The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships among leadership style (telling, selling, participating and delegating), personality preferences (Extravert/Introvert, Sensing/Intuitive, Feeling/Thinking, Judging/Perceiving and effectiveness as a consultant teacher. The sample consisted of thirty-one consultant teachers from Oregon: twenty from the Portland School District, five from the Gresham School District and six from Linn-Benton Education Service District.
Three instruments were selected: (1) The LEAD-Self, (2) the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and (3) the Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants. Data was collected during the 1987-1988 school year.

No significant relationship was found between the consultant teachers' effectiveness score and any of the four measures of leadership, although the raw scores indicated that selling and participating were the two leadership styles most often used by the consultant teachers.

Two significant relationships were found. 1. There was a relationship between personality index preference and effectiveness in consulting. The Sensing score was a significant variable when effectiveness was considered. In addition, the Extravert and the Sensing scores together were good predictors of effectiveness. 2. The leadership style of selling was related to the personality preference of Judging.
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Over two thousand years ago Plato stated, "If anyone is insane, let him not be seen openly in the city, but let the relatives of such a person watch over him in the best manner they know of; and if they are negligent, let them pay a fine.... Those of inferior parents and any children of the rest that are born defective will be hidden away, in some appropriate manner, that must be kept secret" (Hewett and Forness, 1977, p. 18). The history of education for exceptional children is a story of neglect, denial, and rejection. The general consensus was that they could not be taught, and were not worth teaching. Reynolds and Birch (1977) noted that as recently as 1927, Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in Buck v. Bell supported a sterilization policy for retarded citizens. He wrote that it would be better for all the world if, instead of waiting to execute degenerate offsprings for crime or letting them starve from their
imbecility, society would prevent those who are unfit from procreation.

Fortunately, we have come a long way from the Spartan practice of killing malformed infants, hiding handicapped children and sterilizing retarded citizens, but it has been a long and painful journey. The values and beliefs of our founding fathers shaped our society in order to make these attitude changes towards handicapped people possible. (Kirk and Gallagher, 1986).

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, famous educators such as Horace Mann and Dorothea Dix encouraged the establishment of residential schools for children who were deaf, blind, mentally retarded, or orphaned. These schools provided not only training, but also an environment that often gave protection to the person throughout life. Educational reformers, such as the Frenchmen Itard, Seguin, Binet, and Braille, held that children who were handicapped could learn with the help of special education and that intelligence could be improved through education. During the twentieth century we have seen more and more acceptance of handicapped children into the mainstream of society, in order to provide opportunities for the
handicapped to be more self-sufficient and less economically dependent on the state. Gallaudet and Bell insisted that children who were hearing-handicapped could learn to communicate effectively. The Austrian psychologist Anna Freud stated that the techniques of psychoanalysis could be used with children who have emotional problems. In addition, the research done by Alfred Strauss indicated that some children have unique patterns of learning disabilities, probably due to brain injury, and could learn if appropriate methods were applied (Kirk and Gallagher, 1986). Special schools and self-contained special education classrooms within the regular school building are thus not a new concept.
Background of Present Problem

Turnbull and Turnbull (1982), stated that litigation based on the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution was the original source for establishing and maintaining the educational rights of handicapped children. Rulings from federal and state courts have validated the right of handicapped children to equal treatment under the law. Congress, in 1975, designed a uniform national procedure for funding programs for handicapped children and implementing these rights. This Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, also called Public Law 94-142, requires that states provide handicapped children with a "free appropriate public education" in the "least restrictive environment."

The requirement of "least restrictive environment" (LRE) had its origin in Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Pennsylvania (Civil Action No. 71-42. Amended consent agreement 14 February 1972) when the court stated the following:

It is the Commonwealth's obligation to place each mentally retarded child in a free, public program of education and training appropriate to the child's capacity, within the context of the
general educational policy that, among the alternative programs of education and training required by statute to be available, placement in a regular public school class is preferable to placement in a special public school class and placement in a special public school class is preferable to placement to any type of program of education and training.

P.L. 94-142 states that, to the maximum extent appropriate, children with handicaps are to be educated with children who are not handicapped. Although the word "mainstreaming" was not mentioned in the Education of All Handicapped Children Act, in 1976, the Council for Exceptional Children described the school environment in which handicapped children should be educated. An official definition of mainstreaming is as follows:

Mainstreaming is a belief which involves an educational placement procedure and process for exceptional children, based on the conviction that each such child should be educated in the least restrictive environment in which his educational and related needs can be satisfactorily provided. This concept recognizes that exceptional children have a wide range of special educational needs, varying greatly in intensity and duration; that there is a recognized continuum of educational settings which may, at a given time, be appropriate for an individual child's needs; that to the maximum extent appropriate, exceptional children should be educated with nonexceptional children... (Reynolds and Birch, 1977, p.5).

Handicapped children, who can learn in regular classes with
the use of supplementary aids and services, should attend regular classes. The regular classroom is considered the least restrictive environment, because it is the normal educational placement. A recent report by the U.S. Department of Education (1985) Seventh Annual Report to Congress pointed out that 68% of all handicapped students are receiving most of their education in the regular classroom. The primary responsibility for teaching mainstreamed handicapped children is placed on the regular classroom teacher. Although court decisions demand compliance, they cannot assure or guarantee compliance. (Turnbull and Turnbull, 1982). When, as in some cases following P.L. 94-142, the defendants were neither willing nor able to comply, the plaintiffs were forced to return to court for additional assistance (Turnbull and Turnbull, 1982). The Mattie T. v. Holladay (1975) class-action suit focused primarily on the least restrictive environment issue. Placement in a self-contained classroom removed the handicapped child from the opportunity to interact with nonhandicapped peers. Through a consent decree the court held that the rights of the handicapped were violated when those handicapped individuals were removed
from the educational mainstream. The case was settled in favor of
the plaintiffs.

Having legally established the right to be educated in the least
restrictive environment, the task now at hand was to insure that the
handicapped child received an equal education in a mainstreamed
environment. Reynolds and Birch (1977) pointed out that educating
exceptional children in the mainstream requires more than merely
placing them in the regular classroom. Simply dumping children
back into community schools or into regular classes is a cruelty to
everyone involved: pupils, teachers, and parents. It is not enough for
the handicapped child to be physically located in the classroom, and
then to be isolated there academically and socially. In order for the
handicapped child to achieve the greatest success in school, the
most productive learning environment for that child has to be
arranged. Reynolds and Birch (1977) found that a full continuum of
instructional arrangements, to meet the needs of individual children,
is extremely important to mainstreaming.

The definition of mainstreaming by the Council for Exceptional
Children stated that there is a recognized continuum of educational
settings for the exceptional child. As early as 1968, Deno (1970, p. 235) developed a cascade system of special education service. (See Figure 1.) She defined the cascade of services as a design:

- to make available whatever different-from-the-mainstream kind of setting is required to control the learning variables deemed critical for the individual case. It is a system which facilitates tailoring of treatment to individual needs rather than a system for sorting out children so they fit conditions designed according to group standards not necessarily suitable for the particular case.

Deno's cascade of services shows various learning environments for handicapped children. Level I is the least restrictive learning environment. Level VII is the most restrictive learning environment, with a more severe degree of exceptionality. The main objective of this cascade is to move the handicapped child as quickly as possible towards the child's most productive environment based on the child's ability.

Through federal, state and local educational agencies, almost all levels of the Deno's cascade of services are available to handicapped students. For example, the child who is confined to a hospital for a period of time or who is homebound receives tutoring
Figure 1. The cascade system of special education service. The tapered design indicates the considerable difference in the numbers involved at the different levels and calls attention to the fact that the system serves as a diagnostic filter. The most specialized facilities are likely to be needed by the fewest children on a long term basis. This organizational model can be applied to development of special education services for all types of disability. (Deno, 1970, p. 235).
from specially trained itinerant teachers. Every state has residential schools or institutions for handicapped children. Some school systems have special day schools for those children whose special needs are such that they cannot be satisfied in the regular classroom with nonexceptional children, even with the provision of supplemental aids and services. At times severely handicapped children learn best in a self-contained special class. Placed in the part-time special classes are children who need more time for special instruction than the short period of time in the resource room is able to provide. The resource room accepts children for a specific period of time on a regularly scheduled basis. Kirk and Gallagher (1986, p. 51) noted that the resource room teachers "consult with classroom teachers to develop programs that are intended to eventually eliminate the need for resource room help." Finally, Level I of Deno's cascade of services refers to handicapped children who are placed in a regular classroom situation with limited support services. This phase represents the final level of services along a continuum from residential, to special class, to resource room, to the regular classroom. (Reynolds and Birch, 1977).
The classroom teacher is directly responsible for providing effective educational programs to all children, including the handicapped child.

Numerous research studies dealing with the efficacy of mainstreaming confirm the findings by Wang and Baker (1985-1986, p. 503) that "mainstreamed disabled students consistently outperformed nonmainstreamed students with comparable special education classifications." Research done by Wang and Reynolds (1985) showed that the merger of general education and special education services resulted in a better education for handicapped children and more educational individualization for nonhandicapped students. In addition, the exceptional child feels "less isolated, more stimulated, viewed as less special, and having appropriate language and behavioral models to emulate" (Hewett and Forness, 1977, p. 592).

Placing several handicapped children or even one in a regular classroom can be stressful to an already overburdened classroom teacher. As these special children are placed in regular educational programs, teachers will have greater need for consulting services to
help them deal with children whom they feel ill prepared to teach. Placing the handicapped children in a regular classroom without additional assistance for the teacher and student would be a step backwards. Research done by Hudson (1979) revealed that teachers believed they lacked time, training and the necessary support services in order to teach handicapped children effectively. Teachers who have the competencies to include exceptional children in their regular instruction need to receive the necessary instructional materials and specialist staff assistance in order to make mainstreaming of the exceptional child work. Recently considerable attention has been paid to the establishment of an educational consultant model to supply the classroom teacher with additional support. West, Director of the Research and Training Project on School Consultation, and Idol, who has written extensively about the topic of collaborative consultation, saw the need for both quantity and quality of interaction between regular and special educators. West and Idol (1987) explored the use of special education teachers or learning or behavior specialists as consultant teachers in order to provide indirect service delivery and support to the classroom
teachers as a means of improving the quality of instruction for exceptional children in the classroom.

Idol-Maestas and Ritter (1985) stated that teacher consultant services should be regarded as part of a special education continuum of services. Resource room teachers are hired to educate mildly handicapped students, but these special educators do not spend much time as consultants to regular classroom teachers.

Despite these recommendations for a consultant model, little information is available about characteristics and traits needed to be an effective consultant. Friend (1985, p. 119) suggested that research "is needed of the skills hypothesized as valuable for special education consultants, both in terms of specifying efficient and effective training practices...." Expert consultants should be studied. Conoley (1986, p.17) reported that this research is difficult to do, "but overreliance on trainee effects limits our knowledge of the consultation process." Very few regular and special educators are receiving any formal training in consultation skills. More than two-thirds of our handicapped children however, receive some or all their education in the regular classroom. There
is an urgent need to improve the quality of the interaction between general and special educators. Effective consultant teachers and general educators should work collaboratively in order to improve learning opportunities for our handicapped students. The National Education Association, the American Association for School Administrators, and the Council for Exceptional Children (Weintraub, 1987, p.1) published a joint statement "encouraging the further development of collaborative efforts that appropriately and effectively utilize professional and other resources at the local level." This statement was endorsed by the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Easter Seal Society, the National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children, the Council for American Private Education, the Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, the National Association of Pupil Personnel Administrators and the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf.

West and Idol (1987, p. 405) stated the following:

Investigations are needed to determine knowledge, skills, attitudes, and personality characteristics of successful versus unsuccessful
consultants and consultees. Analysis to determine the relative importance of each of these areas to success in consultation are also needed.

