may decrease drive for goal accomplishment.

Stage three: Trust and structure. During this stage, members feel more secure with the group. Communication is increasingly open and task-oriented. Discussions usually focus on how the group will accomplish its tasks rather than on members' anxieties and concerns. Due to their involvement in refining these goals, members begin to feel enthusiastic about their involvement in the group. More concrete ideas about group goals, organizational structure, procedures, roles, and division of labour develop.

Role assignments that were deemed appropriate at the outset of the group are often identified at this stage as unsuitable. This may be due to more accurate information regarding the expertise of each member. Effecting these reassignments is challenging. Individuals who have been given decreased responsibilities may experience a loss of status and power and are often unwilling to accept a change in their role assignment. Exhibiting one's skills and proving one's allegiance to the group increase the likelihood of positively altering one's role and status.

The leader is increasingly viewed as a group advisor rather than director. While leadership is still necessary for coordination, the role no longer carries the weight it had in the past. Leaders often experience difficulty accepting their loss of power as members begin to take over roles that were once in the leader's domain. Different leadership styles are necessary as groups evolve. For example, at stage one, an autocratic style is often ideal. In stage two, the autocratic style should be avoided. A consultative style is probably best from this stage forward.

Coalitions and subgroups continue to emerge, function, and dissolve during this stage. While there is always some resistance to coalitions and subgroups, they are now treated with more tolerance and trust since the group has survived conflict in the past. The group no longer feels that it will break apart if there are disagreements. While members have learned that coalitions can have positive effects, coalitions or subgroups always have the potential to negatively effect the group. Therefore, they continue to be a threat, although to a lesser extent.

The pressure to conform increases again during the trust and structure stage. Since stage three groups have struggled to gain agreement on goals, roles and procedures, it makes sense that pressures to conform to these agreed upon norms increases. Despite this pressure to conform, punishment for deviation decreases. As members feel that their ideas are listened to, they begin to feel more satisfied with the group. Consequently, members feel a sense of unity and are more willing to conform to the group's ideas. Conflict is of short duration and is managed effectively.

Stage four: Work. During this stage, the focus is on performance, productivity, and problem-solving. Members work more productively because they have established group norms, structure, and goals. There are a variety of challenging tasks for members to do and the group has just enough members to achieve its goals. Members are given responsibilities for work that they are skilled at. Access to resources such as information, individual expertise, allotted time and materials is required for the group to be productive. A great deal of time is spent defining task-related problems or decisions, including recognizing and diagnosing the problem, making decisions, and implementing solutions.

The group encourages high quality performance and innovation. Since innovation often requires the breaking of group norms to permit members to attempt something different, successful groups must be tolerant of task-related deviant behaviour.

Different types of communication are more successful for different types of tasks. For example, a centralized communication network is productive for simple tasks, while a decentralized communication network increases effectiveness for complex tasks. Regardless, member satisfaction is lower in centralized networks. Participation in the decision making process increases member satisfaction. Problem solving and decision making are maximized when groups outline in advance the techniques they will use to solve problems and make decisions.

The stage four group perceives the leader as an advisor. Members have taken on increased responsibilities and no longer rely on the leader excessively. A supportive and participatory leader is a valuable asset to the group, and is still responsible for delegating responsibilities to group members.

The contribution of coalitions and subgroups is valued by the group as a whole. Ongoing interaction and feedback between the subgroup and the larger group is important to subgroup productivity. Subgroups must have access to resources, expertise of individuals outside the group, and technical and human relations training necessary to the tasks at hand. Furthermore, groups that have a defined work territory are more productive. The high level of conformity that surfaced in stage three persists. Deviation is tolerated or accepted when related to tasks because members are more familiar with each other, the group is more cohesive, and the deviator has a history of conforming to the

group norms. Members feel connected to and satisfied with the group, and cooperate with each other. While conflicts occur frequently, these events are of short duration and are managed effectively.

Stage five: Termination. Many working groups end at some point. Awareness that the group is ending frequently alters group dynamics, including regression to previous stages. This may include a surge of conflict or negativity. During this stage, members may discuss their feelings to the impending separation. This investigation examines teams with no planned termination point. Members expect their teams to continue in the following school year. Consequently, termination is not explored in depth in this review.

Conclusion

In sum, several noteworthy themes emerge from the literature on collaborative teams and group development. First, collaboration between general and special education teachers appears to be the favoured approach to meeting the needs of all students in regular classrooms. Ideally, by working together as an adhocratic team, members can generate innovative solutions to classroom problems that they might not have thought of separately on their own (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995).

Second, there is widespread agreement between general and special education teachers on the most frequently performed special education teacher roles: (a) administering standardized tests; (b) giving small group instruction in the resource room, and (c) consulting with parents. The two groups also concurred that (a) team teaching in the regular classroom; (b) providing peer tutoring; and (c) providing teachers with professional books and information are infrequently performed special education teacher

behaviours. Evidently, both groups are clear regarding the functions most important and least important for the special education teacher.

Unfortunately, there is a pervasive theme in the literature suggesting that the relationship between general and special education teachers is riddled with problems (e.g., Dugoff et al., 1985; Friend, 1984; Voltz & Elliot, 1990; Voltz et al., 1995). General education teachers often report that special education teachers fail to perform any role function regularly, while special education teachers indicate that they perform the following roles often or always: (a) exchanging student progress information; (b) sharing diagnostic testing information; (c) providing input into grades; (d) conducting joint parent conferences; and (e) providing daily instruction in the special education classroom (Voltz et al., 1994). Further, general education teachers' ratings of the frequency with which special education teachers perform the following role functions were lower than the ratings assigned by the special education teachers themselves: (a) providing classroom teachers with strategies and materials; (b) observing students in the regular classroom; (c) consulting with parents; (d) administering standardized tests, (e) profiling students' abilities; and (f) giving small instruction in the resource room (Dugoff et al., 1985).

The problems in the relationship between general and special education teachers may threaten the success of collaborative teams. If general education teachers think that special education teachers are not meeting their expectations and special education teachers feel overburdened by the demands placed on them, it will be difficult for these professionals to work together. Considering the evidence that teams undergo developmental stages (Wheelan, 1994; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996), it follows that

team members' expectations of themselves and others varies at various stages in the life of their team. Stage one is a time of uncertainty; when members feel anxious and unsure of their duties. In stage two, conflict often occurs as members begin to express their true feelings. This is followed by stage three, a period of increased trust, when members feel increasingly secure about team goals and member roles. Finally, in stage four, teams become productive.

In today's schools, administrators, educators, and parents often seek quick fixes to improve instantaneously children's social and academic welfare. However, by understanding the gradual, evolutionary process of team development, team members may feel less pressured to be productive, cohesive, and satisfied with other members when the team first forms. In sum, the group development literature suggests that adhocracies, where teams work together to generate innovative ideas, need time to develop.

The primary purpose of this exploratory investigation is to examine the relationship between the collaborative team's developmental stage and the perceptions of general and special education teachers regarding the roles of the special education teacher. An understanding of the link between expectations of special education teachers and the team's stage of group development may lead to modifications of professionals' expectations. Additionally, this investigation seeks to understand the nature of general and special education teachers' current and ideal role perceptions of the team's special education teacher. It is hoped that increased knowledge will lead to improvements in the relationship between general and special educators, two of the most important professionals in the lives of included children.

