

AN INVESTIGATION OF PART-TIME AND CONTRACTED
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICE DELIVERY IN RURAL VIRGINIA

by

Clyde Meyer

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

Administration and Supervision of Special Education

APPROVED:

P. R. Jones (Chairman)

J. A. McLaughlin

T. H. Hohenshil

D. M. Moore

J. N. Hughes

April, 1983

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to those who made it possible for me to succeed in this endeavor. Dr. Phil Jones, mentor and chairman of my doctoral committee, provided support and critical review of my work during the last three years. Dr. John McLaughlin was invaluable in terms of his research expertise and willingness to give up personal time on my behalf. Drs. Tom Hohenshil, Mike Moore and Jan Hughes all contributed greatly to the completion of this task.

Without the cooperation of the participants, this study would not have been possible. To those school psychologists, special education supervisors and principals who willingly gave their time, I wish to express my gratitude.

Beverly Taylor spent countless hours typing and re-typing drafts of this dissertation. Her skill, friendship and willingness to help are deeply appreciated.

Without the support, caring and understanding of one very special individual, this task might have become overwhelming. I wish to express "a lively sense of favors to come" to Dr. Andrea Lazzari.

Clyde Meyer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Chapter	
I Introduction	1
The Problem	18
Research Questions	18
Purpose of the Study	20
Significance of the Study	22
Limitation of the Study	22
Definition of Terms	23
Organization of the Study	24
II Review of Related Literature	25
Introduction	25
Special Education Litigation and School	
Psychology	27
Right to Education	27
Procedural Due Process	30
Assessment Bias	32
Special Education Legislation and School	
Psychology	41
Federal Legislation	41
State Legislation	43
Other Influences	45
Opinions and Reactions	51
Psychologist-Pupil Ratio	59

Chapter	Page
Training Needs	61
Recruitment and Retention of Special Education Personnel in Rural Areas	65
Rural School Psychology	68
Determinants of Job Satisfaction	73
Salary	75
Repetitious Tasks	75
Task Variety	76
Job Environment	76
Co-workers	77
Supervision	78
Advancement Opportunities	78
Autonomy	79
Achievement	80
Summary	81
III Research Methodology	83
Introduction	83
Respondents	83
Instrumentation and Data Collection	85
Data Analysis	87
IV Results of the Study	91
Introduction	91
Section I - Case Studies	93
Case Study A	93
Case Study B	98

Chapter		Page
IV (Cont.)	Case Study C	103
	Case Study D	108
	Case Study W	113
	Case Study X	119
	Case Study Y	126
	Case Study Z	131
	Cross-case Analysis - A,B,C,D	136
	Cross-case Analysis - W,X,Y,Z	146
	Cross-case Analysis Comparison	153
	Section II - Service Delivery Comparison ..	156
	Introduction	156
	Demographic Variables	156
	Percentages of Time Devoted to Job Functions	160
	Time Devoted to Handicapped and Non-handicapped	161
	Restrictions Placed on Job Performance	162
	Number of Students Served	163
	Psychologist-to-student Ratio	164
	Professional Development	164
	Salary	165
	Job Satisfaction	166
	Summary	173
	Section III - Principals' Perceptions	178

Chapter	Page
Response Rate	178
Demographic Information	179
Results	180
Interpretations	207
Comments	216
V Summary, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations	224
Summary	224
Discussion	231
Program Recommendations	237
Research Recommendations	239
REFERENCE NOTES	241
REFERENCES	243
APPENDIX A - School Psychologists' Questionnaire	254
APPENDIX B - School Psychologists' Interview Guide ...	264
APPENDIX C - School Psychologists' Supervisors' Questionnaire	266
APPENDIX D - Rural School Principals' Questionnaire ..	269
APPENDIX E - Researcher's Perceptions, Researcher's Questionnaire	277
APPENDIX F - Letter Sent to School Psychologists	285
APPENDIX G - Letter Sent to School Psychologists' Supervisors	287
APPENDIX H - First Letter Sent to Principals	289
APPENDIX I - Follow-up Letter to Principals	291

	Page
VITA	293
ABSTRACT	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Administering and Scoring Indi- vidual Diagnostic Tests.....	181
2	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Administering Group Tests	183
3	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Observing Children in Various settings	185
4	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Reviewing and Researching Records	186
5	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Conducting Diagnostic Interviews	188
6	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Preparing Written Psychological Reports	189
7	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Conducting Interviews with Parents	191
8	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Participating as Members of Special Education Evaluation Teams	192
9	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Serving as Eligibility Committee Members	194
10	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Offering Follow-up Consultation Regarding IEPs or Special Education Placements	195
11	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Offering Follow-up Consultation Regarding IEPs or Special Education Placements	197
12	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Conducting Individual Therapy or Counseling with Children	199

Table		Page
13	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Conducting Group Counseling with Children	200
14	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Training Parents Through Parent Education Classes	202
15	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Conducting In-service Training Pro- grams for School Personnel	203
16	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Consulting with School Personnel Regarding Individual Children, Classroom Management, etc.	205
17	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Conducting Research	206
18	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychol- ogists Following-up Results of Intervention Strategies	208
19	Weaknesses of Part-time and Contracted Employ- ment Compared to Full-time Employment Principals' Perceptions	217-18

Chapter I

Introduction

During the past three decades many investigators have demonstrated an avid interest in the development of the field of school psychology. Professional literature indicates documentation of the changes in the profession as perceived by practicing school psychologists, supervisors of school psychologists, trainers of school psychologists, etc. The need for current information on the state of the art of the profession has resulted in a vast reservoir of data. Studies have been conducted using national, state and individual school district populations to obtain data pertaining to many aspects of the profession.

In a study conducted in Virginia, Herson (1967) investigated the consensus among eight groups of public school personnel in the Commonwealth regarding role expectancies of the school psychologists. The relative frequency of professional functions of Virginia school psychologists and the perceived importance of these functions were also explored. Herson surveyed school superintendents, counselors and elementary teachers from school divisions which did or did not employ school psychologists. Data for the investigation were also

obtained from practicing school psychologists, members of a publication committee concerned with staff relations, and past presidents of the American Psychological Association. Herson's major findings were:

1. There was only moderate agreement among the role definer groups regarding their expectation of the school psychologist in the performance of his work.
2. There was a lack of consensus in some areas between all role definer groups regarding their expectations of the school psychologist.
3. Although there was some disagreement between role definer groups with regard to the specific rank of importance of the ten major service areas in which school psychologists might or do perform (with the exception of Diagnostic Services), they appeared generally to agree as to whether the service area was most important, important, or least important. Most important areas appeared to be Diagnostic Studies, Special Placement for Children, Conferences with Pupils and Parents, and Consultation with Teachers. Important areas were Consultations with Administrators and Follow-up of Studies. Least important areas were Research, Community Services, Group Testing, and Curriculum Development.
4. School psychologists in the State of Virginia performed in the major service areas in the following descending order of frequency:
 - a. diagnostic studies
 - b. consultations with teachers
 - c. conferences with pupils and parents
 - d. consultations with administrators
 - e. special placement for children
 - f. follow-up of studies

- g. community services
- h. research
- i. curriculum development
- j. group testing

(Herson, 1967)

In 1973, Goshorn conducted a survey of 160 members of the Virginia Association of School Psychologists. His investigation attempted to determine the percentage of time Virginia school psychologists spent on various professional duties. His results indicated the following breakdown:

- 1. 45 percent on diagnosis, recommendations and report writing
- 2. 14 percent on consultation with teachers
- 3. 11 percent on teacher discussion groups
- 4. 10 percent on follow-up and case studies
- 5. 8 percent on individual parent counseling
- 6. 6 percent on referrals and other work with community agencies
- 7. 5 percent on individual child guidance
- 8. 4 percent on research
- 9. 2 percent on student counseling groups
- 10. 2 percent on parent discussion groups

(Goshorn, 1973)

Murray (1975) investigated the role of the school psychologist in Virginia by surveying the role expectations of members of three groups: school superintendents, school psychologists, and school psychologist trainers. Murray compared his results with the two earlier investigations (Herson, 1967, Goshorn, 1973) and concluded: 1) the Virginia school psychologist continues to spend most of his

or her time on diagnostic studies which is considered to be the most important function; and 2) a greater degree of consensus exists between those groups of persons who determine the role of the Virginia school psychologist regarding the importance of the other functions (Murray, 1975).

In a recent Virginia study, Hughes (1979) attempted to measure the consistency of administrators' and psychologists' actual and ideal perceptions of school psychologists' activities. School psychologists, directors of pupil personnel services and superintendents in Virginia public schools responded to a questionnaire asking for actual and ideal perceptions of the role of the school psychologist. Hughes discussed her results in terms of the impact of P. L. 94-142 and summarized:

School psychologists desire a shift in job functions away from assessment and toward preventative strategies. There is a large measure of support among directors for this shift and a smaller level of support among superintendents. School psychologists want to intervene, especially, at the system level, but they have to convince administrators of their expertise in this area and of the benefits of systems-change strategies. Finally, school psychologists in Virginia are experiencing a role conflict that may contribute to overall job dissatisfaction. (1979, p. 239)

The most recent study involving school psychologists in Virginia was conducted in 1982 by Merchant. Through the use of a comprehensive survey, she sought to answer the

following questions: 1) Is there a difference between actual and desired functions as perceived by Virginia school psychologists?, 2) What are the factors leading to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction for this group?; and 3) What is the status of certain professional issues confronting the school practitioner in Virginia?

In addition to reporting a detailed demographic profile of responding Virginia school psychologists, Merchant concluded:

1. There were discrepancies between the rated importance of intervention, consultation and research.
2. Assessment activities encompassed the majority of the participants' time, followed by administrative activities, consultation, intervention, and research and follow-up.
3. The majority of the participants' time was spent with activities directly related to handicapped children.
4. The majority of the respondents felt significant restrictions in their functioning in the schools due to time constraints imposed by referrals for testing and administrative duties.
5. Respondents were moderately to very satisfied with their career.
6. With an expanded role, and perceived opportunities for advancement in their careers, more young persons would see the profession as a viable and challenging career (Merchant, 1982, pp. 159-162).

Many studies have been conducted in other states. Kravitz (1973) investigated the role of the school psychologist in Ohio public schools. He asked teachers and principals to rate eleven major functions currently being

performed by school psychologists in order of degree of importance. His results indicated that teachers and principals did not view the evaluative functions of school psychologists as most important. Individual counseling was viewed by both as highest in desirability.

Gilmore and Chancy (1973) interviewed 33 elementary teachers in Texas regarding their views on the role and function of school psychologists. The teachers indicated that school psychologists most often recommend treatment, but seldom provide the treatment themselves. In addition, results indicated that the teachers perceived the role of school psychologists to be primarily assessment-oriented.

In a 1974 New York study, Barbanel and Hoffenberg-Rutman surveyed school psychologists in an attempt to provide information on graduates of the school psychology program at Brooklyn College. Results indicated that these school psychologists viewed consultation with parents, teachers and other school personnel as the most important aspect of their role. Psychometric evaluations were viewed as fourth in importance.

Keogh, Kukic, Beckler, McLoughlin and Kukic (1975) surveyed school psychologists from ten California public school districts which were considered representative of the state as a whole. Again, assessment functions

were reported to take the majority of professional time. Limited time was devoted to consultation functions. Respondents also expressed their need for additional training in educationally-oriented techniques for exceptional children.

The first national survey of school psychologists was conducted in 1971 by Farling and Holdt. The researchers' goals were to establish a data base for future studies and to identify national issues and concerns of the practice of school psychology. Information was sought in the areas of training, certification requirements, professional affiliations, salary and contractual agreements, psychologist-to-student ratios, professional needs and problems and future development of the profession. Results indicated that the routine activities of individual assessment, report writing, and conferences dominated most professional time. Respondents indicated they needed further skills in psychological and educational diagnosis, educational programming, behavior modification planning, counseling and professional communication. The researchers pointed out that the high psychologist-to-student service ratio represented a critical shortage in a number of school psychologists in the nation. They recommended inservice training for areas of need which were identified, clarification of role and function in the future based on

anticipated mental health and educational needs of students, and recruitment of more practitioners to the field.

A second national survey of school psychologists was conducted in 1979 as a joint effort by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and Division 16 of the American Psychological Association (APA). In an effort to establish a data base on problems associated with the federal legislation regarding special education, a survey was mailed to 2,500 school psychologists randomly selected from the 1979 NASP membership. The majority of respondents indicated that their evaluation procedures have remained generally unchanged since the passage of P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975). Classroom observation techniques, non-discriminatory assessment techniques, standardized and unstandardized educational assessment techniques were reported to be used more often by approximately one-third of the respondents. A consistent increase in the amount of time spent with handicapped children was reported. Seventy percent of respondents' time was directed to handicapped children while only thirty percent was spent with non-handicapped learners. P.L. 94-142 was reported to have had little impact on the general role of these school psychologists. Respondents reported seventy percent of their time was spent on individual diagnostic activities, twenty percent was spent on consultation, and ten percent was spent on

direct intervention. Problems were noted with increased paper work and "bureaucratic machination" (p. 8).

Respondents also indicated they desired an opportunity to increase the amount of their time devoted to consultation and direct intervention (NASP Communique, April/May 1981).

Numerous studies have been conducted which attempted to reflect the opinion of other professionals who have contact with school psychologists. Lucas and Jones (1970) studied teachers' views of psychological services in Ohio. Results indicated that teachers who had little personal contact with the psychologist viewed psychological services as much less helpful than did those who felt the psychologist was available on request.

Lesiak and Lounsbury (1977) compared the opinions of a group of Michigan supervisors of school psychologists with the opinions of elementary school principals regarding role priorities of school psychologists. Results indicated that supervisors placed more importance on establishing preventative programs and conducting research. Principals viewed screening children for special class placement as higher in importance. The researchers concluded that school psychologists entering the field may perceive their roles considerably differently than their supervisors do.

Other researchers have investigated the role of the

school psychologist through the perceptions of directors of special education (Tan, 1968; Fridsma, 1973), elementary school principals (Gelerinter, 1967; Heller, 1973), superintendents (Fitts, 1972), and classroom teachers (Soderbert, 1967; Roberts, 1969; Romig, 1970).

A more recent research interest in the field of school psychological service delivery has involved the investigation of demographic variables and their relationship to the type and quality of services offered. Several investigators have attempted to identify differences in professional practices and perceptions of psychologists employed in urban, rural or suburban communities.

Goldwasser (1979) conducted an investigation of the effects of state and federal legislation for handicapped children on school psychological services in New York. A questionnaire was developed and mailed to a representative random sample of school psychologists employed by public school districts throughout the state. Data were reviewed for the total group and by the type of community served; urban, suburban, and rural. Results indicated that rural school psychologists more often followed children through the entire process of referral, evaluation, planning, placement and monitoring than did their urban and suburban counterparts. Urban school psychologists reported a more specialized role definition; usually limited to one

aspect of function. Respondents indicated an increased amount of time spent on diagnostic activity as a result of the legislation. Urban psychologists reported less time devoted to designing Individual Educational Programs and less opportunity to work directly with handicapped children. Rural practitioners noted less participation at impartial hearings. All three groups reported sharing the "gate-keeper" function with other professionals, but felt the legislation had resulted in decreased service to non-handicapped children. Results also indicated little change has occurred in school psychologists' evaluation procedures to meet the nondiscriminatory assessment provision of the mandates. Through general comments respondents noted their desire "to increase funding to reduce case loads and restore the full range of consultation, treatment and prevention activities" (Goldwasser, 1979, p. 196).

Results of a national survey of demographic, job setting and attitudinal characteristics of urban, suburban and rural school psychologists conducted by Division 16 of the American Psychological Association were reported by Demers, Cohen and Fontana (1981). Rural school psychologists reported more buildings to serve, fewer colleagues available, and higher psychologist-to-student ratios than did their urban and suburban counterparts. They also

reported a more direct line to top administration. This was interpreted by the researchers to be advantageous by virtue of avoidance of bureaucratic obstacles. Demers, Cohen and Fontana felt, however, supervision by a non-psychologist could possibly be disadvantageous. These investigators pointed out several weaknesses in their study. A small return rate (23%) and a restricted population (Division 16 members) limited the generalizability of their results. Further study of urban, suburban and rural differences was advocated.

Trenary (1981 a) conducted a survey of 40 school psychologists in Kentucky and Wisconsin representing urban, suburban and rural school divisions. These school psychologists were asked to estimate the percentages of time they devoted to each of five major role activities: psycho-educational assessment, counseling/therapy, consultation, in-service education, and research. Respondents were also asked to list their perceptions of the differences in school psychological services in urban, suburban and rural areas. Although the number of total respondents was small (25 from each state) no significant differences were found for role activities. Trenary also reported that meaningful comparisons between urban, suburban and rural school psychologists in Wisconsin could not be made because of the small size of the sample.