A Delphi panel, under the direction of West and Cannon (1987), rated the knowledge of leadership styles as important, but not essential to the collaborative consultation process. West and Cannon expressed their disappointment in these results. They attributed this rating to a lack of familiarity with the principles and the use of Hersey and Blanchard's (1982) situational leadership styles, known as telling, selling, participating and delegating. West and Idol (1987) identified input, process and output variables in the consultation process which should be investigated by researchers. Among these are consultant characteristics such as personality factors and consultation styles, such as leadership control. This study proposes to increase the body of knowledge in this new discipline by studying the relationship between leadership styles and personality preferences which are necessary to be an effective consultant teacher.

The results of this research can be utilized to improve the consultant teachers' and the regular teachers' preservice and
inservice training program. No research has been conducted on the consultant teachers' leadership styles and personality preferences needed to be an effective consultant.

**Statement of the Problem**

Are there relationships among leadership styles, personality preferences, and being an effective consultant teacher?

**Purpose of the Study**

The major focus of this research study was to investigate the leadership styles and personality preferences of effective consultant teachers. This study utilized as its population groups of teachers with limited background and experience in consulting. They were employed at the Portland School District, Gresham School District and Linn-Benton Education Service District in Oregon. Each consultant teacher received six days of training in the collaborative consultation model from Drs. Bonnie Staebler and Bonnie Young of Western Oregon State College.
The primary questions addressed by this research project are:

(1) Are there differences among leadership styles with respect to consultant teacher effectiveness?

(2) Are there relationships between the four personality index preferences and consultant teacher effectiveness?

(3) Is there a relationship between leadership styles and personality index preferences?

**Definition of Terms**

**Collaborative Consultation.** This term refers to the collaborative interaction process between two or more parties for the purpose of preventing or solving a problem. Collaboration implies parity of knowledge and skills between both parties. Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb, and Nevin (1986, p. ix) stated that "collaborative consultation is an interactive process that enables teams of people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems."
Consultant Teacher: A teacher who, in a collaborative way, works with the regular classroom teacher to solve problems in a creative and effective way.

Handicapped Students: Children with handicapping conditions, such as physical, intellectual and emotional problems, as defined in federal and state regulations and who are eligible for special education in order to reach their fullest educational potential.

Leadership: This term refers to the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in order to accomplish a goal. Hersey and Blanchard (1986, p. 161) describe the four leader behaviors in the following manner:

- **Telling** - Provide specific instructions and closely supervise performance.
- **Selling** - Explain decisions and provide opportunity for clarification.
- **Participating** - Share ideas and facilitate in making decisions.
- **Delegating** - Turn over responsibility for decisions and implementation.

Mainstreaming: This term refers to the practice of educating the handicapped child to the greatest extent possible in the regular classroom with supplemental services from a consultant.
teacher.

**Personality.** This term refers to the complex of characteristics that distinguishes an individual; the totality of an individual's behavioral and emotional characteristics.

**Personality Preferences.** Operationally defined by Isabel Briggs Myers and Mary H. McCaulley (1985, p. 2):

**Extraversion–Introversion (EI)**
Extraverts are oriented primarily toward the outer world; thus they tend to focus their perception and judgment on people and objects. Introverts are oriented primarily toward the inner world; thus they tend to focus their perception and judgment upon concepts and ideas.

**Sensing–Intuition (SN)**
The SN index is designed to reflect a person's preference between two opposite ways of perceiving; one may rely primarily upon the process of sensing (S), which reports observable facts or happenings through one or more of the five senses; or one may rely more upon the less obvious process of intuition (N), which reports meaning, relationships and/or possibilities that have been worked out beyond the reach of the conscious mind.

**Thinking– Feeling (TF)**
The TF index is designed to reflect a person's preference between two contrasting ways of judgment. A person may rely primarily on thinking (T) to decide impersonally on the basis of logical consequences, or a person may rely primarily on feeling (F) to decide primarily on the basis of personal or social values.
Judgement–Perception (JP)
The JP index is designed to describe the process a person uses primarily in dealing with the outer world, that is, with the extraverted part of life. A person who prefers judgment (J) has reported a preference for using a judgment process (either thinking or feeling) for dealing with the outer world. A person who prefers perception (P) has reported a preference for using a perceptive process (either S or N) for dealing with the outer world.

Public Law 94-142. This public law number 142 was passed by the 94th Congress. It is a law signed by President Ford in 1975. It is also referred to as the Education of All Handicapped Children’s Act of 1975. This bill assures a free and appropriate equal education for all handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 21 years.

Special Education Teacher. A teacher certified in Special Education who has an assigned group of handicapped students to teach.
Limitations of this Study

The following should be considered limitations in using these data in other settings:

1. The study was limited to three school districts in Oregon, one urban and two semi-rural.
2. No research has been done regarding leadership style and personality preferences of effective consultant teachers.

Basic Assumption

The following is assumed:

Leadership styles and personality preferences of effective consultant teachers can be identified.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In order to understand the collaborative consultation model as a support service to the regular classroom teacher and the leadership characteristics and personality preferences needed to be an effective collaborative consultant teacher it is necessary to examine the literature from which these concepts originate. The discussion which follows first reviews definitions of consultation, then reviews ten consultant models from an interdisciplinary viewpoint. Finally, it reviews literature identifying essential collaborative consultation competencies needed by effective consultants.

Definitions of Consultation

Consultation is often defined as any service provided by a professional. The ninth edition of Webster's Dictionary (1987, p. 282) defines a consultant as "one who gives professional advice or
services." In the medical, organizational and mental health literature the term "consultation" has been defined in a variety of ways. The medical profession describes consultation as the process by which a physician obtains the expert advice of another physician. Schein (1969) described the task of the organizational consultant as assisting an organization in solving its own problems by making it aware of organizational processes, of the consequences of these processes, and of the skills by which they can be changed. In the mental health profession consultation is a process of interaction between two professional persons: the consultant, who is a specialist, and the consultee, who requests the consultant's help in regard to the management or treatment of a client with whom he is having difficulty and whom he has decided is within the other's area of specialty. (Caplan, 1964).

Regardless of how various disciplines define consultation, the process of consultation is the same. Meyers, Parson and Martin (1979) reported that consultation consists of at least six characteristics. First, consultation is a problem-solving process. Second, it occurs between a consultant (the help-giver), a consultee
(the help-seeker) and a client (the person for whom the consultee has responsibility). Third, consultation is a voluntary relationship. Fourth, the consultant and the consultee share in solving the problem. Fifth, the goal is to solve a current problem of the consultee. Sixth, through consultation the consultee will be able to deal more effectively with a similar problem in the future.

**Consultant Models**

A consultant's efficiency and effectiveness is usually increased when a systematic model is followed. The consultation model provides the road map within which the consultant delivers services. According to West and Idol (1987) there are basically ten consultant models: Mental Health, Behavioral, Organizational - Human Relations, Organizational Thinking, Advocacy, Process, Clinical, Program, Education/Training and finally Collaborative Consultation. Regardless of the specific characteristics of each model, the ultimate purpose of consultation is to provide problem-solving services for present problems and to strive for enhancement
of the consultee's skills for any future problems. The discussion which follows will briefly examine each of these ten consultant models with a more detailed examination of the collaborative consultant teacher model.

**Mental Health Consultation.** One of the most influential scholars in mental health consultation is Caplan (1970). He developed consultation from a psychoanalytic mental health model. Psychotherapy is a treatment provided by a psychiatrist in order to cure or relieve mental disorders in a patient. The patient reveals personal confidential information. During mental health consultation, however, caution is taken not to intrude on the consultee's privacy. The difference between psychotherapy and mental health consultation is that the primary goal of psychotherapy is to cure the patient of personal pain and discomfort, while in mental health consultation the primary goal is to increase effectiveness in the work setting. Caplan described four areas of mental health consultation: client-centered, consultee-centered, program and administrative consultation. The major differences between these approaches are the goals and targets.
In the client-centered approach, the consultant develops a plan to help the client. The goal of this consultation model is that the consultee will have an increased ability to handle a similar situation in the future, to broaden the consultee's thinking. The consultant is seen as the expert.

In the consultee-centered approach the major intervention technique is the process of helping consultees become more sensitive to their feelings as well as to the feelings of others (Reschly, 1976). Consultees may lack knowledge, such as knowledge of mental retardation; or an understanding of the psychological and social issues involved; self-confidence; or professional objectivity in handling clients' problems (Caplan, 1970).

In the "program-centered" administrative consultation, the consultant is invited by an administrator to assist with a current problem. In this case, the consultant focuses on the problem of a whole organization.

Finally, in the "consultee-centered" administrative consultation the consultant is hired by an organization to assist with program difficulties. This work will usually be for a longer
period of time and the consultant will work with individual consultees only.

**Behavioral Consultation.** The behaviorist believes that all behavior is learned as a direct result of environmental factors. In order to understand human behavior one needs to examine that portion of behavior which is observable. While Skinner (1953) proposed that behavior is acquired through positive reinforcement, Bandura (1969) on the other hand believed that imitation results in new behavior even in the absence of direct reward. The goal of behavioral consultation is to reduce the frequency of undesirable client behavior and to increase the frequency of desirable behavior. The behavior model of consultation is, like the above mental health model, a problem-solving process.

The behavioral consultant's job is to identify the social learning problem, identify those environmental variables which affect the negative behavior, draft a plan to produce new behavior through shaping, chaining, or modeling, and finally evaluate whether or not a solution to the problem is achieved. Conoley and Conoley (1982) reported that little attention has been paid to the process of
behavioral consultation. In this model, the consultant is seen as the expert, who needs to stay informed on the latest research findings since journal editors continuously publish refinements of old techniques and the development of new ones.

**Organizational – Human Relations Consultation.** The goals of organizational consultation are to bring about organizational changes in the individuals, their attitudes, their values and group processes. (West & Idol, 1987). The ultimate objective, of course, is to increase profits and to raise productivity. The change-agent, or consultant, should be able to resolve quickly and accurately the tangible and intangible problems in the organization.

The action training and research model of organizational change by Gardner (1974) listed several steps to follow. The first step is the development of trust between the consultant and the clients. Next, through drafting a contract, the consultant and the organization establish commitments to each other. Data are collected about the problem in order that the problem can be identified. Goals and objectives are written and priorities are set.
The next step is experimentation, which gives the group an opportunity to adopt new ideas. Results of this pilot program are analyzed and, if successful, a program is designed. Finally, an evaluation is completed and feedback is provided.

Murray and Schmuck (1972) noted that this organizational consultant can be either an insider or a member from an outside consultant agency. A slightly different opinion was cited by Bennis (1969). He seemed to favor only the external team. The consultant's task in this model is to maintain what is positive in the organization and to change what is negative. This change-agent is the expert consultant.

**Organizational Thinking Consultation.** This second human relations' approach to organizational change focusses more on groups than on individuals. Schmuck and Runkel's research (1972) showed that the entire group or subsystem must be involved in this model of communication and problem-solving. Data are collected in order to diagnose the problem of the organization. Furthermore, based on the data, a subsystem is selected for training. Schmuck and Runkel point out that the consultees within this subsystem should
not be made to participate in the training. The training should be voluntary. Next, problem solving skills are demonstrated. This develops communication skills. A free and open communication system is essential for staff cooperation. The goal of this consultant model is not to change personalities, but to find more effective ways to communicate and to work with one another to solve their own problems.

**Advocacy Consultation.** The question of whether advocacy consultation is a consultation model has been debated vigorously among consultants. Conoley and Conoley (1982, p. 8) point out that this consultation model, unlike the other models, is usually seen as a highly political one, in which "one group is fighting another for a greater share of the resources." West and Idol (1987) state that the goal of advocacy consultation is to seek due process; to facilitate group process so that clients may work together; to organize events and to develop a partnership with parents of clients. Skills needed for advocacy consulting are varied: for example, knowledge of laws, public relations, negotiation skills, writing and speaking skills, support networks, and "tremendous tolerance for both ambiguity and
conflict." (Conoley and Conoley, 1982, p. 51). The advocacy consultant becomes the ally to the underpowered group. "A citizen’s duty is to respond with all available talents to injustices. A citizen is 'his brother's keeper,' and her sister's keeper." (Conoley, 1981, p. 177). While helping one group, the influence of another group is either limited, changed or destroyed. Conoley and Conoley share their views with numerous experts in the consultant field that all consultants are advocacy consultants.

