

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS IN THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA SINCE PUBLIC LAW 94-142

by

David R. Lovern

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Counseling and Student Personnel  
Vocational School Psychology

APPROVED:

Thomas H. Hohenshil, Chairman

Susan Asselin

Martin Gerstein

Harriet Cobb

Dennis Hinkle

May, 1987

Blacksburg, Virginia

116 d 9-28-87

The Role and Function of School Psychologists in the  
Commonwealth of Virginia Since Public Law 94-142

by

David R. Lovern

Committee Chairman: Thomas H. Hohenshil  
Counseling/Vocational School Psychology

(ABSTRACT)

The role and function of school psychologists and changes in such since Public Law 94-142 have been the subject of research by numerous authors. However, more speculation than empirical data exists on the topic. Although speculation in the profession has suggested about equally that the role and function of the school psychologist has changed and has not changed since Public Law 94-142, studies have failed to substantiate such speculation one way or the other.

The population of school psychologists in Virginia was chosen for the present study because of existing research using this population conducted by Murray in 1975, before Public Law 94-142 came into full effect. The study was designed to answer the following eight research questions:

- (1) What expectations do school psychologists have for attributes?

(2) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to participations in various professional activities?

(3) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position?

(4) What is the relative frequency with which school psychologists perform the various functions of their present position?

(5) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position compared to the relative frequency with which they actually perform those same functions?

(6) What are school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions?

(7) What is the influence of selected demographic variables on school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions?

(8) What is the degree of consensus between the results obtained in this study and those obtained in Murray's study relative to the areas outlined above?

Data were collected via mailed surveys using a personal data form, to gain demographic information, and a modified form of the questionnaire used by Murray (1975). Three hundred nineteen members of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists were mailed survey materials, and a

response rate of 80.5% was obtained. Of this total, one hundred seventy-six met the requirements necessary to be included in the data analysis.

Demographic information was obtained and frequency counts of modified questionnaire responses revealed information relative to school psychologists' expectations for attributes, participations in professional activities, and performances of functions, as well as importance attached to, and frequency of performance of, various functions. One-way ANOVA procedures were used to determine the relationship between overall expectations for performances of various functions scores and demographic variables. No significant differences were found among demographic variables.

Chi-square procedures were used to compare the present expectations for role and function with those of Murray (1975). Results indicated that many specific aspects of the Virginia school psychologist's expectations for role and function have changed since 1975 and new roles have emerged. Changes were seen in expectations for attributes, participation in professional activities, and performance of various functions yet these specific changes in expectations have not led to changes in importance attached to, or actual frequency of performance of, functions.

Several implications were drawn from the results of the present study leading to recommendations for school

psychologists and trainers, and employers of school psychologists, as well as professional school psychology organizations. The recommendations focused on training for school psychologists and topics for further research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this dissertation would not have been possible without the assistance of others. The author wishes to acknowledge the following individuals for their significant contributions to this investigation.

Special thanks to Tom Hohenshil, the author's friend and chairman of the dissertation committee, who provided the continued assistance, support, reassurance, and guidance necessary for the successful completion of this dissertation.

The strain brought on by the total dissertation process surely could not have been managed without the love and support provided by the members of my immediate and extended family. Special thanks to \_\_\_\_\_, my wife, for standing by me, through the thick and the thin, and for willing to endure the many sacrifices inherent in this process and to \_\_\_\_\_, my daughter, and \_\_\_\_\_, my son, who so patiently shared their father with this effort. Also, special thanks to \_\_\_\_\_, my parents, for their continued lifelong support, and to \_\_\_\_\_, my wife's parents, for their support and unfaltering faith. To \_\_\_\_\_, special thanks, for without their encouragement and support this dissertation would never have been initiated.

To \_\_\_\_\_, my friend and colleague, go thanks for providing the continued motivation needed to complete this effort.

To \_\_\_\_\_ go thanks for his generous assistance in helping to analyze and interpret the results of the study, and to \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ for their helpful review of the dissertation and assistance in its development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
	Rationale for the Study . . . . .	4
	Purpose of the Study . . . . .	5
	Definitions of Terms . . . . .	7
	Limitations of the Study . . . . .	9
	Summary . . . . .	10
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	12
	School Psychology as a Profession . . . . .	12
	Historical Aspects of School Psychology . . . . .	13
	Role and Function of the School Psychologist . . . . .	22
	The Impact of Public Law 94-142 on the Role and Function of School Psychologists . . . . .	24
	Summary . . . . .	29
III	METHODOLOGY . . . . .	31
	Participants . . . . .	31
	Sections of the Survey . . . . .	33
	Personal Data Form . . . . .	34



TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
Expectations for Attributes . . . . .	35
Expectations for Participations . . . . .	35
Importance and Frequency of Performance of Functions . . . . .	36
Expectations for Performances . . . . .	37
Data Collection . . . . .	38
Preliminary Letter . . . . .	38
Initial Mailing . . . . .	39
First Follow-up Contact . . . . .	39
Second Follow-up Contact . . . . .	39
Third Follow-up Contact . . . . .	40
Data Analysis . . . . .	40
Summary . . . . .	45
IV RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	46
Survey Response Rate . . . . .	46
Demographic Data . . . . .	47
Age . . . . .	47
Sex . . . . .	50
Marital Status and Number of Children . . . . .	50
Employment . . . . .	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
Work Setting . . . . .	52
Academic Training . . . . .	52
Years as a School Psychologist . .	54
Years Experience as a Teacher . .	56
Years Experience in Psychological or Psychiatric Setting . . . . .	57
Certifications and Licenses Held .	57
Membership in Professional Organizations . . . . .	58
Expectations for Attributes . . . . .	58
Educational Level . . . . .	58
Nature of Training . . . . .	58
Nature of Doctoral Training . . .	59
Experience . . . . .	60
Expectations for Participations . . .	60
Importance of Functions . . . . .	63
Performances of Functions . . . . .	63
Comparison of Importance and Performance of Functions Sections of Present Study . . . . .	66
Expectations for Performances . . . .	69

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Expectations for Performances . . . . .	78
Comparison of Present School Psychologists' Responses to Murray's Study . . . . .	79
Comparison of Expectations for Attributes . . . . .	79
Comparison of Expectations for Participations . . . . .	80
Comparison of Importance of Functions . . . . .	83
Comparison of Frequency of Functions . . . . .	84
Comparison of Expectations for Performances . . . . .	85
Summary . . . . .	94
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	96
Review of the Research Questions and Methodology . . . . .	96

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary of the Findings and Conclusions . . . . .	99
Discussion and Implications of the Study . . . . .	105
Recommendations . . . . .	108
Recommendations for the Profession . . . . .	109
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	112
APPENDICES . . . . .	119
A Survey Letters . . . . .	120
B Survey Materials . . . . .	125
VITA . . . . .	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Survey Response Rates . . . . .	48
2	Age Distribution . . . . .	49
3	Annual Salary . . . . .	51
4	Student Populations . . . . .	53
5	Level of Academic Training . . . . .	55
6	Frequencies of Scaled Responses for each item of the Expectations for School Psychologist's Participations Section . . . . .	62
7	Frequencies for the Importance of the School Psychologist's Functions Section . . . . .	64
8	Frequencies for the Frequency of Performance of the School Psychologist's Functions Section . . . . .	67
9	Frequencies for the Expectations for the School Psychologist's Performances Section . . . . .	71
10	Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations for Attributes . . . . .	81
11	Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations for Participations . . . . .	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
12	Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations for Performances . . . . .	87

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The Commonwealth of Virginia, like other states, has witnessed rapid growth in the number of school psychologists since the emergence of Public Law 94-142. There is however, ongoing debate as to the school psychologist's role and function in support of public education in general and the handicapped in particular. It has been suggested that roles have changed as a result of legislation. Also, many believe the traditional role of psychologists in the schools is no longer tenable and new ways of practice may be required that have implications for training and service (Alpert, 1985; Benson & Hughes, 1985; Hayes & Clair, 1978).

The rapid growth in the number of school psychologists in Virginia since 1950 can be documented. In 1950 Virginia employed only ten public school psychologists; by 1960 there were twenty (Magary and Meacham, 1963); by 1975 there were more than 170 (Murray, 1975). Since 1975 that number has more than doubled pointing to Virginia's strong support of psychological services. While it appears doubtful the number of school psychologists will continue to grow at this pace in the foreseeable future, due to funding (Knoff, 1983), the emphasis has now shifted to readdressing the school psychologist's job description.

Virginia's school personnel are presently engaged in debate as to what should be the specific roles and responsibilities of school psychologists. There are a growing number of people advocating what is described as a psychodiagnostic role with evaluation for eligibility for special education purposes being the school psychologist's primary and/or only role. Others continue to view the school psychologist's role as expanded to include follow-up activities such as counseling with students and families, staff and school board consultation, inservice training, community support, and research (Helge, 1985). This may not be the case at the present time since many school divisions advocate the psychometric role and believe the requirements of Public Law 94-142 (PL 94-142) are being met when a minimum or "bare bones" evaluation has been completed and eligibility determined. On the other hand, it is important that the school psychologist is viewed as having an expanded role. This adds responsibilities in areas such as prevention (Perry, 1984; Barclay, 1973, 1983), educational programming (Helge, 1985; Lolli, 1980; Reger, 1965; Shinn, 1986), social facilitation (Carstens, 1985; Gresham, 1985; Lighthall, 1973; Mok, 1962), and organizational development and systems intervention (Takanishi, DeLeon, and Pallak, 1983). Without this view, added responsibilities may diminish. The school psychologist's professional intervention should be



characterized by a cluster of multidimensional activities (Ziv, 1980).

While many school divisions continue to expand the responsibilities of the school psychologist despite the pressure of PL 94-142 and its primary thrust to have children evaluated and placed in the least restrictive environment, others do not. The role of the school psychologist may always include recommendations and reports based on diagnosis, but may also involve follow-up and case studies; consultation with staff and school board members; teacher discussion groups; research; referral and other work with community agencies; child and family counseling (Helge, 1985; Grimes, 1981; Trachtman, 1981).

School psychologists are performing important roles in the public schools of Virginia and although there has been a tremendous amount of growth in numbers of school psychologists in the profession during the past thirty years, growth may not be best described in simple numerical terms. Growth and development may not be synonymous terms here and detailed investigation is necessary to provide information regarding the role and function of school psychologists now as compared to more than a decade ago when Murray's study was completed in 1975.

Professional services are assumed to require special expertise that only a few people possess in their repertoire of skills. The profession of school psychology may be

defined by the body of skills, knowledge, and competencies it claims as its area of authority and responsibility, and its practitioners are evaluated on the basis of their use of them (Oakland, 1986). Claiming an area of professional expertise has responsibilities attached and it is essential to study the present role of Virginia school psychologists to ascertain implications for future training, certification, and standards of competency in general, and specifically with regards to PL 94-142.

Hohenshil (1975) states that if school psychological services are to offer solutions to the broad problems facing children in education, reexamination of those services is essential. It is the intent of this study to make such an examination of the school psychologists currently employed in the public schools of the Commonwealth of Virginia and compare responses on survey questions with those previously obtained by Murray (1975). Through this investigation, the change in role and function, or the lack thereof, since the enactment of PL 94-142 will be examined.

#### Rationale for the Study

The role and function of practicing school psychologists have historically been influenced by a number of forces. Even so, it continues to be a rapidly emerging profession in Virginia and with its growth greater concern

is being given to the variety of functions that school psychologists are expected to perform. Nationally, there has been increased interest in defining the role of the school psychologist. Studies concerning the role of the school psychologist have been done in a number of states. These studies, however, have only limited applicability in the Commonwealth of Virginia and few compare the present role and function of school psychologists with previous research to determine change since the implementation of PL 94-142.

As a function of their particular situation, school psychologists may perform many different professional roles. There is a need, therefore, for research specific to the given situation found in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The decade of the 1970's gave rise to significant growth and added dimensions within school psychology. Little research has been conducted since the mid 1970's when Public Law 94-142 became fully implemented. The focus of this study is to provide empirical data regarding present role and function of school psychologists and changes in such since the enactment of PL 94-142.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the role of school psychologists in the Commonwealth of Virginia based

on their responses to a survey of role expectations and compare this to Murray's results obtained in 1975. This study also has as its purpose to assess the perceived importance Virginia school psychologists attach to the variety of functions they perform, the frequency with which they actually perform these functions, and the relationship between the perceived importance and actual frequency of performance of functions. The study provides data concerning demographic variables of the school psychologists surveyed. The influence of selected demographic variables on expectations for performances of functions was assessed and a comparison of the results of this study with those of Murray's (1975) was made.

Specifically, answers to the following research questions were sought:

(1) What expectations do school psychologists have for attributes?

(2) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to participations in various professional activities?

(3) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position?

(4) What is the relative frequency with which school psychologists perform the various functions of their present position?

(5) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position compared to the relative frequency with which they actually perform those same functions?

(6) What are school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions?

(7) What is the influence of selected demographic variables on school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions?

(8) What is the degree of consensus between the results obtained in this study and those obtained in Murray's study relative to the areas outlined above?

In short, the study examined the school psychologists' expectations for their role, assessed the perceived importance and actual relative frequency of performance of their functions, and provided data concerning demographic information on the school psychologists surveyed. Of primary importance, all results were compared to those obtained by Murray (1975) to investigate consensus among the two groups surveyed and possible changes in the role and function of the Virginia school psychologist.

#### Definition of Terms

The following key terms which are pertinent to the study are herein defined:

1. Expectation - the term "expectation" refers to the evaluative standards of the respondents as applied to their role and function as a Virginia school psychologist. It refers to those activities considered desirable by the respondent. For the purposes of this study, expectations are defined as being the participants' responses to the specific questionnaire items.

2. Performance - the term "performance" refers to any activity which the school psychologist can be expected to engage in while in their present position.

3. Participation - the term " participation" is defined as those outside professional activities and affiliations of the school psychologist which may or may not be an intregal component of present total job responsibility.

4. Role - the term "role" refers to the set of expectations concerning performances, participations, and attributes of the school psychologist.

5. Attribute - the term "attribute" denotes the personal qualities or characteristics of the school psychologist.

6. Function - the term "function" is used to denote the specific activities that are components of a role.

7. School psychologist - the term "school psychologist" is used to describe those persons certificated or licensed as school psychologists employed in the public schools of the Commonwealth of Virginia either full time or part time.

8. Employed - the term "employed" is used to describe those persons under employment contract who receive benefits as prescribed by said employment. The term does not include those persons under service contract who do not receive employment benefits.

#### Limitations of the Study

The present study was limited by the following:

(1) The present study was confined to an analysis of the role of school psychologists working in school systems in the Commonwealth of Virginia and may not generalize to school psychologists working in school systems in other states.

(2) The conclusions of this study are accurate to the extent that the school psychologists surveyed adequately represented the population and the definers of their own role.

### Summary

Historically, school psychologists have performed the duties of testor and classifier of school-aged children. The profession, however, has seen rapid growth in the number of school psychologists employed in recent years. Different functions, encompassing most aspects of the total school program, have been deemed important for the profession. The purpose of this study was to analyze the role of the school psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia, based on a survey of the role expectations of school psychologists. This information is then to be compared with the role and function of school psychologists prior to Public Law 94-142.

The problem was presented; and the purpose, objectives, and the significance of the study detailed in Chapter 1. Limitations of the investigation were outlined and several key terms pertinent to the study were defined. Chapter 2, "Review of Literature", examines related literature regarding the role and function of school psychologists to date. The chapter also includes a review of literature concerning the change in role and function since the enactment of PL 94-142. Chapter 3, "Methodology", describes the investigative techniques used to obtain data for the study, including descriptives of the subjects, sections of the survey, data gathering process, and analysis procedures. The fourth chapter, "Results of the Study", presents the



findings of the study. Chapter 5, " Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations", provides summative remarks based on the results.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter a review of relevant literature is presented as background for this research. The development of school psychology as a profession is discussed followed by a section on the historical aspects of school psychology. A section on the role and function of the school psychologist, including a review of literature on the change in role and function of the school psychologist since Public Law 94-142, will then be presented.

#### School Psychology as a Profession

The rapid development of school psychology as a specific professional discipline is not unlike many other professions. There is a tremendous amount of material contained in the literature, most of which is conflicting and contradictory because of the many different experiences, opinions, and resulting conclusions of various practitioners. Individual and geographical differences may account for the numerous journal articles which offer a great deal of practical information but do not provide for a cohesive and organized overview of the development of the profession of school psychology.

The present research will therefore focus on the expanding body of literature concerned with defining the role and function of school psychologists across the nation. Literature on the impact of PL 94-142 on the school psychologist's role and function will be presented.

### Historical Aspects of School Psychology

School psychology's development can be traced directly to the work of several psychologists in the late nineteenth century. Sir Francis Galton devised a number of psycho-motor instruments in 1884 and school systems were used to maintain ongoing records of pupil performance and progress based on these tests (Bardon and Bennett, 1974). The assessment of children's psycho-motor abilities is considered by some to be exemplary of initial school psychological services (White and Harris, 1961).