She did, however, note an observable trend within the Kentucky sample. Rural school psychologists reported 63% of their time spent on psycho-educational assessment whereas suburban and urban school psychologists reported 56% and 43% respectively. A corresponding decrease in the percentage of consultation was also noted; urban - 29%, suburban - 22% and rural - 19%. Comments on how school psychological services might differ according to the type of community served were mixed in nature. A specialized role for urban psychologists and a more general, broad role for rural psychologists was emphasized. Again, the small sample and method of interpreting these results limits the meaning of these data. Trenary noted her desire for these results to stimulate further investigation.

Several researchers have investigated urban and rural differences in the profession of school psychology. DeVore and Fagan (1979 and 1980) surveyed school administrators representing school divisions in Tennessee in an attempt to surface differences in service delivery and resulting training implications. Results of their study indicated rural school psychologists generally entered the field with less training than did their urban counterparts. The researchers speculated that their findings probably reflected the limited role perception of school

psychologists in rural areas; largely psychometric in nature.

Another study conducted in 1981 by Hughes and Clark sought to discover the training implications related to the differences between urban and rural school psychology in Virginia. These researchers surveyed the total number of rural school psychologists and a stratified random sample of urban school psychologists on demographic and personal information, role diversity and role emphasis. Also asked of the respondents were questions regarding continuing education and job satisfaction. In addition, open-ended questions asked these practitioners for their perceptions of the differences between urban and rural school psychology and their suggestions for rural training programs. Results indicated that: 1) the rural school psychologist performs a wider range of services; 2) is more likely to be involved in activities at the systems and school/community levels; and 3) spends less time in testing and test-related functions (Hughes and Clark, 1981). These investigators noted the need for further research on urban-rural differences and methods for rural school psychological service delivery.

An extremely limited amount of empirical data exists on the practice of rural school psychology and the manpower

needs in this area. Trenary (1981 b) reported the results of a federally funded project designed to alleviate the shortage of school psychologists and psychometrists in rural Eastern Kentucky. Following an intense training program, master's level educators from the region served as school psychologists and psychometrists in their home school systems. Eleven participants then were asked to rank order a list of thirteen problems commonly encountered by all school psychologists. The Committee on Rural School Psychology of Division 16 of APA originally developed the list and ranked them in order to provide a basis of comparison with the perceptions of the now experienced rural school psychologists. The intent of this investigation was to identify discrepancies in the perceptions of the school psychologists with those of the Committee (mostly trainers of school psychologists). Analysis by t-tests showed significant differences in the mean rankings of the two groups in regard to the following: 1) Little understanding of school psychologists' role by parents, teachers and administrators (ranked as the greatest problem by the psychologists and second by the Div. 16 Committee); 2) Isolation from other psychologists (ranked fifth by the psychologists and third by the Committee); 3) Non-acceptance by other school personnel (ranked tenth by the psychologists and seventh by the Committee); and 4) Local

language usage differences (same final rank for both groups). Numbers 3 and 4 were not surprising given the make-up of the group (local residents) and their training which prepared them for non-acceptance by other school personnel. All other nine problems ranked by the two groups showed no significant differences in their perceptions. Trenary noted the limited generalizability of the study because of the uniqueness of the newly trained group, but pointed out the strengths of school psychology training for local residents in rural areas. These strengths were: 1) reduction in the difficulties of isolation from other psychologists; 2) reduction of non-acceptance by other personnel; and 3) reduction in local language usage differences (Trenary 1981 b, p. 4).

In a study conducted in Virginia, Hughes (1981) investigated the turnover rates over a three year period for urban and rural school psychologists and the relationship of selected background variables to rural school psychologists who terminated employment and those who remained. By using data on school psychologists employed in Virginia published in the Virginia Educational Directory, Hughes determined that the turnover rate for rural school psychologists was four times the rate for urban school psychologists. She also found that rural school psychologists who remained were more likely to have been raised in

a non-urban community. In the discussion of her results Hughes noted:

Possible reasons rural schools experience difficulty in retaining school psychologists include cultural and attitudinal factors, geographic and climatic factors, job characteristics, and inadequate training (1981, p. 9).

Hughes considered this study exploratory in nature because of the lack of previous research on manpower needs in rural school psychology. She also pointed out the small size of her sample and noted that the results should not be viewed as definite conclusions.

It becomes apparent that many researchers have been concerned with the manner in which school psychological services are delivered. Most investigations have dealt with issues affecting the profession as a whole, i.e., without considering the differences between urban, suburban and rural variables. The studies which have included this breakdown are limited in number and generally non-conclusive.

Rural school psychology has been gaining the attention of professionals in the field, although an extremely limited amount of research has been conducted on the manner in which these services are offered. Part-time and contractual arrangements are common means of providing school psychological services in rural areas (Fagan and DeVore, 1981). At the present time, however, there exists no data

on the extent to which rural school divisions utilize these arrangements.

The Problem

The literature indicates that rural school divisions have many problems associated with providing school psychological services (Flax, Wagenfeld, Ivens, and Weiss, 1979; DeVore and Fagan; 1980, Fagan, 1981; Hughes; 1981, Demers, Cohen and Fontana, 1981; Fagan and DeVore, 1981; Helge, 1981). Many school divisions in rural areas have opted to provide school psychological services by employing part-time or contract school psychologists (Fagan and DeVore, 1981). The literature contains no data on the strengths and weaknesses of this kind of arrangement, hence school divisions have no data base from which to draw information regarding the employment of part-time or contracted school psychologists. The problem which was addressed in this study, therefore, was the need for relevant information on the problems rural school divisions encounter with part-time or contractual school psychological service delivery as well as the benefits of these arrangements.

Research Questions

This study attempted to determine:

- 1.0 What are the strengths and weaknesses

of employing part-time or contract school psychologists as perceived by rural school division supervisors of part-time or contract school psychologists and part-time or contract school psychologists themselves?

- 2.0 How does rural part-time or contract school psychological service delivery compare with rural full-time school psychological service delivery?
 - 2.1 Demographic variables, i. e., training, experience and certification of practitioners.
 - 2.2 Percentages of time devoted to professional job functions by practitioners.
 - 2.2.1 Assessment
 - 2.2.2 Intervention
 - 2.2.3 Consultation
 - 2.2.4 Research and follow-up
 - 2.2.5 Report writing
 - 2.3 Practitioners' professional time devoted to working with children.
 - 2.3.1 Handicapped children
 - 2.3.2 Non-handicapped children
 - 2.4 Restrictions placed on job performance of practitioners.
 - 2.5 Psychologist-to-student ratio of practitioners.
 - 2.6 Professional development of practitioners.

- 2.7 Salary of practitioners.
- 2.8 Job satisfaction of practitioners.
- 3.0 How does rural part-time or contract school psychological service delivery compare with rural full-time school psychological service delivery through the perceptions of rural school principals.
 - 3.1 Availability of services.
 - 3.2 Utilization of services.
 - 3.3 Level of satisfaction with services.

Purpose of the Study

During the 1982-83 school year, eight rural school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia employed school psychologists on a part-time or contract basis as their sole providers of school psychological services. Information was not available at that time regarding the kinds of services these school psychologists offered. Although a wealth of data had been collected over the years on the functioning of full-time school psychologists in Virginia (Herson, 1967; Goshorn, 1973; Murray, 1975; Hughes, 1979; Hughes and Clark, 1981; Hughes, 1981), no attention had been given to investigating the unique role of the part-time or contract school psychologist. The purpose of this study was to investigate the type and quality of services

provided by rural school psychologists who were employed on a part-time or contract basis. The data collected regarding the role and function of these practitioners was compared with the data collected by Merchant (1982), who conducted a similar study on the role and function of full-time school psychologists in Virginia.

This study represented a constructive replication and extension of Merchant's (1982) study. While Merchant investigated the practices of full-time school psychologists in Virginia, she made no attempt to include those school psychologists who offered their services on a part-time or contractual basis. Thus, this study replicated a portion of Merchant's research (i.e., role and function data), but extended her research to include part-time and contracted school psychologists.

In addition to the role and function data comparison, this investigation solicited responses from part-time or contract school psychologists and their supervisors geared to surfacing their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of these employment arrangements. Rural school principals' perceptions of the availability and utilization of services as well as their level of satisfaction with these services provided further comparative data. Hence, this study provides a comparison of the services rendered by part-time or contract rural school psychologists and full-time rural school psychologists. It also establishes

a data base outlining the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time or contract school psychologists.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study provide rural school divisions current information on the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time or contract school psychologists. Rural school divisions which utilize the services of contract or part-time school psychologists will be able to use the data collected in this study to facilitate their decision-making regarding whether to continue with such an arrangement. Rural school divisions which are considering employing part-time or contract school psychologists have a data base outlining the strengths and weaknesses of this employment.

The comparative data on full-time and part-time or contract school psychologists also facilitate employment decision-making by school divisions as well as provide a data base for institutions involved in training rural school psychologists. In addition, these data are helpful for practitioners who might be considering employment in other than full-time arrangements.

Limitation of the Study

Since this investigation is limited to data gathered within the Commonwealth of Virginia, the results of this

study are not intended for generalization to other states.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they relate to the study:

1. Rural school division - school districts are considered rural when the number of inhabitants is less than 60 per square mile and when located in counties with 60% or more of the population living in communities no larger than 5,000 inhabitants. Divisions within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) as determined by the Census Bureau are not considered rural.
2. Part-time school psychologist - a school psychologist who provides school psychological services for a school division which does not employ a full-time school psychologist. This practitioner is employed on a less than full-time basis, i.e., less than regular instructional staff.
3. Contract school psychologist - a school psychologist who provides school psychological services for a school division which does not employ a full-time school psychologist. This practitioner's contract or working agreement specifies the nature of his/her duties, e.g., assessments, counseling, in-service education, etc. This psychologist also works on a part-time basis.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters to optimize clarity and readability. Chapter I introduces related literature and states the problem, the purpose of the study, objectives of the study and its significance. The investigation's limitation and definition of terms are also offered.

Chapter II contains related literature on problems facing full-time school psychologists, influences on their role and function, and their training needs. Literature on rural special education needs and specifically needs related to rural school psychology is also reviewed. Finally, job satisfaction literature as it relates to the practice of rural school psychology is offered.

Chapter III contains the procedures used for developing the questionnaires and interview guides as well as a description of the respondents. Data collection and analysis methodology is also detailed.

Chapter IV presents the results of the surveys and interviews, and Chapter V contains a summary, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations based on these results.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews important factors which have contributed to the current state-of-the-art of school psychology. The examination of general shaping variables is followed by more specific references related to the practice of rural school psychology. By structuring the chapter in this manner the reader will be able to gain a more complete picture of the profession of school psychology and its development, as well as an understanding of situation-specific problems related to school psychological service delivery in rural areas.

Section one reviews several landmark court decisions which shaped subsequent federal and state legislation. Comments regarding the impact of these decisions on the role and functions of school psychologists are also included.

Section two explores special education legislation. Specifically, sections of the laws and regulations which directly or indirectly involve school psychologists are discussed.

Other influences on the profession of school psychology are discussed in section three. A brief history of the

development of the profession as well as major shaping variables are offered.

Section four examines the opinions of writers in the field relative to their perceptions of effective service delivery. Also included are reactions to major developments in the profession written by leaders in school psychology and special education.

Continuing education needs of school psychologists are reviewed in section five. Results of prior studies which solicited perceived preferences for the future training of school psychologists are also included.

Section six reviews rural special education literature, and, specifically, problems encountered by rural school districts regarding the recruitment and retention of professional personnel. Recent efforts by national and state organizations to alleviate shortages of special education professionals in rural areas are also explored.

Section seven reviews the perceptions of leaders in school psychology and special education relative to the unique problems in rural school psychology. Also, reasons for current differences in the practice of school psychology in rural areas are discussed.

The final related topic, determinants of job satisfaction for school psychologists, is reviewed in section eight.

Job satisfaction literature in education, psychology and sociology is related to the practice of rural school psychology and the unique role of the contract or part-time rural school psychologist.

Special Education Litigation and School Psychology

The legal rights of children have historically been vague and, at times, ignored. Since 1970, dozens of cases brought to court have established significant educational rights for exceptional children. These cases have been regarded in the literature on special education and school psychology as precursory to the passage of federal and state laws which outline the educational rights of handicapped learners.

The three areas of litigation most commonly referred to in the literature as shaping forces of legislative reform are: 1) right to education; 2) right to appropriate placement and due process guarantees; and 3) inappropriate use of assessment instruments which result in misplacements and over-representation of racial and minority groups in special education classes.

Right to Education

Early in the 1970's several landmark cases were brought

to court by individuals and groups in an effort to gain an appropriate education for handicapped students who were either totally excluded from public education or were not being adequately served. In 1971, The Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (P.A.R.C.) brought a class action suit on behalf of 14 mentally retarded children and "all others similarly situated" who had been excluded from public school (PARC vs. Pennsylvania, Note 1). The state secretaries of education and public welfare, the state board of education, and thirteen school districts were the defendants. Although the Pennsylvania School Code included exceptional learners in its provisions, the defendants argued that retarded children were ineducable. After expert testimony was heard the defendants settled the case by consent decree. The injunction required:

1. To provide as soon as possible but in no event later than September 1, 1972, to every retarded person between the ages of six and twenty-one, access to a free public program of education and training appropriate to his learning capacities.
2. To provide as soon as possible but in no event later than September 1, 1972, wherever defendants provide a preschool program of education and training for children aged less than six years of age, access to a free public program of education and training appropriate to his learning capacities to every mentally retarded child of the same age.
3. The Secretary of Education shall be responsible

for assuring that every mentally retarded child is placed in a program of education and training appropriate to his learning and capacities, and to that end... he shall be informed as to the identity, condition and educational status of every mentally retarded child within the various school districts (PARC vs. Pennsylvania, Note 1).

The consent agreement also required the state to develop a plan for locating retarded children and providing services. A notice of the court action was also required to be sent to parents of retarded children. This case established the educability of all retarded children and their access to the public schools.

A second case regarded in the literature as a landmark decision precursory to the development of federal handicapped legislation is that of Mills vs. Board of Education (Note 2). This class action suit was brought against the District of Columbia by the parents and guardians of seven children who charged that the District failed to provide a free public school education for their handicapped children. A lack of financial resources was given by the defendants as the reason for failure to provide this education. The judge ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, establishing a constitutional holding, that all handicapped children must be provided a free appropriate public school education. The judge further stated:

If sufficient funds are not available to finance all of the services and programs that are needed in the system then the available funds must be expended equitably in such a manner that no child is entirely excluded from a publically supported education consistent with his needs and ability to benefit therefrom (Note 2).

Both PARC (Note 1) and Mills (Note 2) had a great impact on the school psychologists' role. Kuriloff (1975) suggested that because of this new population of students being served by the public schools, school psychologists had to spend greater amounts of time assessing and re-evaluating their needs. Kabler (1977) stated that because the public schools have to serve handicapped children who previously had been excluded from attendance, school psychologists needed to acquire assessment and programming skills to work effectively with these children and their parents. Abramowitz (1981) saw the litigation as a driving force for demanding "new" school psychologists with "new" assessment instruments.

Procedural Due Process

In addition to establishing that students could not be excluded from public schools because of their special education needs, PARC (Note 1) and Mills (Note 2) also resulted in court decisions which delineated procedural safeguards for

students and parents. Buss (1975) noted that as a result of these two cases, schools have the burden of proof in establishing the need for special class or special school assignment. He outlined the due process safeguards which resulted from these cases. Prior to any assignment outside the regular class, the courts required that a hearing must be afforded the student and the following procedural safeguards must be given:

1. Notice in advance of the hearing of the factual and theoretical basis of the proposed reclassification.
2. The right to submit evidence.
3. The right to cross-examine any witness supporting the school's position.
4. The right to be represented by a lawyer.
5. The right to have the case decided by an independent hearing officer.
6. The right to learn the details of the school's position, including examination of the student's school records.
7. The right to state-provided independent psychological examination (p. 302).

These due process safeguards have been incorporated in subsequent federal and state legislation. School psychologists, as representatives of the schools, are in a position of providing evidence which contributes to the burden of

proof and can be expected to be called upon to testify at due process hearings.