**Process Consultation.** is an organizational development technique in which the manager and the consultant of an organization are jointly involved in diagnosing a problem and enhancing the organizational functioning. Its aim is to improve the interpersonal procedures of personnel to accomplish objectives. It deals with "the patterns of communication, leadership attempts, underlying tensions, and decision-making procedures" (Schmuck and Schmuck (1974, p. 281). It examines listening skills, questioning strategies, clarifying and confronting skills and systematic problem-solving techniques.

The following is a definition of process consultation (P-C) by
Schein (1969, p 9) "P-C is a set of activities on the part of the consultant which help the client to perceive, understand, and act upon process events which occur in the client's environment." It uses the talents of the group members to identify interaction patterns which are interfering with the overall goals of the organization, thus making the clients aware of interpersonal processes that affect their work. Schein's (1969) work has emphasized business organizations and the process consultant.

An area which is crucial to effective organization performance is how members of the organization communicate with each other, especially in a face-to-face situation. Another important topic in process consultation is the role and function of members in the group. A group problem-solving and decision-making model, presented in Figure 2, was developed by Richard Wallen (Schein, 1969, p. 47). Defining the problem is the most difficult step of this spiral. Finally, an analysis of group interaction is necessary, utilizing concepts such as group norms and group growth, leadership, authority and intergroup cooperation and competition.

Clinical Consultation is patterned after the psycho-
Figure 2. A model of the stages of problem solving. This model is an elaboration of a model developed by Richard Wallen. (Schein, 1969, p. 47).
therapy model. This is the doctor-patient, diagnosis-prescription-treatment model of consultation. The goal of this clinical model is to increase the mental or emotional coping capabilities of the consultee (West and Idol, 1987). The consultant is the expert and is completely responsible for the treatment of the client, from data-gathering to treatment.

**Program Consultation.** When new programs are introduced into an agency, consultants are contracted to assist agencies develop, implement and evaluate these organizational changes. An example might be the planning and administration of services and policies related to the recruitment, training, and effective usage of personnel. Consultants may be in charge of the complete project or may be limited to a highly specialized task.

**Education/Training Consultation.** In this consultant model the consultant is seen as the expert. The goal is to "transmit needed knowledge, information and skills to consultees to alleviate problems." (West and Idol, 1987 p. 394). There are no specific steps in this model. There also seems to be no theory for the consultation relationship.
**Collaborative Consultation.** Traditionally, consultation is seen as an expert-based concept. In a collaborative consultant relationship, however, a triadic interactive relationship exists between the consultant and the classroom teacher working together as equals to improve skills either in dealing with a student or in developing a program. Brown, Wyne, Blackburn and Powell (1979, p. 8) described the consultant role this way:

> ... consultation is usually a process based upon an equal relationship characterized by mutual trust and open communication, joint approaches to problem identification, the pooling of personal resources to identify and select strategies that will have some probability of solving the problem that has been identified, and shared responsibility in the implementation and evaluation of the program or strategy that has been initiated...both the consultant's and the consultee's repertoire of knowledge and skills will be enhanced to the end... both persons will function more effectively in similar situations in the future. Deviations from this approach are made only under those circumstances that demand immediate action and require the consultant to use specialized knowledge to design specific interventions.

Collaborative consultation is used more frequently in the mainstreaming effort directed toward special education students.
This model is "receiving increasing attention in state departments of education and local school districts." (Huefner, 1988, p. 403). The collaborative working arrangement between consultant and regular classroom teacher, emphasizing the parity in consultation, is the key element for successful consultation in mainstreaming exceptional children.

Collaboration also means sharing the work and the responsibility of a task. In a mainstreamed classroom, the collaborative consultant is the special education teacher, or behavior specialist, the regular classroom teacher is the consultee and the mainstreamed student is the client. This model is "both a teaching and a troubleshooting model." (West and Idol, 1987, p. 395). The collaborative consultant teacher influences the instructional techniques of the regular classroom teacher, involves parents in the education process and assists administrators in designing learning environments that will maximize the educational experiences of the mainstreamed exceptional child.

Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin (1986, p. 1) stated that 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 nonhandicapped peers."

The collaborative consultant process is based on several guidelines (Kurpius, 1978). Positive reinforcement, for example, is essential for people to know that their efforts are appreciated. Professionals also need special assistance to define and solve work-related problems. Collaboration builds lasting trust and respect. Collaboration demands that the consultant and the consultee have equal power, authority and status. Consultees gain skills in solving problems and finally, problems once solved, usually stay solved.

Research findings indicate that the collaborative consultation model is preferred by professional educators to any other model. A research study by Babcock and Pryzwansky (1983), noted that teachers prefer collaboration to a medical model. The collaboration approach received the highest mean rating (4.2 on a 5 point scale), followed by the medical model (3.5), the mental health model (3.2) and finally the expert approach (2.4). There is
little doubt about the increasing need for the special educator and the regular classroom teacher to share the responsibility for the education of exceptional children.

Since school consultation is a relatively new field in education, a very limited number of research studies are available regarding the impact of consultation on consultee and client. The Vermont Consulting Teacher Program is an example of a collaborative effort of local school districts, the Vermont State Department of Education, and university personnel. Its goal is to provide consulting services to regular classroom teachers who are in charge of exceptional children. This collaborative consultant program is based on the theory that, through a partnership between the consultant and the regular classroom teacher, the best placement for all children, except the profoundly handicapped, is in the regular classroom (Hewett and Forness, 1977). The steps in this model are referral, entry level measures, specification of instructional objectives, development and implementation of a plan, and finally the evaluation of the plan. The program is data-based. Student performance determines eligibility for services.
Furthermore, the success of the program is based on the active participation by teachers and parents in the program. The Vermont program is very cost-effective. The consultants are only employed for the students who need assistance. (Heron & Harris, 1982). A state-wide analysis done by Hanley and Everitt (1977), quoted by Idol and West (1987), indicated consistent academic gains in children receiving consultant services. A further four-year study compared schools that used the consulting model with those that did not. Results indicated that Special Education students in the school outperformed their counterparts in schools using this consulting model. These gains were maintained through grades seven and eight.

The Vermont Consulting Teacher Program is behaviorally oriented. Through inservice training of the regular classroom teacher applied behavior analysis techniques are taught. This collaborative consultant model is based on precise measurement and the monitoring of children's performance in order to determine an effective intervention approach. In this research study the collaborative consultant model will be used.
Principles of Collaboration

Four principles of collaboration have been identified which form the basis for successful implementation of the collaborative consultant model in the classroom (Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin, 1986). The first principle of collaboration requires team ownership of the problem. According to Idol et al. (1986, p. 6) "equality can be demonstrated by listening, respecting, and learning from each other." It is essential in this model for both the consultant and the consultee to recognize and appreciate the expertise of the other.

The second principle of collaboration is an awareness by all involved of the changes in the consultants, consultee and the client. The consultant’s role is to be sensitive to the effects of changes in the consultee and the client and to make these changes as smooth and nonthreatening as possible. Research at the University of Texas at Austin indicates that there are seven "stages of concern" in any change process (Hall, 1978, p. 52). These stages are: awareness, informational, personal, management, consequences, collaboration
and refocusing. Each stage is linked to specific feelings and behaviors which are then used by the consultant to facilitate the change process.

The third principle of collaboration is the "application of reinforcement principles and practices" (Idol et al. 1986, p. 8) which results in improved skills, knowledge and attitudes for all members of the team. Idol et al. (1986) pointed out that when consultants and mediators use the reinforcement principles to accelerate the academic and social progress of their students, they also apply these same principles to their own interactions. In the collaboration process it is essential to give and receive reinforcement. The need to be accepted, the recognition from others and the maximizing of one's potential, which are three of the basic needs in Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Maslow, 1954), are viewed as essential to promoting effective collaborative consultation.

The final principle for the successful implementation of the collaboration "involves making data-based decisions through a functional analysis of behaviors." (Idol et al. 1986 p. 9). Behavior theorists have found that a person's behavior is a result of events
that precede and follow the behavior. Idol et al. (1986, p. 10) further state that "the major task for the consultation team is to identify those school-based events that increase, decrease or maintain the student's behaviors." Staebler (1988) also believes that the consultant should be equally adept at using reinforcement principles with the consultee, while being cognizant of adult learning characteristics.

**Principles of Collaborative Consultation**

In addition to the principles of collaboration, Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin (1986) have identified six principles which are essential to consultation. The first principle is that situational leadership should guide the implementation of collaborative consultation. A principle of interdependence exists between the members of the consultation team. Each participant must believe in the leadership capability of each member. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) identified four leadership styles based on a combination of task and relationship behavior. Task behavior is the extent to which
a leader provides direction. Relationship behavior is the manner in which the leader is involved in a two-way communication effort with the team members. It indicates active listening and supporting the team members.

The second principle of consultation is that "cooperative goal structures underlie conflict resolution through collaborative consultation." (Idol et al. 1986, p. 14). Open communication and mutual trust are the bases for collaborative consultation. Members of the team must be in control of their personal feelings when confronted with opposing viewpoints. Disagreements and arguments must be viewed as creative problem-solving situations.

The third principle of collaborative consultation is that "collaborative consultation relies on people who use appropriate interview skills." (Idol et al. 1986, p. 15). Through verbal interactions with parents, students, teachers and other specialists, data are collected in order that the members of the collaborative team may change the behavior of the disruptive student or the non-productive student.

The fourth principle is that "active listening facilitates
meaningful interactions from all participants." (Idol et al. 1986, p. 17). In order to avoid misunderstandings active listening is essential in collaborative consultation. Through acknowledging, clarifying, elaborating, reflecting, paraphrasing, and summarizing during the consultation process, information exchanged by the participants assures the accuracy of feedback.

The fifth principle is that "oral and written communication must rely on common nonjargon language." (Idol et al. 1986 p. 17). Where appropriate, consultants need to avoid the technical jargon and must use language that is understood by all the participants.

"Positive nonverbal language is required to implement collaborative consultation" (Idol et al. 1986, p. 19), is the sixth principle of consultation. These include the space one occupies in proximity to the other team members, the space over which a person claims ownership, temperature and lighting, personal style, dress, time management, nonverbal body movements, and vocal interferences or distractors.
Knowledge and Skills Needed by Consultant Teachers.

The purpose of collaborative consultation is to maximize the interaction between two or more parties in order to prevent or solve a problem. Collaboration requires parity of knowledge and skills between all members of the consultant team.

In order to establish a good collaborative working relationship between classroom teacher and the consultant teacher, a variety of skills is required by the consultant. Effective interpersonal communication skills, curriculum related skills, such as assessment, instructional design and evaluation and the consultant's understanding of the learning process (Idol & Paolucci-Whitcomb & Nevin, 1986) are essential ingredients in gaining acceptance by the classroom teacher and in being an effective collaborative consultant teacher. Brown et al. (1979, p. 18) warned of the danger in presenting a comprehensive list of competencies needed by consultants. They noted that "persons interested in consultation will be overwhelmed to the point of abandoning the thought of consultation because of perceived inadequacies." More consultation
skills have been identified than most special education programs could possibly include.

Experts in the field of consultation have recommended a two-year preparation program for consultants. Pryzwansky (1986, p. 484) has even gone so far as to suggest that “consultation might be considered a technique introduced in the final stages of doctoral training or even a postdoctoral pursuit, leaving training earlier than this point in time open to question.” But, traditionally most consultant teachers today have had little training and often have been forced to get on the job training through trial and error.