Others claim psychologists' involvement in education began when Witmer established a psycho-educational clinic at the University of Pennsylvania in 1896 (White and Harris, 1961; Eiserer, 1963; Gray, 1963; Bardon and Bennett, 1974). The clinic's primary objective was to train psychologists to work with the various learning problems of children. Later the same year, Witmer addressed the American Psychological Association by recommending, in part:

"The training of students in a new profession - that of the psychological expert, who should find his career in connection with the school system, through the examination and treatment of mental and morally retarded children" (Gray, 1963, p. 34).

Psychologists were first employed in the United States by the Chicago Public Schools with the establishment of the Department of Child Study and Pedagogic Investigation in 1899 by William Healey (Eiserer, 1963; Bardon & Bennett, 1974). Anthropological norms were established by this department and problems of physical and mental growth of children were studied.

Shortly thereafter, child study and psychological services were operating in other major cities. In 1907, the Child Study Department was established by the Rochester Public Schools in New York. In 1911, the Public School Psychological Laboratory was founded in Cincinnati, Ohio (Wallen, 1942). Other school systems in Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Baltimore were soon providing such services (Tindall, 1964; Wallen, 1942).

Arnold Gesell was appointed as "school psychologist", the first, in 1915 by the state of Connecticut (Fagan, 1984). Gesell tested suspected retardates and made recommendations for educational programming. The title "school psychologist" cannot be found earlier in the historical literature of the profession of school psychology

although psychologists, as previously mentioned, did have similar functions. The term "school psychologist" first appeared in the literature in 1921 in a non-editorial article written by Gesell (Fagan, 1984). The term appeared again in the literature in an article written by Hurt titled specifically, "The School Psychologist" (Gray, 1963). It was only two years later that Walter published an article titled, "Functions of a School Psychologist." (Shepard, 1982).

The advent of mental testing or intelligence measurement in the early twentieth century represents probably the first and most lasting impact on the development of school psychology. Testing has usually been considered a fundamental aspect of school psychological services (Bennett, 1970). School psychology has developed concurrently with the growth of special education since the late 1920's and helped to establish the image and perception of the school psychologist's role as mental tester. This became even more evident with the advent of PL 94-142.

The "Mental Health Movement" added a psychotherapeutic element to the functions of the school psychologist, but has remained an influence of lesser impact. The American public's concern for the mental health of its citizens was stimulated through the work and writings of Clifford Beers. Beers, a former mental patient, wrote of the horrors of his commitment to a mental institution in 1905 in his book

entitled A Mind That Found Itself and later established the National Committee for Mental Hygiene (Bardon and Bennett, 1974; White and Harris, 1961). The period of 1900-1920 also witnessed the beginnings of the "guidance movement" in public schools with the leadership of Brewer and the development of a school psychology training program at Columbia University in the Department of Guidance. The mental health and guidance movements provided the basis for the school psychologist to assist children in ways other than through assessment and diagnosis.

By the 1930's some states had established certification requirements for school psychologists. In 1942, the Journal of Consulting Psychology devoted an entire issue to the broader potential of school psychology (Gray, 1963). Articles in this issue included "The School Psychologist as a Mental Health Specialist" and "The School Psychologist Investigates Reading Disability." In 1946, The Division of School Psychologists (Division 16) was organized as a separate division within the American Psychological Association.

By the early 1950's, the mental health movement was well established and school psychologists became increasingly in demand to work in school systems, typically operating as school based clinicians (Bardon and Bennett, 1974). School psychologists became increasingly involved in assisting children judged emotionally maladjusted and

greater emphasis was placed on the influence of personality factors in learning (Porter, 1960). The post-war era also witnessed a significant growth in special education programs and a greater need for psychological assessment and consultation services (Barlow, 1966). Schools began providing children with special education and moved away from directing all their efforts toward "normal" children. The concern for the individual child with unique problems remains central to professional school psychology.

The profession had now developed to the extent that it needed clarification with respect to the training which school psychologists should receive and the services they would provide. The Thayer Conference of 1954, August 22-31 in West Point, New York, proved to be a milestone in the crystallization of the professional identity of school psychologists. It was sponsored by the Education and Training Board of the American Psychological Association with funds provided by the Public Health Service, and the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Participants included practicing school psychologists and others whose work played a significant part in influencing the role and function of school psychologists. The findings and conclusions of the conference were published in a book entitled, School Psychologists at Mid-Century (Cutts, 1955). Recommendations regarding role, competency, and preparation of school psychologists were included.

Following the Thayer Conference, the Division of School Psychologists of the American Psychological Association further reviewed the role and function of school psychologists and its findings were published in 1958. The report entitled, "The Psychologist on the School Staff", in conjunction with the work of the Thayer Conference, strengthened the identity of school psychology and established it as a specific subdiscipline within psychology.

The 1960's gave rise to increasing influence by public and governmental concern regarding social problems affecting the schools (Bardon and Bennett, 1974). Emphasis was placed on children whose learning and behavioral problems stemmed from the nature of their socio-cultural environments (Bardon and Bennett, 1967). The recognition and use of learning theory in the schools further impacted on the school psychologist's functioning, and more psychologists began to apply principles of human learning theory in educational settings.

As pupil personnel services expanded in the 1970's, so did the number of school psychologists and the services they provided. School psychologists began to function in many diverse areas and an emphasis on more comprehensive involvement in both the training and practice of school psychologists was increasingly observed (Barclay, 1973; Bardon and Bennett, 1974; Bergon and Tombardi, 1976; Grimes,



1981, Kabler, 1977; Kelman and Wolff, 1976; Trachtman, 1981). School psychologists maintained their traditional role of diagnostician and therapist yet were found to have valuable skills related to total childhood development and learning.

The Spring Hill Symposium, in 1980, presented a variety of issues that face the profession of school psychology. These issues were diverse and touched many aspects of the profession's training and work environment. Participants in the Symposium were 69 invited school psychologists from 22 states, the District of Columbia, and Alberta, Canada. General themes of the conference included the following: (1) how school psychologists can serve children and the schooling process effectively, (2) what conditions are conducive to the provision of these services, (3) how environmental conditions for the provision of effective services can be developed, and (4) the appropriate entry level for school psychologists (Peterson, 1981). These critical issues were identified and their nature delineated with regard to those which would impact on school psychology in the 1980's and into the 1990's.

The Olympia Conference on the Future of School Psychology was the second in this series of two designed to examine issues influencing the field into the 21st century (Brown, Cardon, Coulter, Meyers, 1982). Each state psychology association (with a division of school

psychology) and each school psychology association was permitted to select one or more (up to three depending on population) participants for the conference. Other groups were asked to send representatives including Training of School Psychology (TSP), the Council of Directors of the School Psychology Doctoral Program, the Executive Committee of Division 16 and actively involved members, as well as school psychology students who were randomly selected. Other professional organizations were asked to send representatives as were key federal agencies and groups related to education. Selected were 332 individuals attending the conference from across the country. The major themes of commitment and action were professional accountability, political action, public relations, collaboration, research, and values (Hart, 1982). Issues of concern cited were future funding for education and psychological services. Also, many in attendance believed school psychologists would have to change the direction of service provision strategies in order to meet the demands of the educational system.

The future of school psychology depends on many variables and the direction in which the profession evolves may hinge upon its response to technological advances, the needs of society and the educational system, and legislation. The expansion of school psychology is said by many to be directly related to the expansion of the federal

role in education (Abramowitz, 1981). Increased federal mandates such as that of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and that of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142) have greatly increased the demand for the services of school psychologists. But many school psychologists believe this demand is for assessment services and their role lacks the diversity or variety necessary to take advantage of the many competencies they possess (Bardon, 1976; Bennett & Bardon, 1975; Kirp & Kirp, 1976).

School psychologists had a definition forced upon them by the federal mandate of PL 94-142 which they may not have imposed upon themselves (Abramowitz, 1981). Many national conferences, the NASP Standards for the Provision of School Psychological Services and several studies indicate the desire of school psychologists to reduce the amount of time spent in assessment related duties and to increase time spent in consultation and preventive roles (Alpert & Trachtman, 1980; Gibbins, 1978; Hughes, 1979). This desired role change was not shared by persons outside the school psychology profession however (Hughes, 1979). The decisions of federal and state officials indicate this and rather than resolving the historical problems of role definition, the new mandates may have created a new identity problem. Rather than seeking separation from clinical psychology as a

field, school psychologists now sought separation of their field from special education (Abramowitz, 1981).

### Role and Function of the School Psychologist

School psychologists have expended a tremendous amount of time and energy attempting to define their role (e.g., Cooke and Patterson, 1977; Hughes, 1979; Lacayo, Sherwood, and Morris, 1981; Meacham and Peckham, 1978; Ramage, 1979; Wright and Gutkin, 1981), and this obsession with identity may be the result of many factors including the generalist nature of school psychological practice (Bardon, 1976). Several studies have investigated both actual and desired roles (Cooke and Patterson, 1977; Hughes, 1979; Meacham and Peckham, 1978; Ramage, 1979; Wright and Gutkin, 1981) and some proposit to assess changes in role and function as a result of impact of PL 94-142 legislation (Abramowitz, 1981; Goldwasser and Meyers, 1983; Goldwasser, 1979; Goldwasser, Meyers, Christenson & Graden, 1981; Ramage, 1979; Stevenson-Hicks, 1980).

The testing role most likely leads the many proposed for school psychologists (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Chrin, 1974; Cutts, 1955; Hughes, 1979; Mullen, 1958; Oakland, 1986; Valett, 1963; White and Harris, 1961). Consultation with school personnel, parents and community members is another function often found in the literature

for the school psychologist (Chrin, 1974; Grimes, 1981; Helge, 1985; Maher & Illback, 1982; Mullen, 1958; Reschly, 1976; Trachtman, 1981; Valett, 1963). Yet still another area of proposed service is research (Hummel and Bonham, 1968; Keenan, 1964; Smith, 1962). The rationale for research has been outlined by several authors (Bardon and Bennett, 1974; Mullen, 1958; Takanishi, DeLeon & Pallak, 1983; Valett, 1963).

There is a discrepancy found, however, between proposed roles and those actually performed by school psychologists (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Hughes, 1979). Diagnostic assessment is cited as the role most prominent in performance in the literature (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Herson, 1967; Murray, 1975; Ramage, 1979). Parent, teacher, and student conferences have also been listed as primary functions of the school psychologist (Helge, 1985; Herson, 1967; Murray, 1975; and Ramage, 1979). The functions least performed include program evaluation and research (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Herson, 1967; Murray, 1975; and Ramage, 1979).

The interest in examining the role and function of school psychologists working in the United States has been extensive and ongoing. Yet few studies to date have made comparisons of actual performance just prior to Public Law 94-142 and the present. The adequacy of the School Executive Studies of Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958) and

the study by Murray (1975) led to their selection as models for the present investigation.

The relative frequency of performance of functions of the school psychologist cited by Murray (1975) were ranked from high to low as follows: (1) diagnostic studies, (2) conferences with pupils and parents, (3) consultant to teachers, (4) special placements for children, (5) consultant to administrators, (6) follow-up of studies, (7) community services, (8) curriculum development, (9) group testing program, and (10) research (Murray, 1975, p. 168).

The performance of functions of the school psychologist cited by Murray (1975) remain generally descriptive of the role of the school psychologist today. New tasks may have evolved in the decade since Murray's study, and these need to be added to the ten general categories listed above. Emergent duties have included individual and group counseling, inservice for teachers and administrators, and eligibility decisions for children (Grimes, 1981, Helge, 1985, and Ramage, 1979).

#### The Impact of Public Law 94-142 on the Role and Function of School Psychologists

Increased federal mandates, particularly that of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142), have greatly increased the demand for the

services of school psychologists. Many believed this demand would lead to more emphasis on assessment and the role of the school psychologist would be limited further toward psychometric activities (Abramowitz, 1981; Bardon, 1976; Bennett, 1975; Kirp & Kirp, 1976). Others interpreted this legislation as providing opportunities for a broader role model (Alpert & Trachtman, 1980; Gibbins, 1978). Despite these strong opinions and the increase in studies related to proper role and practice of school psychology that tend to dominate the literature (Clark and Reynolds, 1981), empirical data regarding change in the role and function of the school psychologist since PL 94-142 is in fact lacking.

In 1978, Manley and Manley studied Ohio school psychologists on personal determinants of practice. They found that Ohio school psychologists and school superintendents ranked school psychology goals, stated as job functions, with close similarity. Indicated were very similar values and operative goals. The two goals or role functions ranked higher by superintendents than by practicing school psychologists were related to increased learning efficiency and interaction with community agencies. The four goals ranked higher by school psychologists were related to traditional child study activities (including assessment) and continuing education.

Also in 1978, Meacham and Peckham conducted a national survey of school psychologists. They found a close

relationship between the emphasis on skills in training to six job functions and the emphasis given these same roles in the work setting.

In 1979, Ramage surveyed 2,743 randomly selected school psychologists to provide information to be used as the basis for research and policy decisions in the field of school psychology. Results indicated that respondents employed full time in a school system would like to do less psycho-educational evaluations and would prefer to do more group counseling. The actual role and function of the school psychologist appeared to be fairly congruent. Overall, school psychologists appeared to be more comfortable in their role than they were in 1970 when the initial study was done.

Devich (1980) surveyed 122 school psychologists employed in the San Francisco Bay area on perceptions of the impact that PL 94-142 had on their role and function and found that indeed this legislative mandate has affected the school psychologist's professional functioning. The results gave some indication that more time was now spent on those activities required by PL 94-142 though most of these tasks were not related to direct services for handicapped children.

Stevenson-Hicks conducted a study surveying 389 members of the National Association of School Psychologists practicing as school psychologists in 1980. This effort



investigated the potential changes in the practice of school psychology, as perceived by practicing school psychologists, which are affected as a result of the implementation of PL 94-142. The amount of paperwork generated per case was seen as the area of daily practice upon which PL 94-142 would have its greatest impact. School psychology becoming more closely tied to special education was the feeling conveyed by 44% of the respondents. Results of this study also support the continuance of the role of diagnostician as primary; 73.2% of the respondents listed diagnosis and assessment as the most emphasized in their current work environment.

In 1981, Goldwasser, Meyers, Christenson, and Graden conducted a national study on the impact of PL 94-142 on the practice of school psychology. This study, sponsored by NASP and Division 16 of the APA, concluded that this legislation had little impact on the school psychologist's role or the evaluation procedures utilized.

Wright and Thomas, in 1982, studied midwestern school psychologists (n=171) and found that personal characteristics and need for clarity of role and function moderated job-related tension. Intent to leave their present position was nonsignificant for those school psychologists that were low in need for clarity and significant for those high in need for clarity.

In 1983 Goldwasser and Meyers surveyed a national sample of NASP members (856 surveys used in data analysis) on perceptions of the impact that PL 94-142 had on their role and found it had little impact on the evaluation procedures used or on the school psychologist's role. Results indicated an increased focus on handicapped children and increased paperwork. Results also indicated school psychologists had no time to become involved in the IEP process, to provide follow-up consultation, or to provide direct intervention for prevention and/or therapeutic purposes.

Jerrell (1984) surveyed school psychologists (n=18) and school superintendents (n=16) in rural Pennsylvania and found that involvement in community liason and networking functions to be related more to personal preference, employment status, and congruence between personal and administrators' preferences than to professional training and organizational or environmental demands (demands of the present work situation). The school psychologists involved in community liason activities, describing themselves as "networking types", were more aware of the need to collaborate with other professionals in their area, considered themselves to be more influential in determining their role, and were more satisfied with their jobs. They were also more likely to experience role conflict however.

In 1985, Benson and Hughes investigated the process of role definition, attempting to identify factors that were perceived as important to that process. They surveyed 165 school psychologists, sampled from the NASP membership, 92 school superintendents, and 43 state departments of education. Their results indicated that school psychologists play a significant part in defining their role. Also, environmental factors, such as size or setting of the school system, administrative responsibility for school psychology, and personal factors were not significant determinants of actual participations in the job.

#### Summary

Early literature about school psychologists and the profession of school psychology is limited to authors setting forth their opinions and conclusions based on little or no empirical evidence. The origins of school psychology date back to before the turn of the century. The greatest growth however, has occurred during the past thirty years. At the present time, new roles and images continue to emerge.

There are many statements in the literature regarding appropriate functions of school psychologists, based on opinion and empirical study. Although there seems to be some agreement concerning the nature of the functions of the

school psychologist, there exist differences in opinion about the degree of importance of the various functions.

There is a lack of empirical evidence in the literature to support statements made regarding the change in the role and function of the school psychologist since PL 94-142. The present study will investigate changes by direct comparison to data gathered by Murray in 1975 before impact of this legislative mandate was realized.

## Chapter III

### METHODOLOGY

The research methods and procedures used in the present study were developed as part of the School Executive Studies of Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958), and Murray's study in 1975. They were applied to an investigation of the role of the California school psychologists by Smith in 1962. These methods were again used, in a modified form, by Herson in 1967 and Murray in 1975 to study the role and function of Virginia school psychologists.

The research methods and procedures of the School Executive Studies and Murray's study have proven to be applicable to role analyses, and to studies of the role and function of school psychologists. It was therefore considered to be appropriate for the present analysis of the role of the school psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

#### Participants

To survey the expectations for, and the actual role of, Virginia school psychologists, it was necessary to define the population of individuals serving as school psychologists. Other persons may influence the role of the school psychologist such as superintendents, teachers,

counselors, parents, principals, students, etc. It is postulated, however, that these individuals may be more in a position to evaluate the quality of the school psychologist's services, and to offer suggestions, than to directly determine their role. Their influence may not be as great compared to the expectations of school psychologists themselves (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Jerrell, 1984). Therefore, in defining the population most influential in defining the role of the Virginia school psychologist in actual practice, these groups of individuals were considered to be outside the realm of the present study.