CHAPTER 3

Method

Participants

Collaborative teams from six general education English language schools in Quebec (3 elementary schools, 2 high schools, and 1 elementary/high school) were recruited for this study. The student population of these schools ranged from 107 to 900 children, ($M = 415$, $SD = 258.5$), with special needs populations varying from between 12.4% to 37% of the total student body ($M = 24.8$, $SD = 10.4$). Principals nominated teams of educators that work together on an ongoing basis to include children with special needs in the regular classroom. Two criteria had to be met for a respondent to be included in the final sample. First, the respondent's team had to be composed of at least one general education teacher and one special education teacher. Additional team members' (e.g., child care workers, behavioural technicians) responses to the Team Evolution Questionnaire (TEQ) were included to learn about the team's developmental stage. Second, all team members were required to participate for a respondent to qualify.

Forty-five (71.4%) of 63 educators returned usable survey forms. Out of these, 32 (29 females, 3 males) met the participation criteria, including 17 general education teachers, 15 special education teachers, and 2 behavioural technicians. In all, 13 complete teams, ranging from 2 to 4 members, participated. Years of teaching experience did not differ statistically between the general ($M = 12.2$, $SD = 11.1$) and special education teachers ($M = 6.3$, $SD = 5.4$, $t(28) = -1.9$, $p < .09$). There was a wide range of special needs served by the collaborative teams, including students experiencing difficulties in the

following areas: behavioural/emotional, cognitive, learning, physical impairment, physical, vision and hearing, and autism.

Apparatus

School Fact Sheet (SFS)

The purpose of the SFS was to obtain information from the principals about the staff and student body composition at participating schools (see Appendix A). This includes the following characteristics: (a) level of the school (i.e., elementary, high school, or elementary/high school); (b) total school population; (c) special needs population; (d) number of general education teachers; (e) number of special education teachers; and (f) additional comments.

Instruction Sheet (IS)

The IS outlines the contents of the survey package and asks participants to verify the accuracy of a team list (see Appendix B).

Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ)

The BIQ gathered the following biographical information about participants: (a) sex; (b) primary professional role on the team; (c) principal responsibilities on the team; (d) other professional roles in the school; (e) special needs populations currently served by the team (see Appendix C).

Team Evolution Questionnaire (TEQ)

The TEQ was developed to measure the process of group evolution in the collaborative team (see Appendix D). This survey is based on the theoretical underpinnings of Wheelan's theory of group development (Wheelan, 1994; Wheelan &

Hochberger, 1996). As detailed in the literature review, Wheelan describes team evolution in five stages: (1) dependency and inclusion; (2) counterdependency and fight; (3) trust and structure; (4) work; and (5) termination. Item categories were formulated based on empirically validated group characteristics at each stage of team evolution (see Appendix E). Category 1 measures communication. Category 2 assesses goals and tasks. Category 3 taps status and roles. Category 4 is related to leadership. Category 5 concerns subgroup formation. Category 6 investigates the level of conformity and deviation. Category 7 measures cohesion and conflict. Category 8 determines problem solving and decision making.

Each category is composed of four options, arranged randomly, representing the four stages of team evolution. The respondent selects the statement most characteristic of their team at the present time. The instrument does not contain a fifth option for assessing the termination phase of team evolution. This is so for two reasons. First, the instrument is designed for use with continuing groups. Second, the termination phase of team evolution has insufficient empirical validation. The initial wording of items was modified based upon the feedback of a local elementary school team and several individual teachers.

The TEQ is scored in four steps. First, each of the eight items is allotted a point value of 1 to 4, according to the corresponding stage of team evolution. For example, a statement that represents a team in stage one is scored a 1, a statement that represents a team in stage two is scored a 2, etcetera. Second, the respondent's total score is computed by totalling the values for all eight categories, resulting in a total of between 8 to 32.

Third, the team's total score is calculated by summing the total points of each

team's respondent and divided by the number of respondents in the team. The resulting number represents the team's stage of evolution. A score of 1 to 8 represents a stage one team, 9 to 16 corresponds to a stage two team, 17 to 24 is a stage three team, and 25 to 32 is typical of a stage 4 team.

The TEQ is used in this investigation as an exploratory measure. As a result, the psychometric properties of this instrument were assessed. Using Cronbach's alpha, the internal consistency of the TEQ was established at .82. This suggest that the internal consistency of the factors was high. To determine construct validity, the responses of the 43 respondents were analyzed through the use of the factor analysis subprogram of SYSTAT (1991). The eigenvalue was set at .40, the average of the initial communality estimates. The four factors that emerged accounted for 63.2% of the variance. These factors provide preliminary evidence for the construct validity of this instrument: Factor I: Communication (four categories: communication, goals and tasks, status and roles, leadership); Factor II: Productivity (three categories: leadership, subgroup formation, problem solving and decision making); Factor III: Conformity (two categories: subgroup formation and conformity and deviation); and Factor IV: Accomplishments (2 categories cohesion and conflict, and problem solving and decision making). Due to the small sample size, the psychometric properties of this instrument are considered preliminary. Further investigation of the TEQ is required for more definitive conclusions.

Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale (SET-GETIS)

An adaptation of the Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale (SET-GETIS) was developed based on the work of Dugoff et al. (1985)

This instrument has two alternate forms: (a) the general education teacher survey (see Appendix F) and (b) the special education form (see Appendix G). Each form is composed of 18 resource teacher role functions related to the interaction between resource room teachers and regular education teachers. General and special education teachers rated their perceptions of the frequency with which the roles are *currently* performed by the special education teacher (current scale) and the frequency with which the roles should *ideally* be performed (ideal scale). The following scale was used: 1 = *never*, 2 = *seldom*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, 5 = *always*. Subsequently, total scores on the ideal scale are subtracted from total scores on the current scale yielding the satisfaction index that represents the satisfaction of the general or special education teacher with the special education teacher.

The internal reliability of the SET-GETIS was determined by computing Cronbach's alpha. Reliability coefficients were .85 for the current scale and .81 for the ideal scale, suggesting that internal consistency is reasonably high.

Procedure

The principal of each participating school completed a fact sheet describing the characteristics of their school. All team members who provided informed consent (see Appendix H) completed the Background Information Questionnaire, the Team Evolution Questionnaire, and the appropriate form of the SET-GETIS. Completed surveys were mailed back individually to the researchers. To ensure confidentiality, the signed consent forms and identifying information sheets were detached from the completed questionnaires and filed separately. A certificate of ethical acceptability for research was obtained for this investigation (see Appendix I).

CHAPTER 4

Results

The results are presented with reference to the research questions of this investigation. The first analysis involves a global measure of special and general education teachers' satisfaction with the team's special education teacher. The second set of findings concerns general and special education teachers' perceptions of the overall frequency with which special education teachers currently perform and ideally should perform the 18 role functions in the SET-GETIS. The third series of results lists the roles both groups of teachers perceive that special education teachers currently and ideally should perform most and least frequently. Finally, findings regarding the relationship between the developmental stage of the collaborative teams and teacher satisfaction are noted.

Question 1) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Satisfaction With the Team's Special Education Teacher?

To gauge satisfaction with the special education teacher, the difference in general and special education teacher perceptions of the roles special education teachers currently perform and those they would ideally like to be performed were computed. A satisfaction index for each group was calculated by subtracting total scores on the ideal scale from total scores on the current scale and dividing by the number of respondents. General education teachers ($M = -5.0$, $SD = 5.4$) were more satisfied with the special education teachers than the special education teachers were with themselves ($M = -11.2$, $SD = 7.8$, $t(30) = -2.65$, $p < .01$).

Questions 2 & 3) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Perceptions of How Frequently Special Education Teachers Currently Perform and Ideally Should Perform Their Role Functions?