Little research has been done in the area of competencies or skills needed by effective collaborative consultants. Conoley (1986, p. 17) presented a paper at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in which she stated that “expert consultants should be studied in addition to trainees. This is difficult to accomplish, but overreliance on trainee effects limits our knowledge of the consultation process.” Friend (1984, p. 247) in a study of 126 triads, each consisting of a resource teacher, a regular education teacher and a principal, asked the participants to
determine "which skills typically associated with consultation educators believe should constitute part of the resource teacher's repertoire." From the list of 17 consultation skills, such as interviewing regular education teachers, problem-solving, probing, paraphrasing, establishing a climate of mutual trust and observing mainstreamed learners in the regular classroom, she found that all three groups considered all the mentioned skills presented in these 17 statements "important". The two highest rated skills were "systematically evaluating interventions to determine effectiveness" (by 96.7% of the population in this study), and 95.9% considered "establishing a climate of mutual trust" as consultant skills they expected resource teachers to possess (Friend, 1984, p. 248). The two lowest rated skills were "conducting inservice training for regular education teachers" (79.5% of the population) and "using a paraphrasing strategy to confirm the meaning of regular education teachers' communications (83.1%). Friend (1984, p. 249) observed that "resource teachers appear to be expected to be 'super teachers,' that is, in addition to the primary responsibility of providing direct instruction to handicapped
students, they are expected to confer with regular education teachers, observe students in mainstreamed settings, conduct inservice training, and so on through a seemingly endless list of job duties."

Idol-Maestas and Ritter (1985, p.122), have studied 24 graduates of the Resource/Consulting Teacher Program at the University of Illinois. The purpose for their research was to evaluate the consultant preparation program that graduates had received at this university. The graduates had to pass competencies in the areas of "applied behavior analysis, direct instruction, curriculum-based assessment, behavior management, and materials modification." Furthermore, they were helped to obtain communication and leadership styles that increase collaborative consultation with classroom teachers and parents. Those skills that rated the highest when considering essential job skills were assessing study and behavior skills of pupils, participating in staffing conferences, developing written Individualized Education Plans, decelerating inappropriate social behaviors, teaching to specified instructional objectives, and generating methods and
activities for specified objectives. The majority of these skills are general teaching skills, not specific to the consultation role.

In 1987, Idol and West explored training and practices in consultation in special education. They found that training was required in both the technical skills of teaching, (e.g., assessment, curriculum modification, behavior management) and the process skills of interaction skills with others (e.g., written and oral communication, non-verbal communication, active listening, self-confidence, assertiveness, decision-making skills and group leadership skills). The primary focus of this investigation is on training in the consultation process (the leadership characteristics and personality traits of effective collaborative consultants), not on training in academic skills (such as assessment, and evaluation of programs). The remainder of this chapter will concentrate on literature about training in the consultation process.

Idol and West (1987, p. 476) studied eight consultant training programs in regard to their process base. The majority of these consultant training programs saw the need for the consultants to be proficient in "interpersonal communication, interpersonal problem
solving, interviewing, and effective written language."

Using a Delphi technique, with members of the National Teacher Consultation Network serving as the Delphi panel, West and Cannon (1987) have identified 47 competencies, at face validity, in seven categories as essential to consultants. The Delphi panel consisted of one hundred interdisciplinary experts from 47 states. Included were general and special education teachers, teacher educators, supervisors, administrators and state education personnel from such areas as psychology, counseling, general education and special education. Through repeated feedback, the panel members agreed with 94% consensus that 47 competencies were essential in the training program in collaborative consultation for regular and special educators. These competencies were divided into nine categories. Skills in (1) interactive communication, (2) collaborative problem solving and (3) personal characteristics were rated as essential. These three areas had an M score of 3.9 or 4.0 on a 4 point scale. Of less importance were (4) evaluation of consultation effectiveness, (5) the knowledge of consultation theory models, (6) research on consultation theory, training, and practice
and (7) systems change.

Of the three most essential categories of collaborative consultant competencies as researched by West and Cannon (1987), interactive communication received the highest rating. The following is a list of the ten most essential competency statements, the mean and the percentage of consensus among the Delphi panel.

**Interactive Communication:**

```
"Communicate clearly and effectively in oral and written form."  4.0  97

"Utilize active ongoing listening and responding skills to facilitate the consultation process (e.g., acknowledging, paraphrasing, reflecting, clarifying elaborating, summarizing.)"  3.9  93

"Give credit to others for their ideas and accomplishments."  3.9  93

"Be willing and safe enough to say 'I don't know...let's find out'."  3.9  92

"Interview effectively to elicit information, share information, explore problems, set goals and objectives."  3.9  91

"Manage conflict and confrontation skillfully throughout the consultation process to maintain collaborative relationships."  3.9  91
```
"Give and solicit continuous feedback which is specific, immediate, and objective."

Collaborative Problem Solving:

"Remain available throughout implementation for support, modeling, and/or assistance in modification."

Personal Characteristics:

"Exhibit ability to be caring, respectful, empathic, congruent, and open in consultation interactions."

"Demonstrate willingness to learn from others throughout the consultation process."

These high ratings in interactive communication, collaborative problem-solving and personal characteristics are understandably the definition of consultation by Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin, (1986, p. ix) that "collaborative consultation is an interactive process that enables teams of people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems."

Regardless of the discipline they represent, experts in the field of consultation agree with these findings. Schein (1969), an expert in organizational theory, stated that how people communicate
with each other is one of the most important aspects of an organization. Furthermore, a consultant must be ready to intervene in various ways when the opportunity arises through feedback sessions and coaching.

In addition, Caplan, (1970), one of the principal figures in mental health consultation, agreed that empathy and tolerance of feelings are important aspects which consultants should demonstrate for successful consultation. Dinkmeyer (1976), a psychologist, said that consulting goals can only be accomplished through deleting educational jargon and establishing clear communication.

Fine, Grantham and Wright (1979, p. 537), school psychologists, held that possessing "good human relation skills" is an important first ingredient for admittance to a training program for future effective consultants. Conoley (1981), pointed out that having expertise in listening to and giving feedback was one of the competencies in the school psychology training program at New York State University. Listening, attending, reflecting accurately and probing are essential for an open consultant-consultee relationship
in the personnel and guidance field. (Kurpius and Robinson, 1978).

McGreevy (1978) stressed the importance of all communication messages, overt and covert, verbal as well as nonverbal.

Finally, Haight (1984) stated that the ability to use problem-solving strategies, having an aptitude for human relations, and being able to communicate clearly are essentials for a special education consultant teacher. However, these are all assumptions made by people who are practicing collaborative consultation, based on their own experience. There is no research which says that there is a relationship between certain skills and characteristics of consultant teachers and effectiveness in the consultation process.

**Justification Through Research**

The field of collaborative consultation in Special Education is relatively new. As is true in any new field, the research needed is descriptive and correlative in nature, thus forming a base for future experimental research. Idol and West (1987) have proposed that, for research purposes, we view collaborative consultation as a
computer with input, process, and output variables.

Within this analogy, input refers to such information as consultee characteristics, consultant characteristics, the nature of the problem and the consultee's reason for requesting the consultant's services. The process variables are the techniques, styles and models used by the consultant to solve the problem. Finally, the output variables refer to observable changes as a result of consultation (Idol & West, 1987).

This study proposes to investigate the input variables known as consultant characteristics. More specifically, this study will determine if there are relationships among the consultant characteristics of leadership styles and personality preferences and being an effective consultant teacher. A review of the literature on the leadership skills and personality preferences thought by experts to be associated with effective school consultation follows.

**Leadership Skills.** Conoley, and Conoley, (1982, p. 62) authorities on school consultation, also stated that leadership skills are important and delineated the skills that are particularly important in leadership: "(1) to give credit to others very
generously, (2) to be task-oriented, (3) to display facilitative concern toward the staff's personal issues, (4) to actively initiate issues, (5) to be eager for feedback, and (6) to model risk-taking.” In addition, they say that the leader should be comfortable with group processing.

Furthermore, the staff of Project RETOOL, a well-known federally funded post-doctoral training program, also assumed that leadership skills are important. The purpose of the program was to update college and university Special Education faculty in various skills and content knowledge that are relatively new in Special Education. One such topic was Collaborative Consultation. McClellan and Wheatley, (1985, p. 162) reported that one of the skills included in this training program was “displaying appropriate situational leadership ability.” Thus, one of the critical factors missing from the research in consultation is the leadership characteristics needed for effective collaborative consultants.

Because authorities in the field of consultation suggest that leadership skills have a relationship to effective consultation, Idol and West (1988), when speaking at the Futures in Special Education
Conference in Orlando, Florida, called for research studies in the leadership characteristics essential for effective collaborative consultants.

In addition to the relationship between leadership skills and effective consultation, West and Idol (1987, p. 405) stated that "investigations are needed to determine knowledge, skills, attitudes and personality characteristics of successful versus unsuccessful consultants and consultees. Analyses to determine the relative importance of each of these areas to success in consultation are also needed."

**Personality Preferences.** Although professionals in consultation have discussed consultant characteristics, empirical works identifying personal characteristics of successful consultants are very sparse. Dinkmeyer and Dinkmeyer (1976, p. 33) stated that the consultant "must listen, be empathetic, and focus on the teacher's perception of the situation." Personal factors that affect consultation have also been studied by Fine, Grantham and Wright (1979). Their belief is that, besides adequate training in problem-solving model, personal factors, such as individual identity,
facilitator, sharing of expertise, energy, and a broad range of personal-emotional responses make the difference between more effective and less effective consultants.

Conoley and Conoley (1982,) during their research of profiles of good consultants, found that, in general, personal qualities necessary for good consultation include being friendly, egalitarian, open, and good with groups; having non-threatening expertise; being aware of and having sympathy toward the situations of the consultees; being supportive, flexible, efficient, and having good follow-up or follow-through skills.

A study done by Bossard and Gutkin (1983), revealed that the consultant was the single most important factor in determining whether consultation services were utilized in their school. They agreed with previous studies that personality traits conducive to consultation were openness and being easy to talk to, being friendly, out-going and non-threatening.

Brown, Wyne, Blackburn and Powell (1979) compiled a comprehensive list of thirty-eight personal competencies needed by consultants. Among these were being able to identify personal
strengths and limitations, demonstrating emotional stability and independent functioning, having awareness of personal values, being able to maintain objectivity and personal calmness when dealing with a crisis situation, and being able to gain the confidence and trust of others. In addition, the results of the consultants' self-reporting study by Weissenburger, Fine and Poggio (1982) also confirmed the importance of the consultant's facilitative personal characteristics with regard to being an effective consultant.

**Summary**

In conclusion, this review of the literature has explored many descriptors related to consultation. First consultation was defined. Second, the various consultant models were explored, with a more in-depth analysis of the collaborative consultation model. Third, research indicating specific variables that are essential in consultant training were analyzed. Finally, through the review of the literature it became clear that more work has yet to be done in the area of leadership characteristics and personality preferences.
of effective consultants. Although the Delphi panel under the direction of West and Cannon (1987), established three categories of competencies essential for collaborative consultants—(1) personal characteristics, (2) interactive communication, and (3) collaborative problem solving—the panel failed to establish which leadership styles and personality preferences are essential for effective collaborative consultants. It is for this reason that this study was done.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of this research was to investigate the leadership styles and personality preferences of effective consultant teachers. This chapter deals with four major topics related to the design of this research: (1) Population, (2) Instruments, (3) Design and Data Analysis, and (4) Procedures.

Population

The target population for this study consisted of consultant teachers from Portland School District, Gresham School District and Linn-Benton Education Service District.

