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Resumo:
Com o objetivo de compreender como pesquisas brasileiras investigaram as Salas de 
Recursos Multifuncionais entre os anos de 2007 e 2018, apresentamos revisão sistemática 
de vinte e cinco artigos disponíveis nas bases científicas CaPes, Scielo e Redalyc, redigidos 
em português no domínio da Educação. Como resultado mais expressivo constatou-se 
escassez de estudos, tendo havido aumento de 68% em pesquisas publicadas nos últimos 
5 anos, porém, essas desenvolvidas em apenas nove estados brasileiros. Há evidência de 
lacunas científicas, diferenças de operacionalização e da necessidade de discussão dos 
conceitos e modelos adotados. A abordagem mais utilizada nas pesquisas é qualitativa
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**Resumen:**
Para comprender cómo la investigación brasileña investigó las salas de recursos multifuncionales entre 2007 y 2018, presentamos una revisión sistemática de veinticinco artículos disponibles en las bases de datos científicas CaPes, Scielo y Redalyc, escritas en portugués en el campo de la educación. Como resultado más significativo, hubo una escasez de estudios, con un aumento del 68% en los estudios publicados en los últimos 5 años, sin embargo, estos se desarrollaron en solo nueve estados brasileños. Hay evidencia de lagunas científicas, diferencias operativas y la necesidad de discutir los conceptos y modelos adoptados. El enfoque más utilizado en la investigación es cualitativo utilizando entrevistas basadas en contenido. No se encontraron investigaciones sobre discapacidad neuromotora. Se concluyó que a pesar de la gran demanda de personas discapacitadas en Brasil y el abandono señalado por el Ministerio de Educación, hay poca comprensión y evolución en el modelo adoptado.
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**Abstract:**
The present study focused on investigating the professional quality of life of special education teachers of primary and secondary education in Greece. In particular, the three dimensions of the professional quality of life of special education teachers were investigated, based on participants’ responses and some demographic-general characteristics. In addition, the possible relevance of the three dimensions of professional quality of life to each other was investigated. The sample of the study was 106 special education teachers of primary and secondary education. The Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL)-Compassion Satisfaction and Fatigue, Version 5 (Stamm, 2009) was used to assess professional quality of life. The statistical package SPSS version 21.0 was used for statistical analysis of the data. Statistical assumptions were tested for a default level of statistical significance α=.05. The analysis of the data showed that the level of participants' job satisfaction was high, while the level of secondary traumatic stress and burnout was low. A statistically significant relation was found between specialization in special education and job satisfaction, secondary traumatic stress and burnout of special education teachers, respectively. Age and years of service of special education teachers were found to be statistically significant in relation to their burnout. It also emerged that
teachers’ secondary traumatic stress was associated with job satisfaction and burnout. The findings of the present study are expected to contribute to improving the professional quality of life of special education teachers.
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1. Introduction

From 2000 to the present, ample public discussion and the participation of national and international social and political organizations have caused changes and advances in legislation aimed at the disabled population. One of the most significant was the National Policy for Special Education (PNEE)/2007, which introduced Special Education Teaching (SET) and the National Plan for the Rights of Disabled People. One of the promoters of this policy was the United Nations (UN), which, via the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities/2008, proposed international agreements for comprehensive protection of rights and human dignity.

Thus, once Brazil became a signatory, these efforts formed part of a judicial framework capable of ensuring better understanding of “human rights and fundamental freedoms” and providing disable persons with broad social participation, free of discrimination (Minetto & Bermudez, 2017; ONU, 2006).

Law no. 13.146 (LBI) of July 6, 2015, which regulates the inclusion of disabled persons, enabled other changes to be implemented, primarily in the field of education, by strengthening school inclusion and prohibiting private schools from charging higher tuitions fees to disabled students; requiring schools to provide professional support when needed; and including subjects with content discussing disability and accessibility to university courses, among others (Brasil, 2015).

The law currently stipulates that education is the right of everyone and an obligation of the state. Thus, even for disabled persons, LBI specifies that the education system be inclusive to ensure maximum development of “talents and physical, sensory, intellectual and social skills, according to their characteristics, interests and learning needs” (Brasil, 2015).

Disability is understood as physical, intellectual and sensory impediments that limit or obstruct an individual’s full participation in society. For young people with disabilities, barriers that can impede their schooling and total participation are found in learning spaces and the disabilities that should be considered in addressing these limitations include:

“ [...] overall development disorders: those that exhibit changes in neuropsychomotor development that compromise social relations, communication or motor stereotypes; this includes students with autism, autism spectrum disorder and childhood psychosis. High skills/giftedness: those with high potential and significant involvement in areas of
individual or combined human knowledge (intellectual, academic, leadership, arts and psychomotricity, arts and creativity)” (Brasil, 2010, p.7).