To explore the discrepancy in satisfaction, general and special education teachers' reports of how frequently special education teachers currently and ideally should perform their role functions were compared. General education teachers reported that special education teachers *currently* performed the list of roles with greater frequency ($M = 65.5$, $SD = 10.4$) than special education teachers ($M = 55.0$, $SD = 8.9$, $t(30) = -3.1$, $p < .05$).

However, there were no significant differences in how frequently general ($M = 70.5$, $SD = 8.1$) and special education teachers ($M = 66.5$, $SD = 8.1$) would *ideally* like the special education teachers to perform their roles, $t(30) = -1.5$, $p < .2$. This suggests that the discrepancy in satisfaction between the two groups lies in lower special education teacher perceptions of how frequently they currently perform their roles. Both groups had similar ideas of how frequently special education roles should ideally be performed.

Question 4) What Roles Do General and Special Education Teachers Perceive as Currently Most and Least Frequently Performed by the Team's Special Education Teacher?

General and special education teachers' perceptions of the special education teacher roles currently most and least frequently performed were examined by calculating the mean ratings of current role performance for each item, per teaching group (see Table 4). Subsequently items were rank ordered.

Table 4

Mean Current and Ideal Special Education Teacher Role Performance Ratings by Survey Item

Special Education Teacher Role Function	General Education Teacher		Special Education Teacher	
	Teacher		Teacher	
	Current	Ideal	Current	Ideal
Developing objectives jointly with general education teachers	4.5	4.7	3.9	4.4
Conducting inservice training/informational sessions	2.6	3.1	2.1	3.1
Giving small group instruction in the regular classroom	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.7
Providing general education teachers with strategies	3.6	3.9	2.9	3.2
Team teaching in the regular classroom	3.0	3.5	2.4	3.3
Observing students in the regular classroom	3.7	3.9	3.3	3.8
Consulting with parents	4.0	4.3	3.1	3.8
Administering standardized tests	3.9	4.0	3.4	3.3
Profiling students' abilities	4.2	4.2	3.5	3.9
Providing opportunities for peer tutoring	3.1	3.5	2.6	3.5
Providing general education teachers with materials	3.4	3.8	2.9	3.3
Instructing general education teachers to administer/use standardized tests	2.2	2.6	1.4	2.5
Giving small group instruction in the resource room	3.6	3.6	3.0	2.9
Developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.7
Aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs	4.2	4.2	3.2	4.2
Helping general education teachers foster positive student attitude	4.5	4.8	3.7	4.5
Providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented	3.8	4.3	2.9	4.4
Providing general education teachers with professional books and information	3.1	3.5	2.4	3.6

Note. On the rating scale, 1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always.

According to general education teachers, the current most frequently performed special education teacher role functions were: (a) developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers; (b) developing objectives jointly with general education teachers; (c) helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes; (d) profiling students' abilities; and (e) aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs (see Table 5). Special education teachers rated the following functions as most frequently performed: (a) developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers; (b) developing objectives jointly with general education teachers; (c) helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes; (d) profiling students' abilities; and (e) administering standardized tests (see Table 6).

General education teachers noted that special education teachers least often performed the following current roles: (a) instructing general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests; (b) conducting inservice training/informational sessions; (c) team teaching in the regular classroom; (d) providing general education teachers with professional books and information; and (e) providing opportunities for peer tutoring (see Table 5). Special education teachers indicated performing the following current roles least often: (a) instructing general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests; (b) conducting inservice training/informational sessions; (c) team teaching in the regular classroom; (d) providing general education teachers with professional books and information; and (e) providing opportunities for peer tutoring (see Table 6).

Table 5

Mean General Education Teachers' Rankings of Current Special Education Teacher Roles

Special Education Teacher Role Function	Mean	Ranking
Developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers	4.6	1
Developing objectives jointly with general education teachers	4.5	2
Helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes	4.5	2
Profiling students' abilities	4.2	3
Aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs	4.2	3
Consulting with parents	4.0	4
Administering standardized tests	3.9	5
Observing students in the regular classroom	3.7	6
Providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented	3.8	7
Giving small group instruction in the resource room	3.6	8
Providing general education teachers with strategies	3.6	8
Giving small group instruction in the regular classroom	3.5	9
Providing general education teachers with materials	3.4	10
Providing opportunities for peer tutoring	3.1	11
Providing general education teachers with professional books and information	3.1	11
Team teaching in the regular classroom	3.0	12
Conducting inservice training/informational sessions	2.6	13
Instructing general education teachers to administer/use standardized tests	2.2	14

Note. On the rating scale, 1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always.

Table 6

Mean General Education Teachers' Rankings of Current Special Education Teacher Roles

Special Education Teacher Role Function	Mean	Ranking
Developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers	4.3	1
Developing objectives jointly with general education teachers	3.9	2
Helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes	3.7	3
Profiling students' abilities	3.5	4
Administering standardized tests	3.4	5
Observing students in the regular classroom	3.3	6
Aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs	3.2	7
Giving small group instruction in the regular classroom	3.1	8
Consulting with parents	3.1	8
Giving small group instruction in the resource room	3.0	9
Providing general education teachers with strategies	2.9	10
Providing general education teachers with materials	2.9	10
Providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented	2.9	10
Providing opportunities for peer tutoring	2.6	11
Providing general education teachers with professional books and information	2.4	12
Team teaching in the regular classroom	2.4	13
Conducting inservice training/informational sessions	2.1	14
Instructing general education teachers to administer/use standardized tests	1.4	15

Note. On the rating scale, 1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always.

Question 5) What Roles Would General and Special Education Teachers Ideally Prefer the Team's Special Education Teacher to Perform Most and Least Frequently?

General and special education teachers' perceptions of the special education roles they would most and least frequently prefer to be performed were computed by calculating the mean ratings of ideal role performance for each item per teaching group (see Table 4). Subsequently items were rank ordered. General education teachers' perceptions of the ideal role functions that the special education teacher on their team should perform most often include: (a) helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes; (b) developing objectives jointly with general education teachers; (c) developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers; (d) consulting with parents; and (e) providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented (see Table 7). Special education teachers indicated that they would ideally like to perform the following roles most often: (a) developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers; (b) helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes; (c) developing objectives jointly with special education teachers; (d) providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented; and (e) aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs (see Table 8).

General education teachers responded that they would ideally prefer special education teachers to perform the following roles least often: (a) instructing general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests; (b) conducting inservice training/informational sessions; (c) providing general education teachers with professional books and information; (d) providing opportunities for peer tutoring; and

Table 7

Mean General Education Teachers' Rankings of Ideal Special Education Teacher Roles

Special Education Teacher Role Function	Mean	Ranking
Helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes	4.8	1
Developing objectives jointly with general education teachers	4.7	2
Developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers	4.6	3
Consulting with parents	4.3	4
Providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented	4.3	4
Aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs	4.2	5
Profiling students' abilities	4.2	5
Administering standardized tests	4.0	6
Providing general education teachers with materials	3.9	7
Observing students in the regular classroom	3.9	7
Providing general education teachers with materials	3.8	8
Giving small group instruction in the resource room	3.6	9
Giving small group instruction in the regular classroom	3.6	9
Team teaching in the regular classroom	3.5	10
Providing opportunities for peer tutoring	3.5	10
Providing general education teachers with professional books and information	3.5	10
Conducting inservice training/informational sessions	3.1	11
Instructing general education teachers to administer/use standardized tests	2.6	12

Note. On the rating scale, 1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always.