Table 1

Project consultant teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland School District</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham School District</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn-Benton Education Service District</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The city of Portland, with a population of 371,500, is located in Multnomah county in the northwest corner of the state of Oregon. This busy metropolis is dominated by rivers and greenery. The principal industries are: manufacturing, transportation, wholesale and retail trade and tourism. Gresham is also located in Multnomah county and is approximately 20 miles east of Portland. This semi-rural city has a population of 36,370. In addition to farming, many residents work in Portland. Linn-Benton Education Service District (ESD), on the other hand, provides educational services to all school districts in two rural counties; namely, Linn County and Benton County. Linn-Benton ESD is located about 65 miles south of Portland in the city of Albany. The total population for both counties is 158,400. This is both an agricultural and small industry area, with an emphasis on food processing, timber and seed industries.

The consultant teachers, who participated in this research, provide consultation services in their district. The following table represents the breakdown of the total number of students, the number of schools, and the percentage of schools served by consultant teachers.
Table 2

Collaborative Consultation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>% of Schools Served by Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland S/D</td>
<td>51,657</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham S/D</td>
<td>4,823</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn-Benton ESD</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the overall goal of the three participating consultant programs is to provide support to the regular classroom teachers in order to improve the quality of instruction for all students, particularly the mainstreamed exceptional child, there are some subtle differences among the three consultant programs in this study. One such difference is the job description for the consultant teacher. While Portland and Gresham School Districts require several years of regular classroom experience or a Basic Handicapped Learner Endorsement and several years of experience with special needs students, Linn-Benton ESD emphasizes a counseling background. In order to qualify as a consultant teacher in Linn-Benton, a Master's Degree in counseling, clinical psychology,
social work or equivalent is required. In addition, successful experience with the practice and application of counseling techniques and direct experience with students having emotional and behavior problems is essential.

A second difference among the consultation program participants in this research is the intent of the consultation. The overall role of a consultant teacher is to assist the consultee in solving problems related to exceptional mainstreamed students. While the Portland and Gresham programs serve all students during the pre-referral investigation and all the Special Education students eligible under Public Law 94-142 regardless of their handicapping condition, the Linn-Benton consultant program assists during the pre-referral investigation of the emotionally handicapped and behaviorally disordered students and focuses on their special educational needs.

In general, the objectives of the consultant model appear to be the same for the three participating consultation programs. They are based on the four collaborative consultation principles as identified by Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb and Nevin (1986) (1) situational
leadership, (2) open communication and trust among the team members, (3) appropriate interviewing skills and (4) active listening skills. The Linn-Benton Behavior Management Consultation Program, however, seems to emphasize assistance to school districts with students having emotional and behavioral disorders, while the Portland and Gresham consulting teachers serve all Special Education students. The flow chart, designed by Linn-Benton Education Service District, demonstrates the emphasis on discipline policy consultation, group counseling and behavior contracts. (See Appendix D.)

**Instruments**

Three instruments were used to measure relationships among leadership styles, personality types, and being an effective consultant: (1) **LEAD-Self Leadership Inventory**, developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1973), (2) **Myers-Briggs Type Indicator** by Briggs and Myers (1976), and finally (3) **a Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants** adopted by this
The LEAD-Self Leadership Inventory (see Appendix A) evaluates an individual's leadership style. Thus, this instrument measures self-perception of three aspects of the leader's behavior: (1) style, (2) style range, and (3) style adaptability of how an individual behaves as a leader. The Lead-Self contains twelve leadership situations. The leader answers the questions in the instruments based on information that most closely describes the leader's behavior in that type of situation.

The LEAD-Self was originally designed as a training instrument and was developed as a result of studies conducted at the Center for Leadership Studies at Ohio State University in 1945.

Validity. The LEAD-Self was standardized using the responses of two hundred sixty-four managers from various areas of North America. Their age ranged from twenty-one to sixty-four. Thirty percent of these managers were at the entry level of management, fifty-five percent were middle managers, and fourteen percent were high level managers. The validities for the twelve
items ranged from .11 to .52, and 83 percent of the twelve coefficients were .25 or higher. Eleven coefficients were significantly beyond the p < .01 level and one was significant at the p < .05 level.

**Reliability.** The LEAD-Self showed a moderately strong stability level. Seventy five percent of the managers maintained their dominant style and seventy one percent maintained their alternative style after the second administration of the instrument. The contingency coefficients were both .71 and each was significant at the .01 level. The correlation for the adaptability score was .69 (p<.01). "The LEAD-Self scores remained relatively stable across time, and the user may rely upon the results as consistent measures." (Greene, 1980, p. 1). Based on this information, the "LEAD-Self is deemed to be an empirically sound instrument." (Greene, 1980, p. 1).

The second instrument the **Myers-Briggs Type Indicator** (MBTI), (see Appendix B), measures personality types according to Jung's theory of types. (Myers, 1983). Carl Jung claimed that "apparently random behavior on an individual's part is really not
random at all but has a pattern to it. This pattern will reflect the person's preferences for taking in information and for making decisions. It will also reflect the world in which a person feels most comfortable - the outer world of action or the inner world of ideas." (Hirsh, 1985, p. 13). Jung's theory is concerned with perception (information gathering) and judgment (decision making) behavior. Suitable for upper elementary through adult, the Myers Briggs provides four bi-polar personality type preferences. The MBTI is available in three forms: Form F, Form G, and the Abbreviated Version. For this research, Form F containing 166 items was used. Form G contains 126 items from F. It was assumed that more items increases reliability and is more comprehensive.

The four personality index preferences are Extraversion-Introversion, Sensing-Intuition, Thinking-Feeling, and Judging-Perceiving. The Myers-Briggs is the result of sixty years of the Myers' family interest in Jung's theory of psychological types and forty years of their research to develop a way of putting Jung's theory in practice.

The Myers Briggs Type Indicator is used in the United States in
a wide variety of settings, from small organizations to the large Fortune 500 companies. It is used in Europe, Japan, the Middle East and Canada and has been translated into several languages. The Nippon Recruit Center in Tokyo has given the instrument to over one million people. Data gathered by the Honeywell Corporation indicates that the most frequent personality types in management were the same in the United States as they were in other countries.

**Validity.** The validity of the MBTI was determined primarily using construct validity. The scores were correlated with other personality type tests, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), which appear to test the same constructs. When comparing results of the MMPI with the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, the scales range from .01 to .63, with "depression" showing a .39 correlation with introversion; "psychopathic deviate" with perception showing a .23 correlation, and "social introversion" and introversion .63 at a p<.001 significant level.

When comparing results of 16PF with the Myers Briggs Type Indicator, there is a scale from .00 to .76. For example, a score of
.59 between "happy go lucky" and extraversion, .76 with descriptions such as "outgoing, venturesome" and extraversion, and .58 in "leadership" and extraversion at a significant correlation level of p < .001.

**Reliability.** Two types of reliability are reported: (1) internal consistency and (2) replicability over time. For internal consistencies split-half scores were used. With a data bank of 55,971, and a sample of 9,216 the reliabilities were consistent with those of other personality instruments. The typical adult ranged from .80 to .87. In addition, using the Coefficient Alpha, the coefficients were roughly the same as those computed using the Pearson's r.

The second type of reliability, test-retest, shows consistency over time. "When subjects report a change in type, it is most likely to occur in only one preference, and in scales where the original preference was low." (Myers and McCaulley, 1985, p. 171). A study done with 94 elementary teachers, with a test-retest interval of 6 years, showed that 61 percent had no change in type category.

The third instrument used in this study was the
**Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants.**

(see Appendix C). This ten item consultant teacher effectiveness rating scale was adopted by this researcher from Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators by West and Cannon (1987). (See Appendix J). One hundred professionals participated in a Delphi panel. Based on the consensus of experts in fields such as special education, school psychology, counseling and organizational development, forty-seven consultant teachers competencies in eight categories were indicated as being essential to Regular and Special Educators. These forty-seven competencies rated 3.5 or higher on the 4-point Likert-type scale.

A ten-item self-reporting survey of effectiveness of collaborative consultants was compiled, based on the results of this Delphi panel information. The competencies rated highest by the panel after round 2 (3.9 and 4.0 on a 4.0 scale) and which had the highest consensus were used as the basis for the questionnaire. These competencies included: interactive communication, collaborative problem-solving and personal characteristics. The exact wording of the competencies based on the Delphi study by
West and Cannon (1987) were utilized. Permission was received from Dr. Frederick West and Mrs. Cannon to adopt this survey. (See Appendix E and F). On the Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants, if a consultant received a score of 40, the consultant is considered "effective". Forty was selected because on the Likert type scale of this survey, a rating of 4 indicates above average performance by the consultant. There are ten competencies.

**Validity.** In order to appraise the content of the competencies, face validity was determined by the one hundred Delphi panel members in the original study done by West and Cannon (1987).

**Reliability.** A Spearman-Brown analysis done on the adopted Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants showed an excellent reliability of .97.

**Design and Data Analysis**

This study was of a descriptive nature. Three questions were addressed in this research project. (1) Are there
relationships between the four leadership styles' scores from the LEAD-Self and consultant teacher effectiveness? A multiple regression, with the leadership scores as independent variables and the consultant teacher effectiveness score as the dependent variable was chosen as the main statistical tool. This regression consisted of two stages: (1) four simple linear regressions where the consultant teacher effectiveness score was the dependent variable and each of the leadership style scores were the independent variables. This data would indicate whether any of the leadership styles contributed positively and not-positively to consultant teacher effectiveness. (2) The four leadership scores were linearly dependent, because the sum of the four scores always totaled twelve. Knowing any three of these scores contained the same amount of information as knowing all four scores. Due to this dependency a stepwise regression, using only three variables in the equation, was used.

(2) Are there relationships between the four personality index preferences from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and consultant teacher effectiveness? A multiple
regression, using the transformed Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, where the dependent variable was the effectiveness score and the independent variables were the four personality index preferences, were used.

A scatterplot of each of the four personality preference indexes with effectiveness was done in order to find out what the relationship was between the four personality preference indexes and the consultant teacher effectiveness score.

(3) **Is there a relationship between each leadership style and each personality index preference?** A correlation between all pairs of personality index preferences and leadership styles was completed. In addition, a scatter plot to visually investigate the relationship, was included.

Finally, a t-test was used to compare consultant teachers with special education background and consultant teachers with counseling background with respect to the effectiveness score. This same test was used to compare consultant teachers with Bachelor of Arts Degrees and consultant teachers with Master of Science Degrees with respect to the effectiveness score. A scatterplot and
a correlation were chosen to investigate the relationship.

**Procedures**

The data used in this research project came from the collaborative consultant teacher training program conducted by Dr. Bonnie Staebler and Dr. Bonnie Young at Western Oregon State College in Monmouth, Oregon. It appeared that this was the only college in the Northwest which trains collaborative consultant teachers and provides on the job training. Dr. Staebler and Dr. Young have worked four years with the Portland School District, three years with the Gresham School District and one year with Linn-Benton Education Service District. The population of this study was selected because of their participation in this inservice training program.

All thirty-four consultant teachers participating in this training program were asked to complete the LEAD-Self and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. As additional demographic information, the consultant teachers were asked how many years
they had experience in regular education, special education and consultant teaching. Furthermore, they were asked about their levels of education: Bachelors of Arts, Masters Degree, Post Masters Degree and any specific certificates and endorsements they might have earned. This demographic information could also be helpful in predicting the effectiveness of consultant teachers. Would more education and more experience make a consultant teacher more effective?

While the consultant teachers in this study were asked to complete the LEAD-Self and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, their supervisors were asked to rate the consultant teachers on the Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants. This survey uses a Likert type scale from 1 to 5: poor consultant performance is 1, fair indicates 2, average indicates 3, above average is 4 and a rating score of 5 is an outstanding evaluation. It was emphasized that the ratings done by the supervisors were strictly confidential and no names would be used in this research. In summary, the information from the three instruments used in this research created three sets of data: (1) a leadership style score, (2)
four personality index preferences and (3) a consultant teacher's effectiveness score.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of leadership styles and personality preferences on effective consultation. The information in this chapter will be presented in the following manner: (1) a description of the sample, (2) a description of the raw scores, (3) an analysis of the data according to the three research questions as stated in the purpose of this study.