Given this human diversity for school inclusion, and despite advances in guaranteeing rights, the issue is still widely discussed and poorly interpreted. According to Camargo (2017, p.01), the topic should be treated as a “paradigm applied to the different physical and symbolic spaces” where everyone can participate, regardless of their disabilities or potential.

In this respect, the “Universal Design” concept of the LBI stipulates the participation of everyone through “[…] the conception of products, environments, programs and services to be used by all persons, without the need for adaption or specific design, including assistive technology resources” (Brasil, 2015, p. 29). As a rule, inclusion is guaranteed in rights and obligations as a “social practice” applied primarily in daily activities and in “perceiving things about oneself and others” (Camargo, 2017, p.01).

However, the reality remains far from this judicial ruling. Theoretical discussion demonstrates the value of education in the inclusion of people with disabilities, but in practice investment and commitment are still lacking, since the same policy that attempts to create equity, is not producing quality teaching.

Although the implementation of public policies is undoubtedly an important achievement, effective participation must also occur in practice. However, the results of the latest school census/2016 inform us otherwise, indicating that only 174,886 of the 638,485 individuals with mental or intellectual impairments were enrolled in special education (Brasil, 2012, p.4; 2010; 2016).

The precarious infrastructure of many schools exacerbates this problem. According to the Ministry of Education (MEC/2016), only 28% of the 183,376 institutions have disabled access and only 35% have the appropriate legally mandated bathrooms. This leaves much room for improvement, given the significant demand in the country (Brasil, 2010; 2016).

Teacher training is another important issue, since many institutions continue to use pedagogic methods that do not meet specific needs or fail to provide the training required for resource rooms (RR), with no data available to guide strategic measures (Oliveira & Manzini, 2016; Rocha, 2009; Zilly et al., 2015).

According to Zilly et al. (2015), Brazilian schools face serious difficulties and the perception of resource room teachers indicates a need for continuing education, as well as changes in pedagogic methods in light of student diversity.

Resource rooms were initially defined as spaces set up to meet the special education needs of students. In 2009, they were redefined as Special Education Teaching (SET) spaces, which received technical and financial support (Brasil, 2007; Manzini, 2013).

Resource rooms (RRs) evolved from spaces to help “[…] exceptional students with specific needs […]” to “spaces with didactic and pedagogic material, equipment and teachers trained in meeting special education needs” (Alves, 2006, p. 14; Mazzotta, 1982, p. 48).
A number of Brazilian states have implemented independent measures governing these settings. In Paraná, the creation of resource rooms (RRs) for 6 to 9-year-olds in the state network gave disabled children access to special education, ensuring their enrolment, follow-up and assessment in a regular class schedule and after school activities. The state broadened the terminology to type I and II multifunctional resource rooms (MRRs), in line with Ministry of Education (MEC) guidelines contained in Federal Decree 7,611, of November 17, 2011, which defined MRRs as type I multidimensional to meet specialized needs that complement the regular curriculum (Bertuol, 2010; Oliveira & Manzini, 2016; Paraná, 2008; 2011).

RRs were developed in the 1970s in Brazil as integrative settings in regular schools for students with special educational needs previously enrolled in special schools and classes. With the implementation of Special Education Teaching, they were specifically designed to meet diverse disabilities, but the teaching quality in many cases was inadequate. This is because city and state administrators are responsible for the pedagogic content of RRs, and, like Paraná, establish their own rules, which differ according to the region of the country (Albuquerque et al., 2009; Silva, 2003).

As such, monitoring and enforcing the laws and policies throughout the country is a daunting task, since, in addition to disagreements over strategies, governments lack concrete data that reflect the current reality. Research is therefore essential in obtaining real data on social and human issues that could benefit society according to the region, culture and specific needs.

In general, the number of studies directly linked to MRRs is low, which raises doubts limits understanding and clear evidence of their scope and benefits (Ingles & Zaboroski, 2016).

The reason for the scarcity of these studies lies in the fact that a space restricted to just a few contexts is difficult to investigate, making research important in order to demonstrate how guidelines are interpreted, explore alternative access to knowledge, monitor space organization, determine the training, perceptions and needs of professionals, the characteristics of each location, advances, necessary reformulations, etc. (Baptista, 2011). This is because “emphasis on a service should not be confused with defense of a single model for the country”. In other words, regional particularities such as identification processes, adequate schooling level, the complexity of the educational phenomena involved, the uniqueness of people, their special needs, feelings and sociability should also be considered. (Baptista, 2011, p. 72). In this respect, in order to understand how Brazilian studies are currently investigating MRRs in the context of special education and addressing the relevant issues, this study aimed to present a systematic review of articles produced in the last ten years in three databases.