Assessment Bias

Weintraub and Abeson (1972) noted an increasing amount of litigation questioning the placement of children in special education on the basis of assessment instruments that are considered prejudicial because of native language, cultural background, and normative standardization factors. The Hobson vs. Hansen case (Note 3) is considered to be precedent-setting as it was the first time the labelling of children by the use of assessment instruments was questioned in court. Psychological tests were used in the Washington, D.C., school system to track students into ability groups. The tracking system resulted in an over-representation of black students in the lower tracks and an under-representation at higher levels. The court ruled that the use of the tests was biased or unfair to black students because the outcome was discriminatory. Judge Skelly Wright ruled:

Evidence shows that the method by which track assignments are made depends essentially on standardized aptitude tests which, although given on a systems-wide basis, are completely inappropriate for use with a large segment of the student body. Because these tests are

standardized primarily on and are relevant to a white middle class group of students, they produce inaccurate and misleading test scores when given to lower class and Negro students. As a result rather than being classified according to ability to learn, these students are in reality being classified according to their socio-economic or racial status, or - more precisely - according to environmental and psychological factors which have nothing to do with innate ability (Note 3).

Judge Wright ordered the abolishment of the tracking system on the grounds that it was in violation of the equal protection guarantees under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. This case is considered to be a precedent for the establishment of non-discriminatory assessment provisions of future legislation.

The second most frequently cited case involving assessment bias is Diana vs. State of California (Note 4). Improper placement in special education classes for the mildly retarded as a result of inaccurate test scores was the basis for the suit which was filed on behalf of nine Mexican-American public school students from Spanish-speaking families. This case directly involved individual assessment practices of school psychologists. When retested in Spanish, seven of the nine scored higher than the IQ cutoff score for mentally retarded classification. The plaintiffs argued that cultural differences were the reason why children with Spanish surnames received lower scores on IQ tests. Although

the case was settled out of court, the final consent decree required that:

1. Children are to be tested in their primary language. Interpreters may be used when a bilingual examiner is not available.
2. Mexican-American and Chinese children in classes for educable mentally retarded are to be retested and evaluated.
3. The state will undertake immediate efforts to develop and standardize an appropriate IQ test.
4. Special efforts are to be extended to aid misplaced children readjust to the regular classroom (Note 4).

Another case, nearly identical to Diana (Note 4), was filed in Arizona in 1972. Guadalupe Organization, Inc. vs. Tempe Elementary School District (Note 5) involved the overrepresentation of minority students in classes for the mildly retarded. The consent decree which resulted from this case included the same assessment requirements in Diana (Note 4). Reschly (1979) pointed out additional requirements of the Guadalupe (Note 5) decree which were later incorporated in federal legislation:

1. No child shall be placed in programs for the mildly retarded unless the intelligence test score is two or more standard deviations below the mean.
2. Intelligence test results shall not

be the exclusive or the primary basis for classifying children as mentally retarded.

3. If the child's primary language competence was determined to be in some language other than English, classification decisions were to be based upon nonverbal or performance-type measures.
4. Assessment of adaptive behavior must be done through, but not limited to, an interview with the parents or guardian in the child's name (p. 220).

Reschly (1979) further discussed how the Guadalupe case (Note 5) required several other procedures which were incorporated in federal legislation and have implications for school psychologists. These are informed consent for evaluation and placement, due process procedures, and the integration of programs for handicapped students with regular class students.

In 1971, six black, elementary school-aged children attending the San Francisco school system filed suit in federal district court charging racial discrimination. The case, Larry P. vs. Riles (Note 6), eventually took eight years to be decided and has been viewed as a landmark decision having far-reaching effects on the assessment practices of school psychologists. The plaintiffs all had been placed in classes for the mildly retarded ostensibly because of low intelligence test scores. They claimed that

they were not retarded, but that their placement was the result of culturally biased intelligence tests. In support of their claim, evidence was presented demonstrating higher scores (above the cutoff point for mild retardation) when they were retested by black psychologists who reworded test items in language more consistent with their cultural background. The plaintiffs further contended that the school system's testing practices resulted in a disproportionate number of black children being placed in classes for the mildly retarded in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In June 1972, the Federal District Court of Northern California issued a preliminary injunction restraining the San Francisco School District from:

...placing black students in classes for the educable mentally retarded on the basis of criteria which place primary reliance on the results of IQ tests as they are currently administered, if the consequences of such criteria is racial imbalance in the composition of such classes (Note 6).

At the time of the injunction blacks constituted 28.5 percent of all students in the San Francisco school system while 66 percent of all students in programs for the mildly retarded were black.

In 1974, an appellate tribunal affirmed the lower court's order and approved the plaintiff's motion to broaden

the injunction. The result was prohibition of the administration of individual intelligence tests to all black children in the state. The state of California subsequently banned the use of IQ tests to place any child, regardless of race, in classes for the mildly retarded throughout the state. The case continued, however, until October 1979, when the court decided that the preliminary injunction should become permanent.

Bias in assessment instruments was a central issue in the Larry P. case (Note 6). Judge Peckham clearly regarded test bias as the central issue when he stated:

If defendants could have shown here that disproportionate enrollment in EMR classes actually reflected and tapped a greater incidence of mild mental retardation in the black child population, and not cultural bias, then defendant's EMR placement process could have survived. (Larry P. vs. Riles, p. 61, Note 6).

The National Association of School Psychologists devoted its Spring 1980, issue of The School Psychology Review to the Larry P. decision. Bersoff (1980) discussed the profound effect the decision will have on school psychology and special education. He maintained that the decision "has sensitized psychologists and other mental health professionals to the fact that they will be held responsible for their conduct" (p. 122). He also viewed the attack on

psychological testing as a catalyst to accelerate the search for alternative means of assessment.

Reschly (1980) apparently remained somewhat ambivalent about the Larry P. decision. He felt that the narrow issue of test bias should be broadened to issues concerning the usefulness and fairness of assessment procedures in developing effective programs for children. He agreed with the current trends in special education which include "collection and consideration of a broader variety of information; closer links between assessment and intervention; and more emphasis on behavioral data collected in specific situations" (p. 133).

MacMillan and Meyers (1980) elaborated their concerns over the Larry P. decision. They felt that the ban on IQ testing would result in placements based on "subjective, misinterpreted evidence that cannot be contradicted by an IQ" (p. 146).

Madden (1980), one of the plaintiff's trial counsel in Larry P., pointed out that the same over-representation of black children in classes for the mildly retarded found in California exists across the nation. The effects of this litigation on the practice of school psychology in the United States should result in improved assessment practices in line with the spirit of federal legislation regarding

special education.

The results of litigation brought before a United States District Court in Illinois in July, 1980, contradicted the decision in the Larry P. case. The PASE vs. Hannon case (Note 8) was a class action suit filed on behalf of all black children who had been or will be placed in classes for the educable mentally handicapped (EMH) in the Chicago school system. The suit alleged that the use of culturally biased intelligence tests, the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC), the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (WISC-R), and the Stanford-Binet, violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, and the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1975. Plaintiffs sought a permanent injunction against the use of these standard I.Q. tests in the evaluation of black children for EMH placement.

John F. Grady, the District Judge in the case, heard testimony from the plaintiff's experts. He then analyzed each item of the tests in question and determined:

The WISC, WISC-R, and Stanford-Binet tests, when used in conjunction with the statutorily mandated other criteria for determining an appropriate educational program for a child, do not discriminate against black children in the Chicago public schools.

Grady did find one item on the Stanford-Binet and a total of eight items on the WISC and WISC-R were culturally biased against black children or "at least sufficiently suspect that their use is inappropriate," but held that "there is no evidence that misassessments that do occur are the result of racial bias in test items or in any other aspect of the assessment process currently in use in the Chicago public school system" (Note 8, p. 108).

The PASE vs. Hannon decision differed significantly from the decision reached in the Larry P. case. Not only were there no injunctions issued which would limit or ban the use of standardized intelligence tests for placement into EMH classes, but Judge Grady's scrutiny of the instruments in question resulted in the finding that the tests were not racially biased.

Considering that the PASE v. Hannon case was heard at a time when many school psychologists were becoming apprehensive about the use of standardized intelligence tests, the decision was welcomed news. Non-discriminatory assessment procedures had, by that time, become a topic of great concern among practitioners because of their inclusion of federal law.

Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975), reflects the influence of special education litigation. Reschly (1978) pointed out that the legislative guidelines are nearly identical to consent decrees issued by the courts in the 1970's. He noted that the guidelines are stated in general terms with few precise or specific suggestions for practitioners. He also claimed that because of the general nature of the legislation, much discussion and future research will be needed to clarify practitioners' roles in meeting legislative mandates.

Special Education Legislation and School Psychology

Federal Legislation

Public Law 94-142 was passed by Congress in 1975 as a revision of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1970. Regarded as the "Bill of Rights" for handicapped learners, many sections of the act have significant implications for the field of school psychology (Weintraub and Abeson, 1976; Kabler, 1977; Lupiani, 1978; Abramowitz, 1981).

Although implications of the mandates on the profession of school psychology have been a topic of concern in the

literature, the law does not contain any specific clause mandating the school psychologists' role in assessment or placement procedures. Psychological services are mentioned only in the Related Services section of the original act (Sec. 4 (a) (17)). Amendments to the regulations published in 1977, include the definition of psychological services. Apparently, Congress expected the states to decide which group of professionals would provide various services to handicapped learners by stating that there are:

certain kinds of services which might be provided by persons from varying professional backgrounds and with a variety of operational titles, depending upon requirements in individual states. For example, counseling services might be provided by social workers, psychologists or guidance counselors; and psychological testing might be done by qualified psychological examiners, psychometrists, or psychologists, depending upon State standards (Federal Register, 1977, p. 42480).

The absence of mandated participation by a school psychologist in the evaluation and placement of handicapped children has been a topic of concern in recent literature. Ysseldyke (1978) advocated direct input from the profession to amend the mandates in an effort by school psychologists to "create their own destiny" (p. 378). Other writers advocated political activities to strengthen the role and influence of the profession in order to enable school

psychologists to meet the needs of handicapped and non-handicapped learners (Bardon, 1976; Hunter, 1977; Hyman, 1978; Mason, 1978).

State Legislation

Virginia State laws and regulations are more specific than the federal mandates regarding the procedures in evaluating handicapped children and making recommendations for program placement. Although the definition of psychological services was taken directly from the federal regulations, the Virginia regulations include a psychological evaluation as one of four assessment components necessary to determine the eligibility of children for special education programs. The Regulations and Administrative Requirements for the Operation of Special Education Programs in Virginia (Note 7) define psychological assessment as: "written report from an approved psychologist based on the use of a battery of appropriate instruments which shall include individual intelligence test(s) and psycho-educational tests" (1978, p. 18). Although this definition is far from being comprehensive, it does mandate the inclusion of a school psychologist in the determination of eligibility for special education.

Both state and federal legislation contain provisions

which mandate open access to records, an aspect of the mandates which directly affects school psychologists. Originating in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, it was restated in Section 615 (b) (1) (A) of P.L. 94-142. This section of the law provides parents or guardians the right to inspect and review any personally identifiable data relating to their children which are collected, maintained, or used by the agency. Parents of children under the age of 18, or students themselves over 18 years of age have access to all test information, reports and any personal notes in a students' folder. In addition, if a parent requests an impartial hearing, all records become open to any participant in the hearing, including any outside evaluators who might have been employed by the family.

Lupiani (1978) stated that this open access to records provision results in ethical dilemmas and the threat of litigation for the school psychologist. He agreed with Turnbull (1977) that the intent of the legislation is to make education responsive to the individual, rather than to the system. He added, however, that the threat of a damage suit is terrifying, and "what the laws might do to shape the future of school psychology is disheartening" (p. 248).

In a study conducted in New Jersey, Zampardi (1977)

found that school psychologists had altered some of their previous report writing procedures as a result of this open-access policy. Most of the psychologists, however, felt that the provision was a positive move in the best interest of children.

Other Influences

The development of the profession of school psychology in the United States was shaped by a variety of forces. Although a wealth of literature exists which documents major influences in the advent and development of school psychology during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, this review will focus on the development of school psychological services during the second half of this century.

In 1954, the Thayer Conference was held at West Point, New York. Although many professions were represented, the primary goal of the conference was to establish the functions, qualifications and training needs of school psychologists. At that time a great deal of debate focused on the development of a definition for school psychologists (Wallin and Ferguson, 1967). The final conference report, School Psychologists at Mid-Century (Cutts, 1955), established a single definition with the following statement:

The school psychologist is a psychologist with training and experience in

education. He uses his specialized knowledge of assessment, learning, and interpersonal relationships to assist school personnel to enrich the experience and growth of all children, and to recognize and deal with exceptional children (p. 30).

This early definition provides some insight on the expectations of school psychologists. During the 1950's "exceptional children" who received the services of school psychologists were usually classified as mentally retarded or "demonstrating behavioral problems." As schools began to enforce compulsory attendance statutes and provide broader services to exceptional children, the term "special education" became increasingly more commonplace. Good (1959) provided an early definition of special education in his Dictionary of Education:

...The education of pupils (for example, the deaf, the blind and partially seeing, the mentally subnormal, the gifted) who deviate so far physically, mentally, emotionally, or socially from the relative homogeneous groups of so-called "normal" people that the standard curriculum is not suitable for their educational needs; involves the modification of the standard curriculum in content, methods of instruction, and expected rate of progress to provide optimal educational opportunity for such pupils; carried on in special classes, in special curricula, or in special schools (p. 515).

In 1954, Mackie and Dunn estimated that approximately 12.7 percent of the nation's public school population required

"special attention" (p. 3). This attention was provided in many instances by individuals trained in diagnosing learning and behavior problems (i.e., school psychologists). As special education developed, increasing numbers of school psychologists were hired to perform diagnostic assessments. Therefore, it is logical that school psychology and programs for exceptional children have become closely related (Wallin and Ferguson, 1967).

In many states the development of special education provided legal provisions for child-study or psychological services. In Illinois, for example, provisions were made by the State Department of Education to encourage employment of school psychologists by providing financial reimbursement to local school districts (Jolles, 1954).

Professional organizations also had and continue to have a great deal of influence on the development of school psychology (Ramage, 1981; Tindall, 1979; Brown, 1981; Bennett, 1970). The American Psychological Association (APA) formed Division 16 in 1947. Designed to attend to developments and problems in school psychology, its constitution states three purposes: 1) to provide opportunities for professional fellowship and for exchange of professional ideas among school psychologists; 2) to advance the professional status of school psychology; and 3) to promote

Attention Patron:

Page 48 is missing from
all copies

evil in society while maintaining its position as the perpetuator of the society which supports it. School psychologists...are attempting to work with whole groups who exhibit learning disabilities that are primarily socio-cultural in origin (p. 167).

White (1968-69) noted that concerns regarding the education of disadvantaged children have impacted heavily on the role of the school psychologist. She pointed out that society's future view of schooling would determine the future role of school psychologists. The expansion of the role and function of school psychologists because of changes in societal demands has been a topic of concern as indicated in the literature (Barclay, 1973; Gilmore and Chandy, 1973; Hohenshil, 1974; Hyman and Myers, 1973).

Recent societal conditions impacting on school psychological services were outlined by Guidubaldi (1981). He referred to his editorial statement in The School Psychology Review (Fall 1980):

It seems abundantly clear that school psychologists can no longer maintain a singular definition of family, nor can they assume that most families are providing traditional and familiar socializing influences. As a key link between home and school, the school psychologist has a unique opportunity to help shape new family environments and child-rearing practices (p. 293).

Guidubaldi continued by citing alarming statistics

regarding changes in familial conditions. Divorce rates resulting in single parent families, high mobility rate of families, and increased numbers of working mothers were mentioned as having a great influence on the need for school-based psychological intervention. Guidubaldi also cited declining nationally-administered standardized test scores, school crime and delinquency, and the public's general disillusionment and criticism of public schools as further societal influences on the functioning of school psychologists.

A recent influence on the profession of school psychology involves school psychologists' roles in career and vocational education. Prior to 1973, the professional literature contained no references specifically related to school psychologists' roles in occupational training programs (Hohenshil, 1981). In subsequent years many articles have been published and several studies have been conducted related to the expansion of school psychologists' roles. These studies investigated career development activities and duties related to the vocational preparation of secondary students and adults.

Pfeffer (1978) conducted a study to analyze proposed functions related to career education for school psychologists' present and future performance. By surveying individuals in positions of leadership within the NASP,

Pfeffer found minimal involvement in career education-related activities on the part of school psychologists.

He concluded:

...school psychology needs to prepare its members for participation in career education since an overwhelming majority of the respondents believe present training to be inadequate for this task (Pfeffer, 1978, p. 197).

A similar study was conducted in 1982 by surveying a random sample of practicing school psychologists who were members of NASP. Shepard found that although practitioners viewed career development activities as important, they were only minimally involved in these functions. Shepard noted that "particular attention should be paid toward establishing working relationships with other professionals who are involved in career education services" (Shepard, 1982, p. 122).