After defining the population for study, it was necessary to develop a list of individuals as potential participants in this investigation. A list of members prepared by the Virginia Association of School Psychologists for the 1985-86 school year was used and all members were asked to respond to the survey materials. Only those who answered question number one indicating they were employed as a school psychologist, and number six, indicating employment on either a full or part-time basis or as an intern, were included in the data analysis. This meant that an individual had to be certificated or be an intern, and working, as a school psychologist in the public schools of Virginia, and be a member of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists to be selected as a possible respondent

in the present study. This same selection procedure was used by Murray in 1975 except he used the Virginia Educational Directory to cross reference the members of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists. It was found that this document no longer lists the school psychologists of many school divisions and the above method of selection was necessary to maintain consistency in selection procedures so a comparison of results could be made.

#### Sections of the Survey

The opinionnaire selected and modified for the purposes of the present study was originally developed by Smith (1962), and was based on a general format used in the School Executive Studies (Gross, Mason, McEachern, 1958). The opinionnaire was used in an abbreviated form in an analysis of the role and function of Virginia school psychologists by Herson (1967) and in a more complete form in an analysis of the role and function of school psychologists in Virginia done by Murray (1975). Survey materials used in the present study included personal data forms requesting demographic data on each respondent. (Copies of survey materials are found in Appendix B.)

The opinionnaire used in this study facilitated the gathering of data potentially useful in determining the expectations of school psychologists for their role.

Respondents were asked whether and to what extent they believed school psychologists should; (1) possess certain attributes; (2) participate in certain professional activities and organizations; and (3) perform certain duties. The three sections of the survey relating to role expectations of school psychologists were entitled: (1) "Expectations for School Psychologist's Attributes;" (2) "Expectations for School Psychologist's Participations;" (3) "Expectations for the School Psychologist's Performances." The opinionnaire included a section for ranking the school psychologist's functions according to their importance and a section for ranking the actual frequency of the performance of function.

Revisions were necessary to adapt the opinionnaire used by Murray (1975) for the purposes of the present study. In order to update the opinionnaire, reduce ambiguity and use appropriate terminology, modifications were incorporated in the survey used in the present study. In the following sections each component of the opinionnaire is discussed and the modifications made are described.

#### Personal Data Form

Role expectations may be related to the position of the role definer, and the setting in which the role is enacted. Therefore, certain demographic data were requested of the respondents. Identification of participants was necessary



for follow-up and the forms were number coded. Respondents were requested to indicate their specific job title and the personal data forms contained questions concerning their age, sex, marital and parental status, work setting, academic background, experience, certification, licensure, and professional affiliations.

#### Expectations for Attributes

The "Expectations for School Psychologist's Attributes" section originally contained 35 items, each of which was related to some personal quality or characteristic the school psychologist might possess. The opinionnaire used in the present study contained only two of the same attributes items from the modified survey used by Murray in 1975. It was modified to contain a total of five items which utilized a multiple choice format.

#### Expectations for Participations

The "Expectations for School Psychologist's Participations" section, which originally contained eleven items, was revised by Murray (1975) to contain nineteen items to gather opinions about certain activities of school psychologists that may or may not be considered job responsibilities. The present study included two additional items on the participations section used by Murray (1975); it was expanded to twenty one items to increase the number of professional organizations to which the school

psychologist might belong. The new items included the American Vocational Association and the Virginia Vocational Association. Each item was specific to a professional activity or organization membership and the respondents were asked to indicate the importance they attach to the school psychologist's participation by checking one of five columns headed: (1) "absolutely must;" (2) "preferably should;" (3) "may or may not;" (4) "preferably should not;" and (5) "absolutely must not."

#### Importance and Frequency of Performance of Functions

In addition to the three role expectation sections, the opinionnaire in Murray's study included a section for ranking performances according to their perceived importance, and a section for indicating the frequency with which the actual duties were being engaged in by school psychologists.

The original importance of the functions of the school psychologist section contained ten functional service areas. Three items were added for the purposes of the present study; these included Eligibility Decisions for Children, Counseling, and Inservice. Respondents were asked to rank the thirteen areas of the school psychologist's functioning in their order of importance from one, "most important," to thirteen "least important."

The frequency of performance of the school psychologist's functions section contained the same thirteen functional service areas that were used to obtain opinions from respondents about the importance of the functions of the school psychologist. As in Murray's study, the present investigation asked school psychologists to rank the thirteen areas in terms of relative frequency of performance.

#### Expectations for Performances

The next section of the opinionnaire, "Expectations for the School Psychologist's Performances," contained 132 items in Murray's study, but was modified to contain 136 items in the present study; added items included #27 vocational aptitude measures, #28 adaptive behavior measures, #31 objective personality assessment techniques, #67 Participate in eligibility committee meetings, #74 family, #80 family, #103 Assisting in the development of programs which facilitate transition from school to work. Each of the 136 items described a function the school psychologist might expect to perform in the work situation. The statements were designed to include the activities the psychologist is engaged in while working in a school system. The response categories and general format were the same for this section as for the expectations for participations section. Some items for the performances section that were developed by

Smith from the report of The Committee on Reconsideration of the Functions of the School Psychologist of the American Psychological Association were reworded and certain changes in the terminology were considered appropriate by Murray (1975). Murray also added items to reflect potential performances of the school psychologist not evident at the time of the earlier study. The changes made by Murray were incorporated in the opinionnaire used as part of the present study with minor modifications. Certain changes were made in terminology so the wording of the opinionnaire would be consistent with terminology common to Virginia's school psychologists at the present time.

### Data Collection

The survey materials used to gather data were distributed and returned by mail. There were five steps in the data collection process. These were as follows: a preliminary letter, initial survey distribution, two follow-up mailings, and a follow-up phone call.

#### Preliminary Letter

A pre-survey letter introducing the study and requesting cooperation from prospective participants was prepared by the researcher and signed by the present President of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists (VASP), a dissertation committee member, and

the writer's major advisor. The letter was mailed to all VASP members May 24, 1986, six days before the mailing of the survey. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix A.

#### Initial Mailing

On May 30, 1986, surveys consisting of opinionnaires and personal data forms were mailed to 319 Virginia school psychologists. An introductory letter explaining the intent and purpose of the study accompanied each opinionnaire. Although no mention of PL 94-142 was made in either the introductory letter or in the opinionnaire, it was explained that the purpose of the present investigation was to gather data to update information concerning the role and function of school psychologists since Murray's study in 1975. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed with each packet of survey materials to facilitate responding.

#### First Follow-up Contact

On June 13, 1986, (14 days later), a follow-up letter was sent to each school psychologist from whom a completed survey had not been received. Each follow-up letter was accompanied by a copy of the survey and included a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

#### Second Follow-up Contact

On June 30, 1986, (31 days from initial mailing), a second follow-up letter, with a copy of the survey and a

stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent to each remaining school psychologist from whom a completed survey had not been received.

### Third Follow-up Contact

On July 9, 1986, (5 weeks from initial mailing), the date set for the termination of data collection, the psychologists who comprised the group of non-respondents were each assigned a number, and a random selection of 30% of the names was made. This sub-sample of non-responding school psychologists was then personally contacted via telephone by the investigator and asked to send in the completed survey.

### Data Analysis

When the completed survey materials were received, the responses were tabulated and analyzed with the use of the main frame computer at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Each item of the opinionnaire and personal data form was coded, and the responses of the participants were incorporated, according to the coding, into a data file. The data were analyzed according to the identifying characteristics of the respondents as indicated by the information on the personal data form. For each of the categories of demographic information, sums, averages, and percentages were calculated as appropriate. These data,

along with a comparison with Murray's study (1975) are presented in Chapter 4.

The major purposes of data analyses were:

- (1) To determine the expectations of school psychologists for attributes, personal qualities, or characteristics and whether there was agreement within the group surveyed on their expectations for attributes, personal qualities, or characteristics.
- (2) To determine the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to participations in various professional activities and whether there was agreement within the group surveyed on the relative degree of importance attached to participations in various professional activities.
- (3) To determine the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions they perform in their present position and to develop a ranking of these functions by relative importance.
- (4) To determine the relative frequency with which school psychologists perform the various functions of their position, and to develop a ranking of these functions by relative frequency.
- (5) To compare the ranking of the relative degree of importance school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position to the actual frequency with which they perform those same functions.

(6) To determine the expectations of school psychologists for their performances of specific functions and determine whether there was agreement within the group surveyed on their expectations for the role of the school psychologist.

(7) To determine the influence of selected demographic variables on school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions.

(8) To compare the results of the present study to those obtained by Murray (1975).

The techniques employed in the above data analyses were as follows:

(1) To determine the expectations of school psychologists for attributes, personal qualities, or characteristics as expressed by their responses to each item of the opinionnaire, frequency distribution tables were developed. Data tabulated for each item included the total number of school psychologists for each response category.

(2) To determine the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to participations in various professional activities, as expressed by their responses to each item of the opinionnaire, frequency distribution tables were developed. Data tabulated for each item included the total number of school psychologists for each response category.

(3) To determine the relative degree of importance the school psychologists attached to their various functions,



the numerical rankings assigned to each of the thirteen major service areas by each respondent were tabulated. The overall rankings assigned by each group of school psychologists was determined on the basis of mean rankings, which were ordered high to low.

(4) To determine the relative frequency with which school psychologists perform the various functions of their present work situation, the numerical rankings assigned to each service area were tabulated.

(5) To compare the relative degree of importance the school psychologists attached to their various functions with the relative frequency they perform those same functions, the numerical rankings assigned to each of the thirteen major service areas by each respondent for the importance section were compared to the numerical rankings assigned to each of the same service areas indicating the relative frequency with which they perform those same functions. Differences in rankings were described and Spearman rank-order coefficients of correlation were calculated.

(6) To determine the expectations of school psychologists for their performances of specific functions, as expressed by their responses to each item of the opinionnaire, frequency distribution tables were developed. Data tabulated for each item included the total number of school psychologists for each response category.

(7) To determine the influence of selected demographic variables on school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions, items of this section were grouped into the categories: individual assessment, group assessment, follow-up, placement, counseling, consultation, inservice. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for each variable, age, sex, academic training level, number of years experience as a teacher, and number of years experience as a school psychologist.

Statistical significance was set at the .05 level.

(8) To compare the results of the present study with those obtained previously by Murray (1975), statistical analysis of between group differences was conducted. The chi-square statistic was used to compare the two groups, the group's scores from Murray's study and the group's scores from the present study, to determine changes in expectations for personal attributes, expectations for professional participations, and expectations for performances of functions. The Chi-square statistic was calculated for each item for each group and interpreted according to its numerical value. Statistical significance was set at the .05 level. To compare the results of the relative degree of importance school psychologists attached to various functions section and the relative frequency with which they perform those same functions section to Murray's study, the numerical rankings obtained in each study were compared.

Differences in rankings were described and Spearman rank-order coefficients of correlation were calculated.

### Summary

In this chapter, the procedures and methods used to study the role of the school psychologist in Virginia have been described. The first section of the chapter dealt with the population for study. The criteria for selection of school psychologists was then discussed.

Another section of the chapter presented the various parts of the opinionnaire, and described the modifications made to the section used by Murray (1975) by the present investigator. The procedures for data collection were then described. Finally, the methods for the analysis of data gathered in the study were detailed.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the results of the study. Response rates for each data collection step and for the entire study are examined. Demographic data collected from responses to the personal data form are presented and the population is described. Information related to the present role and function of school psychologists is presented and the influences of demographic variables are examined. Finally, the results of present study are compared to the results previously obtained by Murray (1975).

#### Survey Response Rate

There were five steps in the data collection process and these included the following: (1) a preliminary letter, (2) the initial mailing of survey materials, (3) the first follow-up mailing, (4) the second follow-up mailing, and (5) the follow-up personal phone call. Initially 319 packets were mailed out. Each return was identified with a mailing stage which elicited it through the use of dating each survey on the front of the personal data form. One packet was returned by the postal service as "Moved, Not Forwardable," and this was deleted, yielding a total of 318 possible participants.

A response rate of 41.82% was received as a result of the original mailing of survey materials. The first follow-up produced an additional 24.53% return. The second follow-up mailing led to an additional 8.18% return. The personal phone contact resulted in an additional 5.97% return. In all, a total percentage rate of 80.50 was obtained as presented in Table 1. Of the 256 total responses, 80 were self-classified as non-practitioners. Study findings thus reflect the data from 176 practicing school psychologists.

#### Demographic Data

School psychologist practitioner responses to the Personal Data Form items were used to describe the personal and professional characteristics of the population, and were also used to identify relationships between selected demographic variables and expectations for performances scores. The following subsections contain descriptive data pertinent to respondents' age, gender, marital status, number of children, work (full-time, part-time, intern), salary, etc.

#### Age

The number of respondents in each age category is presented in Table 2. Of the 176 respondents, 70.7% (n=124) were between 24 and 39 years of age. Specifically, 43.18%

Table 1

## Survey Response Rates

<u>Step</u>	<u>Number returned</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
Initial Mailing	133	41.82
First Follow-up Mailing	78	24.53
Second Follow-up Mailing	26	8.18
Follow-up Personal Phone Call	19	5.97
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	256	80.50

---

Note: There were 318 possible participants

Table 2

## Age Distribution

<u>Age Range</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
Less than 25	4	2.27
25-35	76	43.18
36-45	60	34.09
46-55	21	11.93
56-65	3	1.70
Over 65	0	0.00
No response	12	6.81
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	176	100

---

(n=76) were aged 25-35, 34.09% (n=60) were aged 36-45, and 11.93% (n=21) were aged 46-55.

### Sex

Males comprised 32.4% (n=57) and females 67.6% (n=119) of the total group of participants. All participants responded to this question.

### Marital Status and Number of Children

Of the total group of school psychologists, 71.6% (n=126) indicated they were married or had been married; 27.8% (n=49) indicated they were single; while .6% (n=1) did not respond to the question. When asked the number of children, 43.8% (n=77) indicated they were not parents; 55.1% (n=97) indicated they were parents; and, 1.1% (n=2) did not respond to the question.

### Employment

The school psychologists were asked to indicate whether they were employed full-time, part-time, or as an intern. Of the 175 responses to this item, 86.4% (n=152) indicated they were working full-time; 5.7% (n=10) were part-time; and 7.4% (n=13) were interns.

Annual salary of respondents ranged from unpaid (intern) to more than \$40,000. Specific figures relative to the number of individuals within each of the eighteen (18) salary ranges is presented in Table 3.



Table 3

## Annual Salary

Salary Range	Frequency	Percent of total
\$ 8,000 - \$ 9,999	5	2.84
\$10,000 - \$11,999	5	2.84
\$12,000 - \$13,999	1	.57
\$14,000 - \$15,999	4	2.27
\$16,000 - \$17,999	3	1.70
\$18,000 - \$19,999	6	3.41
\$20,000 - \$21,999	17	9.66
\$22,000 - \$23,999	12	6.82
\$24,000 - \$25,999	22	12.50
\$26,000 - \$27,999	22	12.50
\$28,000 - \$29,999	18	10.23
\$30,000 - \$31,999	15	8.52
\$32,000 - \$33,999	10	5.68
\$34,000 - \$35,999	15	8.52
\$36,000 - \$37,999	10	5.68
\$38,000 - \$39,999	3	1.70
\$40,000 or over	5	2.84
Unpaid	1	.57
No response	2	1.14
	176	100
Total		

The lengths of contract indicated by the group of respondents were 2.8% (n=5) held nine month contracts, 38.1% (n=67) held ten month contracts, 31.3% (n=55) held eleven month contracts, and 26.7 (n=47) held twelve month contracts. All respondents answered this question, but two (1.1%) school psychologists indicated "other" without qualifying their response.

### Work Setting

Of the 154 responses to this item, 11.4% (n=20) indicated they worked in a single school psychologist system, while 36.3% (n=59) indicated they worked in systems employing one to four other psychologists; 17.6% (n=31) indicated they worked with four to eight other psychologists; and, 28.6% (44) indicated they were employed by systems with more than ten other psychologists. Twenty-two respondents did not answer this question.

The number of pupils enrolled in the school system in which the psychologists were employed ranged from 1,000 to 120,000 or more. Specific information regarding student populations is presented in Table 4.

### Academic Training

The school psychologists were asked to indicate the institutions where they completed the majority of their training. A total of 69.3% (n=122) indicated they received

Table 4

## Student Populations

<u>Number of pupils</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
1 to 5,000	46	26.14
5,100 to 10,000	38	21.60
10,100 to 15,000	15	8.52
15,100 to 20,000	3	1.70
20,100 to 30,000	15	8.52
Over 30,000	27	15.34
No response	32	18.18
	—	—
Total	176	100

---

their school psychology training in programs in Virginia; a total of 30.1% (n=53) received training outside Virginia.

The level of academic training received ranged from the Masters level (14.20%, n=25) to the doctoral level (12.5%, n=22) with the majority of the doctoral level respondents holding the Ed.D. (55.55%, n=12). Specific figures are presented in Table 5.