We sought to answer the following question: how are studies on multifunctional resource rooms being carried out? The following objectives were proposed: determine how studies on RRs occur; identify the number of published articles; map scientific production; and report possible gaps.
As such, this paper will provide data on the number of published articles, institutions involved, chronology, authorship, geographic context, methodological approaches, object, individuals investigated and primary concerns. This review provides a synthesis of the literature, and may help researchers, educators and other professionals in their daily work routine.

2. Method

Scientific articles were extracted from three databases (Capes, Scielo and Redalyc). The review procedure consisted of three phases: start, procedure and conclusion. The first stage involved establishing the question of the investigation, objectives, primary sources, search string, inclusion and exclusion criteria, qualification categories, method and chronogram.

Primary data sources were used in the scientific articles extracted from the aforementioned databases. The search string consisted of “sala de recursos” and “sala de recurso” (resource room), in the title or keywords. The second phase involved searching for and reading the articles and analyzing the results, as well as documenting the studies (Esteves, et al., 2017; Nakano & Weshsler, 2007; Sampaio & Mancini, 2007).

The first filter located the string in the title or keywords, which was followed by reading of the abstract, introduction and conclusion. When this second filter was insufficient, a third filter consisted of reading the entire article. After the articles were classified, they were compared as to frequency in order to quantify and determine the types of studies conducted (Esteves, et al., 2017; Nakano & Weshsler, 2007; Sampaio & Mancini, 2007).

Documenting information during the search contributed to the theoretical argument surrounding the issue, cataloging and filing the texts. The third stage was the bibliometric analysis and summary of the results in an Excel spreadsheet, as well as qualitative data analysis.

The inclusion criteria were articles published in Portuguese between 2007 and 2018, indexed in the above-mentioned databases, peer-reviewed, and in the field of Human Sciences. The exclusion criterion was not addressing multifunctional resource rooms.

The systematic review definition adopted was the collection, understanding, analysis, synthesis and assessment of scientific articles in order to generate state of the art information on the topic of investigation (Levy & Ellis, 2006).

The articles were imported from the sources selected and the results refined, organized into a single list, and duplicates excluded. Next, they were sorted by title, keywords and abstract.

Categories were created to arrange the studies according to the following analysis criteria: number of publications, institutions involved, chronology, authorship, geographic context, methodologies, object, study subjects and primary concerns.
was followed by intensive and extensive reading of the articles to obtain information of interest (Nakano & Weshlser, 2007; Sampaio & Mancini, 2007).

3. Results

The search resulted in thirty-two studies: Scielo (14), Redalyc (8) and Capes (10). After being submitted to filters, 5 repeated articles were excluded, leaving twenty-seven eligible studies.

After further refining, two additional studies were removed for not being related to RRs. Next, they were organized according to the established criteria and read to extract information of interest from the twenty-five remaining articles.

Nine journals published the articles, 72% of which focused on special education and 28% on the general areas of Education and Psychology, as follows: Revista Brasileira de Educação (2); Revista Educação Especial (5); Revista Brasileira de Educação Especial (9); Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs – JORSEN (4); Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa (1); Cadernos de Pesquisa (1); Paidéia (1); Revista do Centro de Educação UFSM (1); Psicologia Escolar e Educacional (1).

The chronological distribution of the publications between 2007 and 2018 increased by 68% in the last five years (2013-2018), which may indicate greater scientific interest in the topic, but the total number of published articles (25) is considered small, with gaps in 2008 and 2010 when none were published.

Fourteen teaching and research institutions, namely, Unioeste (1); University of Joinville (1); Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) (1); Federal University of Amazonas (UFAM) (1); Federal University of Espirito Santo (UFES) (1); State University of Londrina (UEL) (1); UNICENTRO (1); University of São Paulo (USP) (2); Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS) (2); Paulista State University (UNESP) at Marília (2); University of Brasilia (UNB) (2); Rio de Janeiro State University (UERJ) (2); State University of Maringá (UEM) (2); and Federal University of São Carlos (UFSCAR) (6) – conducted studies related to SRRs in nine Brazilian states, the highest production being in São Paulo (10). The Southeast published the largest number of articles (13), followed by the South (9), Center-West (2), and North (1), with no publications in the Northeast during the study period.

The aims of the studies were to analyze the implementation of RRs and special education teaching (SET); assess and gain knowledge of SET and RRs; investigate pedagogic practices and teacher training; discuss the assessment and student identification processes; determine teacher, student and family perception of SET and RRs; monitor curricular and pedagogical planning of RRs and SET, as well as tests, assessment protocols and interventionist procedures.