Opinions and Reactions

Many authors have expressed their opinions regarding the manner in which school psychological services are delivered. Criticisms of current practices and suggestions for alternative service delivery models have been popular in recent years. Categorization is difficult. Most authors do, however, agree that the traditional "gate-keeper" function of school psychologists has interfered with efforts by the profession to expand its influence to other important

areas of education.

Singer, Whiton and Fried (1970) advocated the use of group process and social systems theory to aid children with school adjustment difficulties and increase their learning. They believed that school psychologists, as educational consultants, could be more effective in bringing about positive changes in the public schools. As consultants to a head-start program, these researchers described their successful efforts to reduce anxiety around authority relationships and improve both attendance and behavior. They advocated psychological service delivery by external consultants.

Kohlberg (1972) stressed recent findings in developmental psychology as the basis for his model of service delivery. He advocated the stimulation of cognitive and emotional development of children through psychologist-provided teaching, discussion and dialogue with students. Kohlberg pointed out that the prevention of mental illness would not result from school psychologists spending all their time with emotionally disturbed youngsters. He advocated the need for all children to have psychological input in order for them to develop appropriately and to prevent learning and adjustment difficulties.

Cowen and Lorion (1976) and McGuiness (1976) stressed

large group screening processes designed to provide early detection and prevention of school adjustment problems. Prevention rather than remediation was emphasized by these authors. They felt that school psychologists should provide consultation with parents, teachers, and other school personnel and should be involved in the recruitment, training and supervision of nonprofessional help agents. De-emphasis of the traditional clinical child psychology role was advocated because of past failures in reducing the incidence of children with learning and behavior problems.

Psycho-educational assessment in the context of instructional dynamics among teachers and students was discussed by Porter and Holzberg (1979). This model stressed the teacher and school psychologist working together as a team to decide upon the most useful areas for assessment, data gathering and the generation of practical implications of the assessment findings. The authors provided an example of the model applied in the assessment of a deaf, multihandicapped student.

Larger team participation through the mandates of P.L. 94-142 was discussed by Pryzwansky (1981). The author stressed the merits of the team approach to psycho-educational assessment and programming, but cautioned that "preliminary reactions to team experiences would suggest that the

approach has been easier to write into law than to implement effectively" (p. 460). Pryzwansky noted that additional competencies may be needed by school psychologists before they can participate effectively in formulating the decision-making approach while enhancing team efforts. He advocated research in the concepts underlying the theory of teams; the nature of the team decision-making process; and the reactions of team members to the team experience.

Placement team participation and role satisfaction was investigated in a study conducted in Connecticut by Yoshida, Fenton, Maxwell and Kaufman (1976). The investigators indicated that school psychologists ranked highest of all team members on variables of participation and satisfaction of their roles on pupil placement teams. It appeared that school psychologists in this study felt positively about their role in assessment and educational planning within the team concept.

Many writers have advocated increased consultation functions for school psychologists. Gibbons (1978) felt that the mandates of P.L. 94-142 gave increased impetus for school psychologists to clearly define and delineate the services they can provide teachers, parents and administrators. He analyzed specific aspects of the mandates which provide school psychologists opportunities to increase

their consultation role. Gibbons claimed that school psychologists' expertise in evaluation should be used in an on-going, problem-solving relationship between teacher and psychologist to evaluate the goals and objectives on children's IEP's (Individualized Education Program). He felt that the psychologist can be seen as a resource person who can offer in-service training for regular teachers who may have disabled children integrated into their classes. Affective education, changing attitudes toward the handicapped, and individualizing instruction were noted as important areas of needed in-service training which could be offered by school psychologists in home instruction activities, behavior modification techniques and interpretation of educational goals and objectives. Gibbons summarized by stating that school psychologists should take advantage of the mandates of P.L. 94-142 for developing and improving consultative services in the schools.

Reschly (1976) discussed three models of consultation which could be used by school psychologists. He claimed that the concept consultation had been previously used to describe practically any form of service. Reschly believed that in order to give the concept meaning it is necessary to specify differences between the consultant and other roles of school psychologists. He claimed that previous efforts

by the profession to improve the educational system by individual casework resulted in ineffectiveness; hence greater change must be based on consultation. Reschly advocated consultation through either a mental health model based on clinical theories of personality development; an organizational development model based on Lewin's phenomenology; or a behavioral consultation approach based on the work of Skinner and Watson. In order for these approaches to succeed, Reschly asserted they must become the major role of the school psychologist.

Earlier articles addressed the consultative role of school psychologists. Hops (1971) reported a program of school psychologist consultation to help teachers use operant conditioning techniques to reduce undesirable behaviors in a large class of acting-out boys in Oregon. Ebert, Dain and Philips (1970) discussed a consultation model used in a Texas learning laboratory classroom for mostly disadvantaged minority students. The school psychologist acted as a consultant to aid other staff members using psychological principles to formulate educational recommendations. These recommendations were designed to avoid labelling and increase integration with the total program.

Alpert and Trachtman (1978) discussed how varying degrees of consultation by school psychologists as efforts to

meet the mandates of P.L. 94-142 could result in a "death penalty" for consultation or "life imprisonment", or "freedom". The authors claimed that if school psychologists spent most of their time completing psycho-educational assessments, consultative functions would be sentenced to the "death penalty". In order to meet the least restrictive environment provision of the mandates school psychologists need to provide indirect service involving communication patterns, problem-solving methods and decision-making procedures with parents and teachers. This type of consultation, according to Alpert and Trachtman, would result in a "verdict" of "life imprisonment" because this method of consultation has been offered over the last decade and apparently has not resulted in any flexibility. The authors claimed that "freedom" will be achieved if school psychologists use a model they called "environmental consultation". This model included assessing classroom environments and facilitating environmental change by utilizing procedures such as survey feedback, etc.

Other writers in the field have expressed opinions regarding why school psychologists function in varied manners. Ysseldyke (1978) claimed that while school psychologists were busy arguing about their role and function, the courts, the legislature and special education administrators have deter-

mined the destiny of their profession. He pointed out that school psychologists are not prepared to carry out what the law mandates. Ysseldyke felt, however, that involvement in educational planning through the development of IEP's was encouraging to the profession. He also noted that implementing the least restrictive environment regulation was a positive step. Diversification of function and retraining will be necessary for school psychologists in order for them to meet the mandates of P.L. 94-142 (Yesseldyke, 1978).

Kuriloff (1975) wrote that because of the past responsibility of school psychologists to act as gatekeepers for entry into special education programs, the profession has been criticized for labelling or mislabelling handicapped children. Court decisions have furthered this negative image. Kuriloff pointed out that school psychologists need to prepare themselves to become expert witnesses and warned of personal liability suits for "misapplication of power". He then continued by citing a Pennsylvania study designed to measure variables which influenced the functioning of school psychologists. Through extensive interviews with special education administrative personnel, principals, guidance counselors, social workers and teachers the investigation concluded:

In the context of a highly centralized, formal urban school organization, school psychologists tended to define their roles narrowly, as professionals certifying through testing the placement of children according to the letter of state statutes. This meant children's needs were fulfilled most often when they coincided with organizational demands and expectations. In the context of a decentralized, informal rural school organization, school psychologists tended to define their role broadly, as professionals seeking the most appropriate placement of children through testing, observation of current and proposed placements, consultations with teachers and parents, and follow-up evaluations of individuals and programs. This meant children's needs were usually fulfilled, even when they conflicted with organizational imperatives (p. 340).

Bardon (1976) expressed his opinion on factors which influence the profession. He claimed that school psychology is a "specialty in disequilibrium" and is directly affected by movements in psychology, education and allied fields.

Psychologist - Pupil Ratio

Both the National Association of School Psychologists and the American Psychological Association suggest that an appropriate school psychologist-to-student ratio is 1:2,500. The psychologist-to-student ratio is an important variable in determining the effectiveness of school psychologists. Monroe (1979) noted other important variables to consider when judging the appropriateness

of this ratio:

It may not be appropriate to set an ideal ratio from a national perspective, as a workable ratio of pupils to psychological personnel would seem to be dependent upon many factors, including the characteristics of the population served, the density of the population, and the availability of other professional staff (p. 27).

Several studies have been conducted which provide data useful for understanding the state-of-the art of school psychology. They also provide a method of comparing individual state ratios with national averages. Ramage (1979) reported the results of her 1976 national survey. Included for comparison were the results of the national survey conducted by Farling and Hoedt (1971). In addition to asking respondents to note their present psychologist-to-student ratio, Ramage also solicited respondents' perceptions of an ideal ratio:

<u>Psychologist/Student</u>	<u>Actual 1970</u>	<u>Actual 1976</u>	<u>Ideal 1976</u>
1:500 or less	-	7%	28%
1:1,000	3%	6%	26%
1:1,500	-	9%	21%
1:2,000	10%	18%	17%
1:3,000	18%	24%	7%
1:4,000	3%	14%	1%
1:5,000	28%	9%	1%
1:6,000	3%	5%	0%
1:7,000	3%	2%	0%
1:8,000	3%	1%	0%
1:9,000 or more	15%	5%	0%

(Ramage, 1979, p. 160)

Ramage concluded these data indicate that the role and function of school psychologists is made more difficult

due to high ratios of students to school psychologists. She also claimed, on the basis of opinions of ideal ratios, there is a shortage of school psychologists to carry out appropriate functions.

Kicklighter (1976) collected demographic information on school psychologists from each state in the country. He reported a mean psychologist-to-pupil ratio of 1:4,800 with a range of 1:1,000 in Connecticut to 1:47,000 in Wyoming.

Results of the 1979 national survey by the NASP and APA indicated that approximately 61% of the respondents worked in school divisions with a psychologist-to-student ratio within recommended limits, i.e., 1:2,500 or less. (NASP Communique, April/May 1981)

Training Needs

Continuing professional development for school psychologists has not been an area addressed in the literature until recent times. Much has been written about pre-service training programs for the field of school psychology, but scarce attention has been given to programs designed to update the skills of practitioners.

Ramage (1979) reported results of a national survey of

school psychologists conducted in 1976 prior to the impact of P.L. 94-142. The purpose of the survey was to update an earlier data base on the field of school psychology conducted by Farling and Hoedt (1971). The survey contained a section which asked respondents to identify specific areas in which they felt they needed additional training. The five areas most frequently cited were: 1) assessment of emotional handicaps (33%); 2) consultation skills (31%); 3) projective instrument usage (28%); 4) counseling skills (25%); and 5) assessment of neurologically handicapped children (24%) (Ramage, 1979, p. 155). When presenting her conclusions Ramage noted that it would be interesting to compare these results with data obtained after P.L. 94-142 had been implemented.

Several authors have investigated continuing education needs of school psychologists since the passage of P.L. 94-142 and subsequent state legislation. Mowder and DeMartino (1978) surveyed 250 school psychologists in New York. The investigators developed a continuing education questionnaire which solicited responses regarding interest in participating in forms of professional development; the conditions under which they would attend such training; and the areas of study they would choose. Respondents were also asked what length of time they preferred to devote to

study, preferred location of the training, and how much they were willing to spend. A majority of the respondents indicated a willingness to attend workshops of three to five days duration, located within commuting distance of their hometowns, with or without credit. They indicated the following areas of greatest concern for future training (in order): learning disabilities/emotional disturbance; counseling and interviewing techniques; assessment techniques with various areas of exceptionality; neuropsychological assessment; group dynamics and counseling; and preschool assessment. Mowder and DeMartino noted that the areas of learning disabilities, preschool assessment, and assessment techniques with various areas of exceptionality were also concerns specified in state and federal laws regarding education for handicapped children.

Goldwasser (1979) asked school psychologists in New York to list their priorities of desired training and where they would prefer to receive such training. Respondents indicated the following four priorities for future training (in order): 1) legal implications on their role (58%); 2) role of the school psychologist under regulations and laws (45%) 3) educational diagnosis (42%); and 4) non-discriminatory assessment (34%). Professional conferences were preferred for obtaining this training (61%), followed

by in-service training (55%), local college (25%), and independent study (25%). Approximately one-fifth of all respondents felt they did not need additional training (Goldwasser, 1979).

Results of the 1979 national survey of school psychologists conducted jointly by the American Psychological Association and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP Communique, April/May, 1981) resulted in slightly different preferences. Respondents to the national survey indicated the following priorities for future training (in order): 1) nondiscriminatory assessment (64%); 2) legal implications on their role (63%); 3) educational diagnosis (49%); and 4) role of the school psychologist under regulations and laws (41%). Respondents to this study indicated they preferred to receive this training through: 1) attending workshops (72%); 2) reading professional journals and books (54%); 3) attending professional conventions (38%); and 4) graduate course work for credit (25%).

Ysseldyke (1978) noted the need for school psychologists to update their skills in regard to recent legislative mandates. He also elaborated his concerns relative to realistic efforts school psychologists will make to obtain these skills:

Most school psychologists will not return to university settings to develop competence in the kinds of new activities in which they are being required to engage. The knowledge must somehow be brought to them. We need to address the training issue at all levels. Leadership is needed to encourage local and state education agencies to provide inservice activities specifically addressed to the needs of school psychologists (p. 377).

Recruitment and Retention of Special Education Personnel in Rural Areas

Helge (1981) reported the results of a 1978-1979 study of personnel shortages in rural areas. Ninety-four percent of the 21 states sampled reported acute problems in recruiting and retaining special education personnel in rural areas. Sontag and Button (1980) reported as many as 5,000 special education teaching vacancies in remote, isolated or culturally distinct rural areas throughout the nation. These rural schools serve approximately 32% of the nation's public school children, but because of personnel shortages and difficulties in retaining qualified special education staff, the majority of unserved and underserved handicapped children live in rural areas (Sher, 1978).

Several authors have offered their perceptions of the problems facing rural school districts in regard to recruiting and retaining special education personnel. Helge (1981)

noted inadequate numbers of trained personnel to meet the demands of compliance with the mandates of P.L. 94-142.

Sontag and Button (1980) highlighted the fact that special education personnel have not been trained to adjust to the demands of rural areas. They stated:

The difficulty posed by such areas is not the problem of preparing sheer numbers of teachers, but of preparing teachers who are willing and capable of teaching in areas which impose disincentives to the majority of teachers (p. 6).

These "disincentives" for special education personnel in rural areas have been described by others. Flax, Wagenfeld, Ivens, and Weiss (1979) pointed out transportation difficulties, small numbers of low incidence handicapped, widely scattered populations, geographic isolation, poverty, and conflicting values as problems which impede the delivery of comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Sher (1978) noted the small amount of state and federal monies allocated to rural communities. Hughes (1982) added that in addition to these small allocations, rural areas' low tax base results in lower salaries for rural school personnel.

Bina (1982) found that supervision of special education personnel in rural areas also represented a problem. Frequency of supervision in rural school divisions was more

difficult due to geographic variables and itinerant schedules, and was found to be a negative factor in special education personnel morale and "burn-out" (Bina, 1982, p. 3).

Solutions to the problems associated with the recruitment and retention of special education personnel have been discussed in the literature. The American Council on Rural Special Education (ACRES) has recently established the ACRES Task Force on Recruitment and Retention in Rural Areas. Although the strategies of this task force are forthcoming, the thrust of their work will involve emphasizing the positive aspects of rural America.

In an article titled, How to Keep Them in Rural Appalachia, Wilson (1982) suggested possible approaches to the recruitment-retention problem in special education. Attempts to interest rural college-bound students in special education and related fields were mentioned. Part-time employment of other local agency personnel, e. g., speech therapists or audiologists, was also advocated. Inservice instruction through local colleges as a means of developing additional competencies for existing staff was another suggestion given by Wilson.

Gibson (1982) described the efforts of the Northeast Colorado Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) in overcoming problems with the recruitment and retention of special education teachers. The BOCES

formulated three strategies: 1) developing and accentuating the positive; 2) active self and group involvement in problem solving; and 3) creating coalitions for positive actions (Gibson, 1982). Results of these strategies were not clearly indicated, however, the author claimed "increased staff enthusiasm and momentum" (p. 13).

Clearly, luring qualified special education personnel to rural areas, and retaining their services, is a great concern for rural school divisions. In order to meet the demands of state and federal regulations and adequately serve handicapped and non-handicapped children, rural school districts must develop long-term policies which will facilitate recruiting new special education staff while reducing the turnover rate of existing personnel.

The turnover rate for school psychologists employed in rural areas was found by Hughes (1982) to be much higher than that of urban practitioners. An understanding of this phenomenon is gained through examination of the literature related to rural school psychology problems and factors which effect the overall job satisfaction of rural school psychologists.