Description of the Sample

Data from consultant teachers from Portland School District, Gresham School District and Linn-Benton Education Service District were collected. Due to attrition, the original N of thirty-four was reduced to thirty-one. Data could not be collected from three Portland School District’s consultant teachers. The remaining thirty one completed the LEAD-Self instrument to determine their leadership style. Their personality preference was determined by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In order to determine their
effectiveness as consultant teachers, the supervisors rated them on the Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants.

In addition, demographic information on the consultant teachers was collected. Table 3 illustrates the number of years of experience in regular education, special education and consultant teaching. Five members of the sample did not have any teaching experience either in the regular classroom or special education. All but one, had five or fewer years of experience as consultant teacher.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>more than 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the level of education of the sample in this study. All completed a Bachelor's Degree, while twenty-one
consultant teachers also completed a Master's Degree.

In addition to the academic degrees, the majority of the sample had one or more certificates or endorsements, such as Handicapped Learner Endorsement, Administrative and Supervisory Certificate, School Psychologist Certificate, or they were registered as Counselors or Clinical Social Workers.

Table 4

Consultant Teachers' Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
<th>Master's Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>No Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>Education/Spec Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 31\] \hspace{1cm} \[N = 31\]
Description of the Raw Scores.

The data was analyzed at Oregon State University in Corvallis, Oregon. "P.C. Write" was used to enter the data into an IBM Personal Computer (P.C.). Datalink, a computer program developed by Oregon State University, was used to transmit the data from the P.C to Oregon State University's mainframe computer. Finally, Statistical Interactive Programming System (SIPS) was used to analyze the data on a Cyber 170/720 mainframe computer.

Data from three different instruments was used in this research study: LEAD-Self, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants. The following is an explanation of the scoring of these instruments.

First, the LEAD-Self (see Appendix A) consists of twelve situations of leadership. The participants in this study were asked to select from four alternative actions (A-B-C-D), representing the leadership style they feel would closely describe their own behavior in that particular situation. The total of the columns represents the scores entered into the computer. Column A indicates a telling
style of leadership, column B represents selling, column C indicates a participating style and finally column D gives a delegating score. The column with the highest score represents the consultant teacher's preferred leadership style in those particular situations.

An analysis of raw scores for this particular study is listed in Table 5. The range, mean, and standard deviation are presented according to the arrangement of the variables on the instrument.

**Table 5**

**Consultant Teachers' LEAD-Self Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>.741935</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>0 - 8</td>
<td>4.225810</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>1 - 11</td>
<td>6.451610</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>.580645</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second instrument was the The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). A sample is provided in Appendix B. It is a self reporting instrument, consisting of 166 situations. The participants chose one answer based on the way they preferred to take in information and the way they preferred to make decisions. Raw
scores for each variable were calculated and then converted into a standard score. The instrument yields four personality preference clusters. The four clusters are: EI - Extravert or Introvert; SN - Sensing or Intuitive; TF - Thinking or Feeling; JP - Judging or Perceiving. Since each preference is treated discretely, sixteen personality preferences are possible. Table 6 provides a visual overview of the number of consultants in the study who fell within each of the sixteen personality preferences.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Teachers' Personality Type</th>
<th>Preferences</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>INFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>N=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=2</td>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=0</td>
<td>N=5</td>
<td>N=4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I= Introvert    E= Extravert    S= Sensing    N= iNtuition    T= Thinking    F= Feeling    J= Judging    P= Perceiving
Since a zero score is not possible on the MBTI, statistically it was necessary to transform these scores. The following is an example of the transformation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator scores:

**Table 7**

**Transformed Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introvert</th>
<th>Extravert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
E \longrightarrow + (E-1) \quad 32 \longrightarrow (32-1) = 31
\]

\[
I \longrightarrow - (I-1) \quad -20 \longrightarrow -(20-1) = -19
\]

**Example:** The original score of I -20, when transformed is -19. The negative and positive signs do not imply a value judgment. Similarly, a score of E 32 is transformed into 31.

In order to make a distinction between the two opposites in a personality cluster, for the purpose of statistical analysis opposite categories were arbitrarily assigned a + or - value. The minus value
was not intended to imply a value judgment. For example, within the El cluster, a positive value was assigned to the Extravert category, while the negative value was assigned to Introvert. Similarly, for the SN cluster, Sensing was assigned positive value while Intuitive was assigned negative value. In the TF cluster, Thinking was assigned a positive value while Feeling was assigned negative value. Finally, in the JP cluster, Judging was assigned a positive value, while Perceiving was assigned a negative value.

The following table reports the range, sample mean scores and standard deviations of each of the four personality clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Preference</th>
<th>Range Max-Min</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El</td>
<td>+36 -48</td>
<td>-3.548</td>
<td>23.550</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>+52 -44</td>
<td>-5.000</td>
<td>26.004</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>+36 -40</td>
<td>-8.387</td>
<td>19.612</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>+50 -48</td>
<td>7.129</td>
<td>25.862</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third instrument used in this study was the Survey of
Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants as listed in Appendix C.
The supervisors of the consultant teachers in this study were asked to evaluate the consultant teachers based on ten competencies. A Likert type scale was used. A score of 1 on any item indicated a poor performance on that item. An item score of 2 indicated a fair performance, an item score of 3 indicated average performance. A score of 4 indicated the performance was above average and a score of 5 indicated outstanding. The raw score was the sum of the results of the ratings of the ten items on the Survey of Effectiveness of Collaborative Consultants by their supervisors.

Table 9 provides a visual representation of the number of consultant teachers whose total score fell within each category. The raw score ranged from 15 to 50. The mean for the sample was 40.9. The standard deviation was 8.8.
Table 9

Number of Consultant Teacher Effectiveness' Range of Scores as Rated by their Supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 31

An analysis of Research Questions.

Three research questions were raised for consideration in this study. Each question will be discussed separately.

**Research Question #1:** Are there relationships between the four leadership styles' scores from the LEAD-Self and consultant teacher effectiveness?

Four simple linear regressions were completed where the consultant teacher effectiveness score was the dependent variable and each of the leadership style scores were the independent variables. Table 10 lists the P value and R² for each variable of the LEAD-Self Instrument.
Table 10

Results of Regression Analysis for Leadership Styles and Consultant Teacher Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The P-values for these regressions are not significant and suggest that there is no significant relationship between the consultant teachers' effectiveness score and any of the four measures of leadership. The range of raw scores did suggest, however, that selling and participating were the two leadership styles most often used by the consultant teachers.

Upon completion of the four linear regressions, a scatterplot was completed for each leadership style. There was no suggestion of any relationship. There was also no relationship suggested when a
multiple regression was completed. No combination of variables proved to be significant.

**Research Question #2:** Are there relationships between the four personality preferences from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and consultant teacher effectiveness?

A simple linear regression was used with each personality preference. A multiple regression technique was used as the statistical tool to compare personality preference with consultant effectiveness. Transformed scores were used since a zero score is not possible on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The following is an analysis of the scores of the personality type preferences based on the four choices: Extravert-Introvert, Sensing-Intuitive, Thinking-Feeling, Judging-Perceiving.
Table 11

Relationship between Personality Preferences and Consultant Teacher Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Preference</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.0883</td>
<td>.0969</td>
<td>no significant relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.0329</td>
<td>.1476</td>
<td>significant relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>.6890</td>
<td>.0056</td>
<td>no significant relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>.2721</td>
<td>.0414</td>
<td>no significant relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extravert-Introvert (EI)** - The results of this analysis suggest that there is no relationship between the Extravert Introvert Mode Preference and effectiveness as a consultant teacher. The EI and Effectiveness correlation coefficient was .0969. Therefore only approximately ten percent of the variance was accounted for by the EI variables. In order to be significant at p = .05, the R² value has to be at least .126. For the simple linear regression the P value was .0883, which suggests no relationship, although it is borderline and approaching significance.

**Sensing-Intuitive (SN)** - A P value of .0329 indicates that
there was a significant relationship between the SN Mode of Preference and Effectiveness as a consultant teacher. The $R^2$ value was .1476 which indicates that almost fifteen percent of the variability in effectiveness can be explained by the SN Mode Preference. As it can be seen in Table 8 (page 85), a positive score indicates a preference for sensing and a negative score a preference for intuition. The positive regression coefficient reflects an Sensing preference. Therefore a Sensing teacher tends to be significantly more effective than an Intuitive teacher.

There is a significant relationship between the SN Mode Preference and effectiveness as a consultant teacher ($p > .05$). The positive regression coefficient in SN indicates that a sensing consultant teacher has a tendency to be more successful (see Table 8, page 85). Since a higher SN score means the more sensing, the more successful the consultant teacher is.

**Thinking-Feeling (TF)** - A $P$ value of .6890 indicates that there is no relationship between the thinking-feeling preference and being an effective consultant teacher.

**Judging-Perceiving (JP)** - The $P$ value for this Preference
Mode is .2721. This also shows that there is no significant relationship between Judging and Perceiving and being an effective consultant.

Next, in order to determine the strength of the variance a stepwise regression was completed using all four personality preferences. The first variable to emerge was SN, which was already shown to be significant (see Table 12). With an $R^2$ of .1476 almost fifteen percent of the variability in success can be contributed to SN.

**Table 12**

**Stepwise Regression Analysis of Effectiveness and the Myers-Briggs Personality Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.0329</td>
<td>.1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ei</td>
<td>.0322</td>
<td>.2785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>.6172</td>
<td>.2553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next variable to emerge was the Ei variable with a P value
of .0322. At this step $R^2$ equals .278, which indicated that almost 28% of the variability in effectiveness of consultant teachers can be attributed to the combination of El and SN. Alone the El variable was not significant, but when combined with the SN variable, significance was found.

Both the El and SN modes had positive regression coefficients. Thus indicating that the more sensing, and the more extraverted a subject was, the more effective the subject was as a consultant teacher. Additionally after testing for an interaction between El and SN, no significant interaction was discovered. Finally, the remaining variables JP and TF were not significant.

**Research Questions # 3.** Is there a relationship between each leadership style and each personality index preference? A correlation coefficient was computed for all pairs of leadership styles and all personality preferences. The only significant correlation found was between selling and J of the JP variable (see table 13). This indicated that when the selling score increased, there was a tendency to be more judgmental. A
judgmental score on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is characterized by organizational abilities, following a plan and the completion of a task, which are essential attributes in a selling situation.

Table 13

Correlations Between Leadership and Personality Preference Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Personality Preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>R= .1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>R= -.0132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>R= -.1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>R= -.0997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An R value of .355 is needed for significance at the P <.05 level.

* significant at p < .05.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the signing of Public Law 94-142 in 1975 there has been a greater emphasis on the role of the consultant teacher. This Education for all Handicapped Children Act mandates a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment. The consultant teacher model for mainstreaming handicapped children provides support to the regular classroom teacher for keeping children in the regular classroom from the start. Thus, children with handicaps are not removed in the first place, but are educated with their peers.

The consultant teacher model requires "equal relationships among professionals characterized by mutual trust and open communication, joint approaches to problem identification, the pooling of personnel resources to identify and select strategies that will have some probability of solving the problem that has
been identified, and shared responsibility in the implementation and evaluation of the program or strategy that has been initiated." (Brown, Wyne, Blackburn, and Powell, 1979, p. 8).

The purpose of this concluding chapter is to summarize the findings presented in the previous chapters and relate this information to the purpose of this study. Conclusions are drawn from these findings. Finally, implication from this study and recommendations for future research are discussed.

**Summary**

The purpose of this research study was to determine if there were relationships among leadership styles and personality preferences, and effective consultation. This study was divided into three research questions:

1. Are there differences among leadership preferences with respect to consultant teacher effectiveness? The results indicated that there was no relationship between any of the measures of leadership (telling, selling, participating or delegating) and being an effective
consultant teacher.