Participants were asked to indicate the number of years since full time training in school psychology. A total of 19.32% (n=34) indicated that it had been one year or less; 19.89% (n=35) indicated that it had been two years to five years; 29.55% (n=52) indicated that it had been six years to ten years; and, 31.24% (n=55) indicated it had been more than ten years. A total of 2.27% (n=4) did not respond to this item.

#### Years as a School Psychologist

A total of 21.59% (n=38) of the participants in the study indicated it had been one year or less since their endorsement as a school psychologist; 26.70% (n=47) indicated it had been two years to five years; 26.70% (n=47) indicated it had been six years to ten years; and, 24.43% (n=43) indicated it had been more than ten years. One person did not respond to this item (.57%, n=1).

When asked about years experience as a school psychologist, 14.20% (n=25) participants indicated they had

Table 5

## Level of Academic Training

<u>Level</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Masters in Education	9	5.11
Masters in Psychology	16	9.09
Training beyond Masters in Education	33	18.75
Training beyond Masters in Psychology	49	27.84
Educational Specialist Degree	36	20.45
Training beyond Educational Specialist Degree	10	5.68
Doctor of Education	12	6.82
Doctor of Philosophy	8	4.55
Doctor of Psychology	2	1.14
No response	1	.57
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	176	100

---

one year or less; 21.02% (n=37) had two years to five years; 31.82% (n=56) had six years to ten years; and, 26.70% (n=47) had more than ten years. A total of 6.25% (n=11) did not respond to this item.

With regard to years in present position, 20.45% (n=36) had been there one year or less; 32.39% (n=57) had been there for two years to five years; 25.00% (n=44) had been there for six years to ten years; and, 17.61% (n=31) had been there for more than ten years. A total of 4.54% (n=8) of the participants in the study did not respond to this question.

#### Years Experience as a Teacher

A total of 62.5% (n=110) of the school psychologists indicated they had zero years experience as a teacher. A total of 22.73% (n=40) indicated they had one to five years, while 11.93% (n=21) indicated they had more than five years experience as a teacher. Five (2.84%) of the participants did not complete this item.

A total of 56.25% (n=99) of the respondents indicated they had zero years experience in other capacities in education. A total of 18.75% (n=33) indicated they had one to five years experience in other capacities, while 3.41% (n=6) indicated they had more than five years experience in other capacities. Thirty-eight (21.60%) of the respondents failed to complete this item.

### Years Experience in Psychological or Psychiatric Setting

A total of 54.5% (n=96) of the school psychologists responding to the survey indicated they had zero years experience in a psychological or psychiatric setting other than in the schools. A total of 31.82% (n=56) had one to five years experience, while 6.82% (n=12) had more than five years experience. Twelve (6.82%) of the participants did not complete this question.

### Certifications and Licenses Held

A total of 2.27% (n=4) of the school psychologists responding to the survey had teacher certificates in addition to their Virginia school psychologist certificate, and .57% (n=1) held a certificate as an administrator. Five (2.84%) of the respondents held certifications as a school psychologist in other states in addition to Virginia. Only 12.5% (n=22) of the psychologists indicated they were licensed in Virginia as a school psychologist; four (2.27%) held a Virginia license as a psychologist; and only one (.57%) indicated they held a license in a state other than Virginia. Two (1.14%) of the respondents did not complete this item. Of those licensed as a school psychologist or psychologist in Virginia, only 5.11% (n=9) indicated they engaged in private practice activities with their hours per week averaging 5.89 hours.

### Membership in Professional Organizations

All participants in the study were members of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists. A total of 38.64% (n=68) of the respondents indicated they belong to one other professional organization; 31.82% (n=56) of the respondents indicated they are members of two to four other professional organizations; and, ten respondents (5.7%) indicated they belong to more than five professional organizations in total.

### Expectations for Attributes

#### Educational Level

Question one asked the participants to specify the level of education they preferred for the school psychologist. The data reveals that 10.80% (n=19) of the respondents believed the school psychologist should have training at the doctoral level, while 44.89% (n=79) indicated that the school psychologist should have training at the nondoctoral level. A total of 43.75% (n=77) indicated no preference regarding training level. Only one (.57%) of the participants did not respond to this item.

#### Nature of Training

Question two required the participants to specify the nature of the training preferred for the school psychologist, in education, in psychology, or, in both with



equal emphasis. A total of .57% (n=1) of the school psychologists held the opinion that the majority of training should be in education. More respondents (43.18%, n=76) believed the majority of training should be in psychology, and 54.55% (n=96) believed the school psychologist should have equal training in education and psychology. Three (1.70%) individuals indicated no preference regarding the nature of training.

#### Nature of Doctoral Training

Questions three and four required the participants to indicate the preferred nature of training for the school psychologist educated at the doctoral level. On question three, the majority of the respondents, 72.16% (n=127), indicated the school psychologist should hold the doctorate in school psychology or educational psychology, while only 5.11% (n=9) believed it should be held in general psychology or clinical psychology, and 1.14% (n=2) believed it should be held in education. A total of 21.59% (n=38) indicated no preference on this question.

On question four, 100 (56.82%) of the respondents indicated no preference between the Doctor of Education degree (Ed.D.), Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.), and the Doctor of Psychology degree (Psy.D.). Twenty-three (13.07%) of the respondents believed the school psychologist should

hold the Ed.D., while twenty-six (14.77%) preferred the Ph.D., and twenty-seven (15.34%) preferred the Psy.D.

### Experience

Question five concerned the experience preferred for school psychologists. A total of 13.64% (n=24) of the respondents indicated they believed school psychologists should have experience as a classroom teacher. A total of 9.66% (n=17) believed they should have experience in a psychological or psychiatric setting other than the schools, and 28.41% (n=50) believed they should have experience in both the classroom and in a psychological or psychiatric setting. A total of 47.16% (n=83) of the respondents indicated they had no preference regarding the experience the school psychologist should have.

### Expectations for Participations

The Expectations for School Psychologist's Participations section was used to gather information regarding the importance attached to a variety of professional activities in which the school psychologist might engage. To facilitate the analyses of participants' responses to the scaled items of this section, numerical values of one to five were assigned to each of the response categories. The numerical value of one was assigned to the "Absolutely Must" category; the numerical value of two was

assigned to the "Preferably Should" category; the numerical value of three was assigned to the "May or May Not" category; the numerical value of four was assigned to the "Preferably Should Not" category; and, the numerical value of five was assigned to the "Absolutely Must Not" category. Table 6 presents the responses of school psychologists for each item of the expectations for participations section.

An examination of the distribution of frequencies of scores of the respondents in this study indicated that they believe the school psychologist "absolutely must" maintain close working relationships with other professionals and professional groups (item #4) and "preferably should" engage in approximately 43% of the other possible participations listed; these included reading current professional publications (item #1), making informal visits to other school divisions and community service agencies (item #3), attending meetings of professional psychological and educational groups (items #5 & #6), attending workshops and conventions of professional organizations (item #7), participating in the activities of community organizations concerned with mental health (item #9), and being a member of the Virginia Psychological Association (item #12) and the National and Virginia Associations of School Psychologists (items #17 & #18). The remaining 52% of the possible participations were designated as activities in which the school psychologist "may or may not" be involved.

Table 6

Frequencies of Scaled Responses for each item of the  
Expectations for School Psychologist's Participations  
Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	No Response	Mean
1	90	81	4	0	0	1	1.51
2	0	24	148	4	0	0	2.89
3	5	102	67	1	0	1	2.37
4	98	74	3	1	0	0	1.47
5	45	110	21	0	0	0	1.87
6	11	80	83	1	0	1	2.42
7	47	112	16	0	0	1	1.82
8	5	67	102	2	0	0	2.57
9	7	98	70	1	0	0	2.37
10	2	27	137	10	0	0	2.89
11	4	41	127	4	0	0	2.74
12	16	64	92	2	0	2	2.46
13	0	7	164	5	0	0	2.99
14	0	9	163	4	0	0	2.97
15	0	13	148	13	1	1	3.01
16	2	13	147	12	1	1	2.98
17	41	103	31	1	0	0	1.96
18	65	88	19	1	0	3	1.75
19	3	47	124	1	0	1	2.70
20	1	5	165	4	1	0	2.99
21	0	6	163	4	1	2	3.00

### Importance of Functions

The Importance of the Functions of the School Psychologist section asked the respondents to indicate how important they considered each of a variety of functions by ranking them in order of importance. The diagnostic studies category was ranked first, with a total of 57.95% (n=102) of the respondents indicating it was the most important of the functions, while the group testing program was ranked thirteenth, with a total of 40.91% (n=72) indicating it was the least important of the functions. The rankings assigned by the school psychologists to each of the thirteen categories of functions are presented in Table 7. A rank of one indicates that the category was considered by respondents to be most important, and a rank of thirteen indicates that the category was considered to be least important.

### Performances of Functions

The Frequency of Performance of the School Psychologist's Functions section asked the participants to indicate the frequency with which they performed a variety of functions. This section contained the same thirteen categories of functions as the Importance of the Functions of the School Psychologist section. The diagnostic studies category was ranked first, with a total of 86.36% (n=152) of

Table 7

Frequencies for the Importance of the School Psychologist's Functions  
Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	No Response	Mean
Diagnostic Studies	102	21	11	9	11	8	5	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.46
Consultant to Teachers	35	26	34	24	29	16	9	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	3.52
Conferences with Pupils and Parents	13	24	48	36	29	15	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	4.02
Eligibility Decisions for Children	11	50	25	21	23	22	7	9	0	2	3	1	1	1	4.47
Counseling	12	23	20	27	21	18	21	21	8	3	0	0	2	0	5.01
Consultant to Administrators	2	14	9	20	18	39	24	19	16	5	2	6	1	1	6.34
Follow-up of Studies	1	11	11	17	18	23	23	28	21	7	7	5	3	1	6.70
Special Placements for Children	1	4	12	12	16	14	32	27	14	12	13	12	4	2	7.37

Table 7 (continued)

Frequencies for the Importance of the School Psychologist's Functions  
Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	No Response	Mean
Inservice	0	3	2	5	8	9	28	28	46	27	14	3	2	1	8.26
Community Services	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	14	22	35	47	26	21	1	10.43
Curriculum Development	0	0	1	2	1	4	8	8	18	26	35	37	33	3	10.64
Research	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	12	21	34	30	35	34	2	10.71
Group Testing Program	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	21	23	48	72	2	11.82

the respondents indicating they performed this function the greatest frequency, while the research category was ranked thirteenth, with a total of 33.52% (n=59) of the respondents indicating they performed this function with the least frequency. The functions were ranked according to the relative frequency performed; a rank of one indicated the category was performed with the greatest frequency, and a rank of thirteen indicated it was performed with the least frequency. The rankings assigned by school psychologists to each of the thirteen categories of functions are presented in Table 8.

Comparison of Importance and Performance of  
Functions Sections of Present Study

There was agreement between the importance and frequency rankings of school psychologists on the following categories: diagnostic studies, conferences with pupils and parents, counseling, consultant to administrators, follow-up of studies, special placements for children, inservice, community services, and curriculum development. The diagnostic studies category was ranked first as most important and as performed with the highest frequency by school psychologists; conferences with pupils and parents was ranked third; counseling and consultant to administrators categories were ranked fifth and sixth,



Table 8

Frequencies for the Frequency of Performance of the School Psychologist's  
Functions Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	No Response	Mean
Diagnostic Studies	152	7	4	3	2	0	1	0	1	4	1	0	0	1	1.53
Eligibility Decisions for Children	5	94	30	14	14	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.99
Conferences with Pupils and Parents	3	20	41	56	20	20	9	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	4.16
Consultant to Teachers	9	17	32	37	45	19	10	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	4.27
Counseling	5	11	21	18	10	27	35	26	9	3	3	4	1	2	6.03
Consultant to Administrators	1	7	10	20	33	32	31	17	14	5	3	2	0	1	6.10
Follow-up of Studies	0	15	7	9	25	25	21	28	26	9	5	4	1	1	6.70

Table 8 (continued)

Frequencies for the Frequency of Performance of the School Psychologist's  
Functions Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	No Response	Mean
Special Placements for Children	0	4	27	13	14	24	25	23	14	15	10	4	2	1	6.71
Inservice	0	0	0	1	5	10	16	38	49	24	17	11	4	1	8.90
Community Services	0	0	0	1	2	9	0	14	25	45	38	21	18	3	10.22
Curriculum Development	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	12	22	42	51	27	6	10.99
Group Testing Program	0	0	1	2	2	1	5	6	9	25	25	38	58	4	11.20
Research	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	16	22	28	31	59	6	11.21

respectively; follow-up of studies, special placements for children, inservice, community services, and curriculum development categories were ranked seventh to eleventh, respectively. There was some difference between the importance and frequency rankings assigned to consultant to teachers, ranked second in importance and fourth in frequency performed, eligibility decisions for children, ranked fourth and second, respectively, research, ranked twelfth and thirteenth, respectively, and group testing program, ranked thirteenth and twelfth, respectively.

To investigate the relationship between rankings of importance and rankings of frequency of performance of functions, the Spearman rank-order coefficient of correlation (Spearman rho) was calculated. This coefficient (.973) indicates that there is a very high positive correlation between the two. A total of 94.67% of the variance in importance rankings is associated with the variance in frequency of performance rankings.

#### Expectations for Performances

The Expectations for the School Psychologist's Performances section included items regarding the importance attached to the school psychologist's performance of specific functions. To facilitate the analyses of responses to the section, items were classified into seven groups

which included: individual assessment, group assessment, follow-up, placement, counseling, consultation, and inservice. Numerical values of one to five were assigned to each of the response categories in the same manner as described for the Expectations for the School Psychologist's Participations section. Table 9 presents the responses of school psychologists for each item of the expectations for performances section.

An examination of the distribution of frequencies of scores of the respondents in this study indicated that they believe the school psychologist "absolutely must" perform duties such as making diagnostic studies of individual children to identify the mentally handicapped (item #2), emotionally disturbed (item #4), learning disabled (item #5), and culturally disadvantaged (item #8) and "absolutely must" administer, score, and interpret tests of intelligence (item #23), personality questionnaires and projectives (items #25 & #30), and visual-motor coordination (item #29) in doing so. They also believe the school psychologist "absolutely must" use cumulative records (item #9), make observations of the individual child in the school (item #10), and obtain information from the child (item #13), teachers (item #14), school social workers/visiting teachers (item #17), and parents (item #20) to make diagnostic studies. They believe the school psychologist "preferably should" perform all other duties listed with respect to

Table 9

Frequencies for the Expectations for the School  
Psychologist's Performances Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	No response	Mean
1	33	86	44	9	0	4	2.71
2	158	15	0	0	1	2	1.11
3	49	57	54	13	1	2	2.20
4	157	15	1	1	1	1	1.14
5	153	18	3	0	0	2	1.14
6	39	66	46	22	1	2	2.31
7	124	37	14	0	0	1	1.37
8	59	55	45	8	3	6	2.07
9	113	51	7	1	0	4	1.40
10	112	57	6	0	0	1	1.39
11	6	46	108	11	2	3	2.75
12	2	37	118	14	2	3	2.87
13	149	21	5	0	0	1	1.18
14	146	26	3	0	0	1	1.18
15	96	68	11	0	0	1	1.51
16	41	71	59	2	0	3	2.13
17	104	60	11	0	0	1	1.47
18	57	70	47	0	0	2	1.94
19	42	64	68	0	1	1	2.17
20	117	47	11	0	0	1	1.39
21	40	79	56	0	0	1	2.09
22	22	68	83	1	0	2	2.36
23	164	8	3	0	0	1	1.08
24	64	60	48	2	1	1	1.95
25	126	33	15	0	0	2	1.36
26	11	63	98	3	0	1	2.53
27	11	52	105	6	1	1	2.62
28	69	74	30	1	0	2	1.79
29	116	46	11	1	0	2	1.41
30	115	35	22	1	1	2	1.49
31	108	46	20	1	0	1	1.51
32	153	15	6	0	0	2	1.56
33	16	68	86	2	2	2	2.46
34	22	85	66	2	0	1	2.27
35	2	16	93	46	17	2	3.35
36	4	11	76	63	18	4	3.47
37	11	47	97	16	3	2	2.73
38	4	21	71	52	25	3	3.42
39	7	50	91	23	4	1	2.81
40	10	66	82	17	0	1	2.61
41	5	30	102	30	8	1	3.03

Table 9 (continued)

Frequencies for the Expectations for the School  
Psychologist's Performances Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	No response	Mean
42	8	36	99	25	7	1	2.93
43	3	28	107	30	7	1	3.06
44	10	35	98	23	7	3	2.90
45	2	25	106	29	10	4	3.12
46	82	57	28	3	0	6	1.72
47	120	51	3	1	0	1	1.34
48	91	76	5	1	0	3	1.51
49	47	88	38	1	0	2	1.96
50	60	82	31	1	0	2	1.85
51	27	72	72	3	0	2	2.29
52	26	73	71	3	1	2	2.31
53	107	58	8	1	0	2	1.44
54	13	67	90	4	0	2	2.49
55	12	67	85	2	1	9	2.48
56	38	94	40	1	0	3	2.02
57	41	111	21	0	0	3	1.88
58	5	45	108	14	2	2	2.79
59	34	89	50	0	0	3	2.09
60	8	51	98	10	7	2	2.75
61	17	70	74	8	3	4	2.48
62	57	77	24	0	0	18	1.79
63	74	63	32	6	0	1	1.83
64	128	40	7	0	0	1	1.31
65	47	72	54	1	0	2	2.05
66	93	62	13	1	0	7	1.54
67	90	45	39	1	0	1	1.72
68	117	40	17	1	0	1	1.44
69	57	103	15	0	0	1	1.76
70	94	70	10	0	0	2	1.52
71	60	40	43	21	11	1	2.33
72	51	47	44	21	11	2	2.39
73	14	30	75	38	18	1	3.09
74	9	31	75	43	17	1	3.16
75	8	45	68	38	15	2	3.04
76	10	28	57	48	31	2	3.36
77	92	66	16	0	0	2	1.56
78	77	79	17	1	0	2	1.67
79	41	58	67	5	3	2	2.26
80	26	50	79	16	2	3	2.53
81	23	62	76	11	2	2	2.47
82	16	53	62	27	14	4	2.83