Table 8

Mean Special Education Teachers' Rankings of Ideal Special Education Teacher Roles

Special Education Teacher Role Function	Mean	Ranking
Developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers	4.7	1
Helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes	4.5	2
Developing objectives jointly with general education teachers	4.4	3
Providing evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented	4.4	3
Aiding general education teachers in identifying students with special needs	4.2	4
Profiling students' abilities	3.9	5
Observing students in the regular classroom	3.8	6
Consulting with parents	3.8	6
Giving small group instruction in the regular classroom	3.7	7
Providing general education teachers with professional books and information	3.6	8
Providing opportunities for peer tutoring	3.5	9
Team teaching in the regular classroom	3.3	10
Administering standardized tests	3.3	10
Providing general education teachers with materials	3.3	10
Providing general education teachers with strategies	3.2	11
Conducting inservice training/informational sessions	3.1	12
Giving small group instruction in the resource room	2.9	13
Instructing general education teachers to administer/use standardized tests	2.5	14

Note. On the rating scale, 1 = never; 2 = seldom; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = always

(e) team teaching in the regular classroom (see Table 7). Special education teachers would ideally prefer to perform the following functions least often: (a) instructing general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests; (b) giving small group instruction in the resource room; (c) conducting inservice training/informational sessions; (d) providing general education teachers with strategies; (e) administering standardized tests; (f) providing general education teachers with materials; and (g) team teaching in the regular classroom (see Table 8).

Question 6) Is the Team's Current Developmental Stage Related to General or Special Education Teachers' Satisfaction With the Special Education Teacher?

One objective of this investigation was to examine the effect of the team's developmental stage on general and special education teacher satisfaction with the special education teacher. The TEQ is an exploratory measure included in this investigation to assess team development. The four factors that emerged from factor analysis provide evidence for the construct validity of this instrument. These four factors are: Factor I: Communication (four categories: communication, goals and tasks, status and roles, leadership); Factor II: Productivity (three categories: leadership, subgroup formation, problem solving and decision making); Factor III: Conformity (two categories: subgroup formation and conformity and deviation); and Factor IV: Accomplishments (2 categories: cohesion and conflict, and problem solving and decision making). The reader is referred to Chapter 3 for more information on the validity of the TEQ.

An examination of the data revealed that all thirteen teams were in phase four, Work. All teams scored above the cutoff score of 24 for inclusion in the fourth stage of

team evolution ($M = 28.8$, $SD = 1.5$). Characteristics of this stage represented in this measure include: (a) members express themselves openly and honestly without fear of rejection; (b) members can describe the purpose of the team and are committed to this purpose; (c) members are clear about their roles within the team; (d) members share responsibility for team leadership; (e) subgroups are an important element of the team; (f) members share similar views and choose to go along with the ideas and decisions of the team; (g) there is a strong feeling of respect and appreciation among team members; and (h) the team accomplishes work in a timely and effective manner (see Appendix E for a more detailed description). Due to this lack of variability in group development, statistical analyses comparing the relationship between the team's developmental stage and the satisfaction levels of the general and special education teachers were not computed. The restriction of the qualifying sample to stage four teams may be an indicator that members of teams in earlier stages of evolution may be less motivated to participate in research studies, particularly if they are in the first two stages of development.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

Several important findings emerged from this investigation of general and special education teacher perceptions of the roles of special education teachers and the process of collaborative team evolution. First, general education teachers were more satisfied with their team's special education teacher than the special education teachers were with their own role performance. Second, this difference is attributable to general education teachers' higher ratings of *current* special education teacher role performance. No differences between general and special education teacher perceptions were found in how frequently they would *ideally* like special education teachers to perform their role functions. Third, both groups agreed on the most and least frequently performed special education teacher role functions, as well as those they would ideally like and least like the special education teacher to execute. Finally, since all teams were in the fourth stage of group development, a comparison of group evolution and teacher satisfaction could not be made in this investigation. Interpretations of these findings, limitations of the investigation, and future directions are presented in this chapter.

Question 1) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Satisfaction With the Team's Special Education Teacher?

The derived satisfaction indices indicate that both teacher groups would ideally like the special education teacher to perform their role functions somewhat more frequently than at present. While all teachers report some dissatisfaction with the special education teacher, the satisfaction indices in this investigation were higher than reported by Voltz

and Elliot (1990). In the present study, satisfaction indices of -5 and -11.2 were reported by general and special education teachers which is considerably higher than indices of -28.55 and -23.05 reported by general and special education teachers in the Voltz and Elliot (1990) investigation. While there were 22 items in the Voltz and Elliot (1990) study compared to 18 roles in the present investigation, the satisfaction differences between the investigations nevertheless remain noteworthy.

Sample differences may account for the higher levels of satisfaction in this investigation. Earlier studies sampled teaching professionals that worked in two parallel systems within the same school: general and special education. Traditionally, little contact existed between general and special education teachers who work in such environments. In studies by Voltz and Elliot (1990) and Dugoff et al. (1985), there is no mention of whether a working relationship existed between the two groups of teachers. It appears that general and special education teachers sampled in previous studies worked in the same schools, with the same children, but did not work together. In contrast, the participants in the present investigation were all team members who worked collaboratively to include children with special needs in the regular classroom. It is hypothesized that participating in a collaborative team --a group in which educators brainstorm and problem-solve together-- may account for the higher rates of satisfaction with the special education teacher found in the present investigation.

In addition, general education teachers were more satisfied with the special education teacher on their collaborative team than special education teachers were with themselves. These findings are also contrary to previous evidence that general education

teachers are less satisfied with their special education counterparts than members of the latter group were with their own performance (Dugoff et al., 1985; Voltz & Elliot, 1990). The existence of collaborative relationships between general and special education teachers may have resulted in larger gains for the general education teacher. Perhaps general education teachers feel that the responsibility for including children has shifted to the collaborative team, leading to higher satisfaction with the special education teacher. Perhaps continued collaborative efforts will lead to increased satisfaction for both general and special education teachers.

Questions 2 & 3) Do General and Special Education Teachers Differ in Their Perceptions of How Frequently Special Education Teachers Currently Perform and Ideally Should Perform Their Role Functions?

Special education teachers reported currently performing their tasks less often than the general education teachers noted them as performing. Interestingly, general and special education teachers held similar perceptions of how frequently the special education teacher ideally should perform their role functions. This suggests that the difference between general and special education teachers' overall satisfaction is largely attributable to special education teachers' comparatively lower perceptions of how frequently they currently perform their role functions. With severe cutbacks to the educational system in combination with increasing student needs for services, it is not surprising that the shrinking numbers of special education teachers feel deluged by requests for services. Considering their time constraints and reduced resources, special education teachers may be less satisfied with the services they provide to students and general education teachers

Question 4) What Roles Do General and Special Education Teachers Perceive as Currently Most and Least Frequently Performed by the Team's Special Education Teacher?

There was surprising consistency between general and special education teachers' perceptions of the most frequently performed roles special education teachers currently perform. Both sets of teachers reported the following three roles as currently performed most frequently: (a) developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers; (b) developing objectives jointly with general education teachers; and (c) helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes.