Rural School Psychology

Although recent interest in rural school psychology has

surfaced, professional literature contains only a sparse number of references addressing the unique problems encountered by rural school divisions regarding the delivery of school psychological services. In a fairly comprehensive article published through ACRES, Fagan (1982) outlined the problems in rural school psychology. He stated that the development and growth of the profession in rural areas was inhibited by two factors: incidence and population. Because of the relatively low incidence of handicapping conditions and the low population of rural areas, Fagan noted that community sensitivity to the problems of the handicapped tended to be less than in rural areas with higher incidences and greater populations. Fagan offered the following table delineating the historical stages of advancement in the development of school psychological services in rural areas:

1. No Services
2. State Department of Education Circuit Examiners
3. State Department of Education Supervision of Regional Circuit Examiners
4. Private Circuit Examiners From Nearby Communities
5. University Based Clinics
6. Contracts With Mental Health Facilities
7. Services of a School Psychologist Employed by a Mental Health Center
8. Services Obtained From a Special Education Agreement District
9. Services Obtained by School Districts Sharing the Employment of a School Psychologist

10. Services Obtained by School Districts
Hiring Their Own Full-time School
Psychologist(s) (Fagan, 1982, p. 6)

Of notable interest to the present investigation, Fagan clearly stated his assumption that full-time services were superior to other arrangements. He continued by outlining specific problems related to attracting and retaining qualified school psychologists in rural areas: lack of understanding by parents and school personnel about the role and function of school psychologists; heavy caseloads; isolation from other psychologists; and the perception of the school psychologist as a "test-giver" only (Fagan, 1982, p. 6).

The rural South was mentioned by Fagan as a particularly troublesome area for the full delivery of school psychological services. He pointed out the common practice of school districts contracting "psychological examiners" who possess "dubious credentials" to assess no less than three or four children per day (Fagan, 1982, p. 7). He also noted that in the long run, these contracting school divisions actually pay more for services because of the additional expenses they face for counseling, consultation and inservice education; services a full-time school psychologist could provide.

Another problem with contracting school psychologists, mentioned by Fagan, was the likelihood of placement errors in special education programs resulting in litigation and due process hearings. Fagan concluded his discussion of the problems in rural school psychology by listing the results of unspecified surveys. These problems included: large distances traveled by rural school psychologists; lack of knowledge of local channels of communication; inadequate space; limited availability of quality school personnel to serve in rural areas; and non-acceptance by other school personnel (Fagan, 1982, p. 7).

The Committee on Rural School Psychology of Division 16 (APA) developed and ranked thirteen problems they perceived as troublesome for rural school psychologists. The list was reported by Trenary (1981 B) and used in a study to determine how the Committee's perceptions compared with the perceptions of newly trained rural school psychologists who had previously been employed in rural areas. The following table represents the rankings of the Committee and the rural school psychologists.

COMPARISON OF RANK ORDERINGS OF THE PROBLEMS OF
RURAL SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

	<u>Div. 16 Committee</u>	<u>Rural School Psychologists</u>
	Final Order	Final Order
1. Heavy caseload	1	3
2. Little understanding of school psychologist's role by parents, teachers, administrators	2	1
3. Isolation from other psychologists	3	5
4. Much travelling	4	6
5. Limited availability of quality school personnel to serve in rural areas	5	4
6. Lack of understanding of exceptional children by parents, other school personnel	6	2
7. Non-acceptance by other school personnel	7	10
8. Inadequate space	8	9
9. Distance to universities for information, support	9	8
10. Lack of knowledge of local channels of communication	10	7
11. Value system differences	11	12
12. Test instruments sometimes inappropriate for rural kids	12	11
13. Local language usage differences	13	13

Trenary's further analysis of the rankings indicated that the perceptions of the Committee differed significantly from those of the school psychologists for numbers 2, 3, 6, 7, and 13. Trenary suggested these results indicated that offering additional training in psychoeducational assessment to school personnel already working in rural areas can reduce: 1) difficulties of isolation from other psychologists; 2) non-acceptance by other school personnel, and 3) local language usage differences (Trenary 1981 B, p. 4).

DeMers, Cohen and Fontana (1981) found through a survey of Division 16 members of APA that rural school psychologists reported higher psychologist-to-student ratios, more buildings to serve, and fewer colleagues than did their urban and suburban counterparts. These investigators also found that rural school psychologists had a more direct line to top administration and speculated that this might create a problem in terms of being supervised most likely by a non-psychologist (1981, p. 5).

Hughes (1982) reported the likelihood of two variables as important determinants of employment termination by rural school psychologists; community non-support for psychological services and job dissatisfaction.

Determinants of Job Satisfaction

Unlike rural school psychology, job satisfaction and

its implications have been a topic of concern by many representing the disciplines of psychology, sociology, education, etc. For the purpose of this review, specific determinants of job satisfaction as they relate to the practice of rural school psychology will be discussed.

Anderson (1982) completed a comprehensive job satisfaction literature review as part of a doctoral dissertation on the job satisfaction of full-time school psychologists in the United States. Anderson noted nine determinants of job satisfaction which surfaced in the literature:

1. salary
2. repetitious tasks
3. task variety
4. job environment
5. co-workers
6. supervision
7. advancement opportunities
8. autonomy
9. achievement

(Anderson, 1982) .

Anderson cautioned that there was little agreement in the literature regarding 1) the relative importance of these determinants; 2) the definition and measurement of job satisfaction; and 3) the relationship between job satisfaction and other life satisfactions. Each of the nine determinants listed by Anderson will be discussed as they relate to rural school psychology, and, specifically, rural contract or part-time school psychology.

1. Salary

Although the salaries of rural school psychologists are generally lower than their urban or suburban counterparts (Sher, 1978; Hughes, 1982; Fagan, 1982), rural contract or part-time school psychologists probably earn comparable, if not higher wages, than do most full-time practitioners. This remains to be substantiated by the results of this investigation, but appears logical given the demand for rural school psychological services and the apparent shortage of qualified, willing practitioners. There is disagreement over the relationship between salary and job satisfaction. Most authors support a strong positive relationship between pay and job satisfaction (Ewen, 1966; Portugal, 1976; Barbash, 1976; Kasl, 1977; Phillips and Hays, 1978), but others support a lesser relationship (Hoppock, 1935; Smith, Kendall and Hullin, 1969; Fagan, 1982).

2. Repetitious Tasks

The tendency for rural school psychologists' duties to be largely psychometric in nature has been discussed in the literature (Goldwasser, 1979; Hughes, 1982; Fagan, 1982). Rural part-time or contract school psychologists are often employed solely for psychometric evaluations (Fagan, 1982). If, indeed, repetitious tasks are negatively related to job

satisfaction as the literature indicates (Hoppock, 1935; Ronan, 1970; Blai, 1970; Portigal, 1976; Kasl, 1977), rural contract or part-time school psychologists should indicate their dissatisfaction with the psychometric nature of their duties.

3. Task Variety

School psychologists are trained to perform a variety of functions; consultation, inservice education, research, etc. Because of erroneous perceptions and lack of understanding by rural school administrators and rural populations pertaining to the wide array of skills school psychologists possess, rural school psychologists are often cast into the "test giver" mold (Fagan, 1982). Again, rural contract or part-time school psychologists are even more inclined to be viewed in this manner; hence their task variety is minimal. Levels of job satisfaction have been found to be negatively related to lack of task variety (Hulin and Smith, 1976; Kasl, 1977; Sarata and Jepsen, 1977; Phillips and Hays, 1978).

4. Job Environment

Rural school psychologists often have to travel great distances to perform their roles. Conditions of roads, lack

of adequate testing and office space, restricted travel and entertainment opportunities have been mentioned as negative factors affecting the recruitment and retention of rural school psychologists (Hughes, 1982; Fagan, 1982). Contract or part-time rural school psychologists most often must travel even greater distances to reach the place of their employment. On the positive side, it is possible that these part-time or contract practitioners reside in less isolated communities, thus reducing the potential for job dissatisfaction because of restricted travel and entertainment opportunities. Portigal (1976) and Kasl (1977) found that job environments were an extremely important determinant of overall job satisfaction.

5. Co-workers

Professional isolation of rural school psychologists has been identified as a problem (Goldwasser, 1979; DeMers, Cohen, and Fontana, 1981; Trenary, 1981; Hughes and Clark, 1981; Fagan, 1982). Rural contract or part-time school psychologists most likely encounter this isolation during their employment, but may have greater opportunities to associate with professional colleagues at or near their place of residence. Kasl (1977) found that job dissatisfaction resulted from inability to associate and interact with other workers. Barbash (1976) and Phillips and Hays

(1978) indicated that social interaction among co-workers was an important determinant in overall job satisfaction.

6. Supervision

Little or no psychological supervision for rural school psychologists was noted by DeMers, Cohen, and Fontana (1981). Rural part-time or contract school psychologists probably encounter the same difficulty given the nature and setting of their employment. The literature indicates that lower levels of job satisfaction result from ambiguous employee-supervisor roles (Kasl, 1970; Barbash, 1976).

7. Advancement Opportunities

Many writers in the field of school psychology have indicated the potential for job dissatisfaction as a result of limited opportunities for school psychologists to advance themselves within the scope of their employment (Grimley, 1978; Ysseldyke, 1978; Alpert, 1980; Anderson, 1982); or as a result of limited advancement because of the narrowness of their current roles (Hayes and Clair, 1978; Ramage, 1979). Rural school psychologists undoubtedly face the same potential dissatisfaction. Rural part-time or contract school psychologists, because of an even greater lack of association with the "system", probably encounter greater obstacles associated with opportunities for advancement. Farris (1971) found that the lack of opportunity for advancement

was negatively associated with employee turnover rates. Graen and Hulin (1968) and Barbash (1976) reported the association of job satisfaction and perceived opportunities for promotions and advancement.

8. Autonomy

Bennett (1970) referred to school psychologists as "guests" in the house of education. She further noted that some school psychologists complain bitterly because they lack authority in the schools (p. 170-171). Hayes and Clair (1978) saw potential dissatisfaction as a result of school psychologists serving both special service administrators and school principals. Rural contract or part-time school psychologists may face even greater dissatisfaction regarding their autonomy because of limited expectancies resulting from narrow roles. Furthermore, if, in fact, part-time school psychologists are seen as "guests" of the system, they might not desire to disturb the status quo; hence they might become dissatisfied with their roles. The literature indicates job dissatisfaction is more likely to occur when employees lack the freedom to control work methods (Portigal, 1976; Kasl, 1977). Sarata and Jeppesen (1977) and Phillips and Hays (1978) reported increased job satisfaction among human service providers when these employees were allowed greater autonomy and independence.

9. Achievement

In his description of what school psychologists are expected to do, Miller (1978) noted that common expectations could be accomplished only by "Almighty" (p. 514). The list of potential job responsibilities for school psychologists is quite lengthy, as noted by Lolli (1980): educational and psychological assessment; individual and group intervention (i.e., counseling, behavior modification); referral and consultation for teachers; referral and consultation for parents; contributor to individual educational plan committee; liaison with community, county, and state social service agencies; faculty counselor, resource person for school district in related areas of expertise (i.e., program evaluation, standardized testing); resource person for special education programs, and child advocate (p. 70). The job of a school psychologist employed full-time by a school district is certainly demanding. To achieve a level of success in the above functions would require, and undoubtedly does, a great deal of effort and commitment. To expect a part-time or contract school psychologist to achieve comparably appears to be a great deal to ask. The need for achievement in work settings is well documented in the literature (Ronan, 1970; Farris, 1971; Portigal, 1976).

Summary

The profession of school psychology has undergone dramatic changes since mid-century. In order for the reader to gain an understanding of the development of the profession, major shaping variables were offered.

Of great importance to the development of the profession were court decisions which directly or indirectly impacted on the role and function of all school psychologists. Highlighting the impact of these court decisions were subsequent federal and state legislation.

State and federal laws and regulations reflected the decisions reached by the courts in regard to the rights of handicapped children. These laws and regulations continue to influence the manner in which school psychological services are delivered.

Although legislative and regulatory requirements have shaped the development of the profession of school psychology, many writers in the field have advocated changes in the manner in which school psychological services are offered. Most leaders in the profession agree that the traditional assessment function of school psychologists must be minimized in order to allow practitioners to utilize their training and expertise in consultation, parent education, counseling, etc.

Recent concern over the practice of school psychology in rural areas has been reflected in the literature. The

tendency for rural school psychologists to be viewed as test-givers only is a particular concern.

Other barriers to the full delivery of school psychological services in rural areas which have been noted in the literature include: 1) difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified school psychologists; 2) high psychologist-to-student ratios; and 3) factors which result in rural school psychologists' job dissatisfaction.

Although the role and function of full-time rural school psychologists has been a topic of concern in the literature, no empirical data has been collected in regard to the strengths and weaknesses of employing rural school psychologists on a part-time or contract basis. The information gathered through this study provides a better understanding of these types of alternative school psychologist employment arrangements.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This investigation sought to gather information relative to the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time or contract rural school psychologists. In addition, relevant information was collected which enabled comparison of these types of alternative service delivery methods with the full-time services of rural school psychologists who participated in Merchant's (1982) study.

This chapter offers the research methodology utilized in the investigation. The methods used to select respondents and the data collection and analysis procedures are discussed.

Respondents

A list of school divisions in Virginia which did not employ full-time school psychologists was obtained from the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Education. Eight school divisions provided school psychological services through part-time or contractual arrangements during the 1982-83 school year. The supervisors of special education from each division who were responsible for arranging the delivery of school psychological services were contacted by telephone to solicit their cooperation in the study. All

eight supervisors agreed to participate. They also provided the investigator with the name(s) and telephone number(s) of the part-time or contract school psychologist(s) who were employed by their school divisions.

These school psychologists were subsequently contacted by telephone and asked to participate in the study. The total population of part-time or contract school psychologists agreed to cooperate. Because one school psychologist served two school divisions and one school division utilized the services of three school psychologists (the researcher was employed by one of the reporting school divisions, but was not included in the study), the total number of school psychologists included in the study was eight. It was explained to these school psychologists and their supervisors that their involvement would include the completion of a survey questionnaire followed by a personal interview with the investigator.

The third group of respondents was rural school principals. They represented all the principals of the eight rural school divisions which employed part-time or contract school psychologists. In addition, to facilitate comparison of service delivery methods, a stratified random sample of rural school principals employed in school divisions which were reported in Merchant's (1982) study (i.e., school divisions with full-time school psychologists) was included in the study. Forty-three rural school principals repre-

senting school divisions employing part-time or contract school psychologists, and forty-three principals representing school divisions employing full-time school psychologists were sent survey materials. The total number of principals representing rural school divisions employing full-time school psychologists (reported by Merchant) was quite large. Therefore, rural school principals were randomly selected using the type of school (i.e. elementary, middle or high) as strata. Of the forty-three principals from each of the two types of school divisions, 12 high school principals, 5 middle school principals, and 26 elementary school principals were sent survey materials. The addresses of these principals were obtained from the 1981-82 Virginia Educational Directory.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Each rural school principal was sent survey materials which included a cover letter, questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and asked for the principal's support. The questionnaire (Appendix D) was developed by the investigator and modified according to suggestions from several area school principals and the investigator's doctoral committee. The questionnaire solicited rural school principals' perceptions of the availability and utilization of services as well as their level of satisfaction with

utilized services.

Each contract or part-time school psychologist was sent a questionnaire containing three sections: personal data, survey of professional practices, and survey of professional issues (Appendix A). The questionnaire was developed by Merchant (1982) and modified for use with this distinct group. Modifications included: 1) additions of questions related to licensure, secretarial service and mileage reimbursement; 2) deletions of questions which did not directly relate to part-time or contract employment; and 3) changes in wording to help clarify several questions. Merchant's questionnaire was chosen to facilitate comparisons between full-time rural school psychological service delivery reported in her study and part-time or contract rural school psychological service delivery being investigated in this study.

After receipt of the questionnaires the investigator scheduled a forty-minute interview with each of the part-time or contract school psychologists. The interviews were used to clarify responses to the questionnaire as well as to surface perceived strengths and weaknesses of the part-time or contract employment relationship. Each of the interviews was tape recorded to ensure complete collection of responses and was structured according to an interview guide (Appendix B). Both the survey questionnaire and the

interview guide were field tested on three doctoral level school psychology graduate students attending Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Each of the field test participants had experience as a part-time or contract school psychologist in nearby rural school divisions. Their comments, additions and deletions were incorporated in the final instruments used in the study (Appendices A and B).