Table 9 (continued)

Frequencies for the Expectations for the School  
Psychologist's Performances Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	No response	Mean
83	28	56	71	13	5	3	2.49
84	23	56	75	14	5	3	2.55
85	132	36	5	2	0	1	1.30
86	148	23	3	1	0	1	1.18
87	2	21	116	25	10	2	3.12
88	42	69	59	3	1	2	2.15
89	53	83	36	2	0	2	1.93
90	23	83	60	5	0	5	2.28
91	22	77	63	12	0	2	2.37
92	51	84	33	7	0	1	1.98
93	51	81	37	4	2	1	2.00
94	9	65	74	22	5	1	2.71
95	1	18	82	61	13	1	3.38
96	0	13	79	64	19	1	3.51
97	0	5	31	87	52	1	4.06
98	11	77	73	12	2	1	2.53
99	5	36	99	30	4	2	2.95
100	14	85	67	8	1	1	2.41
101	6	50	103	14	1	2	2.74
102	5	40	107	20	3	1	2.86
103	6	47	102	18	1	2	2.78
104	135	36	4	0	0	1	1.25
105	118	49	7	0	0	2	1.36
106	31	35	66	34	9	1	2.74
107	40	96	38	1	0	1	2.00
108	45	92	38	0	0	1	1.96
109	44	92	39	0	0	1	1.97
110	33	83	58	1	0	1	2.15
111	39	97	36	3	0	1	2.02
112	32	80	61	1	0	2	2.18
113	5	52	89	22	5	3	2.83
114	4	53	97	18	3	1	2.79
115	7	41	104	19	4	1	2.84
116	33	84	47	8	2	2	2.21
117	35	110	29	1	0	1	1.98
118	31	110	34	0	0	1	2.02
119	31	106	37	1	0	1	2.05
120	34	102	37	2	0	1	2.04
121	30	107	36	2	0	1	2.06
122	78	74	21	2	0	1	1.70
123	53	58	47	14	1	3	2.15

Table 9 (continued)

Frequencies for the Expectations for the School  
Psychologist's Performances Section

Item	1	2	3	4	5	No response	Mean
124	65	90	18	2	0	1	1.75
125	13	59	99	3	1	1	2.54
126	24	74	76	1	0	1	2.31
127	5	31	118	19	2	1	2.90
128	9	61	94	11	0	1	2.61
129	12	56	95	12	0	1	2.61
130	14	50	99	11	1	1	2.63
131	16	72	80	5	0	3	2.43
132	12	72	81	8	0	3	2.49
133	9	67	86	12	0	2	2.58
134	22	85	63	5	0	1	2.29
135	10	59	97	9	0	1	2.60
136	8	62	95	10	0	1	2.61



diagnostic studies except make observations of the individual child in the home (item #11) and community (item #12) and administer, score, and interpret tests of vocational interest and aptitude (items #26 & #27); these duties "may or may not" be performed.

With respect to working with the group testing program, respondents indicated that they believe the school psychologist "preferably should" work with school staff to develop group testing programs by recommending specific tests (item #34) and use case conferences to develop plans and recommendations for helping the child (item #46), yet "may or may not" perform other duties relating to this area.

The respondents believe the school psychologist "absolutely must" confer, as part of case study follow-up, with teachers (item #47) and parents (item #53) and "preferably should" confer with all other professionals listed who are involved in the case. They believe that follow-up by means of home visits (item #58) and inter-office memoranda (item #60) "may or may not" be done.

Making recommendations for placement of children in special classes or programs (item #64) "absolutely must" be done by school psychologists, according to the respondents, and they "absolutely must" participate in placement committee meetings (item #68). The school psychologist "preferably should" make recommendations for placement of children in other classes or programs and settings such as

residential treatment centers (item #66) and participate in eligibility committee meetings (item #67) as well as advise and collaborate with school personnel offering remedial instruction and services (item #69) and coordinate psychological services with the activities of other pupil personnel workers and school staff (item #70).

The respondents indicated the school psychologist "preferably should" conduct psychotherapy and counseling with individual children and groups of children (items #71, #72 & #77, #78) and conduct counseling with parents and groups of parents (items #79 & 81). They also believe the school psychologist "preferably should" provide supervised play therapy sessions for individual children (item #83) yet "may or may not" perform other duties relating to psychotherapy, counseling, and play therapy.

Consultation activities related to making referrals to community agencies or professional specialists when necessary, providing useful, relevant information to classroom teachers in a manner easily understood, and conferring with teachers, counselors, and other school personnel who request and need help in coping with pupil problems (items #85, #86, & #104, #105) are considered to be functions the school psychologist "absolutely must" perform. All other areas of consultation "preferably should" be engaged in by the school psychologist except activities related to doing classroom teaching (item #87), presenting

school programs to the public (item #94), assisting administrators in recruiting teachers or other school personnel (item #95), working with teachers and administrators on matters involving teaching methods (item #98), participating in curriculum planning for regular and vocational classes and programs (items #99 & #101), assisting in the development of comprehensive career education programs and programs which facilitate transition from school to work (item #103), conferring with teachers, counselors, and other school personnel who request help in coping with personal problems (item #106), and facilitating the application of research findings to the local program by designing and conducting original research to investigate current problems and by training and collaborating with school personnel in research matters or by keeping records available for researchers (items #125, #127, #128, #129, & #130). They believe the school psychologist "may or may not" perform these duties as well as those relating to participation in periodic evaluation programs pertaining to regular and vocational classes, services, or programs and needs assessment (items #133, #135, & #136). They believe the school psychologist "preferably should not" assist administrators in the selection or promotion of teachers or other school personnel (items #96 & #97).

The respondents indicated that they believe the school psychologist "preferably should" participate in in-service

training programs for all school personnel including administrators/supervisors of elementary, secondary, or special education, elementary and secondary teachers of regular or special education, counselors, other school personnel, and secondary teachers of vocational education (items #107-#112). They believe the school psychologist "preferably should" conduct in-service training of school personnel in the development and use of test data (item #116), yet "may or may not" do this for the use of cumulative and anecdotal records, home-school reports, or pupil progress reports (items #113-#115). They indicated that they believe the school psychologist "preferably should" conduct parent education classes in all areas listed including behavior management, child development, learning and emotional disabilities and mental retardation (items #117-#121).

#### Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Expectations for Performances

To determine the influence of selected demographic variables on school psychologists' expectations for their performances of various functions, One-way ANOVA procedures were employed. The analyses were completed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X). The previously described item groupings of the Expectations

for the School Psychologist's Performances section were utilized and included: individual assessment, group assessment, follow-up, placement, counseling, consultation, and inservice. Selected demographic variables included: age, sex, academic training level, number of years experience as a teacher, and number of years experience as a school psychologist.

In order to maintain an experiment-wise error rate of .05 for all comparisons together, an alpha level of .0014 or less was required in each comparison to reach an overall significance of .05. No significant differences were found among demographic variables.

#### Comparison of Present School Psychologists' Responses to Murray's Study

In order to compare the results of the expectations sections of the present study with those of Murray's study, chi-square analyses were performed. Comparisons of rankings utilized the Spearman rank-order coefficient of correlation. The results are presented in the following sections.

#### Comparison of Expectations for Attributes

Only two of the original expectations for school psychologist's attributes items were retained and used in the present study. One difference was found between the two groups; that was on preferred area of experience (item #5).

An examination of the distributions of frequencies of responses to this item suggests that the present group has less preference regarding areas of experience for the school psychologist than Murray's group in 1975. These results are presented in Table 10.

#### Comparison of Expectations for Participations

The original nineteen items of the "Expectations for the School Psychologist's Participations" section used by Murray (1975) were used in this study; items thirteen and fourteen were changed due to the renaming of the organizations since 1975, but they are equivalent. Two items were added, numbers 20 and 21; the American Vocational Association and the Virginia Vocational Association. Therefore, nineteen items were used in the comparison.

Differences were found between the two groups on expectations for the school psychologist's participation in professional activities related to community organizations concerned with mental health (item #9), membership in the American Psychological Association (item #10), membership in the National Association of School Psychologists (item #17), and membership in the Virginia Association of School Psychologists (item #18). These results, presented in Table 11, suggest that while the present group attaches less importance to the participation of the school psychologist in the activities of community organizations concerned with

Table 10

Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations  
for Attributes

Item	1975/Present					Chi-square
	1	2	3	4	No response	
2.	<sup>116</sup> 1/1 .01%	<sup>101</sup> 57/76 49.14%	54/96 46.55%	4/3 .03%	0/0	2.39
5.	20/24	15/17	51/50	30/83	0/2	*14.33

\*significant at the .05 level.

Table 11

Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations  
for Participations

Item	1975/Present					No Response	Chi-Square
	1	2	3	4	5		
1	43/90	69/81	0/4	0/0	0/0	4/1	5.51
2	0/0	16/24	96/148	0/4	0/0	4/0	.01
3	6/5	76/102	29/67	0/1	0/0	5/1	5.26
4	48/98	59/74	5/3	0/1	0/0	4/0	5.76
5	21/45	80/110	11/21	0/0	0/0	4/0	2.49
6	3/11	66/80	42/83	1/1	0/0	4/1	5.81
7	18/47	83/112	10/16	0/0	0/0	5/1	4.54
8	1/5	53/67	57/102	1/2	0/0	4/0	3.31
9	5/7	78/98	29/70	0/1	0/0	4/0	*6.05
10	2/2	35/27	75/137	0/10	0/0	4/0	*9.02
11	3/4	39/41	70/127	0/4	0/0	4/0	4.20
12	6/16	47/64	59/92	0/2	0/0	4/2	1.76
13	0/0	5/7	102/164	4/5	0/0	5/0	.18
14	0/0	4/9	104/163	4/4	0/0	4/0	.78
15	0/0	8/13	98/148	5/13	1/1	4/1	1.13
16	1/2	9/13	96/147	5/12	1/1	4/1	.86
17	9/41	52/103	49/31	2/1	0/0	4/0	*28.85
18	23/65	67/88	21/19	1/1	0/0	4/3	*10.41
19	4/3	37/47	69/124	2/1	0/0	4/1	3.69

\*significant at the .05 level.



mental health and to their membership in APA than the 1975 group, the present group attaches more importance to the school psychologist's membership in NASP and VASP than the 1975 group.

#### Comparison of Importance of Functions

Since the present study added three functional areas of importance to the original section used by Murray (1975), these were deleted in order for comparisons to those results. It is important to mention, however, that these new service areas received higher rankings than many of those used in the survey in 1975; the items included: eligibility decisions for children, ranked fourth; counseling, ranked fifth; and inservice, ranked ninth; by the present group. There was agreement between the two groups on the importance of the school psychologist's functions on the following categories: diagnostic studies, consultant to teachers, and conferences with pupils and parents. School psychologists still attach the greatest importance to these functions, first, second, and third, respectively; greater importance is attached to consultant to administrators, ranked fourth, by the present group and ranked fifth by Murray's group. Follow-up of studies was ranked fifth and sixth respectively, community services was ranked seventh and eighth respectively, and research was ranked ninth and tenth. They attach lesser importance to

special placements for children, ranked sixth by the present group and fourth by Murray's group, and curriculum development, ranked eighth and seventh respectively, and group testing program ranked tenth and ninth.

To investigate the relationship between rankings of importance of functions by the present group and Murray's group in 1975, the Spearman rank-order coefficient of curriculum (Spearman rho) was calculated. This coefficient (.939) indicates that there is a very high positive correlation between the two groups' rankings. A total of 88.17% of the variance in importance rankings of the present group is associated with the variance in importance rankings of Murray's group.

#### Comparison of Frequency of Functions

The comparison of present frequency of performance of the school psychologist's functions utilized the same method as described in the previous section. As was the case in the previous section, it is important to mention, however, that these new service areas received higher rankings than many of those used in the survey in 1975; the items included: eligibility decisions for children, ranked second; counseling, ranked fifth; and inservice, ranked ninth; by the present group. There was agreement between the two groups on diagnostic studies, conferences with pupils and parents, consultant to teachers, community

services, curriculum development, group testing program, and research. These were ranked first, second, third, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth respectively. School psychologists report present performance of functions with greater frequency as compared to 1975, in the areas of consultant to administrators ranked fourth and fifth respectively, and follow-up of studies ranked fifth and sixth; while they report less frequency of special placements for children ranked sixth and fourth respectively.

To investigate the relationship between rankings of frequency of performance functions by the present group and Murray's group in 1975, the Spearman rank-order coefficient of correlation (Spearman rho) was calculated. This coefficient (.964) indicates that there is a very high positive correlation between the two groups' rankings. A total of 92.9% of the variance in frequency of performances rankings of the present group is associated with the variance in frequency of performance rankings of Murray's group.

#### Comparison of Expectations for Performances

Item changes, additions, and deletions in the original expectations for the school psychologist's performances section used by Murray (1975) necessitated the deletion of unequivalent items for comparison to the present study results. Therefore, one hundred twenty-nine

item-comparisons were performed with the use of chi-square. Differences were found on thirty-nine (30.23%) of the one hundred twenty-nine items. The frequencies of responses to each of these items for each group along with the chi-square values are presented in Table 12.

The interpretation of chi-square values and for the comparison of present results of expectations for the school psychologist's performance of functions to 1975 indicates significant differences at the .05 level. The two groups differ regarding their expectations for making diagnostic studies of individual children to identify the gifted, the physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the learning disabled, the speech, hearing, or visually impaired, and the multi-handicapped (items #1, #3-#7). Both groups indicated the school psychologist "preferably should" be involved with gifted identification but an examination of the distributions of frequencies of scores suggests that the present group attaches less importance to this function than the 1975 group. The opposite was true regarding expectations for the performance of functions related to identifying the physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the learning disabled, the speech, hearing, or visually impaired, and the multi-handicapped; present respondents indicated the school psychologist's involvement is more important than the 1975 group. Expectations regarding using information obtained from cumulative

Table 12

Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations  
for Performances

Item	1975/Present					No Response	Chi-Square
	1	2	3	4	5		
1	44/33	46/86	22/44	1/9	1/0	2/4	*15.89
2	94/158	16/15	3/0	2/0	0/1	1/2	2.38
3	21/49	21/57	51/54	13/13	7/1	3/2	*20.36
4	81/157	28/15	3/1	2/1	0/1	2/1	*17.81
5	89/15	24/18	1/3	0/0	0/0	2/2	*6.57
6	13/39	30/66	34/46	32/22	6/1	1/2	*22.62
7	32/124	35/37	39/14	8/0	0/0	2/1	*52.32
8	29/59	46/55	29/45	8/8	1/3	3/6	4.18
9	50/113	45/51	13/7	5/1	2/0	1/4	*17.74
10	74/112	37/57	5/6	0/0	0/0	0/1	.15
11	2/6	36/46	58/108	17/11	3/2	0/3	8.87
12	1/2	27/37	68/118	18/14	2/2	0/3	4.78
13	98/149	16/21	2/5	0/0	0/0	0/1	.55
14	95/146	19/26	2/3	0/0	0/0	0/1	.12
15	78/96	33/68	5/11	0/0	0/0	0/1	4.46
16	51/41	36/71	29/59	0/2	0/0	0/3	*12.69
17	66/104	41/60	8/11	0/0	0/0	1/1	.13
18	50/57	46/70	20/47	0/0	0/0	0/2	4.90
19	38/42	45/64	32/68	0/0	0/1	1/1	4.62
20	79/117	36/47	1/11	0/0	0/0	0/1	5.42
21	39/40	52/79	22/56	0/0	0/0	3/1	*7.39
22	23/22	52/68	38/83	0/1	0/0	3/2	*6.59
23	87/164	23/8	3/3	0/0	0/0	3/1	*18.38
24	52/64	41/60	18/48	4/2	0/1	1/1	7.38
25	49/126	39/33	24/15	3/0	0/0	1/2	*24.15
26	9/11	30/63	66/98	8/3	0/0	3/1	7.42
27	Added item						
28	Added item						
29	62/116	37/46	16/11	0/1	0/0	1/2	*6.88
30	52/115	31/35	29/22	3/1	0/1	1/2	*14.89
31	Added item						
32	100/153	14/15	1/6	0/0	0/0	1/2	2.78
33	8/16	44/68	55/86	8/2	0/2	0/2	7.19
34	10/22	49/85	49/66	8/2	0/0	0/1	*8.68
35	2/2	10/16	47/93	45/46	12/17	0/2	6.01
36	1/4	3/11	35/76	50/63	26/18	1/4	*13.68
37	4/11	29/47	66/97	11/16	6/3	0/2	3.91
38	3/4	17/21	44/71	34/52	17/25	1/3	.54
39	6/7	39/50	48/91	18/23	5/4	0/1	3.65