These roles represent a marked difference from the majority of items endorsed as most frequently performed by the special education teacher in previous studies. In the Voltz and Elliot study (1990), general and special education teachers ranked the following items as the top three on the current and ideal scales: (a) providing input into grades and promotion decisions; (b) giving small group instruction in the resource room; and (c) exchanging student progress information. Dugoff et al. (1985) found that both groups of teachers ranked the following top three items: (a) administering standardized tests; (b) giving small group instruction in the resource room; and (c) consulting with parents. In the present study, general and special education teachers' highest ranked responses reflected the importance of collaborative rather than traditional special education teacher roles. Similarly, Speece and Mandel (1980) noted that over 50% of the respondents rated the following roles as very important: (a) providing remedial instruction in the resource room; (b) providing academic assessment data; (c) providing materials for classroom use; and (d) providing written reports of students' activities and progress. The roles most often

reported in the literature concern standardized testing and resource room instruction; roles customarily associated with traditional special education whereas developing cooperative relationships and jointly developing objectives emerged as most valued in the present investigation. This shift toward the valuing of collaborative roles is to be expected, considering that special education teachers are moving away from isolated service delivery that removes a student from the regular class (Stainback, Stainback, & Harris, 1989). This notion is further supported by special education teachers' response that they ideally consider giving small group instruction in the resource room a low priority task. These findings suggest that the adhocratic principles of joint problem-solving and exchanging of ideas (Skrtic, 1986; 1991; 1995) are increasingly being adopted by collaborative teacher teams.

Both teacher groups ranked the following special education teacher functions as least often currently performed: (a) team teaching in the regular classroom; (b) conducting inservice training/informational sessions; (c) instructing general educators to administer and use standardized tests; (d) providing opportunities for peer tutoring; and (e) providing general education teachers with professional books and information. Consistent with the findings of Voltz and Elliot (1990), both groups reported that special education teachers did not frequently perform role functions requiring special education teacher presence in the regular classroom. This may be due to territoriality, whereby general education teachers consider the regular classroom their exclusive domain. An alternative explanation involves budgetary constraints; there may not be enough money to support the presence of two teachers in one classroom. Similarly, the use of standardized tests is considered the

territory of special education teachers, accounting for the lack of a perceived need to train general education teachers in the administration of standardized tests.

Question 5) What Roles Would General and Special Education Teachers Ideally Prefer the Team's Special Education Teacher to Perform Most and Least Frequently?

General and special education teachers agreed that the currently most frequently performed special education teacher roles were also the roles ideally most frequently performed: (a) developing objectives jointly with general education teachers; (b) developing cooperative relationships with general education teachers; and (c) helping general education teachers foster positive student attitudes. The similarity between current and ideal special education teacher role priorities suggests that although both professionals support an increase in the frequency of role performance, they did not desire a change in the nature of the roles special education teachers should perform. In other words, both groups were interested in receiving the same special education services they presently received, on a more frequent basis. This suggests that general and special education teachers agreed about the special education roles services most and least desired.

Similarly, several items that received low ratings on the current scale received low ratings on the ideal scale as well: (a) conducting inservice training/informational sessions, (b) team teaching in the regular classroom; and (c) instructing general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests. This suggests that although special education teachers are perceived as performing these role functions relatively infrequently, neither teacher group perceives these roles as essential. Further, the low ranking of these three

roles are comparable to the findings of the Dugoff et al. (1985) investigation in which these items placed within the lowest ranked 5 out of 18 items. The low priority assigned to team teaching is a weak area for the teams in this study. If student cooperative learning is a valuable tool for realizing the inclusion of students with disabilities, then team teaching is a visible method of modelling cooperative learning by the teachers for the students. In other words, teachers act as an example for students. Otherwise, the following question lingers in students' minds: "If cooperation is important, how come I don't see any teachers doing it in my classroom?"

Question 6) Is the Team's Current Developmental Stage Related to General or Special Education Teachers' Satisfaction With the Special Education Teacher?

All of the participating teams were categorized by the TEQ at the fourth stage of group evolution, Work. Therefore, directly establishing the relationship between group evolution and teacher satisfaction was not possible. However, collateral evidence from this study supports the idea that general and special education teachers' satisfaction with the special education teacher increases as teams evolve. First, in this investigation a high priority was placed on collaborative special education teacher roles and a high level of agreement existed between both teacher groups regarding special education teacher roles. Second, general education teachers were more satisfied with the special education teachers relative to previous studies that found high levels of dissatisfaction. These findings indicate that team members problem-solved together and agreed on individual member roles, two hallmarks of highly evolved teams (see Appendix E for the stage four characteristics of Wheelan's integrated model of development).

Further, linking the present results with the literature provides additional evidence of a pattern between team evolution and satisfaction with the special education teacher. Ostroff (1992) concluded that dissatisfied professionals are less likely to collaborate and may divert their attention away from team goals. In the present study, general education teachers were relatively satisfied and reported that the special education teacher on their team developed objectives jointly with them. It follows that these teams were likely at an evolved stage of group development since both groups of teachers reported that they frequently worked together to create goals, a characteristic of stage four groups (Wheelan, 1994; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996).

Lobosco and Newman (1992) noted that general education teachers who instructed children with disabilities were likely to experience decreased satisfaction with their jobs. This was not the case in the present investigation. In contrast, general educators in this study were actually more satisfied than special education teachers themselves. This may be due to the collaborative relationship they have established with the special education teacher on their team. Working cooperatively and encouraging innovation are stage four skills involved in collaborative work (Wheelan 1994; Wheelan & Hochberger, 1996) that may be linked to increased teacher satisfaction with the special education teacher.

Friend (1984) concluded that a seemingly endless number of role functions were requested of special education teachers by their general education counterparts. Further, general education teachers reported that the special education teachers in their school were moderately skilled as consultants. Dissimilarly, in the present investigation, general

education teachers were quite satisfied with the role performance of the special education teacher on their team. It is quite typical in groups at early stages of development to be unsure of the role functions one is supposed to perform as well as those that should be undertaken by other team members. This is in line with the notion that individuals tend to rate their own responsibilities more highly than those of others. In contrast, it is characteristic for members of highly evolved groups to feel satisfied with the roles that others are performing. This provides further evidence that the groups in this investigation were in stage four, the most highly evolved stage of group development.

Limitations of the Present Investigation

There were several limitations to this study. First, the link between group development and satisfaction with the team's special education teacher could not be established directly since all the teams were classified in stage four-- Work, on the TEQ. Several reasons may account for the TEQ's lack of differentiation between stages of group evolution. First, perhaps the wording of the items lead respondents to answer in a socially desirable manner. As a result, team members might have indicated that their group was more highly evolved than they currently were. Second, one item per characteristic of group evolution may not have been sensitive enough to tap group development. However, collateral evidence indicates that all the teams in the present investigation were highly evolved, and thus were appropriately classified as stage four groups. This is a reasonable hypothesis since data was collected toward the end of the school year, after teams had been working together for many months. Further, some team members in 8 out of the initially 21 targeted teams did not return all their questionnaire, thus disqualifying.

Consequently, the teams that did not respond may have been in earlier stages of development. Any one or a combination of these factors may explain the lack of variability in group evolution in the sample. Third, questionnaires were mailed to respondents. While all educators were asked to complete the questionnaires individually in an effort to tap each respondent's perceptions, it is possible, although the researcher has no such indication, that responses were discussed. This would have biased the results.

Future Directions

Several suggestions for future research are made based on the findings of the present investigation. In this study, general education teachers reported more satisfaction with special education teachers on their team than special education teachers themselves indicated. Since this is directly opposed to the literature, a replication of this study with a larger sample size might provide further evidence as to whether the most important roles valued by general and special education teachers have truly shifted from traditional to collaborative ones. Third, further validation of TEQ is needed to evaluate the psychometric properties of this instrument. Fourth, a longitudinal study tracking group development over the school year and satisfaction with the special education teacher should be undertaken. This would contribute information regarding changes in group evolution that occur over time. Fifth, a comparative investigation of collaborative teacher teams and noncollaborative general and special education teacher relationships should be conducted to explore the role that collaboration plays in satisfaction with the special education teacher. Finally, the possibility that survey questionnaire completion may need to be conducted in the presence of researcher representatives is worthwhile exploring.