(2) Are there relationships between the four personality index preferences and consultant teacher effectiveness? There was a relationship between personality index preference and effective consultant teacher. The sensing consultant teachers in this sample were more effective than the Intuitive. In addition, extraverts appeared to be more effective than introverts.

(3) Is there a relationship between leadership styles and personality index preferences? There was a significant correlation between the leadership style of selling and the personality index preference of judging.

**Conclusion**

The following conclusions can be drawn from the statistical analysis of this data:

1. The element of leadership was not a factor in this research study. Since consultant teachers work collaboratively with regular classroom teachers to solve problems in a creative and effective
way this finding should not be a surprise. Hersey and Blanchard (1982, p. 3) state that "leadership occurs any time one attempts to influence the behavior of an individual or group regardless of the reason." They also state that "effective leaders are able to adapt their style of leader behavior to the needs of the followers and the situation." (p. 94). There is then no best leadership style in the consultant model, because the consultant teacher model requires equal relationships and shared responsibility. This would imply that there is a lack of collaboration between the leader and the individual or the group. The consultant teacher model is not supposed to have "followers". It is not a hierarchy, rather "it involves the creation of a sense of parity, which is a part of, yet is distinct from, equality. Equality can be demonstrated by listening, respecting, and learning from each other. Parity is demonstrated as the mediator's skills and knowledge are blended with the different skills and knowledge of the consultant." (Idol, Paolucci-Whitcomb, Nevin, 1986, p. 6).

2. Perhaps of greatest single significance was the S factor from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The sensing teacher was found to be significantly more effective than the intuitive teacher when
effectiveness in consulting was considered. The realistic, factual, pragmatic approach of the data based S mode was found to be more effective than the spontaneous, creative and enthusiastic approach of the N mode. Indeed the S factor was significantly a better factor than all variables measured by the Myers-Brigg Type Indicator.

In addition, a second finding in regard to predictors of effectiveness was the El combination. Together these scores are significant predictors of effectiveness. Based on this study, the consultant teachers whose personality index preference is Extravert and Sensing are most effective in the process of working collaboratively in the consultant situation. The TF scores and the JP scores were not significant and thus did not influence effectiveness.

Myers-Briggs (1983) described Extraverts as individuals who express thoughts and ideas through talking or doing. They work best in action. They often think aloud. An extravert is outwardly more emotional and expressive. In a creative problem solving situation, such as in the consulting model, the extravert consultant teacher communicates, acts and carries out solutions to the problem. The competency with the highest mean in the Delphi panel conducted by
West and Cannon (1987) was to be able to communicate clearly and effectively in oral and written form. Furthermore, the Delphi panel members considered it extremely important during collaborative problem solving for the consultant teacher to remain available for support, modeling, and/or assistance in modification.

The Sensing consultant teachers see the world through their senses—vision, hearing, touch and smell. Facts and what is actually happening is important to them. Literal meaning, detail and exact recall—seeing is believing—makes these consultant teachers effective. They break information into small pieces of actual facts, are tenacious and work through a problem to reach a conclusion. They like stability. They are very pragmatic (Myers-Briggs, 1983).

The sensing consultant teacher creates order in the solving of a problem, applies experience to problems and forms habits. The primary goal of consultant teaching is for the consultee to be able to solve future problems of the same nature without the consultant teacher's assistance.

3. The higher the selling score of the LEAD-SELF, the more judging the consultant teacher is. According to the Myers-Briggs
Type Indicator, the judging person follows a plan and completes work on time. In a selling situation one needs to be extremely organized in order to avoid confusion of the buyer. In contrast to judging, the perceptive personality is characterized by a world of possibilities. This lends itself to brainstorming activities, but does not provide for the closure that is necessary for the selling style of leadership. For example, in selling an idea as a consulting teacher it is as important to seek the consultee's commitment to follow through as it is to originally generate the idea.

**Implications**

The following are a number of specific implications based upon the review of the literature and the information derived from this study:

1. Since the S factor was the strongest predictor of consultant effectiveness, it is evident that administration must consider the factor when hiring personnel.

2. Since there was evidence to support the concept that the S personality profile was significantly more
effective in consulting, school districts may wish to add a personality preference instrument as part of their interviewing process.

3. Teacher training programs may need to add a personality preference instrument to their admission process in order to identify which students might be more suitable for consultant training.

4. Since the findings indicate that the effective consultant is one who is outgoing and data based (the ES personality profile) colleges and universities may wish to include a communications course, as well as a data management course in their curriculum for the consultant teacher program. Such techniques as listening, feedback skills, videotaping procedures, and fishbowl ing techniques could be stressed. In regard to data management, charting, measurement techniques and comparison strategies could be emphasized. Once implemented these procedures should be documented to determine if such training procedures effect the scores on the
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

5. Since the information from the personality profile could prove helpful to the participants in a teacher training program, staff may wish to make participants more aware of the impact that style has on the consulting process.

6. Based on the fact that the Extravert likes to work with people, the supervisor might assist the consultant teacher in such areas as group processing, team building, interaction patterns and trust building.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. Since this study was limited in size of sample, it is recommended that this study should be replicated with a larger sample.

2. Since it may be possible that the supervisor's personality preference might have a relationship to how they view the effectiveness of the consultants, it is suggested that a study be conducted to test this
hypothesis. For example, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator could be used with the supervisors as well as the consultants to see if there is a relationship among these variables when supervisor's preferences are considered. This same rationale could be used for designing a study to test the relationship between the consultee's styles and the consultant's styles when effectiveness is being measured.

3. Since the sample in this study represented consultants from a variety of professional backgrounds, this study should be replicated with larger numbers of consultant teachers who have the same professional experience background - such as Special Education or Counseling, or Regular Education, to determine if the type of experience can make an impact on being an effective consultant.

4. Since written and oral communication had the highest mean in the Delphi Panel conducted by West and Cannon, a research study should be done to ascertain which of the two is the most effective communication
technique to the consulting process.

5. Since the heart of the consultant process is student change, a follow-up study should be done to determine if there is change in academic scores of students who are mainstreamed in a consultant teacher situation.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone ( )</td>
<td>Please check: ☐ business ☐ home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
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<th>Extended Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First-time, student, & foreign orders & orders under $15.00 must be prepaid.

Mail this order with your payment to:

CPP
P.O. Box 60070
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(415) 857-1444

Subtotal 1
(minimum $5.00)

Applicable Discount (if any)

Subtotal 2

Sales Tax
(for CA customers only: 6% or 7% of Subtotal 2)
(No sales tax on prepaid scoring)

Shipping Charges
☐ Reg. mail (10% of Subtotal 1 — $1.35 min.)
☐ Airmail (20% of Subtotal 1 — $3.00 min.)
☐ Canadian airmail (25% of Subtotal 1 — $3.35 min.)
☐ Prepaid scoring (1% reg. mail, 2% air)

Amount Enclosed (U.S. $)

Authorizing signature. I agree to the terms and conditions specified on page 104 of this catalog. Thank You!
Identification #__________

SURVEY* OF EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATIVE CONSULTANTS.

Listed below are 10 essential collaborative consultation competencies. Please rate each item based on your observation as the consultant's supervisor. A rating of 1 indicates poor, 2 indicates fair, 3 indicates average, 4 indicates above average and 5 indicates outstanding.

The above mentioned consultant I (have) supervise (d):

1. Exhibits ability to be caring, respectful, empathic, congruent, and open in consultation interactions. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Demonstrates willingness to learn from others throughout the consultation process. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Communicates clearly and effectively in oral and written form. 1 2 3 4 5

4. Utilizes active ongoing listening and responding skills to facilitate the consultation process (e.g., acknowledging, paraphrasing, reflecting, clarifying, elaborating, summarizing). 1 2 3 4 5

5. Interviews effectively to elicit information, shares information, explores problems, sets goals, and objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

6. Gives and solicits continuous feedback which is specific, immediate, and objective. 1 2 3 4 5

7. Gives credit to others for their ideas and accomplishments. 1 2 3 4 5

8. Manages conflict and confrontation skillfully throughout the consultation process to maintain collaborative relationships. 1 2 3 4 5

9. Is willing and safe enough to say "I don't know.... let's find out." 1 2 3 4 5

10. Remains available throughout implementation for support, modeling, and/or assistance in modification. 1 2 3 4 5

* Adopted from:
West, Frederick J., & Cannon, Glenna S. Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators. Technical Report No. 103. Research and Training Project on School Consultation, September, 1987. Department of Special Education. The University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.
Appendix D.
BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT CONSULTATION PROGRAM
SERVICES FLOW CHART

Request for Consultation Services
1. School staff completed Request for Consultation Services form
2. Principal and District Liaison person signs request.
3. Request form is forwarded to consultant.

Initial Consultation
1. Consultant contacts the originator of the request (consultee) to set appointment.
2. Consultant meets with consultee to explore issues of concern, examine alternatives and to determine course of action.

Termination of Consultation

Classroom Services
1. Management Consultation
2. Classroom Observation
3. Class Presentations

District/Building Services
1. Discipline Policy Consultation
2. Inservices
3. Group Counseling - Leadership Training

Student Services
1. Generic Consultation
2. Specific Student Consultation
   a. Assessment
   b. Behavior Contracts
   c. Referral to district or community resources.
   d. PL 94-142 Eligible Students
      (1) Identification Consultation
      (2) IEP Consultation
      (3) Identify and Mobilize resources/related services.

Termination Student Service Report

Evaluation
1. District feedback on Behavior Management Program.
2. Parent feedback on Behavior Management Program.
3. In-Program feedback on Behavior Management Program.
February 10, 1988

J. Frederick West, PhD.
Research and Training Project on
School Consultation
Department of Special Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dear Dr. West,

Currently I am completing the requirements for a PhD degree in education from Oregon State University/Western Oregon State College School of Education, Monmouth, Oregon. As part of my doctoral dissertation, I would like to use part of the information from your technical report No. 103, Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators, (September, 1987).

I am studying the relationship of leadership styles and personality types of effective collaborative consultants. I will be using three instruments: (1) A questionnaire based on ten competencies as reported in the technical report no. 103, (2) Lead-Self Leadership Inventory and (3) Myers-Briggs Type indicator Form F.

I have selected the 10 competency statements which received the highest mean on round 2 of your Delphi panel information and have compiled these into a questionnaire. The supervisors of my population of consultants will complete the questionnaire on each consultant. From this information I hope to gain a profile of the consultants' effectiveness from their supervisors' point of view. The consultants in my study are asked to fill out the Lead-Self Leadership Inventory by Hersey and Blanchard. This instrument will give me their leadership styles. In addition, the consultants are asked to complete the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form F. This instrument will supply me with their personality type. Finally, I will do statistical analyses using the information gained from these three instruments to discover if there is a relationship between leadership styles, personality types, and being an effective consultant. Attached to this letter, I have included a copy of the questionnaire.
If this request meets your approval, please fill in the bottom portion of this letter and return it to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided.

I have also written to your co-author, Dr. Glenna S. Cannon, Research Associate, to request her permission.

Sincerely,

Redacted for privacy

Mary Savelsbergh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
WOSC, Special Education Department

Date: 2/24/88

Mary Savelsbergh, Graduate Teaching Assistant, OSU/WOSC School of Education, Monmouth, Oregon has my permission to use the attached questionnaire, as a research tool in her dissertation.

Redacted for privacy

Signature
J. Frederick West, PhD
Research and Training Project
School Consultation
Department of Special Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

February 10, 1988

Glenna S. Cannon, PhD.
Research and Training Project on
School Consultation
Department of Special Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Dear Dr. Cannon,

Currently I am completing the requirements for a PhD degree in education from Oregon State University/Western Oregon State College School of Education, Monmouth, Oregon. As part of my doctoral dissertation, I would like to use part of the information from your technical report No. 103, Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators, (September, 1987).