Table 12 (continued)

Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations  
for Performances

Item	1975/Present					No Response	Chi-Square
	1	2	3	4	5		
40	10/10	44/66	43/82	13/17	5/0	1/1	2.40
41	4/5	14/30	54/102	37/30	6/8	1/1	*9.72
42	8/8	22/36	59/99	23/25	4/7	0/1	2.55
43	4/3	20/28	60/107	27/30	5/7	0/1	3.37
44	6/10	25/35	63/98	20/23	4/7	0/3	.91
45	3/2	18/25	64/106	23/29	6/10	2/4	1.72
46	52/82	46/57	13/28	1/3	1/0	3/6	2.56
47	88/120	25/51	3/3	0/1	0/0	0/1	2.31
48	71/91	38/76	7/5	0/1	0/0	0/3	4.76
49	50/47	49/88	17/38	0/1	0/0	0/2	*8.29
50	53/60	44/82	19/31	0/1	0/0	0/2	3.67
51	30/27	43/72	42/72	1/3	0/0	0/2	4.96
52	24/26	41/73	50/71	0/3	0/1	1/2	2.17
53	81/107	31/58	4/8	0/1	0/0	0/2	1.95
54	21/13	51/67	42/90	0/4	1/0	1/2	*10.89
55	14/12	42/67	53/85	1/2	2/1	4/9	3.62
56	30/38	64/94	22/40	0/1	0/0	0/3	1.01
57	30/41	68/111	18/21	0/0	0/0	0/3	1.06
58	5/5	28/45	62/108	17/14	2/2	2/2	4.39
59	21/34	68/89	26/50	1/0	0/0	0/3	1.86
60	7/8	37/51	55/98	13/10	4/7	0/2	4.15
61	8/17	49/70	49/74	9/8	1/3	0/4	2.28
62	64/57	46/77	4/24	0/0	0/0	2/18	*15.80
63	59/74	34/63	22/32	1/6	0/0	0/1	3.99
64	93/128	22/40	1/7	0/0	0/0	0/1	3.45
65	39/47	45/72	30/54	2/1	0/0	0/2	2.67
66	63/93	39/62	14/13	0/1	0/0	0/7	1.58
67	Added item						
68	88/117	28/40	0/17	0/1	0/0	0/1	.06
69	52/57	58/103	5/15	1/0	0/0	0/1	5.63
70	77/94	36/70	2/10	0/0	1/0	0/2	*6.14
71	7/60	25/40	41/43	31/21	12/11	0/1	*36.96
72	3/51	31/47	44/44	25/21	13/11	0/2	*36.32
73	2/14	19/30	47/75	32/38	16/18	0/1	6.85
74	Added item						
75	1/8	21/45	48/68	29/38	17/15	0/2	7.66
76	2/10	15/28	43/57	30/48	25/31	1/2	4.15
77	35/92	51/66	27/16	3/0	0/0	0/2	*18.18
78	25/77	56/79	32/17	3/1	0/0	0/2	*25.44

Table 12 (continued)

Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations  
for Performances

Item	1975/Present					No Response	Chi-Square
	1	2	3	4	5		
79	28/41	54/58	31/67	3/5	0/3	0/2	6.00
80	Added item						
81	18/23	48/62	41/76	7/11	1/2	1/2	2.13
82	17/16	41/53	44/62	12/27	1/14	1/4	*10.76
83	3/28	23/56	62/71	19/13	7/5	2/3	*24.94
84	3/23	27/56	59/75	19/14	7/5	1/3	*17.55
85	95/132	20/36	1/5	0/2	0/0	0/1	2.11
86	105/148	9/23	2/3	0/1	0/0	0/1	2.12
87	3/2	12/21	76/116	19/25	6/10	0/2	1.26
88	38/42	53/69	24/59	1/3	0/1	0/2	7.09
89	55/53	51/83	9/36	1/2	0/0	0/2	*13.14
90	34/23	54/83	26/60	2/5	0/0	0/5	*12.92
91	23/22	52/77	36/63	5/12	0/0	0/2	3.66
92	45/51	50/84	19/33	2/7	0/0	0/1	3.74
93	54/51	52/81	9/37	1/4	0/2	0/1	*14.58
94	19/9	34/65	45/74	16/22	2/5	0/1	*11.07
95	6/1	8/18	50/82	37/61	15/13	0/1	*9.63
96	6/0	6/13	54/79	31/64	19/19	0/1	4.13
97	5/0	5/5	36/31	41/87	24/52	5/1	*10.94
98	15/11	46/77	40/73	9/12	2/2	4/1	4.90
99	11/5	22/36	67/99	15/30	1/4	0/2	7.29
100	17/14	59/85	33/67	7/8	0/1	0/1	5.22
101	9/6	29/50	63/103	14/14	1/1	0/2	4.40
102	8/5	20/40	73/107	11/20	4/3	0/1	4.77
103	Added item						
104	89/135	25/36	2/4	0/0	0/0	0/1	.14
105	83/118	24/49	6/7	2/0	0/0	1/2	1.85
106	21/31	20/35	42/66	25/34	7/9	1/1	.58
107	33/40	57/96	25/38	1/1	0/0	0/1	1.39
108	39/45	59/92	17/38	1/0	0/0	0/1	3.39
109	34/44	62/92	18/39	1/0	0/0	1/1	2.08
110	25/33	56/83	32/58	3/1	0/0	0/1	3.02
111	34/39	58/97	24/36	0/3	0/0	0/1	1.73
112	23/32	47/80	45/61	1/1	0/0	0/2	.90
113	10/5	36/52	55/89	13/22	1/5	1/3	6.15
114	7/4	28/53	62/97	15/18	3/3	1/1	4.28
115	8/7	29/41	62/104	13/19	3/4	1/1	1.68
116	22/33	58/84	27/47	4/8	1/2	4/2	.62
117	19/35	55/110	39/29	2/1	1/0	0/1	*13.02

Table 12 (continued)

Frequencies and Corresponding Chi-Squares for Expectations  
for Performances

Item	1975/Present					No Response	Chi-Square
	1	2	3	4	5		
118	17/31	53/110	44/34	2/0	0/0	0/1	*13.00
119	18/31	54/106	42/37	2/1	0/0	0/1	*9.42
120	19/34	56/102	39/37	2/2	0/0	0/1	5.97
121	18/30	57/107	40/36	1/2	0/0	0/1	7.12
122	35/78	63/74	16/21	2/2	0/0	0/1	6.22
123	22/53	49/58	38/47	6/14	1/1	0/3	6.74
124	33/65	69/90	12/18	1/2	1/0	0/1	2.45
125	6/13	47/59	61/99	2/3	0/1	0/1	1.63
126	12/24	75/74	27/76	2/1	0/0	0/1	*16.36
127	3/5	31/31	72/118	8/19	2/2	0/1	4.33
128	5/9	53/61	53/94	4/11	0/0	1/1	4.17
129	9/12	43/56	59/95	4/12	0/0	1/1	2.23
130	6/14	45/50	51/99	11/11	3/1	0/1	8.20
131	13/16	59/72	42/80	1/5	1/0	0/3	4.61
132	11/12	60/72	40/81	3/8	2/0	0/3	5.40
133	7/9	50/67	50/86	7/12	1/0	1/2	1.11
134	22/22	70/85	23/63	1/5	0/0	0/1	*11.22
135	5/10	49/59	55/97	6/9	1/0	0/1	2.49
136	8/8	51/62	48/95	8/10	1/0	0/1	4.52

\*significant at the .05 level.



records, administrators/supervisors, physicians/community health workers, and community agencies in making studies of individual children was different for the two groups (items #9, #16, #21, #22). An examination of the distributions of frequencies suggests that while both groups indicated the school psychologist should use all these sources of information, the present group believes that they "absolutely must" use cumulative record information and that it is of greater importance, and that information obtained from administrators /supervisors of elementary, secondary, and special education is of less importance than the 1975 group. Administering, scoring, and interpreting intelligence tests, personality questionnaires, tests of visual-motor coordination, and projective techniques for individual child study is also different for the two groups (items #23, #25, #29, #30). The present respondents indicated that the school psychologist should perform these functions, as did respondents in 1975, but attach greater importance to the functions.

Working with the group testing program by recommending specific tests, administering and scoring group tests, and presenting the results of group tests to students is seen as more important by the present group than the 1975 group (items #34, #36, & #41). Both groups believed the school psychologist "preferably should" be involved by recommending specific tests, "but may or may not" be involved by

administering and scoring them or by presenting their results to students.

With respect to follow-up of case studies, both groups generally indicated the school psychologist "preferably should" perform this function. The present group's responses, however, suggest the school psychologist's involvement is less important with respect to conferring with administrators/supervisors and physicians/community health workers, and re-assessing recommendations in light of follow-up study (items #49, #54, & #62).

Coordinating psychological services with the activities of other pupil personnel workers and school staff concerning recommendations for placements of children in various programs was considered important as an area of functioning by both groups, yet the present group indicated the school psychologist "preferably should" do this while the 1975 group indicated the school psychologist "absolutely must" do this (item #70).

Counseling with individual children and groups of children was indicated by both groups as a function which the school psychologist "preferably should" perform, but the present group considers it to be more important than the group in 1975 (items #77 & #78). While the 1975 group indicated the school psychologist "may or may not" conduct psychotherapy with individual and groups of children, the present group indicated they "preferably should" (items #71

& #72). Counseling with school personnel was indicated as a function which school psychologists "may or may not" perform by the present group while the 1975 group indicated they "preferably should" (item #82). Providing supervised play therapy sessions for individual children was considered a function school psychologists "preferably should" perform and for small groups of children a function they "may or may not" perform by the present group, yet the 1975 group attached less importance to this function indicating they "may or may not" be involved in either (items #83 & #84).

Consultation regarding presenting evidence of the need for special and vocational classes, services, or programs to the administration was indicated to be a function the school psychologist "preferably should" perform by both groups (items #89 & #90). The present group, however, considered this to be a function of lesser importance than the 1975 group. Consulting with school board members, when they desired, to discuss the psychological implications of school policies was indicated by both groups to be a function which "preferably should" be performed by school psychologists, yet the present group considered it to be of less importance than the 1975 group (item #93). Also considered to be of less importance, and "may or may not" be performed, was the function of explaining and interpreting school programs and policies to the public (item #94). Consulting with administrators in the recruitment of teachers or other

school personnel was considered a function which school psychologists "may or may not" perform by both groups and the present group considered it to be less important than the 1975 group (item #95). Both groups indicated the school psychologist "preferably should not" be involved in the selection or promotion of teachers or other school personnel with the present group expressing a stronger opinion to this effect (items #96 & #97). The function of relating the results of existing research to the local program was considered a duty which "preferably should" be performed, yet the present group considered it to be less important than the 1975 group (item #126). The same was true of evaluating programs pertaining to special classes or programs (item #134).

Conducting inservice training or parent education classes on behavior management, child development, and learning disabilities was indicated by both groups as a function which "preferably should" be performed, but the present group indicated it to be of more importance than the 1975 group (items #117-#119).

#### Summary

The results of the study have been presented in this chapter. An overall response rate of 80.50% was obtained. Demographic data was presented and respondents indicated

which attributes the school psychologist should possess and the professional activities in which they should be involved. The respondents indicated, via rankings, the relative importance and frequency of performance of specific functions of the school psychologist and there was no significant difference in these rankings. They also indicated which functions the school psychologist should perform. Of the selected demographic variables studied, age, sex, level of academic training, experience as a teacher, experience as a school psychologist, no relationships were found with expectations for performances of the school psychologist's functions. When compared with 1975, the present results show differences on items of each section related to the expectations for the role and function of the school psychologist. These included: expectations for attributes, participations, and performances. No differences were found between the two groups with respect to importance and frequency rankings of functions, but the added service areas received higher rankings than some 1975 items.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the findings of the study and includes a review of the research questions, methodology, findings and conclusions. Discussion and implications of the findings, and recommendations for the profession and future research are also provided.

#### Review of the Research Questions and Methodology

This study was designed to investigate the present role and function of school psychologists employed in the Commonwealth of Virginia and to assess changes since 1975, when Public Law 94-142 came into effect. Specifically, answers to the following research questions were sought:

(1) What expectations do school psychologists have for attributes?

(2) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to participations in various professional activities?

(3) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position?

(4) What is the relative frequency with which school psychologists perform the various functions of their present

position?

(5) What is the relative degree of importance that school psychologists attach to the various functions of their present position compared to the relative frequency with which they actually perform those same functions?

(6) What are school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions?

(7) What is the influence of selected demographic variables on school psychologists' expectations for their performances of specific functions?

(8) What is the degree of consensus between the results obtained in this study and those obtained in Murray's study relative to the areas outlined above?

Participants in the study were identified using a list of members prepared by the Virginia Association of School Psychologists for the 1985-86 school year; all members were asked to respond to the survey materials. Data collection was accomplished through the following six steps: (1) a pre-letter, (2) the initial survey mailing to all participants, (3) the first follow-up mailing, (4) the second follow-up mailing, (5) The third follow-up mailing, (6) the telephone contact of randomly selected non-respondents. Initially, 319 packets, including a cover letter, were mailed out. One packet was returned as "Moved, Not Forwardable," yielding a total of 318 possible

participants. A total of 256 participants returned completed survey materials, yielding a response rate of 80.50%. Of this total, 176 were school psychologists employed full or part-time or as interns in public school systems in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Responses were analyzed statistically with the use of the computer facilities at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and a Hewlett-Packard 65 calculator.

The specific computational techniques employed in the data analysis included:

1. Descriptive information relating to school psychologist's expectations for attributes, participations, and performances, and the personal and professional characteristics of the responding school psychologists was determined by tabulating frequencies of scores.

2. Relative importance attached to and actual frequency of performance of various functions was determined by ranking the mean scores. Differences in rankings were described and Spearman rank-order coefficients of correlation were calculated for each comparison.

3. The influence of selected demographic variables on expectations for performances of functions was determined by conducting a series of One-way analyses of variance between groups or levels for each sub-scale of this section of the survey.



4. Chi-square procedures were used to determine changes/differences in expectations for attributes, participations, and performances scores between present school psychologists and those who responded in 1975.

#### Summary of the Findings and Conclusions

The results of the study can be utilized to answer the research questions posed and to provide conclusions. These research questions will be used to provide a framework for summarizing findings and thus, conclusions.

1. The expectations of school psychologists for attributes were indicated by their responses to items of the attributes section. Generally, almost 45% preferred the school psychologist have training at the nondoctoral level, while almost 44% indicated no preference, and only 11% believed the school psychologist should be trained at the doctoral level. More than half (55%) believed the school psychologist should have the majority of the training equally in education and psychology, while 43% believed it should be in psychology, and only one held the opinion it should be in education. Most school psychologists (72%) preferred the doctorate in school or educational psychology for those trained at the doctoral level and indicated no preference between the Doctor of Education and Doctor of Philosophy degrees. More school psychologists indicated no

preference regarding area of experience than indicated a preference for experience as a classroom teacher or experience in a psychological or psychiatric setting other than the schools.

2. The expectations for participations of school psychologists were indicated by their responses to the participations section. Generally, all of the participations listed received positive or neutral responses by the group. No respondents indicated the school psychologist should not participate in any of the activities listed.

3. The relative importance attached to various functions was determined by ranking responses to the importance of functions section. The overall importance rankings were developed based on the mean rankings of the school psychologists. The diagnostic studies category was ranked as the most important function; consultant to teachers was ranked second, conferences with pupils and parents was ranked third, eligibility decisions for children was ranked fourth, counseling was ranked fifth, and consultant to administrators sixth. Ranked seventh was follow-up of studies, eighth was special placements for children, ninth was inservice, and tenth was community services. Curriculum development and research were ranked eleventh and twelfth respectively, with group testing program ranked thirteenth as least important.

4. The relative frequency of performance of various functions was determined by ranking school psychologists' responses to the frequency of performance of functions section. The diagnostic studies category was ranked as the function performed with the highest frequency. Eligibility decisions for children was ranked second, conferences with pupils and parents was third, consultant to teachers was ranked fourth, counseling was fifth, and consultant to administrators sixth. Follow-up of studies was seventh, special placements for children was ranked eighth, inservice was ninth, and community services tenth. Ranked eleventh and twelfth were curriculum development and group testing program respectively, with research ranked thirteenth or performed with the least frequency.

5. The relative importance attached to, and the relative frequency of performance of, various functions were compared by the item rankings of each of the sections. The diagnostic studies category was ranked as most important and as performed with the highest frequency by school psychologists; counseling and consultant to administrators were ranked fifth and sixth respectively; inservice, community services, and curriculum development were ranked ninth to eleventh respectively. There were differences between importance and frequency rankings assigned to consultant to teachers, eligibility decisions for children, group testing program, and research. While school

psychologists ranked consultant to teachers as second in importance, they report its frequency ranking as fourth; eligibility decisions for children received an importance ranking of fourth and is performed with a frequency ranking of second; research was ranked as twelfth in importance and was reported as the least performed function; group testing program was ranked thirteenth in importance, yet was reported as twelfth in terms of frequency of performance of function. These minimal differences in rankings were found to be nonsignificant, however, when investigated with the use of the Spearman rank-order coefficient of correlation.