The same procedures were used for data collection from each of the supervisors of contract or part-time school psychologists. The survey questionnaire was developed by the investigator and modified by his doctoral committee (Appendix C). The questionnaire was designed to gather demographic data on each of the eight school divisions and to solicit responses concerning the supervisors' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the part-time or contract relationship. These perceptions were later clarified and expanded during the personal interviews. Each of the interviews varied according to the supervisors' responses to specific questions on the survey instrument. Follow-up telephone contact was used to clarify information gathered during the interviews.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed according to the research questions formulated in Chapter I. In

order to determine the strengths and weaknesses of part-time or contract school psychological services, data collected through the interviews of part-time or contract school psychologists and their supervisors in addition to the supervisors' questionnaires were analyzed. Case studies of each school division employing a part-time or contract school psychologist were developed to highlight favorable and unfavorable aspects of the part-time or contract employment relationship. Cross-case analyses were then completed.

Comparisons of full-time school psychological services to part-time and contract services were accomplished by analyzing the eight questionnaires completed by the part-time or contract school psychologists who participated in this investigation. Their responses were then compared to the responses of all the school psychologists employed in rural school divisions who participated in Merchant's (1982) study. By employing this method of comparison, only rural full-time school psychologists in Virginia were compared to rural part-time or contract school psychologists; hence eliminating differences between urban, suburban and rural practitioners' perceptions of their employment. From the total number of respondents in Merchant's (1982) study, questionnaires from thirty-one school psychologists employed in twenty-three rural school divisions were

utilized in the comparisons. The latest census figures available (Note 9) were used to determine which school divisions met the criteria of the rural definition employed in this study.

The final data analyzed in this investigation were the rural school principals' questionnaire responses. The perceptions of principals working in school divisions which employed full-time school psychologists were compared to their counterparts working in school divisions which employed part-time or contract school psychologists. Availability, utilization and level of satisfaction with the school psychological services received were compared according to the nature of the school division's employment of either a full-time, part-time or contract school psychologist(s). Because of the small number of respondents in each group (principals with full-time, part-time or contracted services), and because it was expected that some of the 18 school psychologist functions would not be available or utilized by any of the principals with part-time or contracted services, the Chi-square test was not utilized in the data analysis. Weaknesses of part-time and contracted services were determined if 15% or more of the respondents with part-time or contracted services (compared to those with full-time services) noted less availability, utilization or satisfaction with the services they received. The 15% criterion for determining comparative weaknesses was

utilized because it required more than one respondent in each group to indicate a weakness.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections to present the data gathered in the investigation according to the three major research questions: 1) What are the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time or contract school psychologists as perceived by part-time or contract school psychologists' supervisors and part-time or contract school psychologists?; 2) How does part-time or contract school psychological service delivery compare to full-time school psychological service delivery?; and 3) What differences exist between the perceptions of school principals working in school divisions employing either full-time, part-time or contract school psychologists in regard to the availability, utilization and level of satisfaction with the school psychological services they receive?

Section I presents the strengths and weaknesses of the part-time or contract employment relationship by describing in case study form the data collected through the supervisors' questionnaires and interviews as well as the school psychologists' interviews. The case study format provides the means for determining the differences between the two types of employment. Of the eight school divisions investi-

gated, four utilized part-time school psychologists and four provided school psychological services through contract arrangements. School divisions labeled as A, B, C and D employed part-time school psychologists. School divisions labeled as W, X, Y and Z employed contract practitioners.

Section II provides the results of the analysis of the school psychologists' questionnaires. Full-time school psychologists' responses are compared to those obtained from practitioners employed on a part-time or contract basis. Hence, this section offers comparisons in regard to demographic information, professional practices and professional issues.

Section III reports the results of the school principals' responses. The perceptions of responding school principals working in school divisions employing full-time school psychologists are compared to the perceptions of responding school principals working in school divisions employing part-time or contract school psychologists. Availability and utilization of school psychological services and principals' level of satisfaction with services utilized are also compared.

SECTION I
CASE STUDIES
PART-TIME SERVICES

SCHOOL DIVISION A

Demographic Information

The total student enrollment of this school division is 435. Included in this total are 66 identified handicapped youngsters who receive special education services. During the 1981-82 school year, 29 student referrals were received by the coordinator of special education.

The special education coordinator is completing his second year in this role. He also serves as an elementary school principal. His formal training was in regular education and administration. He has never supervised a full-time school psychologist. According to the coordinator, school psychological services have always been provided for this school division by a part-time practitioner.

The part-time school psychologist employed by this school division is certified in Virginia. He maintains a private practice in a distant metropolitan area. His private practice duties involve working with parents and children in need of psycho-educational prescriptions, counseling, etc. In addition to his private practice, this school psychologist is also employed by a state rehabilitation center as an educational consultant. He is currently com-

pleting his first year as a part-time school psychologist for this school division. Prior to this part-time school psychology employment, he had never functioned as a school psychologist in public schools.

Part-time Employment Provisions

The agreement between the part-time school psychologist and the school division is a verbal understanding consisting of the following:

- 1) The school psychologist is available for one day per week to provide psycho-educational assessments, consultation with parents and teachers, counseling of students, in-service for teachers, and any other school psychological service deemed necessary by the special education coordinator.
- 2) The school psychologist is paid \$30 per hour for eight hours each day worked (\$240/day).
- 3) The school psychologist is not reimbursed for mileage and is responsible for providing the typing of psychological reports.
- 4) No administrative duties are included in the school psychologist's functions.

Strengths of the Part-time Employment

According to the special education coordinator, the parents viewed the school psychologist's recommendations as being impartial. Contact with and referral to outside agencies known to the part-time school psychologist was given by the coordinator as an additional strength of the employment.

The coordinator further elaborated that the expertise and experience of a highly qualified, part-time school psychologist was beneficial to his school division. He noted that it would be difficult to attract and retain a person with these qualities for a full-time position in this rural setting. Both the part-time school psychologist and the special education coordinator felt that the employment relationship was a cost efficient means of offering comprehensive services to this small, remote school division. The ability of the part-time school psychologist to bring in "new ideas" from other areas and to keep school personnel abreast of "what is going on in the field" was seen as a strength by the coordinator.

Weaknesses of the Part-time Employment

The coordinator of special education believed that more school psychologist input at the time of in-school evaluations (screenings) would be helpful. He also noted that because of the limited availability of the school psychologist, consultation with parents and teachers was often not possible. The coordinator indicated that more intervention activities, such as individual and group counseling, might be possible if more school psychologist time were available.

The psychologist's initial difficulty of becoming accepted by school personnel was mentioned by the coordinator.

He noted that the part-time school psychologist was viewed as an outsider who did not understand the needs of the rural community, but that school staff had come to feel more "comfortable" with the psychologist as the school year progressed.

Another weakness perceived by the coordinator was the limited amount of communication between himself and the part-time school psychologist. The coordinator noted that he did not like any "surprises" and he wanted to know what recommendations were being made prior to meetings with parents. This communication was often difficult between the psychologist and the supervisor.

The final weakness of the part-time relationship was discussed by the coordinator. He pointed out that the school division had, at times, "some level of difficulty" meeting evaluation timelines because of the scheduling of the part-time school psychologist.

Internal and External Resources Utilized

This school division belongs to a consortium which provides educational consultants who offer in-service training for regular and special education teachers. The division also has an agreement with a major university which provides personnel development classes in special education.

At the present time, the part-time school psychologist

completes the educational component of the formal evaluation as well as the psychological. The special education coordinator mentioned that he is planning to provide his special education teachers with release time to allow them to complete the educational requirement. No other internal or external resources used to supplement the roles of the part-time school psychologist were given.

Respondents' Summary

The coordinator of special education felt that his superintendent was committed to "providing adequate special education services". The superintendent had initially contacted the current part-time school psychologist because he had been advised by colleagues of the psychologist's expertise. The present arrangement is viewed favorably by the superintendent, coordinator of special education and the part-time school psychologist. All of them appear willing to continue with the current part-time employment relationship next year.

Interviewer's Summary

Considering the size and location of this school division, the part-time school psychological services they receive appear adequate, if not admirable. The interviewer was impressed by the willingness of the school division to

expend a considerable amount of local funds in order to obtain a highly qualified practitioner.

The school psychologist brings in a wealth of information from outside sources and shares the commitment of the superintendent to provide adequate services. This is demonstrated by his involvement in student counseling, eligibility meetings, parent and teacher consultation, teacher workshops, etc. As a result, comprehensive services are provided.

SCHOOL DIVISION B

Demographic Information

This school division serves approximately 2,540 students. Special education programs serve 290 identified handicapped children. During the 1981-82 school year, approximately 120 student referrals were received by the central office.

The supervisor of special education has been a General Supervisor for more than 10 years. Prior to this supervisory role, she was employed as a regular classroom teacher. She is responsible for supervising all special education programs and services. This supervisor noted that the school division has always utilized the services of a part-time school psychologist.

The part-time school psychologist who serves this school division is certified as a school psychologist in Virginia. He has been employed by many rural school divisions on a part-time or contract basis over the last 16 years. He currently serves as a part-time school psychologist for four school divisions in the Commonwealth. This school psychologist's professional experiences include employment as a full-time school psychologist in an urban setting, university and public school teaching, local mental health clinic counseling, and state training school consulting. He has worked on a part-time basis for this school division for eight years.

Part-time Employment Provisions

The part-time working arrangement negotiated by the school psychologist and the school division is a verbal agreement which includes the following:

- 1) The school psychologist is available at least four days per month to provide psycho-educational assessments, attend eligibility meetings, and perform any other school psychological function deemed necessary by the supervisor.
- 2) The school psychologist is compensated \$150 for each day worked.
- 3) Mileage is reimbursed from the school psychologist's home. The school psychologist is responsible for the typing of psychological reports.

Strengths of the Part-time Employment

The supervisor noted that the school division was fortunate to have a "highly competent" part-time school psychologist. She felt that he was efficient in evaluating youngsters' needs and generating "clear, concise, and practical psychological reports". The experience of the part-time school psychologist was mentioned by the supervisor as valuable in terms of consultation with teachers and principals. Most importantly, the supervisor noted the part-time arrangement was a "budgetary advantage".

Weaknesses of the Part-time Employment

The special education supervisor believed there was sufficient time allowed for testing, but more school psychologist input was needed for eligibility meetings. She noted that the number of days the school psychologist was available did not allow him to be involved with in-school (screening) evaluations, action by the screening committees, and intervention activities (e.g., counseling).

The supervisor elaborated by stating that, "If he were present at the screening committee meetings, it would help weed out inappropriate referrals." She mentioned that, "He occasionally meets with parents. I would like him to meet more often with them." The supervisor perceived the need for more counseling time as well as time spent consulting with parents and teachers. She indicated this by stating,

"We anticipate increasing the number of days to allow for more counseling and teacher consultation. We're growing. We will add more days as our knowledge of his usefulness increases."

The part-time psychologist agreed with the supervisor that more of his time was needed for all non-assessment functions. He stated, "So often I would like to follow-up on a kid's progress, but I just don't have the time. I would also like to help develop a program to deal with slow-learning kids. We don't seem to have anything for them. I haven't done any in-service in the last three years. What is done is sporadic and limited."

Internal and External Resources Utilized

The faculty of a local college has been utilized to provide workshops for special education teachers, according to the special education supervisor. In-service for pre-school handicapped staff has been provided by a Technical Assistance Center located at a major university. The local mental health clinic accepts referrals from the school division and has been willing to "offer input" at screening and eligibility meetings. The supervisor also mentioned that the learning disabilities teachers observe children in regular classrooms and often "help the regular teachers with problem kids".

Respondents' Summary

According to the special education supervisor, the superintendent was willing to add more school psychologist work days if "we could justify the need for more consultation time". The supervisor believed that a full-time school psychologist was not needed for the division, but perhaps an arrangement to share a full-time school psychologist with another school division would be acceptable. She noted, "We're considering one or two more days (per month), but we have to be sure there is a legitimate need."

The part-time school psychologist indicated that he was "comfortable" with the services he provided, although he felt the school division could use more of his time for teacher and parent consultation, follow-up of students' progress and individual counseling. He saw "some improvement" in the services being offered this year because he is able to devote one-half day per month to teacher consultation.

Interviewer's Summary

This school division receives approximately 40 days of school psychological services per year. Because of the number of student referrals received (120), most of the practitioner's time is spent on student assessments. The school division apparently has never received a full range

of services and doesn't realize the potential benefits of these services. Adding one or two days per month to the present number of days a school psychologist is available will not provide comprehensive services. Financial concerns appear to limit the probability of better services in the future.

SCHOOL DIVISION C

Demographic Information

The total pupil enrollment of this school division is 2,252. Included in this total are 261 identified handicapped children who receive special education services. During the 1981-82 school year an estimated 32 referrals were received by the central office.

The administrator responsible for supervising all special education programs and services holds the title of General Supervisor. This supervisor is currently completing his first year of employment with this school division. He had prior experience as a regular classroom teacher and school administrator, but was never assigned special education supervision in any other school division.

For the past three years, this school division has provided school psychological services through a part-time arrangement. Prior to this, a full-time school psychologist was employed. The special education supervisor noted it

was his understanding that after the voluntary termination of the last full-time school psychologist, the school division could not obtain another full-time practitioner. Part-time services were then begun. The supervisor felt that because of the "cost efficient" nature of the part-time arrangement, the school division decided not to employ a full-time school psychologist.

The part-time school psychologist employed by this school division is the same practitioner who provides part-time services for School Division B. He has served this school division since they began part-time employment of a school psychologist (three years).

Part-time Employment Provisions

The agreement between the part-time school psychologist and the school division is a verbal understanding consisting of the following:

- 1) The school psychologist is available at least three days per month to provide psycho-educational assessments, attend eligibility meetings and perform any other school psychological function deemed necessary by the supervisor.
- 2) The school psychologist is compensated \$150 for each day worked, or \$50 per student assessment (if more than three assessments are completed in one day).
- 3) Mileage is reimbursed from the school psychologist's home. The school psychologist is responsible for the typing of psychological reports.

Strengths of the Part-time Employment

According to the special education supervisor, "Having a part-time school psychologist is better than having one full-time. He's not colored by teachers. They don't get to him. He's more impartial and free from any pressure. He's not around to be influenced by anyone."

The supervisor also mentioned, "In times of tight resources, we get our money's worth. With a full-time school psychologist, he would sit around drinking coffee and the kids wouldn't get tested. We spend less than \$6,000 a year for psychological services total."

The part-time school psychologist indicated the strengths of the employment by stating, "Because I'm viewed as an outsider, I can be somewhat objective and apolitical. I bring in years of experience. I don't get bogged down with personalities. I won't be drawn into it, it's counter-productive. It (part-time employment) forces the school division to rely on themselves. Makes them self-reliant. They can't rely on experts. If I were there full-time, there probably would be no limit to the responsibilities they would put on me. I could be abused and overwhelmed. They treat me with a lot of respect and keep the relationship very professional. I've thoroughly enjoyed the 'have kit will travel'."

Weaknesses of the Part-time Employment

The special education supervisor pointed out that because of the limited number of days the school psychologist is available, consultation with parents is extremely difficult. The supervisor was unable to perceive any other weakness in the employment relationship.

The part-time psychologist felt that he needed more time to devote to consultation with parents and teachers and counseling of children with emotional and behavioral problems. He also noted, "I'd like to do more in-service. You reach more people that way. It gives them a chance to know you and see you as a member of the team, rather than someone who lives way out there and is idealistic and not concerned with the practical things -- the reputation a psychologist gets sometimes. I always see much more that I would like to do."

Internal and External Resources Utilized

The special education supervisor felt that school psychologist time was saved because the school principals "are used to ensuring that good referrals come from the school screening committees." He also noted that the learning disabilities teachers do an "outstanding job" during the in-school screening process. The visiting teacher works with children in conjunction with the school psychologist to offer informal counseling, according to the supervisor.

The following external resources were given by the supervisor as supplementary to the part-time school psychological services received:

- 1) Personnel from the State Department of Education - provide free in-service workshops for special education teachers.
- 2) Personnel from a university children's rehabilitation center - provide in-service for regular and special class teachers (charged).
- 3) Consortium arrangement - provides programs for low-incidence handicapped children (emotionally disturbed, hearing impaired, and multihandicapped) and adaptive physical education services (charged).

Respondents' Summary

The special education supervisor of this school division is most concerned with cost efficiency in regard to offering psychological services. He feels that having a full-time practitioner would be wasteful because there would be only a few duties available. He perceives the current part-time employment as efficient and practical for the small size of the school division.

The part-time school psychologist is content with the arrangement. He mentioned that he included the per child rate in the verbal working agreement because, "They can take advantage of a per diem rate and want you to test five kids or something ridiculous like this. I learned this through

the 'school of hard knocks'."

Both the supervisor and the part-time school psychologist indicated that they would be willing to continue with the part-time relationship next year.

Interviewer's Summary

This school division obtains extremely limited school psychological services. Most of the school psychologist's time is spent on assessment duties. The special education supervisor's desire to keep these services "cost efficient" appears to be hindering any potential expansion of the psychologist's current role. In addition, the supervisor's limited special education administrative experience appears to have clouded his understanding of the possible shortcomings of this part-time arrangement. Perhaps if this administrator had supervised a full-time school psychologist who was able to provide a full range of psychological services, he might view non-assessment duties differently.