Conclusion

General and special education teacher satisfaction with special education teacher roles was higher in this investigation than it has been reported in the literature. This was especially true for the general education teachers. It is hypothesized that increased levels of satisfaction were, in part, due to the fact that participants in this study were collaborative team members—educators who work together to ensure the social and academic inclusion of children with special needs. The results of this study suggest that there is an ongoing shift from valuing traditional special education teacher roles to appreciating collaborative special education teacher roles. Continued exploration of the link between teacher satisfaction and collaborative team evolution is recommended to shed further light on our changing school systems.

REFERENCES

- Back, B. W. (1979). What's happened to small group research? Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 15, 265-432.
- Bales, R. F., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1951). Phases in group problem solving. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46, 485-495.
- Bennis, W., & Shepard, H. (1956). A theory of group development. Human Relations, 9, 415-437.
- Berres, M. S., Ferguson, D. L., Knoblock, D. L., & Woods, C. (Eds.). (1996). Creating tomorrow's schools today: Stories of inclusion, change, and renewal. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bion, W. (1961). Experiences in groups and other papers. New York: Basic Books.
- Bradford, L., Gibb, J., & Benne, K. (1964). T-group theory and the laboratory method: Innovation in re-education. New York: John Wiley.
- Cissna, K. N. (1984). Phases in group development: The negative evidence. Small Group Behavior, 15, 3-32.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1991). Collaboration in special education: Coming of age in the 1990s. Preventing School Failure, 35 (2), 24-27.
- Dettmer, P. A., Dyck, N. T., & Thurston, L. P. (1996). Consultation, collaboration, and teamwork for students with special needs (2nd ed.). Needham Heights Allyn and Bacon.
- Dugoff, S. K., Ives, R. K., & Shotel, J. R. (1985). Public school and university

staff perceptions of the role of the resource teacher. Teacher Education and Special Education, 8 (2), 75-82.

Ellis, D. G. (1979). Relational control in two group systems. Communication Monographs, 46, 153-166.

Foskett, J. J. (1967). The normative world of the elementary school principal. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Advanced Study for Educational Administration.

Friend, M. (1984). Consultation skills for resource teachers. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 7, 246-250.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1990). Collaboration as a predictor for success in school reform. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1 (1), 69-86.

Harris, K. C. (1990). Meeting diverse needs through collaborative consultation. In W. Stainback & S. Stainback (Eds.), Support networks for inclusive schooling: Interdependent integrated education (pp. 139-150). Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Heron, T. E., & Kimball, W. H. (1988). Gaining perspective with the educational consultation research base: Ecological considerations and further recommendations. Remedial and Special Education, 9 (6), 21-28, 47.

Idol, L. (1988). A rationale for establishing special education consultation programs. Remedial and Special Education, 9 (6), 48-58.

Idol, L., Paolucci-Whitcomb, P., & Nevin, A. (1986). Collaborative consultation. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Karagiannis, A. (1992). The social-historical context of special education and mainstreaming in the United States from independence to 1990. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Montreal.

Karagiannis, A., Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1996). Rationale for inclusive schooling. In S. Stainback & W. Stainback (Eds.), Inclusion: A guide for educators (pp. 3-15). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Keller, H. R. (1981). Behavioral consultation. In J. C. Conoly (Ed.), Consultation in the schools (pp. 59-100). New York: Academic Press.

Keogh, B. K. (1988). Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21 (1), 19-22.

Lakin, N., & Carson, R. C. (1964). Participant perceptions of group process in group sensitivity training. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 14, 116-122.

Lobosco, A. F., & Newman, D. L. (1992). Teaching special needs populations and teacher job satisfaction: Implications for teacher education and staff development. Urban Education, 27 (1), 21-31.

Lovitt, T. C. (1993). Recurring issues in special and general education. In J. I. Goodland & T. C. Lovitt (Eds.), Integrating general and Special Education (pp. 49-72). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Nowacek, E. J. (1992). Professionals talk together: Interviews with five collaborating teachers. Intervention in School and Clinic, 27 (5), 262-276.

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 963-974

Pugach, M., & Lilly, M. S. (1984). Reconceptualizing support services for classroom teachers: Implications for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (5), 48-55.

Reynolds, M. C., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and general education. Exceptional Children, 53 (5), 391-398.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1987). The national education reports and special education: Implications for students. Exceptional Children, 53 (5), 300-307.

Schutz, W. (1966). The interpersonal underworld. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Shaw, S. R., & Swerdik, M. E. (1995). Best practices in facilitating team functioning. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), Best practices in school psychology III. (pp. 153-159). National Association of School Psychologists: Washington, D.C.

Shepherd, L. A. (1987). The new push for excellence: Widening the schism between regular and special education. Exceptional Children, 53 (5), 327-329.

Skrtic, T. M. (1986). The crisis in special education knowledge: A perspective on perspective. Focus on Exceptional Children, 18 (7), 1-16.

Skrtic, T. M. (1991). The special education paradox: Equity as the way to excellence. Harvard Educational Review, 61 (2), 148-206.

Skrtic, T. M. (Ed.). (1995). Disability and democracy: Reconstructing (special) education for postmodernity. New York: Teachers College Press.

Slater, P. (1966). Microcosm. New York: John Wiley.

Speece, D. L., & Mandel, C. J. (1980). Resource room services for regular

teachers. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 3, 49-53.

Stainback, S. & Stainback, W. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51 (2), 102-111.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S., & Bunch, G. (1989). Introduction and historical background. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education (pp. 3-14). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Stainback, S. B., Stainback, W. C., & Harris, K. C. (1989). Support facilitation: An emerging role for special educators. Teacher Education and Special Education, 12 (4), 148-153.

Stock, D., & Thelen, H. (1958). Emotional dynamics and group culture. New York: New York University Press.

Tuckman, B.W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 384-399.

Vandercook, T., Fleetham, D., Sinclair, S., & Tetlie, R. (1988). Cath, Jess, Jules, and Ames ... A story of friendship. IMPACT, 2, 18-19.

Voltz, D. L. (1992). Just what do you mean, collaborate? LD Forum, 17 (4), 32-34.

Voltz, D. L., & Elliot, R. N. (1990). Resource room teacher roles in promoting regular interaction with regular educators. Teacher Education and Special Education, 13, 16-166.

Voltz, D. L., Elliot, R. N., & Cobb, H. B. (1994). Collaborative teacher roles: Special and general educators. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27 (8), 527-535.

Voltz, D. L., Elliot, R. N., & Harris, K. C. (1995). Promising practices in facilitating collaboration between resource room teachers and general education teachers. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 10 (2), 129-36.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1986). Rethinking special education. Educational Leadership, 44 (1), 26-31.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (10), 673-676.

Wheelan, S. A. (1990). Facilitating training groups: A guide to leadership and verbal intervention skills. New York: Praeger.

Wheelan, S. A. (1994). Group processes: A developmental perspective. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Wheelan, S. A., & Hochberger, J. M. (1996). Validation studies of the group development questionnaire. Small Group Research, 27 (1), 143-170.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52 (5), 411-415.

Yalom, I. D. (1975). The theory and practice of group psychotherapy (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The School Fact Sheet (SFS)

COLLABORATIVE TEAMS PROJECT SCHOOL INFORMATION

Dear (name of principal),

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the McGill University Collaborative Teams Project. To get a better understanding of your school, we would like some additional information on the following:

1) Level of school:

- A) Elementary school only
- B) High school only
- C) Elementary and high school
- D) Other (specify: _____)

2) Total school population: _____

3) Approximate number of children that you consider to have special needs: _____

4) Number of special education/resource teachers/tech aides/shadows: _____

5) Number of general education teachers: _____

6) Further comments that may help us understand the student body and the process of inclusion at your school:

Please mail this information sheet by May 23, 1997 in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. We have also requested that the participating teams mail the completed surveys by May 23, 1997. Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix C

The Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ)

Please circle or answer <u>all</u> items.