6. The expectations of school psychologists regarding performances of specific functions were indicated by their responses to the items of the expectations for performances section. The majority of the functions received positive or neutral responses except items related to being involved in administrative activities concerning personnel matters.

7. Examination of One-way ANOVA results concerning relationships between demographic variables and school psychologists' expectations for performances of functions yielded no significant results.

8. Examination of chi-square values for comparison of present results of the expectations for the school psychologist's attributes to 1975 yielded significant differences at the .05 level, between the two groups regarding preferred area of experience. The results suggest

that respondents in the present study show less preference for area of experience for the school psychologist than respondents in the 1975 study.

The chi-square values for comparison of present results of expectations for the school psychologist's participations to the 1975 results yielded significant differences at the .05 level, between the two groups regarding importance attached to participation in the activities of community organizations concerned with mental health. The results suggest that the school psychologist's involvement is considered less important by the present group than the group in 1975. Significant differences at the .05 level were also found between the two groups concerning membership in the American Psychological Association. Present respondents indicated the school psychologist's membership is less important than the respondents in 1975. Membership in the National and Virginia Associations of School Psychologists is believed to be more important by the present group than the 1975 group.

There was agreement between the two groups on ranking the importance attached to diagnostic studies, consultant to teachers, and conferences with pupils and parents. They were ranked first, second, and third, respectively by the school psychologists in the present study and in 1975. The present group attached slightly greater importance to consultant to administrators, follow-up of studies,

community services, and research than the 1975 group; and, attached slightly less importance to special placements for children, curriculum development, and the group testing program. It is important to note that while these minimal differences in rankings were found to be nonsignificant when investigated with the use of the Spearman rank-order coefficient of correlation, the three added service areas, eligibility decisions for children, counseling, and inservice, recieved higher rankings by the present group than many original service areas in 1975.

There was agreement between the two groups on ranking the frequency of performance of functions related to diagnostic studies, conferences with pupils and parents, consultant to teachers, community services, curriculum development, the group testing program, and research. They were ranked first, second, third, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth, respectively. School psychologists report present performance of functions related to consultant to administrators and follow-up of studies with slightly higher frequency than in 1975. They report that functions related to special placements for children are performed with slightly less frequency than in 1975. It is important to note that while these minimal differences in rankings were found to be nonsignificant when investigated with the use of the Spearman rank-order coefficient of correlation, the three added service areas, eligibility decisions for

children, counseling, and inservice, recieved higher rankings by the present group than many original service areas in 1975.

School psychologists in the present study differed from the 1975 group on various items of each category of functions of the expectations for performances section which included: individual assessment, group assessment, follow-up, placement, counseling, consultation, and inservice. The differences are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

#### Discussion and Implications of the Study

The results of this study supported many of the roles and functions proposed for school psychologists in the literature. The finding that practicing school psychologists perform diagnostic studies more frequently than any other function supports Benson and Hughes' (1985), Chrin's (1974), Cutts' (1955), Hughes' (1979), Mullen's (1958), Oakland's (1986), Valett's ((1963), and White and Harris' (1961) contentions that the testing role most likely leads the many proposed for school psychologists and that it is the role most prominent in performance (Benson and Hughes, 1985; Herson, 1967; Murray, 1975; Ramage, 1979; Stevenson-Hicks, 1980).

Findings also support literature indicating that research is the least performed function (Benson and Hughes, 1985; Herson, 1967; Murray, 1975; and Ramage, 1979). Testing has usually been considered a fundamental aspect of school psychological services (Bennett, 1970); and, the results of the present study indicate it is considered to be of primary importance to school psychologists in Virginia. Although previous studies by Alpert and Trachtman (1980), Gibbins (1978), and Hughes (1979) indicate the desire of school psychologists to reduce the amount of time spent in assessment related activities and to increase time spent in consultation, assessment is still seen as most important and is ranked much higher than consultation activities by school psychologists in this study.

The traditional role of diagnostician is maintained, yet school psychologists have valuable skills related to total childhood development and learning. The demand for assessment services is great as supported by the contentions of Bardon (1976), Bennett and Bardon (1975), and Kirp and Kirp (1976), yet present school psychologists indicate their role is diverse and utilizes many of the competencies they possess.

Comparisons of present results and those reported by Murray (1975) indicate no changes in functioning in areas related to consultation in that school psychologists now perform such duties with essentially the same frequency now



as in 1975. This does not support the contentions of Alpert and Tractman (1980) and Gibbins (1978) that Public Law 94-142 may provide opportunities for a broader role model.

Special placements for children was reported as a function performed with essentially the same frequency and was also considered to be of the same importance by the present group as the 1975 group. This does not support findings reported by Stevenson-Hicks in 1980 regarding school psychologists' beliefs that school psychology is becoming more closely tied to special education.

Several implications can be drawn from the results of this study. They may have value to Virginia school psychologists, trainers, and employers of school psychologists, and to professional organizations as well as other pupil personnel workers. They are dealt with in the following discussion.

1. It would appear that school psychologists believe that the practicing school psychologist be trained at the nondoctoral level, not the doctoral level. This is consistent with contentions of the profession and the National Association of School Psychologists that doctoral training is not necessary for the practicing school psychologist nor is it preferred. Therefore, implications for the National Association of School Psychologists are that they should maintain their stand that all psychologists do not need training at the doctoral level and the American

Psychological Association's belief that they should, may not be applicable to school psychologists.

2. Given that equal training in education and psychology is believed essential by the majority of school psychologists, training programs and the State Department of Education should consider this a goal for training and certification and take the necessary steps to accomplish it.

3. In developing changes in existing programs and in establishing new school psychology training programs, the central issue is that of the functions for which the school psychologist should be trained. To determine what skills are necessary to function is to insure systematic, relevant training. The actual role, and expectations for the role, of the school psychologist must be taken into account. The findings of this study detail the skills now needed by school psychologists to function, and suggest certain functions which will require new competencies. The role and function of school psychologists now includes new areas of functioning related to assessment and eligibility decisions for children.

### Recommendations

The results and implications of this study provide the basis for recommendations for the profession and further research.

### Recommendations for the Profession

1. The Virginia State Department of Education and school psychology training programs in conjunction with local school systems, should consider coordinating certification requirements with training to include training and experience required for school psychologists to realize aspirations regarding role and function. These requirements should be communicated to school psychology trainers.

2. The Virginia Association of School Psychologists should actively involve itself in providing skill attainment in areas of functioning essential to effective practice through conferences, seminars, inservice education and feedback to school psychology training institutions regarding the importance of these functions. New areas of functioning since 1975 include: adaptive behavior and objective personality assessment, eligibility decisions for children, counseling, and inservice.

### Recommendations for Further Research

1. As with many research studies, it was not possible to investigate in complete detail the relationships, implications, and possible explanations of all the data obtained. Therefore, additional studies of the role and function of school psychologists in Virginia should be conducted in an attempt to further analyze the influence of demographic variables such as size of school division and

location (rural or urban) on role expectations and functions. Also, further validation of these results might be obtained via interviews and observations of school psychologists in their work setting.

2. Studies are needed to explore the training of Virginia school psychologists in an attempt to assess how well they are prepared to perform the functions expected by them.

3. Studies should be conducted to investigate the beliefs of other pupil personnel specialists, school administrators, school psychologist trainers, and other school personnel regarding school psychologists' functioning and compare this with the beliefs of practicing school psychologists.

4. Additional studies should be conducted which include non-VASP members. Such studies could be compared to the present study to investigate the effect of VASP membership on expectations for, and actual, role and function.

5. Longitudinal study, in approximately ten years, of the role and function of Virginia school psychologists would be helpful in determining changes in role and function over time.

6. Studies should be designed and conducted to investigate the effects of school system policies and practices on expectations versus roles and functions.

Factors which might be related to such policies and practices should be focused upon to determine the effects they may have on role discrepancy.

7. Research should be conducted on a national sample of school psychologists regarding expectations for role and function using a survey similar to the one used in the present study. The results could be compared with the findings of this study and would provide a baseline for future national longitudinal studies regarding changes in the role and function of school psychool psychologists over time.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowitz, E. A. (1981). School psychology: A historical perspective. School Psychology Review, 10, 121-126.
- Alpert, J. L. (1985). Change within a profession: Change, future, prevention, and school psychology. American Psychologist, 40, 1112-1121.
- Alpert, J. L. & Trachtman, G. M. (1980). School psychological consultation in the eighties. Relevance for the delivery of special services. School Psychology Review, 9, 234-238.
- Barclay, J. R. (1973). Multiple input assessment and preventive intervention. The School Psychology Digest, 2, 13-18.
- Barclay, J. R. (1983). Moving toward a technology of prevention: A model and some tentative findings. School Psychology Review, 12, 228-239.
- Bardon, J. I. (1976). The state of the art (and science) of school psychology. American Psychologist, 31, 785-791.
- Bardon, J. I. & Bennett, V. C. (1967). Preparation for professional psychology: An example from a school training program. American Psychologist, 22, 652-655.
- Bardon, J. I. & Bennett, V. C. (1974). School Psychology. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Barlow, B. (1966). The emotionally and socially handicapped. Review of Educational Research, 36, 120-133.
- Bennett, V. C. (1970). Who is a school psychologist? Journal of School Psychology, 8, 166-171.
- Bennett, V. C. & Bardon, J. I. (1975). Law, professional practice and professional organizations: Where do we go from here. Journal of School Psychology, 13, 349-358.
- Benson, A. J. & Hughes, J. (1985). Perception of role definition processes in school psychology: A national survey. School Psychology Review, 14, 64-74.

- Bergon, J. R. & Tombari, M. L. (1976). Consultant skill and efficiency and the implementation and outcomes of consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 14, 3-14.
- Brown, D. T., Cardon, B. W., Coulter, W. A., & Meyers, J. (1982). Section I, Introduction and historical background. School Psychology Review, 11, 107-111.
- Carstens, A. A. (1985). Retention and social promotion for the exceptional child. School Psychology Review, 14, 48-63.
- Chrin, J. J. (1974). Some professional partners: The school psychologist. Today's Education, 58, 23-24.
- Clark, J. H. & Reynolds, C. R. (1981). Research trends in school psychology: 1974-1980. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (89th, Los Angeles, CA, August 24-26, 1981).
- Cooke, V., & Patterson, J. (1977). Psychologists in the schools of Nebraska: Professional functions. Psychology in the Schools, 14, 371-376.
- Cutts, N. E. (Ed.). (1955). School psychologists at mid-century. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Devich, P. G. (1980). The impact of PL 94-142 on the behavior of school psychologists and their professional identity. University of San Francisco (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Eiserer, P. E. (1963). The School Psychologist. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Fagan, T. (1984). Literary origins of the term "School Psychologist". The School Psychology Review, 13, 216-220.
- Gibbins, S. (1978). Public Law 94-142: An impetus for consultation. The School Psychology Digest, 7, 18-25.

- Goldwasser, E. (1979). Effect of recent legislation for handicapped children on school psychological services in New York State. Fordham University (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Goldwasser, E. & Meyers, J. (1983). The impact of PL 94-142 on the practice of school psychology: a national survey. Psychology in the Schools, 20, 153-165.
- Goldwasser, E., Meyers, J., Christenson, S., & Graden, J. (1981). A national survey of the impact of PL 94-142 on the practice of school psychology. NASP Communique, April/May.
- Gray, S. W. (1963). The psychologist in the schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gresham, F. M. (1985). Behavior disorder assessment: Conceptual, definitional, and practical considerations. School Psychology Review, 14, 495-509.
- Grimes, J. (1981). Shaping the future of school psychology. School Psychology Review, 10, 206-231.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. S., & McEachern, A. W. (1958). Experiences in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Son, Inc.
- Hart, S. (1982). Reactions to Olympia, school psychology takes the driver's seat. School Psychology Review, 11, 186-188.
- Hayes, M. E. & Clair, T. N. (1978). School psychology - why is the profession dying? Psychology in the Schools, 15, 518-521.
- Helge, P. (1985). The school psychologist in the rural education context. School Psychology Review, 14, 402-420.
- Herson, J. L. (1967). An Exploration of the Role Expectations of the School Psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia. University of Virginia (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Hohenshil, T. H. (1975). Call for redirection: A vocational educator views school psychological services. Journal of School Psychology, 13, 58-62.



- Hohenshil, T. H. (1978). Vocational education for youth with special learning needs: Roles for the vocational school psychologist. The School Psychology Digest, 7, 3-4, (guest editorial).
- Hughes, J. N. (1979). Consistency of administrators' and psychologists' actual and ideal perceptions of school psychologists' activities. Psychology in the Schools, 1979, 16, 234-239.
- Hummel, D. L. & Bonham, S. J., Jr. (1968). Pupil personnel services in schools: Organization and coordination. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.
- Jerrell, J. M. (1984). Boundary-spanning functions served by rural school psychologists. The Journal of School Psychology, 22, 259-271.
- Kabler, M. L. (1977). Public Law 94-142 and school psychology: Challenges and opportunities. The School Psychology Digest, 6, 19-30.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Keenan, L. (1964). A job analysis of school psychologists in the public schools of Massachusetts. Psychology in the Schools, 1, 185-186.
- Kelman, E. & Wolff, G. (1976). Data feedback and group problem-solving: An approach to organizational development in schools. Psychology in the Schools, 13, 421-427.
- Kirp, D. L. & Kirp, L. M. (1976). The legalization of the school psychologist's world. Journal of School Psychology, 14, 83-89.
- Knoff, H. M. (1983). Justifying projective/personality assessment in school psychology: A response to Batsche and Peterson. School Psychology Review, 13, 446-456.
- Lacayo, N., Sherwood, G., & Morris, J. (1981). Daily activities of school psychologists: A national survey. Psychology in the Schools, 18, 184-190.
- Lighthall, F. F. (1973). Social psychologists in schools. The School Psychology Digest, 2, 10-15.

- Lolli, Anthony, Jr. (1980). Implementing the role of the school psychologist. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 70-74.
- Magary, J. F. & Meacham, M. L. (1963). The growth of school psychology in the last decade. Journal of School Psychology, 1, 5; 13.
- Maher, C. A. & Illback, R. J. (1982). Organizational school psychology: Issues and considerations. Journal of School Psychology, 20, 244-253.
- Manley, T. R. & Manley, E. T. (1978). A comparison of the personal values and operative goals of school psychologists and school superintendents. Journal of School Psychology, 16, 99-109.
- Meacham, M. L. & Peckham, P. D. (1978). School psychologists at three-quarters century: Congruence between training, practice, preferred role and competence. Journal of School Psychology, 16, 195-206.
- Mok, P. B. (1962). A view from within. New York: Carlton Press.
- Mullen, F. A. (1958). The Psychologist on the School Staff. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Murray, P. (1975). An Analysis of the role of the school psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Oakland, T. D. (1986). Professionalism within school psychology. Professional School Psychology, 1, 9-27.
- Perry, C. L. (1984). Health promotion at school: Expanding the potential for prevention. School Psychology Review, 13, 141-149.
- Peterson, D. R. (1981). Overall synthesis of the Spring Hill Symposium on the future of psychology in the schools. School Psychology Review, 10, 307-314.
- Porter, R. B. (1960). School psychology in Indiana. Teachers College Journal, 31, 131-133.

- Ramage, J. (1979). National survey of school psychologists: Update. School Psychology Digest, 8, 153-161.
- Reger, R. (1965). School psychology. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas.
- Reschly, D. J. (1976). School psychology consultation: "Frenzied, faddish, or fundamental." Journal of School Psychology, 14, 105-113.
- Shepard, J. W. (1982). Career development functions of school psychologists. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Shinn, M. R. (1986). Does anyone care what happens after the refer-test-place sequence: The systematic evaluation of special education program effectiveness. School Psychology Review, 15, 49-58.
- Smith, T. E. (1962). An analysis of the role of the school psychologist in the State of California. University of Southern California (unpublished doctoral dissertation).
- Stevenson-Hicks, R. (1980). Public Law 94-142: Practicing school psychologists' perceptions of how this law affects them. Psychology in the Schools, 17, 491-496.
- Takanishi, R., DeLeon, P. H. & Pallak, M. S. (1983). Psychology and education. American Psychologist, 38, 996-1000.
- Tindall, R. H. (1964). Trends in development of psychological services in the school. Journal of School Psychology, 3, 1-12.
- Trachtman, G. M. (1981). On such a full sea. School Psychology Review, 10, 138-181.
- Valett, R. E. (1963). The practice of school psychology: professional problems. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1963.
- Wallin, J. E. (1942). Forum: The school psychologist in retrospect. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1942, 6, 309-312.

- White, M. A. & Harris, M. W. (1961). The school psychologist. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Wright, D. & Gutkin, T. B. (1981). School psychologist's job satisfaction and discrepancies between actual and desired work functions. Psychological Reports, 49, 735-738.
- Wright, D. & Thomas, J. (1982). Role strain among school psychologists in the midwest. Journal of School Psychology, 20, 96-102.
- Ziv, A. (1980). The school psychologist at work. Israeli Journal of Psychology and Counseling in Education, 12, 25-33.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Survey Letters

**VIRGINIA TECH**

Division of Administrative  
and Educational Services

University City Office Building  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear Virginia School Psychologist,

The purpose of this letter is to encourage you to participate in a study being conducted by David R. Lovern, a VASP member and doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic and State University/James Madison University. David has worked as a school psychologist in the state of Virginia for eight years.