SCHOOL DIVISION D

Demographic Information

The total student enrollment of this school division is approximately 3,100. There are 328 identified handicapped students who receive special education services. During

the 1981-82 school year the central office received between 40 and 50 student referrals. At that time, the total student enrollment was slightly more than 2,000 students. Because this school division consolidated with another this year, the projected number of student referrals is approximately 70.

The special education supervisor has been employed in her current position for five years. Prior to accepting this administrative position, she taught both regular and special education classes. The supervisor has received some training toward school psychology certification, but to date has not completed all the necessary requirements.

This school division has never employed a full-time school psychologist. Until August, 1982, all school psychological services had been provided on a contract basis. During the 1982-83 school year the present researcher was hired as a part-time school psychologist for this school division.

The information which follows is based on the perceptions of the special education supervisor. The investigator's perceptions of the strengths and weakness of this employment relationship are found in Appendix E.

Part-time Employment Provisions

The agreement between the part-time school psychologist

and the school division is a verbal understanding consisting of the following:

- 1) The school psychologist is available 10 days per month to provide psycho-educational assessments, attend eligibility meetings and perform any other school psychological function deemed necessary by the supervisor.
- 2) The school psychologist is compensated \$100 for each day worked.
- 3) Mileage is reimbursed for distances traveled from the central office to the various schools. Secretarial service is available for the typing of psychological reports.

Strengths of the Part-time Employment

The greatest strength of the part-time employment, according to the supervisor, is financial. She noted that part-time school psychological services cost the school division approximately one-half the cost of employing a full-time practitioner.

The supervisor also noted that the part-time school psychologist has more credibility and relates much better to school staff than the previous contract school psychologist. This, she pointed out, was because the previous contract practitioner was employed to provide psycho-educational assessments only, and did not consult with teachers, meet with parents, offer in-service, etc. The supervisor elaborated that she felt the part-time school psychologist

"works into the system" and "provides a greater degree of organization" than the contract psychologist.

Another strength of part-time services compared to contract services mentioned by the supervisor was time efficiency. She noted that the part-time practitioner "utilizes his time effectively and maximizes his input in the system". Help with administrative duties (i.e., keeping records of timelines, program development and evaluation, etc.) was also seen as a strength of the part-time employment.

Weaknesses of the Part-time Employment

Although the special education supervisor noted an improvement over the former contract assessment services, she felt the part-time school psychologist was unable to attend to all functions adequately. She stated, "The number of days budgeted are hardly adequate for student assessments. Counseling, consultation, research, and crisis intervention go begging."

The supervisor also mentioned that school principals indicated they would like to see more student observation by the school psychologist. They also perceived a need for more input by the psychologist at eligibility and I.E.P. meetings. Finally, the supervisor indicated that she would like to see the school psychologist more involved with the

teachers "helping them feel more secure with problem students".

Internal and External Resources Utilized

The special education supervisor indicated that few external resources were available to supplement the work of the part-time school psychologist. The local mental health clinic takes student referrals for individual and family counseling, but often has a waiting list. Staff development is accomplished by providing release time for teachers to attend professional conferences and seminars. "On a very limited basis," the supervisor indicated, "we bring in a university professor to offer in-service to teachers during one of their professional development days."

Respondent's Summary

The special education supervisor felt that the part-time services the school division receives this year are superior to the assessment services contracted last year. She noted, however, that a great deal more time was needed to provide "adequate" services. The supervisor indicated that she has budgeted for the employment of a full-time school psychologist next year.

CONTRACTED SERVICES
SCHOOL DIVISION W

Demographic Information

This school division serves approximately 6,500 students. To date, 603 of these students have been identified as handicapped and are served in special education programs. During the 1981-82 school year, the central office received approximately 150 student referrals.

The supervisor of special education was a former special education teacher and has performed his current role for approximately five years. He has never supervised a full-time school psychologist in this or any other school division. School psychological services have always been provided for this school division on a contract basis.

Contract school psychological services are provided by a Virginia certified school psychologist who, prior to this current contract relationship, was employed on a full-time basis for two years in a neighboring rural school division. Discontent with prior full-time employment (little role flexibility) and family concerns were given by this school psychologist as reasons for working on a contract basis this year.

Contract Provisions

The contract negotiated by the school psychologist and the school division is written and contains the following

agreements:

- 1) The school psychologist completes 15 student evaluations monthly and attends the eligibility meetings for these children.
- 2) The school psychologist conducts six (6) inservice workshops (unspecified topics) within the course of the 10 month school year.
- 3) The school division pays the school psychologist \$115 per evaluation - \$1,725 per month.
- 4) The school psychologist is responsible for the typing of psychological reports. Mileage reimbursement is provided for distances traveled between the central office and the schools.

Strengths of the Contract Employment

The special education supervisor noted that parents regarded the school psychologist as a highly trained consultant; hence they were less likely to question her ability. He pointed out that parents viewed the school psychologist as working independently of the school division and thus did not represent a "threat" in terms of confidentiality of personal family information. The supervisor also believed that the scheduling of testing and eligibility meetings was efficient. By this, the supervisor indicated that he scheduled the dates and was certain of the availability of the psychologist.

Less pressure from teachers to have particular children placed in special education programs was also mentioned

by the supervisor as a positive factor associated with contracted services. By this, the supervisor alluded to the lesser degree of school psychologist exposure to teachers or principals who might have a predisposition on a perceived placement need of a child.

The contract school psychologist for this school division felt that her current contract was beneficial for her; noting that it gives her a great deal of flexibility to write reports at home and attend to personal affairs on days not worked. She was concerned about her lack of involvement in several school psychological functions, but noted that after many years of employing a contract school psychologist, the school division had come to utilize several internal and external resources to "fill in the gaps" of services not offered by the psychologist.

Weaknesses of the Contract Employment

The supervisor of special education mentioned that approximately 150 referrals were received by his office during the 1981-82 school year. He felt that the number of days a school psychologist was available was adequate for the number of referrals received, but more school psychologist time was needed for observation of children in various settings, teacher consultation and behavior management of students. He also believed that a school psychologist would be helpful in planning and conducting research within

the school division, if time and contractual circumstances allowed. The supervisor noted that the lack of a full-time school psychologist had created problems when expertise was needed during in-school (screening) evaluations of children and when the screening committees met to decide on the possible need for formal evaluations. He felt that intervention activities (e.g., counseling and crisis intervention), consultation with parents, and evaluation of existing programs would be performed more satisfactorily if the school division employed a full-time practitioner. The supervisor pointed out that other personnel must meet with parents, design programs and work with individual teachers; duties that would be part of the job of a full-time school psychologist. Lack of accessibility to the school psychologist by parents and teachers on a day-to-day basis had brought about criticisms from both groups, according to the supervisor.

Internal and External Resources Utilized

Internal resources utilized by the school division to supplement the roles of the school psychologist include the use of the visiting teacher to deal with crisis intervention needs and to work with the courts and social service agencies. The teachers of learning disabled students are given release time to function as educational consultants. Their roles include working with classroom teachers who need support with acting out students and helping set up behavior

modification schedules for youngsters in need of such a program. The contract psychologist also mentioned that she provides some teacher consultation.

External resources utilized by the school division were pointed out by the supervisor of special education. He listed several area and community agencies/personnel used to provide certain needed functions sometimes fulfilled by full-time school psychologists. These included:

- 1) Local mental health clinic - provides parenting skills sessions for area parents and follow-up counseling for emotionally troubled youngsters (no charges).
- 2) State hospital personnel - give detailed (clinical) evaluations of emotionally disturbed children (charged).
- 3) Child Evaluation Clinic (Richmond) furnishes follow-up evaluations for difficult placements (charged).
- 4) University and large city school division personnel - contribute to in-service programs and staff development offerings (charged).

Respondents' Summary

Both the contract school psychologist and her supervisor believed they would continue with the current contract relationship after this year. They pointed out that the amount of money expended for contracted school psychological services would enable the school division to employ a full-time school psychologist, but the administrative philosophy

of the superintendent was for continuation of the contract arrangement. They perceived the superintendent as "committed to adequate services", but noted that he preferred to have "one less person in the central offices" because the public viewed the central offices as getting too "crowded".

The contract school psychologist noted that her contract was an "excellent one", and she felt good about going "above and beyond" contractual duties. She compared her present employment to previous full-time school psychology employment by noting that her current duties were "much better" in terms of job pressure, flexibility and feelings of being "overwhelmed".

The special education supervisor was also pleased with the contract arrangement. He thought that although the contract school psychologist had bargained for "an excellent contract", both the psychologist and the school division had benefitted.

Interviewer's Summary

The cooperative nature of the contract school psychologist and her supervisor have strengthened the employment relationship in this school division. In addition, after years of contracting for school psychological services, the school division has become aware of potential gaps in service delivery and as a result, they have developed many internal and external resources to supplement the limited functions

of their contracted school psychologist. The amount of money allocated for contracted services, approximately \$18,000, is substantial for this type of contract arrangement and undoubtedly has had a positive effect on the overall job satisfaction of the contracted psychologist. Her willingness to perform non-contractual duties is evidence of this and has resulted in better services to children, parents and school personnel.

The fact remains, however, that the psychologist-to-student ratio in this school division is extremely high. Most of the contract school psychologists' time is devoted to assessment functions. A full-range of psychological services is not being provided.

SCHOOL DIVISION X

Demographic Information

The total student population of this school division is 2,260. Special education programs serve approximately 240 identified handicapped students. The estimated number of referrals received by the central office for the 1981-82 school year was 50.

School psychological assessment services, consisting of psycho-educational assessments and eligibility meeting participation, are provided this year through a contract arrangement with a licensed psychologist who teaches at

a nearby university and operates a private psychological services practice. This psychologist supervises three school psychology graduate students who complete the psycho-educational assessments. The supervising psychologist then reviews the results and interpretations with the graduate students and attends the eligibility meetings in their place to interpret testing results and offer input for the determination of special education needs of students.

Although this licensed psychologist is responsible for the supervision of the student school psychologists, the I.E.P. Coordinator for the school division was used as a respondent to supply information relative to the strengths and weaknesses of this contract method of providing school psychological services. Through the coordinator's perceptions it was possible to surface favorable and unfavorable aspects of the contracted services from within the school division.

Prior to this year, a full-time school psychologist was employed. The coordinator noted that the school division had initially budgeted for a full-time school psychologist this year, but was forced into the contract relationship because of difficulty attracting and retaining a full-time practitioner. After the contract had been established, a "budget crunch" diminished the available funds for a full-time position. Hence, the coordinator perceives it will be "extremely difficult" to restore the amount needed

in the budget to employ a full-time school psychologist in the future.

The I.E.P. Coordinator has been employed by the school division for 4 years. Her duties are to coordinate all special education programs and services. She reports directly to an assistant superintendent.

The three school psychology graduate students who complete psycho-educational assessments all hold masters degrees in psychology or school psychology and are completing requirements for the educational specialist degree in school psychology. Their academic preparation involves formal coursework at the university setting, and practica (e.g., counseling and consultation) in nearby school divisions. No course credit is given for this contract involvement in this school division.

Contract Employment Provisions

The contract between the supervising (licensed) psychologist and the school division is written and includes the following agreements:

- 1) Psycho-educational assessments are completed by masters level psychometrists. These psychometrists interpret the results of the assessments and provide written reports. The psycho-educational assessments include:
a) review of records; b) classroom observation; c) intelligence assessment; d) specific cognitive functioning; e) perceptual development; f) educational, achievement and personal/social

adjustment; and g) any additional tests deemed necessary by the psychologist.

- 2) The supervising (licensed) psychologist reviews the assessments and interpretations with the psychometrists.
- 3) The supervising (licensed) psychologist attends the eligibility meetings and offers input on the educational needs of the children in regard to the formal assessments conducted by the psychometrists. This psychologist is also available to meet with parents to discuss the results of the formal assessments.
- 4) The school division compensates the supervising psychologist \$90 per evaluation (and eligibility participation) *

Strengths of the Contract Employment

The I.E.P. Coordinator felt that the most obvious strength of contracting for school psychological services was financial. She noted that it will cost the school division approximately one-half the amount of a full-time school psychologist's salary for contracted services this year. The coordinator also perceived the quality of the psycho-educational assessments provided as "far superior" to the assessments conducted by prior full-time school psychologists. Also mentioned by the coordinator as a strength was the great degree of expertise from which to draw upon at the eligibility meetings. By this, the coordinator

* Note - The psychometrists receive \$60 per evaluation from the supervising psychologist

indicated that the supervising psychologist's knowledge and experience supplemented the formal assessments and interpretations of the graduate students; resulting in superior diagnoses of special education needs and placement decisions. As a final strength of contracted services, the coordinator viewed the supervising psychologist as "going overboard" to offer consultation with teachers, even though this was not included in the contract arrangement.

Weaknesses of the Contract Employment

Because the contract arrangement mainly provides assessment services, many weaknesses were identified by the I.E.P. Coordinator and the graduate student psychometrists. The coordinator commented, "There are so many needs the schools have identified that we can't meet."

The contract includes no time to consult with teachers, nor does it allow a practitioner to be available for crisis intervention or student counseling. In-service for school personnel is also not available. According to the supervisor, "The principals have been expressing their concerns about the need for a full-time school psychologist."

The contract psychometrists also expressed their concerns in regard to the weakness they perceived in the contracted assessment services. One psychometrist noted, "The principals and teachers are begging for service,

realizing they're hard-up. We don't spend enough time observing children in the classroom or talking with parents or teachers. Kids could get much better services with a full-time person."

Another psychometrist felt, "The most frustrating aspect of the job is not being able to attend the eligibility meetings. I also don't have time to go back and see the child or follow-up on his progress."

The third psychometrist also expressed concern about the contracted services by noting, "In other settings, folks have more stability and organization - it's more enjoyable. I was really rushed the last time I was down there. When I write the report, I'd like to be there to explain what I've written. If they had a real commitment to psychological services, they would have a full-time person."

Internal and External Resources Utilized

The coordinator noted that a local mental health clinic provided triennial re-evaluation assessments and a "limited" amount of individual counseling. A substance abuse counselor was also "scheduled to be available" for individual and group counseling as well as consultation with teachers.

A school psychology practicum student from a nearby university provides consultation for teachers approximately

4 hours per week, according to the coordinator. The coordinator also stated that the school nurse and the home-school coordinator do an "excellent job" consulting with teachers and "talking" with students who have "problems".

The I.E.P. Coordinator noted that she observes children in classroom settings and provides some consultation for teachers. She mentioned that the learning disabilities teachers help out as much as possible and that, "We're all pulling together."

Respondents' Summary

The three graduate student psychometrists and the I.E.P. Coordinator all agreed that "extremely limited" school psychological services were being provided. Hampering this level of service delivery was a lack of clerical staff to aid in scheduling testing and eligibility meeting times, maintaining files of students' records, etc.

None of the three psychometrists were willing to continue with the contracted services after this year. They all felt the experience was good in terms of assessment skill development, but were interested in utilizing their training in parent and teacher consultation, student counseling, and workshop offerings within a school division where it was possible to do so.

The I.E.P. Coordinator felt there was a "definite need" for a full-time school psychologist for the school division.

She had reservations about obtaining one next year because, "Some administrators take the attitude - you have done without and can function this way."

Interviewer's Summary

Although the present assessment contract provides the psychological component of the formal special education evaluation, this school division is lacking in all other areas of school psychological services. Budgetary concerns appear to have overshadowed the needs of the community. It is unfortunate that the school administration places such a low priority on school psychological services. Without public pressure through advocacy or litigation, it does not appear likely that more comprehensive services will be provided in the future.

SCHOOL DIVISION Y

Demographic Information

The total student population of this school division is 757. Included in this total are 109 identified handicapped children who receive special education services. During the 1981-82 school year the central office received approximately 30 student referrals.

The supervisor of special education also serves as an elementary principal. He has been a principal in this school

division for five years, but has supervised special education programs and services for less than two years. In the supervisor's words, "I griped the most about procedures (special education) and he (superintendent) made me the special education supervisor."

This school division, mainly because of its small student enrollment, has always contracted for school psychological services. Currently, the school division utilizes the contracted services of a licensed professional counselor who has a private practice in a neighboring community.

The counselor holds a Ph.D. in child development and counseling, but is not certified as a school psychologist in Virginia. She has performed the roles of a school psychologist through contracted arrangements with local school divisions for four years. This is her second year of contracted employment with this school division.