The problems described in the studies provide an important diagnosis of the RR model adopted, highlighting shortcomings the need for revision given the diversity of the children and young people involved; lack of coordination between RR teachers and their colleagues; absence of parameters for assessment; lack of consideration for the
motivations, feelings, autonomy and socialization of young people; incongruous activities with students; few studies that broaden discussion on the issue; little democratic debate on the problems; reports not corresponding to that observed in RRs; lack of commitment on the part of parents and public entities; poor infrastructure, non-compliance with current legislation; lack of public investment in expanding and innovating the service; insufficient resource rooms to meet the demand; lack of communication and information between public sectors; insufficient knowledge regarding inclusion guidelines; RRs considered somewhat exclusionary and classificatory; teachers regarding themselves as heroes, not as properly trained professionals; families removing children from the program before the end of the school year; lack of adequate training; learning difficulties of children sent to the RR; underdeveloped cognitive potential; lack of knowledge regarding the laws governing RRs and their relation with human rights.

Meanings and concepts attributed to specialized resource rooms (SRRs) ranged from those specified by law to spaces for specific disabilities, excluding other children from their diversity. Moreover, RRs are also seen as an imposition on the school environment, or as a stigmatized area of exclusion and classification. In this respect, they have been described as follows: a space required by law; a significant achievement; specialized learning space; complex environment of knowledge and pedagogic methods; a place that guarantees specific student needs in order to minimize social and educational vulnerability; a service that contributes to social inclusion; an environment characterized by classification and stigmas; an environment promoting cognitive, educational, affective and social development; a room that develops potentials; spaces governed by law that holds teachers responsible; welcoming environment for disabled students to foster development and learning; support for special education; a sign language teaching room; and a place that uses technology and methodology that ensure school inclusion.

The methodologies used in the studies vary in their approach, instrument and analysis, as follows: qualitative (19); quantitative (3); and mixed (3). Interviews were used in 10 studies, documents, laws and internet texts in 9, questionnaires in 5, observation in 3, focus groups in 2 and protocol tests in 1. In regard to result analysis, there was a preference for content analysis (9), followed by statistical (5), discourse (3), reflexive (3), narrative (2), and others (3).

The participants and objects of study varied, but most of the research focused on the teachers, laws and guidelines for special education, special education teaching and resource rooms. Study subjects included gifted children, those with visual, hearing or intellectual impairment, and autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Children with neuromotor physical impairment and global development delay were not considered.

The theoretical framework was primarily based on legal documents and government guidelines, the most frequently cited references being Brasil; UNESCO; Vygotsky; and Mantoan.

Finally, this review demonstrated a lack of scientific journals with articles on specialized resource rooms, and few that contextualized this learning environment.
Southern and Southeastern Brazil produced the largest number of studies, while none were published from the Northeast.

The lack of research involving different data sources represents a methodological gap and there are few studies that analyze disabilities individually or together.

Investment, supervision and revision of the model is needed to guarantee rights, as well as scientific studies that produce educational innovation and reduce the non-compliance of schools identified by the School Census (2010) and Ministry of Education (MEC) (2016).

None of the studies proposed a new SRR model, but rather concentrated their analyses on diagnosis and assessment.

4. Final Considerations

Understanding special education, special education teaching and specialized resource rooms and their teachers, students and families requires further research that addresses not only the gaps presented here, but also the complex network of disabled children and adolescents, examining important issues that go beyond long-established laws and guidelines.

These environments and individuals need evidence-based measures that consider pedagogic, social, cognitive, psychological, health information and training aspects equally. This evidence is capable of communicating and socializing concepts, meanings and realities in a more transparent manner, thereby overcoming the problems experienced in the last decade through cooperation between human rights, political and social entities.

Specialized resource rooms (SRRs) are pedagogically important places that can enhance learning, but in order to achieve these benefits, they must evolve beyond their original model. As an educational environment, RR teachers and professionals can work together with others, integrating people and school spaces to include all the children.

There is a need to discuss and perhaps rethink the model and topic of inclusion since the prerogative of exclusion has already been accepted. Thus, it is suggested that new studies analyze the process as the cause of the problems detailed here.

As such, both a geographic and scientific gap were observed, since 18 Brazilian states did not produce a single study on the topic in the databases surveyed. Furthermore, teaching and research institutions, except for the fourteen mentioned here, which are legally bound to include the topic in their curricula, have published no studies in the last ten years. Equally lacking are Human Sciences and Education journals that publish articles on resource rooms.

Finally, we demonstrated a lack of information and dialogue in children, adolescents and families that directly or indirectly participate in resource rooms. The model requires urgent financial, political, human, social, educational and scientific investment.
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