1) What is your sex?

- A) Male
- B) Female

2) What is your *primary* professional role in the school with respect to this team? Check one.

- ☐ A) General education teacher
- ☐ B) Resource teacher (Special education teacher, free-flow teacher, etc.)
- ☐ C) Principal
- ☐ D) Behaviour technician/Shadow
- ☐ E) Other (specify: _____)

3) In brief, list the principal responsibilities of this position:

4) How many years of experience do you have in this capacity?

_____ years

5) Do you currently hold *other* professional role(s) in the school? Rank up to 3 roles (1 = most important, 2 = moderately important, 3 = least important)

- ☐ A) General education teacher
- ☐ B) Resource teacher (Special education teacher, free-flow teacher)
- ☐ C) Principal
- ☐ D) Behaviour technician/Shadow
- ☐ E) Other (specify: _____)

5) Which statement best describes the function of your team? Circle A or B.

- A) The general education teacher seeks the input of one or more professional(s) to address a problem concerning a child in his/her class.
- B) Two or more team members voluntarily share decision making as they work toward integrating a child.

6) On average, how frequently has your team met from August 1996 to the present?

- A) More than 4 meetings per month
- B) 3-4 meetings per month
- C) 1-2 meetings per month
- D) less than one meeting per month

7) What special population(s) is/are currently served by your team? Circle all that apply.

- A) Behavioural/Emotional difficulty
- B) Cognitive disability
- C) Learning disability/difficulty
- D) Physical impairment
- E) Vision or hearing impairment
- F) Other (specify: _____)

Appendix D

The Team Evolution Questionnaire (TEQ)

In each category, circle the letter next to the statement that is most characteristic of your team at the present time. Circle only one letter per category and respond to all 8 categories. Please take into account the behaviours of your team as a unit, rather than the individual behaviours of the members.

Category 1

- A) Members express themselves openly and honestly without fear of rejection. Members listen to each other and express warmth, understanding, and acceptance. Differences of opinion and perspective are valued.
- B) Members often interrupt, withdraw, or express negative reactions to the formal leadership of the group and/or each other. Communication within the team is guarded or impulsive, reflecting conflict and/or frustration. The team shows little evidence of listening and understanding.
- C) Members act politely and cautiously toward each other, because they are unfamiliar with the team. Members look to the group leader to facilitate communication in the team. Members are often hesitant to express their feelings and opinions.
- D) Members encourage and support each other. They tend to withhold negative comments. Members listen to one another more and more.

Category 2

- A) Each member can describe the purpose of the team and is committed to this purpose. Goals and tasks are clear and appropriate. Tasks are varied and challenging for the members.
- B) Not all members express their views. Therefore, it is unclear if team members share a common goal. Members are more focused on "How do I fit in?" and "How will we work together?"
- C) Individual members are becoming committed to the goals of the team. Team goals and tasks are becoming clear, and the team is beginning to develop methods for achieving them.
- E) Members seem confused or disagree about the goals of the team.

Category 3

- A) **Members are clear about their roles within the team. Work assignments match the abilities of members.**
- B) **Members tend to disagree about their role assignments. Members find themselves in uncomfortable situations in which others expect something from them that they are unable or unwilling to do.**
- C) **Members' roles tend to be based on first impressions and on their professional status before joining the team rather than on their abilities.**
- D) **The team is redefining or reassigning roles that fail to match members' abilities. These adjustments are made to increase the likelihood of achieving the goals of the group.**

Category 4

- A) **The team depends on the leader or formal structure of the team for direction. Members are cautious and formal in their contributions to the team.**
- B) **Members share responsibility for team leadership and fulfil various roles for accomplishing tasks and running the group.**
- C) **The leader acts as an advisor to the group. Members are beginning to share responsibility for running the group.**
- D) **Members are disenchanted with the team leader. There is low confidence in the leader's ability to provide direction and structure.**

Category 5

- A) **Members are beginning to form subgroups (smaller working groups) with individuals who have similar goals or tasks to accomplish. The existence of these subgroups causes anxiety and conflict between the subgroup and the rest of the team.**
- B) **There is an increased acceptance of subgroups by the team.**
- C) **Members have yet to form subgroups, either because they have limited knowledge of each other or because the team is composed of only two members.**
- D) **Subgroups are an important element of the team. Subgroups have access to and use available resources effectively.**

Category 6

- A) Members share similar views and choose to go along with the ideas and decisions of the team.
- B) Members go along with the ideas and decisions of the team because they wish to be accepted.
- C) Members express views that are different from those of the team. The team is receptive to these views if they are in harmony with the overall ideas of the team.
- D) Members express views that are different from those of the team. This difference in opinion often results in conflict.

Category 7

- A) Members rarely give recognition to or express appreciation for each other. They tend to criticize each other or focus on the negative aspects of the team.
- B) There is a strong feeling of respect and appreciation among team members. Individual and team accomplishments are frequently recognized by the team members, the team leader, and the team as a whole.
- C) Members increasingly express recognition and appreciation for one another. Trust and harmony are developing in the group.
- D) Members look more to the group leader for recognition, approval, and appreciation than to other team members.

Category 8

- A) The team shows evidence of accomplishing a considerable amount of work. Members often agree on how to solve problems and make decisions.
- B) The team shows evidence of accomplishing a considerable amount of work. Members struggle with problem-solving and decision-making.
- C) The team shows little evidence of accomplishing work. The problem-solving and decision-making skills of the team are undeveloped.
- D) The team accomplishes work in a timely and effective manner. Members have highly developed problem-solving and decision-making skills and value each others' differences in opinion.

Appendix E

Characteristics of the Integrated Model of Group Development (Wheelan, 1994)

Stage	Characteristics
One: Dependency and inclusion	1. Members are concerned with personal safety in the group 2. Members are concerned with acceptance and inclusion 3. Members fear group rejection 4. Members communicate in a tentative and very polite manner 5. The members behave in ways suggesting a need for directive leadership 6. The leader is expected to provide members with direction & safety 7. The leader is rarely challenged 8. Goals are not clear to members, but clarity is not sought 9. Members rarely express disagreement with initial group goals 10. The group assumes that consensus about goals exists 11. Role assignments tend to be based on external status, first impressions, and initial self-presentation of members 12. Member compliance is high 13. Communication tends to be centralized 14. Participation is generally limited to a few vocal individuals 15. Overt conflict is high 16. Conformity is high 17. A lack of group structure and organization is evident 18. Member deviation from emerging norms is rare 19. Cohesion/group commitment are based on identification with the leader 20. Subgroups and coalitions are rare at this stage
Two: Counter- dependency and fight	1. Conflicts about values emerge 2. Disagreements about goals and tasks emerge 3. Increased feelings of safety allow dissent to occur 4. Dissatisfaction with roles may surface 5. Clarification of goals begins 6. Role clarification also begins 7. Members challenge the leader 8. Subgroups and coalitions form 9. Group intolerance of subgroups and coalitions is manifest 10. Increased member participation is evident 11. Decreased conformity begins 12. Deviation from emerging group norms occurs 13. Attempts at conflict management are evident 14. If efforts to resolve conflicts are successful, increased consensus about group goals and culture become evident near the end of this stage 15. Conflict resolution, if successful, increased trust and cohesion

Characteristics of the Integrated Model of Group Development (cont.)