I am studying the relationship of leadership styles and personality types of effective collaborative consultants. I will be using three instruments: (1) A questionnaire based on ten competencies as reported in the technical report No. 103, (2) Lead-Self Leadership Inventory and (3) Myers-Briggs Type indicator Form F.

I have selected the 10 competency statements which received the highest mean on round 2 of your Delphi panel information and have compiled these into a questionnaire. The supervisors of my population of consultants will complete the questionnaire on each consultant. From this information I hope to gain a profile of the consultants' effectiveness from their supervisor's point of view. The consultants in my study are asked to fill out the Lead-Self Leadership Inventory by Hersey and Blanchard. This instrument will give me their leadership styles. In addition, the consultants are asked to complete the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form F. This instrument will supply me with their personality type. Finally, I will do statistical analyses using the information gained from these three instruments to discover if there is a relationship between leadership styles, personality types, and being an effective consultant. Attached to this letter, I have included a copy of the questionnaire.
Date: 2/26/88

Mary Savelsbergh, Graduate Teaching Assistant, OSU WOSC School of Education, Monmouth, Oregon has my permission to use the attached questionnaire, as a research tool in her dissertation.

Redacted for privacy

Signature
Glenna S. Cannon, M.Ed.
Research and Training Project
School Consultation
Department of Special Education
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

Good luck. Interesting project. Seems like the Myers-Briggs has all sorts of uses. I’m looking forward to seeing your results.

Redacted for privacy
CONSULTANT TEACHER DATA

Name consultant teacher: ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MYERS-BRIGGS scores</th>
<th>LEAD-SELF scores</th>
<th>SURVEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extravert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Regular Education: _______
Special Education: _______
Consultant Teacher: _______

LEVEL OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post M.S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certificates - endorsements: __________________

Western Oregon State College Monmouth, Oregon 97361 (503)838-1220 Ext. 322, 444
March 31, 1988

Mr. Cory Dunn
Linn-Benton Education Service District
905 4th Ave SE
Albany, Oregon 97321-3199

Dear Cory:

Thank you very much for assisting me with the data collection for my research. But, I need to ask for help just one more time. Would you please ask your staff to fill out the bottom half of this letter and return these letters to me as soon as possible. I ran a copy for each consultant. This information is, of course, confidential. No names will be published or used in this study.

NAME OF CONSULTANT

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Regular Education
Special Education
Consultant teaching

LEVEL OF EDUCATION - DEGREE MAJOR

B.S.
M.S.
Post M.S.
Certificates - endorsements:

Again, thank you very much for your help. I have attached a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Mary Savelsbergh

Western Oregon State College Monmouth, Oregon 97361 (503)838-1220 Ext. 322, 444
# Appendix I

## Effects of Each Preference in Work Situations

### Extraverts
- Like variety and action
- Are often good at greeting people
- Are sometimes impatient with long slow jobs
- Are interested in how others do their jobs
- Often enjoy talking on the phone
- Like to have people around in the working environment
- Often act quickly, sometimes without thinking
- May prefer to communicate by talking rather than writing
- Like to learn a new task by talking it through with someone

### Introverts
- Like quiet for concentration
- Have trouble remembering names and faces
- Can work on one project for a long time without interruption
- Are interested in the idea behind the job
- Dislike telephone interruptions
- Think before they act, sometimes without acting
- Work alone contentedly
- May prefer communications to be in writing
- May prefer to learn by reading rather than talking or experiencing

### Sensing Types
- Are aware of the uniqueness of each event
- Focus on what works now
- Like an established way of doing things
- Enjoy applying what they have already learned
- Work steadily, with a realistic idea of how long it will take
- Usually reach a conclusion step by step
- Are not often inspired, and may not trust the inspiration when they are
- Are careful about the facts
- May be good at precise work
- Can oversimplify a task
- Accept current reality as a given to work with

### Intuitive Types
- Are aware of new challenges and possibilities
- Focus on how things could be improved
- Dislike doing the same thing repeatedly
- Enjoy learning new skills
- Work in bursts of energy powered by enthusiasm, with slack periods in between
- May leap to a conclusion quickly
- Follow their inspirations and hunches
- May get their facts a bit wrong
- Dislike taking time for precision
- Can overcomplexify a task
- Ask why things are as they are

### Thinking Types
- Are good at putting things in logical order
- Respond more to people’s ideas than their feelings
- Anticipate or predict logical outcomes of choices
- Need to be treated fairly
- Tend to be firm and tough-minded
- Are able to reprimand or fire people when necessary
- May hurt people’s feelings without knowing it
- Have a talent for analyzing a problem or situation

### Feeling Types
- Like harmony and will work to make it happen
- Respond to people’s values as much as to their thoughts
- Are good at seeing the effects of choices on people
- Need occasional praise
- Tend to be sympathetic
- Dislike telling people unpleasant things
- Enjoy pleasing people
- Take an interest in the person behind the job or idea

### Judging Types
- Work best when they can plan their work and follow the plan
- Like to get things settled and finished
- May decide things too quickly
- May dislike to interrupt the project they are on for a more urgent one
- Tend to be satisfied once they reach a judgment on a thing, situation, or person
- Want only the essentials needed to begin their work
- Schedule projects so that each step gets done on time
- Use lists as agendas for action

### Perceptive Types
- Do not mind leaving things open for last-minute changes
- Adapt well to changing situations
- May have trouble making decisions, feeling like they never have enough information
- May start too many projects and have difficulty in finishing them
- May postpone unpleasant jobs
- Want to know all about a new job
- Get a lot accomplished at the last minute under pressure of a deadline
- Use lists as reminders of all the things they have to do someday
## Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators

### Competency Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statement</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation Theory/Models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Practice reciprocity of roles between consultant and consultee in facilitating the consultation process.</td>
<td>3.4 .7</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrate knowledge of various stages/ phases of the consultation process.</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assume joint responsibility for identifying each stage of the consultation process and adjusting behavior accordingly.</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Match consultation approach(es) to specific consultation situation(s), setting(s), and needs(s).</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>3.8 .5</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research on Consultation Theory, Training and Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Translate relevant consultation research findings into effective school-based consultation practice.</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exhibit ability to be caring, respectful, empathic, congruent, and open in consultation interactions.</td>
<td>modified 3.9 .3</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Establish and maintain rapport with all persons involved in the consultation process, in both formal and informal interactions.</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statement</th>
<th>Round 1 M and SD</th>
<th>Round 2 M and SD</th>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Identify and implement appropriate responses to stage of professional development of all persons involved in the consultation process.</td>
<td>modified 3.5 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maintain positive self-concept and enthusiastic attitude throughout the consultation process.</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Demonstrate willingness to learn from others throughout the consultation process.</td>
<td>3.9 .4</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Facilitate progress in consultation situations by managing personal stress, maintaining calm in time of crisis, taking risks, and remaining flexible and resilient.</td>
<td>3.8 .5</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Respect divergent points of view, acknowledging the right to hold different views and to act in accordance with convictions.</td>
<td>3.8 .5</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactive Communication**

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statement</th>
<th>Round 1 M and SD</th>
<th>Round 2 M and SD</th>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Communicate clearly and effectively in oral and written form.</td>
<td>3.9 .3</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Utilize active ongoing listening and responding skills to facilitate the consultation process (e.g., acknowledging, paraphrasing, reflecting, clarifying, elaborating, summarizing).</td>
<td>3.9 .4</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Determine own and others' willingness to enter consultative relationship.</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statement</th>
<th>Round 1 M and SD</th>
<th>Round 2 M and SD</th>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Adjust consultation approach to the learning stage of individuals involved in the consultation process.</td>
<td>modified 3.7 .5</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Exhibit ability to grasp and validate overt/covert meaning and affect in communications (perceptive).</td>
<td>modified 3.6 .7</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Interpret nonverbal communications of self and others (e.g., eye contact, body language, personal boundaries in space) in appropriate context.</td>
<td>modified 3.8 .5</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Interview effectively to elicit information, share information, explore problems, set goals and objectives.</td>
<td>3.9 .4</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Pursue issues with appropriate persistence once they arise in consultation process.</td>
<td>3.5 .6</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Give and solicit continuous feedback which is specific, immediate, and objective.</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Give credit to others for their ideas and accomplishments.</td>
<td>3.9 .4</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Manage conflict and confrontation skillfully throughout the consultation process to maintain collaborative relationships.</td>
<td>3.9 .3</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Manage timing of consultation activities to facilitate mutual decision making at each stage of the consultation process.</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Apply the principle of positive reinforcement to one another in the collaborative team situation.</td>
<td>added 3.6 .7</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Statement</td>
<td>Round 1 M and SD</td>
<td>Round 2 M and SD</td>
<td>Level of Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Be willing and safe enough to say &quot;I don't know... let's find out.&quot;</td>
<td>added</td>
<td>3.9 .3</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Problem Solving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Recognize that successful and lasting solutions require commonality of goals and collaboration throughout all phases of the problem solving process.</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Develop a variety of data collection techniques for problem identification and clarification.</td>
<td>3.5 .7</td>
<td>3.5 .7</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Generate viable alternatives through brainstorming techniques characterized by active listening, nonjudgmental responding, and appropriate reframing.</td>
<td>3.8 .5</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Evaluate alternatives to anticipate possible consequences, narrow and combine choices, and assign priorities.</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Integrate solutions into a flexible, feasible, and easily implemented plan of action relevant to all persons affected by the problem.</td>
<td>3.8 .5</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Adopt a &quot;pilot problem solving&quot; attitude, recognizing that adjustments to the plan of action are to be expected.</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Remain available throughout implementation for support, modeling, and/or assistance in modification.</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>3.9 .4</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Redesign, maintain, or discontinue interventions using data-based evaluation.</td>
<td>3.4 .7</td>
<td>3.6 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Essential Collaborative Consultation Competencies for Regular and Special Educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statement</th>
<th>Round 1 M and SD</th>
<th>Round 2 M and SD</th>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Utilize observation, feedback, and interviewing skills to increase objectivity and mutuality throughout the problem-solving process.</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Systems Change

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

36. Develop role as a change agent (e.g., implementing strategies for gaining support, overcoming resistance). | 3.6 .7           | 3.7 .6           | 94%                |

37. Identify benefits and negative effects which could result from change efforts. | modified          | 3.6 .6           | 92%                |

### Equity Issues and Values/Belief Systems

Regular and special educators engaging in collaborative consultation will:

38. Facilitate equal learning opportunities by showing respect for individual differences in physical appearance, race, sex, handicap, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or ability. | modified          | 3.8 .5           | 98%                |

39. Advocate for services which accommodate the educational, social, and vocational needs of all students, handicapped and nonhandicapped. | 3.7 .6           | 3.8 .6           | 97%                |

40. Encourage implementation of laws and regulations designed to provide appropriate education for all handicapped students. | modified          | 3.5 .8           | 88%                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statement</th>
<th>Round 1 M and SD</th>
<th>Round 2 M and SD</th>
<th>Level of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Utilize principles of the least restrictive environment in all decisions regarding handicapped students.</td>
<td>3.7 .7</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Modify myths, beliefs, and attitudes which impede successful social and educational integration of handicapped students into the least restrictive environment.</td>
<td>3.6 .7</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Recognize, respect, and respond appropriately to the effects of personal values, beliefs systems of self and others in the consultation process.</td>
<td>modified</td>
<td>3.8 .4</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Ensure that persons involved in planning and implementing the consultation process are also involved in its evaluation.</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Evaluate the impact of input, process, and outcome variables on desired consultation outcomes.</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Engage in self-evaluation of strengths and weaknesses to modify personal behaviors influencing the consultation process.</td>
<td>3.7 .6</td>
<td>3.7 .7</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Utilize continuous evaluative feedback to maintain, revise, or terminate consultation activities.</td>
<td>3.7 .7</td>
<td>3.7 .5</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>