His study is designed to investigate the expectations of school psychologists in the Commonwealth of Virginia regarding their role and function. The purpose of the study is to assess possible changes in the role and function of school psychologists since the 1975 statewide study by Philip Murray, former VASP president.

We believe the information obtained as a result of this study will be of great benefit to the profession of school psychology and your participation is essential to its success. Your individual responses will be confidential and only group data will be used in the analysis.

Please take a few minutes to complete the survey you will receive from David in a few days. We know you are busy and thank you in advance for your cooperation and subsequent contribution in this effort.

Susan Horger  
School Psychologist  
President, Virginia  
Association of  
School Psychologists

Harriet Cobb  
Dissertation  
Committee Member  
James Madison  
University

Thomas H. Hohenshil  
Dissertation Director  
Virginia Polytechnic  
Institute & State University

## VIRGINIA TECH

Division of Administrative  
and Educational Services

University City Office Building  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear Virginia School Psychologist,

I am conducting a study which is designed to investigate the expectations of school psychologists in the Commonwealth of Virginia regarding their role and function. The purpose of the study is to assess possible changes in the role and function of school psychologists since the 1975 statewide study by Philip Murray, former VASP president.

You are being asked to indicate the functions you think the school psychologist should or should not be performing; the activities the school psychologist should or should not participate in; the qualities the school psychologist should or should not exhibit.

The materials I am asking you to complete will require about 20 minutes of your time. Please be sure to complete both sides of the survey. There is a self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed for your convenience. Your responses will be held in strictest confidence and the numbers which appear on the form will be used to keep materials together and to aid in follow-up of non-respondents. Only group scores will be used in the data analysis.

Your participation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

David R. Lovern



VIRGINIA TECH

Division of Administrative  
and Educational Services

University City Office Building  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear Virginia School Psychologist,

I am writing to follow-up my survey of school psychologists in Virginia. To date, more than 40% of your fellow school psychologists have returned their completed materials.

According to my records you have not responded to my request for information. Perhaps you misplaced the materials or put them aside to respond at a later time. Won't you please take a few minutes and complete the materials which are enclosed?

Your individual response, while confidential, is essential to the success of the study. Representativeness and validity of my results depend upon the largest possible response rate.

Please respond by June 23rd. I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

Sincerely,

David R. Lovern

VIRGINIA TECH

Division of Administrative  
and Educational Services

University City Office Building  
Blacksburg, VA 24061

Dear Virginia School Psychologist,

About four weeks ago, I mailed surveys to 319 VASP members asking them to participate in a study regarding the role and function of school psychologists in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The response of our fellow school psychologists has been tremendous. At the present time, more than 65% have responded by completing and returning the survey materials.

According to my records, I have not yet received your completed materials. Since I need the highest possible participation, I will appreciate it very much if you will assist me with my study. Even if you are not employed in a public school setting, your responses are vital to my findings. The results are intended to show possible changes in the role and function of school psychologists since 1975 and have implications for training and practice. All individual responses will be held in strictest confidence.

Enclosed are duplicate survey forms and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Would you please take a few minutes to complete and forward them to me as soon as possible? Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

David R. Lovern

APPENDIX B  
Survey Materials

## PERSONAL DATA FORM

## PERSONAL DATA FORM

The information requested below will be helpful in interpreting the results of this study. Please return this form with the completed opinionnaire. Your cooperation is appreciated. Thank you.

1. Title of your position \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. Age (optional) \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Sex \_\_\_\_\_  
 4. Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Number of Children \_\_\_\_\_

6. Name of school division by which you are employed \_\_\_\_\_

Please specify whether you are employed full or part time \_\_\_\_\_

If employed part time please indicate number of hours per week \_\_\_\_\_

Approximate number of pupils enrolled in the division \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of full-time school psychologists employed by the school division \_\_\_\_\_

7. Please indicate your salary range:
- |                           |                           |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ \$6,000 - \$7,999   | _____ \$24,000 - \$25,999 |
| _____ \$8,000 - \$9,999   | _____ \$26,000 - \$27,999 |
| _____ \$10,000 - \$11,999 | _____ \$28,000 - \$29,999 |
| _____ \$12,000 - \$13,999 | _____ \$30,000 - \$31,999 |
| _____ \$14,000 - \$15,999 | _____ \$32,000 - \$33,999 |
| _____ \$16,000 - \$17,999 | _____ \$34,000 - \$35,999 |
| _____ \$18,000 - \$19,999 | _____ \$36,000 - \$37,999 |
| _____ \$20,000 - \$21,999 | _____ \$38,000 - \$39,999 |
| _____ \$22,000 - \$23,999 | _____ \$40,000 or over    |

8. Length of contract:
- |                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| _____ 9 month                      |
| _____ 10 month                     |
| _____ 11 month                     |
| _____ 12 month                     |
| _____ other (please specify) _____ |

9. Please indicate your most advanced level of academic training:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Master's Degree in Education  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Master's Degree in Psychology  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Training beyond the Master's Degree in Education  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Training beyond the Master's Degree in Psychology  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Educational Specialist Degree (Ed.S.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Training beyond the Educational Specialist Degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Doctorate in Education (Ed.D.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Doctorate in Education (Ph.D.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Doctorate in Psychology (Psy.D.)

10. Name of institution where you took the major amount of graduate training in school psychology \_\_\_\_\_

11. Number of years since completion of full-time training in school psychology \_\_\_\_\_

12. Number of years since endorsement as a school psychologist by the Virginia State Department of Education \_\_\_\_\_

13. Number of years experience as a school psychologist \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of years in present position \_\_\_\_\_

14. Number of years experience as a classroom teacher \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of years experience in education in other capacities (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

15. Number of years experience in a psychological or psychiatric setting other than in the schools \_\_\_\_\_

16. Type(s) of Virginia professional certificate(s) held: \_\_\_\_\_

17. Are you a licensed psychologist, school psychologist, clinical psychologist? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

In which state(s)? \_\_\_\_\_

Approximate number of hours per week in private practice \_\_\_\_\_

18. Are you endorsed or certified as a school psychologist by any state(s) other than Virginia? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

19. Please indicate any professional organization(s) of which you are a member:

- \_\_\_\_\_ American Psychological Association (A.P.A.)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Division 16, the Division of School Psychologists, of the A.P.A.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Virginia Psychological Association  
 \_\_\_\_\_ American Association for Counseling and Development  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Virginia Association for Counseling and Development  
 \_\_\_\_\_ National Education Association  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Virginia Education Association  
 \_\_\_\_\_ National Association of School Psychologists  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Virginia Association of School Psychologists  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Council for Exceptional Children  
 \_\_\_\_\_ American Vocational Association  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Virginia Vocational Association  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S ATTRIBUTES  
and  
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SCHOOL  
PSYCHOLOGIST**

**EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S ATTRIBUTES**

Please indicate your opinion concerning the following specific qualities or characteristics of the school psychologist by checking the most appropriate response for each item.

1. The school psychologist should:
  - be trained at the doctoral level
  - be trained at the nondoctoral level
  - no preference
2. The school psychologist should:
  - have had the major amount of his/her training in education
  - have had the major amount of his/her training in psychology
  - have had equal training in education and psychology
  - no preference
3. The school psychologist, if trained at the doctoral level, should:
  - hold the doctorate in general psychology or clinical psychology
  - hold the doctorate in school psychology or educational psychology
  - hold the doctorate in education
  - no preference
4. The school psychologist, if trained at the doctoral level, should:
  - hold the Doctor of Education degree (Ed. D.)
  - hold the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Ph.D.)
  - hold the Doctor of Psychology degree (Psy.D.)
  - no preference
5. The school psychologist should:
  - have had experience as a classroom teacher
  - have had experience in a psychological or psychiatric setting other than the school's
  - have had experience in both of the above situations
  - no preference

**THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FUNCTIONS OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST**

The functions of school psychologists can be categorized according to the major headings that are listed below. Please indicate how important you think these functions are by ranking the headings in order of importance from one to thirteen. Please do not leave out any heading. Write the letter of the heading opposite the most appropriate number.

- |  |                          |                     |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------|
| A. Diagnostic Studies                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. most important   |
| B. Follow-up of Studies                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2.                  |
| C. Special Placements for Children (IEP) | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3.                  |
| D. Eligibility Decisions for Children    | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4.                  |
| E. Conferences with Pupils and Parents   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5.                  |
| F. Consultant to Administrators          | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6.                  |
| G. Consultant to Teachers                | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7.                  |
| H. Group Testing Program                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8.                  |
| I. Curriculum Development                | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9.                  |
| J. Community Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10.                 |
| K. Research                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | 11.                 |
| L. Counseling                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12.                 |
| M. Inservice                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. least important |

## EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S PARTICIPATIONS and THE FREQUENCY OF PERFORMANCE OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S FUNCTIONS

### EXPECTATIONS FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S PARTICIPATIONS

Please indicate the importance you attach to the school psychologist's participation in each of the following professional activities by placing a check in the appropriate column.

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	May or may not	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
1. Reads current professional publications.					
2. Writes articles for publication in professional journals.					
3. Makes informal visits to other school systems and community service agencies.					
4. Maintains close working relationships with other professionals and professional groups.					
5. Attends local, regional, state, and national meetings of professional psychological groups.					
6. Attends local, regional, state, and national meetings of professional educational groups.					
7. Attends workshop sessions and conventions of professional organizations.					
8. Attends meetings of the P.T.A. and other community service organizations.					
9. Participates in the activities of community organizations concerned with mental health.					
10. Is a member of the American Psychological Association.					
11. Is a member of Division 16, the Division of School Psychologists of the A.P.A.					
12. Is a member of the Virginia Psychological Association.					
13. Is a member of the American Association for Counseling and Development.					
14. Is a member of the Virginia Association for Counseling and Development.					
15. Is a member of the National Education Association.					
16. Is a member of the Virginia Education Association.					
17. Is a member of the National Association of School Psychologists.					
18. Is a member of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists.					
19. Is a member of the Council for Exceptional Children.					
20. Is a member of the American Vocational Association.					
21. Is a member of the Virginia Vocational Association.					

### THE FREQUENCY OF PERFORMANCE OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S FUNCTIONS

Please indicate the relative frequency with which you perform the functions implied by the major headings that are listed below. Please rank the headings in order of frequency from one to thirteen. Do not leave out any heading. Write the letter of the heading opposite the most appropriate number.

- |  |       |                    |
|--|-------|--------------------|
| A. Diagnostic Studies                    | _____ | 1. most frequent   |
| B. Follow-up of Studies                  | _____ | 2.                 |
| C. Special Placements for Children (IEP) | _____ | 3.                 |
| D. Eligibility Decisions for Children    | _____ | 4.                 |
| E. Conferences with Pupils and Parents   | _____ | 5.                 |
| F. Consultant to Administrators          | _____ | 6.                 |
| G. Consultant to Teachers                | _____ | 7.                 |
| H. Group Testing Program                 | _____ | 8.                 |
| I. Curriculum Development                | _____ | 9.                 |
| J. Community Services                    | _____ | 10.                |
| K. Research                              | _____ | 11.                |
| L. Counseling                            | _____ | 12.                |
| M. Inservice                             | _____ | 13. least frequent |

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S PERFORMANCES

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S PERFORMANCES

Please indicate the importance you attach to the school psychologist's performance of each of the following specific functions. Indicate your opinion by checking in the appropriate column.

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	May or may not	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
Making diagnostic studies of individual children to identify the:					
1. gifted					
2. mentally handicapped					
3. physically handicapped					
4. emotionally disturbed					
5. learning disabled					
6. speech, hearing, or visually impaired					
7. multi-handicapped					
8. culturally disadvantaged					
9. Using cumulative records in making studies of individual children					
Making observations of the individual child:					
10. in the school					
11. in the home					
12. in the community					
Obtaining information for diagnostic case study from:					
13. the child					
14. teachers					
15. counselors					
16. administrators supervisors (elem., sec., spec. ed.)					
17. school social workers/visiting teachers					
18. the school nurse					
19. other school personnel					
20. parents					
21. physicians, community health workers					
22. representatives of community agencies					
Administering, scoring, and interpreting for individual child study:					
23. intelligence tests					
24. achievement tests					
25. personality questionnaires					
26. vocational interest inventories					
27. vocational aptitude measures					
28. adaptive behavior measures					
29. tests of visual-motor coordination					
30. projective techniques (such as the Rorschach Ink Blots, Thematic Apperception Test, House-Tree-Person, etc.)					
31. objective personality assessment techniques					
32. Summarizing, interpreting, and reporting findings of individual child study.					
Working with the group testing program by:					
33. consulting with school staff for the purpose of developing group testing programs					
34. recommending specific tests					
35. preparing calendars and schedules for the group testing program					
36. administering and scoring group tests					
37. interpreting the results of group tests					
38. maintaining group test data as part of the permanent records of students					
39. training school personnel in group test administration and scoring					
40. training school personnel in group test interpretation					
Presenting the results of group tests to:					
41. students					
42. school personnel					
43. the school board					
44. parents					
45. lay groups					
46. Using the case conference to develop plans and recommendations for helping the child.					
Conferring, as part of case study follow-up, with:					
47. teachers (elem., sec., spec. ed.)					
48. counselors					

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S PERFORMANCES  
(continued)

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	May or may not	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
49. administrators/supervisors (elem., sec., SPDC, ed.)					
50. school social workers, visiting teachers					
51. the school nurse					
52. other school personnel					
53. parents					
54. physicians, community health workers					
55. representatives of community agencies					
Following-up the study of a child by means of:					
56. observation					
57. case conferences					
58. home visits					
59. student interviews					
60. inter-office memoranda					
61. cumulative records					
62. re-assessing and re-evaluating recommendations in the light of follow-up study.					
Making recommendations for placement of children in:					
63. regular classes or programs					
64. special classes or programs					
65. vocational classes or programs					
66. other settings (e.g., residential treatment centers, special schools, etc.)					
67. Participate in eligibility committee meetings					
68. Participate in placement committee meetings (IEP)					
69. Advising and collaborating with school personnel offering remedial instruction and services					
70. Coordinating psychological services with the activities of other pupil personnel workers and school staff.					
Conducting "psychotherapy" with:					
71. individual children					
72. groups of children					
73. parents					
74. family					
75. groups of parents					
76. school personnel					
Counseling with:					
77. individual children					
78. groups of children					
79. parents					
80. family					
81. groups of parents					
82. school personnel					
Providing supervised play therapy sessions for:					
83. individual children					
84. small groups of children					
85. Making referrals to community agencies or professional specialists when necessary.					
86. Providing useful, relevant information to classroom teachers in a manner readily understood.					
87. Doing classroom teaching (e.g. of high school psychology courses).					
Presenting to the administration evidence of the need for:					
88. regular classes, services, or programs					
89. special classes, services, or programs					
90. vocational classes, services, or programs					
Assessing school system's ability to meet the needs of:					
91. regular students					
92. exceptional students					
93. Being available to members of the school board when desired, to discuss the psychological implications of school policies.					
94. Explaining and interpreting school programs and policies to the public.					
Assisting administrators in the:					
95. recruitment of teachers or other school personnel					
96. selection of teachers or other school personnel					



EXPECTATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S PERFORMANCES  
(continued)

	Absolutely must	Preferably should	May or may not	Preferably should not	Absolutely must not
97. promotion of teachers or other school personnel					
98. Consulting with teachers and administrators on matters involving teaching methods.					
Participating in curriculum planning for:					
99. regular classes and programs					
100. special classes and programs					
101. vocational classes and programs					
102. Assisting in the development of comprehensive career education programs.					
103. Assisting in the development of programs which facilitate transition from school to work.					
Conferring with teachers, counselors, and other school personnel who:					
104. request help in coping with pupil problems					
105. need help in coping with pupil problems					
106. request help in coping with personal problems					
Participating in in-service training programs for:					
107. administrators/supervisors (elem., sec., spec. ed.)					
108. elementary teachers (general or spec. ed.)					
109. secondary teachers (general or spec. ed.)					
110. secondary teachers (vocational)					
111. counselors					
112. other school personnel					
Conducting the in-service training of school personnel in the development and use of:					
113. cumulative and anecdotal records					
114. home-school reports					
115. pupil progress reports					
116. test data					
Conducting parent education classes on:					
117. behavior management					
118. child development					
119. learning disabilities					
120. emotional disabilities					
121. mental retardation					
Implementing in the school the techniques associated with learning theory by:					
122. developing programs of behavior management for use with individual students or entire classes					
123. administering programs of behavior management					
124. training school personnel to develop and administer programs of behavior management					
Facilitating the application of research findings to the local program by:					
125. designing and conducting original research to investigate current problems					
126. relating the results of existing research to the local program					
127. training school personnel in designing and conducting research					
128. collaborating with school personnel in designing and conducting research					
129. training school personnel in relating the results of existing research to the local program					
130. keeping records available for researchers					
Participating in periodic evaluation programs pertaining to:					
131. pupil progress					
132. attainment of educational objectives					
133. regular classes, services, or programs					
134. special classes, services, or programs					
135. vocational classes, services, or programs					
136. characteristics of the community (needs assessment)					

**The two page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been  
removed from the scanned  
document. Page 2 of 2**