Stage	Characteristics
Three: Trust and structure	1. Increased goal clarity and consensus are evident 2. Roles/tasks are adjusted to increase the likelihood of goal achievement 3. The leader's role becomes less directive and more consultative 4. The communication structure appears to be more flexible 5. The content of communication becomes more task oriented 6. Pressures to conform increase again 7. Helpful deviation is tolerated 8. Coalitions and subgroups continue to form 9. Increased tolerance of subgroups and coalitions is evident 10. Cohesion and trust increase 11. Member satisfaction also increases 12. Cooperation is more in evidence 13. Individual commitment to group goals and tasks is high 14. Greater division of labour occurs 15. Conflict continues to occur 16. Conflict management strategies are more effective 17. The group works to clarify and build a group structure that will facilitate goal achievement and productivity
Four: Work	1. Members are clear about group goals 2. Members agree with the group's goals 3. Tasks are appropriate to group versus individual solution 4. Members are clear about their roles 5. Members accept their roles and status 6. Role assignments match member abilities 7. The leadership style matches the group's developmental level 8. Delegation, or unleadership, is the prevailing leadership style 9. The group's communication structure matched the demands of the task 10. The group has an open communication structure in which all members participate and are heard 11. The group has an appropriate ratio of task and socio-emotional statements 12. The group gets, gives and utilizes feedback about its effectiveness/productivity 13. The group spends time defining problems it must solve and make decisions 14. The groups spends time planning how to solve problems & make decisions 15. The group spends enough time discussing decisions it faces 16. The group chooses participatory decision-making methods

Characteristics of the Integrated Model of Group Development (cont.)

Stage	Characteristics
Four: Work (cont.)	17. The group implements and evaluates its solutions and decisions. 18. Voluntary conformity is high 19. Task-related deviance is tolerated 20. The group norms encourage high performance and quality 21. The group expects to be successful 22. The group encourages innovation 23. The group pays attention to the details of its work 24. The group accepts coalition and subgroup formation 25. Subgroups are integrated into the group-as-a-whole 26. Subgroups work on important tasks 27. Tasks contain variety and challenge 28. Subgroups work on a total product or project 29. The group contains the smallest number of members necessary to accomplish its goal(s) 30. The group has access to technical and people resources necessary to accomplish its task(s) 31. The group has access to needed technical/interpersonal consultation 32. The group has access to needed technical/human relations training 33. The group has a defined work territory 34. The group is allotted sufficient time to develop a mature working unit and to accomplish its goals 35. Subgroups are recognized and rewarded by the group 36. The group is highly cohesive 37. Interpersonal attraction among members is high 38. Members are cooperative 39. Periods of conflict are frequent but brief 40. The group has effective conflict-management strategies
Five: Termination	1. Group members know that the group will be ending soon 2. The group's ability to manage conflict may begin to deteriorate 3. Members may discuss ways to continue the group 4. Work activity may increase or decrease abruptly 5. Feelings of solidarity among members may increase 6. Increased expressions of positive feelings among members may occur 7. Problematic issues may be avoided 8. Stress and anxiety among members is evident 9. Some members may become apathetic with regard to the group. 10. Members discuss group achievements.

Note. Characteristics are excerpted from Wheelan (1994); p. 64-5, 83, 100, 116-7, 119

Appendix F

The Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale (SET-GETIS)

-Adapted Version For General Education Teachers

Using the following rating scale, indicate the frequency with which *Jane Doe* the RESOURCE TEACHER (I.E., SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER, FREE FLOW TEACHER, etc.) on your team:

A) Currently performs the following roles/functions with your team.

B) Ideally would perform the following roles/functions with your team.

Please respond to A and B for all items

Rating Scale:		never	seldom	sometimes	often	always
1) Develops objectives jointly with the general education teachers						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
2) Conducts inservice training/informational sessions						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
3) Gives small group instruction in regular classroom						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
4) Provides general education teachers with strategies						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
5) Team teaches in the regular classroom						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
6) Observes students in the regular classroom						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
7) Consults with parents						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
8) Administers standardized tests						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
9) Profiles students' abilities						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale:		never	seldom	sometimes	often	always
10) Provides opportunities for peer tutoring						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
11) Provides general education teachers with materials						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
12) Instructs general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
13) Gives small group instruction in the resource room						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
14) Develops cooperative relationships with general education teachers						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
15) Aids general education teachers in identifying students with special needs						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
16) Helps general education teachers foster positive student attitudes						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
17) Provides evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
18) Provides general education teachers with professional books and information						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
PLEASE RETURN ALL SURVEYS IN THE POSTAGE-PAID ENVELOPE BY
MAY 23, 1997.

Appendix G

The Special Education Teacher-General Education Teacher Interaction Scale (SET-GETIS)

-Adapted Version For Special Education Teachers

According to the following rating scale, indicate the frequency with which you, as a RESOURCE TEACHER (I.E., SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER, FREE FLOW TEACHER, etc.):

A) Currently perform the following role functions with your team.

B) Ideally would perform the following role functions with your team.

Please respond to A and B for all items

Rating Scale:		never	seldom	sometimes	often	always
1) Develop objectives jointly with the general education teachers						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
2) Conduct inservice training/informational sessions						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
3) Give small group instruction in regular classroom						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
4) Provide general education teachers with strategies						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
5) Team teach in the regular classroom						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
6) Observe students in the regular classroom						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
7) Consult with parents						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
8) Administer standardized tests						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
9) Profile students' abilities						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5

Rating Scale:		never	seldom	sometimes	often	always
10) Provide opportunities for peer tutoring						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
11) Provide general education teachers with materials						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
12) Instruct general education teachers to administer and use standardized tests						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
13) Give small group instruction in the resource room						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
14) Develop cooperative relationships with general education teachers						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
15) Aid general education teachers in identifying handicapped students						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
16) Help general education teachers foster positive student attitudes						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
17) Provide evaluation of students before and after a strategy is implemented						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5
18) Provide general education teachers with professional books and information						
A) Currently		1	2	3	4	5
B) Ideally		1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
PLEASE RETURN ALL SURVEYS IN THE POSTAGE-PAID ENVELOPE BY
MAY 23, 1997.

Appendix H

The Consent Form

COLLABORATIVE TEAMS SURVEY

Dear Jane Doe,

Educators working in teams play an important role in the lives of children with special needs in our schools. To date, little research has been conducted in this field in Quebec. Your school is cooperating with McGill University in a study investigating the experiences of educators that work as a team to include students with special needs. Participants will be asked to complete the enclosed 30-minute survey. ***Please note that all team members are needed to participate if your team is to be considered in this study.***

Only the researchers will have access to the raw data. Complete anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained. No reports or data will use your name. To ensure this, every survey has been given a random number that corresponds to the number on the consent form. This number will represent the participant's identity. These two documents will be kept separate.

Should you wish to participate in this study, please sign the consent form below. We would appreciate if you could mail the completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by **Friday, May 23, 1997**. Thank you in advance for your cooperation. If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact us at the following telephone numbers: Anna (514-695-5083) or Maria (514-484-3599).

Anna Sanalidro, B.Ed, Sp. Ed. Certificate
Grade 2 Teacher, Preville Elementary
M.Ed Candidate
Dept. of Educational and Counselling Psychology
Faculty of Education
McGill University

Maria Litvack, B.A.
M.A. Candidate
Dept. of Educational and Counselling Psychology
Faculty of Education
McGill University

CONSENT FORM

_____ agrees to complete the survey on the experiences of
(Print your name)
educators engaged in collaborative teaming. I am free to withdraw at any point
during the study.

Date : _____

Signature: _____