Contract Provisions

The contract negotiated by the school psychologist and the school division is written and contains the following provisions:

- 1) The school psychologist is available two days per month to provide psycho-educational assessments and attend eligibility meetings.
- 2) The school psychologist is compensated \$180 for each day worked.

- 3) Mileage is reimbursed for distances traveled from the school psychologist's private practice office. The school psychologist is responsible for the typing of psychological reports.

Strengths of the Contract Employment

Because of the small number of referrals generated by this school division, the contract school psychologist has been able to perform a wide range of functions in addition to student assessments. According to the supervisor, "She does everything -- talks with parents and teachers, counsels students, attends eligibility meetings and offers in-service training to our staff. She even goes through proposed changes in federal and state regulations and brings them to me. She wants me to be informed of what's going on."

The special education supervisor further stated, "She brings integrity, even if she doesn't agree with us. I like her independence." Another positive factor pointed out by the supervisor was the high level of training and expertise of the contract psychologist. As he pointed out, "The services I have seen through the mental health clinic have not been par with what we get. We get much better services."

The willingness of the contract psychologist to go far beyond contractual stipulations was also noted as a strength by the supervisor. He stressed, "She also arranges for other specialists (e.g., occupational therapist) to come here when

needed. She's even speaking at our P.T.A. meeting next week."

The contract school psychologist found the working arrangement "very manageable". She felt she was providing "fairly comprehensive" services to this school division. She also noted that she provides the educational component of the formal evaluation in addition to the psychological. She felt this was "positive" because it gave her a better understanding of the child.

Weaknesses of the Contract Employment

The special education supervisor felt that although the contract school psychologist does some counseling, more was needed. He stated, "Not all our counseling needs are met. We've just scratched the surface in the counseling area."

The supervisor also noted that the contract school psychologist is not utilized during child study (in-school screening). He noted, "We could probably use more input from her in this area."

Internal and External Resources Utilized

The special education supervisor pointed out that state funds are utilized to bring in professors from a nearby university. The supervisor noted that these professors have offered in-service education for regular classroom teachers on the needs of special education children who are inte-

grated into regular classrooms.

Also mentioned by the supervisor as an external resource were technical assistance personnel who provide support to teachers of pre-school handicapped children. These support personnel also come from a nearby university and do not require reimbursement from local funds.

Respondents' Summary

Both the contract school psychologist and the special education supervisor were pleased with the working arrangement. They agreed that continuation of the present contract next year was in their best interests.

The supervisor noted, "She's (contract school psychologist) just a real jewel. She can anticipate problems and work on them. We're fortunate to have her. I'm very content."

The contract psychologist felt that the school division was committed to "quality programs and services". She noted that school personnel were "open to suggestions on how things could be improved".

Interviewer's Summary

This school division receives fairly comprehensive school psychological services because: 1) the number of referrals is small; and 2) the contract school psychologist is willing to go far beyond contractual demands. In addition,

the close working relationship between the contract psychologist and the supervisor keeps both of them informed in regard to present needs and program development. It appears that the students, parents and school personnel benefit from this contract employment arrangement.

SCHOOL DIVISION Z

Demographic Information

This school division has a pupil enrollment of 4,530. Currently, 290 of these students have been identified as handicapped and are receiving special education services. During the 1981-82 school year approximately 200 student referrals were received by the central office.

The special education director has been employed by this school division for 12 years. She taught special education classes prior to becoming an administrator. She has supervised all special education programs and services for this school division for the past 10 years. This supervisor noted that school psychological services have always been provided for this school division by contractual arrangements.

The two contract school psychologists employed by this school division operate a private practice in a city located 150 miles from this school division. They are both licensed professional counselors. Neither of these practitioners is

certified as a school psychologist in Virginia. Both have four years experience as contract school psychologists. This is the second year of their contract employment in this school division.

Contract Provisions

The written contract negotiated by the school psychologists and the school division contains the following agreements:

- 1) Both school psychologists travel to the school division twice monthly. They spend two days working for the school division during each trip.
- 2) Each school psychologist performs three psycho-educational assessments per day or their equivalent. The equivalent of a psycho-educational assessment is stipulated as one of the following: a) attendance at two eligibility meetings; b) one parent conference; c) one child counseling session; or d) two teacher consultations.
- 3) Each school psychologist is paid \$180 for each day worked.
- 4) Mileage is reimbursed from the school psychologists' private practice office. Meals and lodging are also reimbursed. The contract school psychologists are responsible for providing the typing of psychological reports.

Strengths of the Contract Employment

The special education supervisor noted that the current contract employment costs the school division approximately

one-half the salary of a full-time practitioner. She felt the school division would have "a hard time" attracting a highly qualified full-time school psychologist, and that the current contract provides "high quality services". The supervisor elaborated that, "The testing we get now is excellent. These people (contract school psychologists) are efficient and professional."

The contract school psychologists noted that when personnel from this school division called them to request contract services, "they (school personnel) were desperate". The psychologists felt that they were providing services that could not be obtained elsewhere at the time.

Weaknesses of the Contract Employment

The school psychologists agreed that they were providing "bare bones" school psychological services. One of the contract psychologists noted, "We provide practically no individual counseling; only in special, severe cases. We do no in-service. We can barely keep up with the testing. They need someone there full-time desperately."

The other contract psychologist mentioned, "We do not provide all the services they need. Sometimes when we get to a school the kids are absent. We never have a chance to follow-up on a kid's progress. Most of the time we don't even attend the eligibility meetings."

The special education supervisor also thought it would

be better to have a full-time school psychologist "on-hand". She noted, "We could avoid the scheduling hassles. The teachers would like to have a school psychologist available to talk about problem kids."

Internal and External Resources Utilized

The special education supervisor mentioned that she uses masters level special educators as educational diagnosticians. These staff members provide the educational components of the formal evaluations and assess students' perceptual functioning. In-service programs are given by contracted personnel from "various colleges and universities", according to the supervisor. The supervisor also noted, "The mental health clinic takes referrals for some counseling of our kids."

Respondents' Summary

The contract school psychologists indicated that they would not renew the contract with this school division next year. They felt that the distances traveled were too great and that it took too much time away from their private practice.

The special education supervisor mentioned that she would prefer to have a full-time practitioner, but that "having a psychologist on a full-time contract does not guarantee satisfactory service". She further noted that,

"If we're not satisfied with contract services, we can easily contract with another agency."

Interviewer's Summary

It appears that this school division could hire a full-time school psychologist for the amount of money they spend on contracted services. It does not appear that school division personnel have made an effort to attract a full-time practitioner. As a result, the services they receive are limited. Because the school division has, in the past, been able to obtain contracted services, school personnel apparently do not realize the benefits of having a full-time practitioner on staff. For this reason, the school division will most likely continue to contract for limited school psychological services.

CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

SCHOOL DIVISIONS A, B, C, D

Demographic Information

These rural school divisions which employ part-time school psychologists have a total student enrollment ranging from 435 to 3,100 students. The mean number of students enrolled is 2,156. The number of identified handicapped children ranges from 66 to 328 ($\bar{X}=236$). During the 1981-82 school year, student referrals ranged from 29 to 120 ($\bar{X}=58$).

The supervisors of special education have performed their current roles for 1 to 10 years ($\bar{X}=4.5$). Two hold the title General Supervisor, one has the additional responsibilities of an elementary principal; and one is responsible only for supervising special education programs and services. Two of the supervisors have special education training and teaching experience (one with school psychology training); two were trained and experienced in regular education.

Three of the four school divisions have always provided school psychological services through part-time, or contracted arrangements. The fourth has employed a part-time practitioner for the past three years, prior to which this school division employed a full-time school psychologist.

The demographic data reveal several differences between

the school divisions. School Division A with a total student enrollment of 435, employs a part-time school psychologist as might be expected for a school division its size. The other three school divisions have student enrollments which, according to the professionally recognized ideal ratio (1:2,500), would indicate the need for a full-time practitioner.

The training and experience of the special education supervisor possibly has an impact on the administrative decision-making regarding the means of employing a school psychologist. It appears more likely, however, that the school division superintendents' perceptions and past experiences with part-time school psychological services weigh more heavily on service delivery decisions. The supervisors with special education teaching experience, however, appear to be more critical of the psychological services they receive. This could have an impact on employment decisions.

Part-time Employment Provisions

All of the part-time practitioners have a verbal agreement with their employing school divisions. The number of days agreed upon to provide school psychological services ranges from 4 to 10 days per month ($\bar{X}=5.25$). Compensation ranges from \$100 to \$240 per day ($\bar{X}=\$160$). All of the practitioners agree to provide psycho-educational assessments and any other school psychological function deemed necessary

by the supervisor. Three of the practitioners are reimbursed for mileage (two from home; one from central office). Only one school psychologist is provided secretarial service for the typing of psychological reports. One school psychologist specifically mentioned that no administrative duties were to be included in his roles. One agreement includes \$50 additional reimbursement for each assessment beyond three per day worked.

The most obvious difference between the working agreements is the amount of reimbursement. While one school psychologist earns \$100 per school day, another earns \$240. The preparation and typing of psychological reports must be taken into consideration, as well as the distances traveled to reach the places of employment. Given these time consuming activities (traveling and preparation of reports), the amount of reimbursement for the four part-time practitioners is somewhat more comparable. The mean reimbursement (\$160/day) is viewed as the most realistic figure for part-time school psychological services.

Detailed analysis reveals a greater difference in the working agreements. By comparing the number of days per year allocated for school psychological services to the number of referrals received, it becomes apparent that some part-time practitioners are forced to spend more of their time completing psycho-educational assessments than others.

School Division A receives approximately 29 student referrals per year and provides 40 days of school psychologist time. This would require an average of 1.75 student assessments per day worked and would allow the part-time school psychologist to perform other functions. School Division B receives approximately 120 student referrals per year and provides 40 days of school psychologist time. This would require the practitioner to complete an average of three student assessments per day worked. Very little, if any, time would be left for other functions. Indeed, the completion of three assessments per day appears somewhat overwhelming and certainly limits the comprehensiveness of the evaluations. School Division C receives approximately 32 referrals and provides 30 days of school psychologist time. This would require the practitioner to complete an average of 1.07 assessments per day worked. School Division D receives approximately 70 student referrals and provides 100 days of school psychologist time. This would require the completion of an average of .70 assessments per day worked by the part-time school psychologist. Thus, in one school division which utilizes the services of a part-time school psychologist (School Division B), the practitioner's time is devoted almost totally to psycho-educational assessments.

Strengths of the Part-time Employment

The greatest advantage of employing a part-time school

psychologist is financial. The special education supervisors from each of the four school divisions employing part-time practitioners noted this advantage. Their comments included: "cost efficient", "budgetary advantage", "get our money's worth", and "one-half the cost". After employing a part-time school psychologist who was able to adequately meet evaluation timelines, it was difficult for one special education supervisor to recommend the need for a full-time practitioner. Two other supervisors with part-time services noted that they would not be able to get a good return for the additional expense of a full-time psychologist. The fourth supervisor believed his school division was spending as much as could be justified to provide adequate services.

The second most frequently noted strength was the impartiality of part-time school psychologists. The supervisors and the part-time practitioners perceived that the part-time nature of the employment resulted in a greater degree of school psychologist credibility with parents and teachers. Also noted was less pressure from school personnel to place children in special programs as well as less involvement in staff personality conflicts.

Knowledge and expertise of the part-time school psychologists was mentioned as a strength. Two special education supervisors pointed out the high quality of the psycho-educational assessments and reports they received. They also indicated that the training and experience of their

part-time school psychologists was a strength of the employment relationship. One supervisor noted the ability of his school division's part-time practitioner to bring in ideas from outside sources and refer children to specific agencies.

The final strength of the part-time employment of a school psychologist was revealed by one supervisor when comparing part-time services to contracted assessment services. The supervisor felt the part-time practitioner was able to "work into the system" better and "provided more organization" on a day-to-day basis.

Weaknesses of the Part-time Employment

The following weaknesses were noted by the supervisors of special education and/or the part-time school psychologists:

- a) limited availability for consultation with parents and teachers (four school divisions)
- b) more time for individual and group counseling needed (four school divisions)
- c) more in-service time needed (three school divisions)
- d) more input for eligibility meetings needed (three school divisions)
- e) more input for in-school screenings needed (two school divisions)
- f) more time for research and program evaluation needed (two school divisions)
- g) time needed for crisis intervention (one school division)

- h) time needed for student observation
(one school division)
- i) problems meeting evaluation timelines
(one school division)
- j) limited communication between supervisor
and psychologist (one school division)

These weaknesses indicate that the employment of part-time school psychologists results in the limited availability of a practitioner on a day-to-day basis for important functions such as parent and teacher consultation, student counseling, in-service for school personnel, etc. All school divisions employing part-time school psychologists faced a number of the above weaknesses.

Internal Resources Utilized

A very limited number of resources available within school divisions were identified by the supervisors of special education as supplementary to the work of the part-time school psychologists. Two supervisors indicated that teachers of learning disabled students were used to "help with problem kids" and conduct "informal counseling". One supervisor noted the use of learning disabilities teachers to help reduce the rate of inappropriate referrals reaching the central office. This supervisor indicated that the expertise of these teachers was used by the in-school screening committees.

One special education supervisor pointed out that school

principals were helpful during in-school screening evaluations. This supervisor felt that the principals were instrumental in ensuring that only "appropriate" referrals were received by her office.

The final internal resource mentioned which supplemented the work of the part-time school psychologist in one school division was the visiting teacher. The supervisor of special education noted that this individual offered "some counseling" to children in conjunction with the counseling provided by the part-time school psychologist.

External Resources Utilized

Several resources outside the parameters of the public schools were identified by the supervisors of special education as supplementary to their school psychological services. Most frequently mentioned were staff members from local colleges and universities who provided in-service and staff development programs for regular and special class teachers. Three of the four school divisions which employed part-time school psychologists utilized these personnel.

Another external resource mentioned by the supervisors were local mental health clinics. These facilities offered individual and family counseling to two of the four school divisions employing part-time school psychologists.

Consortium arrangements were noted by two supervisors of special education. One supervisor indicated that his

school division received in-service offerings for special education personnel from educational consultants employed by the consortium. Another supervisor noted that the consortium her school division belonged to provided programs and services for low incidence handicapped children.

The final external resource utilized was technical assistance personnel funded by the Virginia State Department of Education. These individuals assisted teachers of preschool handicapped students with individual children and offered in-service education for these teachers.

Respondents' Summary

Three of the four school divisions will continue to offer school psychological services through part-time employment of a practitioner next year, according to the supervisors of special education. The special education supervisor of the fourth school division indicated that a full-time school psychologist will be sought next year. This supervisor pointed out that because of a recent consolidation of this school division with another, the superintendent was aware of the need to hire a full-time practitioner in order to offer adequate services.

All of the supervisors from school divisions which will continue to employ part-time school psychologists indicated their approval of this continuance. They felt this employment offered adequate services in the most cost efficient

manner. The part-time school psychologists (excluding the investigator) also indicated their willingness to continue with their present part-time employment arrangements.

Summary

The only school division which was able to offer comprehensive school psychological services through part-time employment of a school psychologist was School Division A. Because of its small student enrollment, adequate number of school psychologist working days, and willingness to expend a substantial amount of local funds to attract a highly qualified psychologist, this school division was able to provide a full range of services to the parents, teachers and students of the community.

The other three school divisions which employed part-time practitioners were not able to provide comprehensive services. As noted by the supervisors and the part-time school psychologists, more school psychologist time was needed to adequately perform even the "bare bones" functions which enable school divisions to meet state and federal guidelines.

The most important variables to consider when attempting to judge the comprehensiveness of part-time school psychological services appear to be: 1) the total number of students enrolled; 2) the number of referrals received;

3) the number of days a school psychologist is available; and 4) the amount and quality of supplementary internal and external resources.

CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

SCHOOL DIVISIONS W, X, Y, Z

Demographic Information

These rural school divisions have total student enrollments ranging from 757 to 6,500 ($\bar{X}=3,512$). The number of identified handicapped children ranges from 109 to 603 ($\bar{X}=310$). During the 1981-82 school year, student referrals in these school divisions ranged from 30 to 200 ($\bar{X}=107$). School psychological services are provided for each of these four school divisions on a contractual basis.

Three of these school divisions have administrators who are responsible for the supervision of all special education programs and services. One employs an I.E.P. Coordinator to oversee special education services. The number of years these supervisors (and coordinator) have been employed to perform their current roles ranges from 4 to 12 years ($\bar{X}=7$). Three of the four have special education teaching experience. One has the additional duties of an elementary school principal and has never taught special education classes or received formal special education administrative

training.

Three of these school divisions always contracted for school psychological services. This is the first year of contracted services for the fourth school division.

The demographic data reveal differences in the size of the school divisions and their contracting experience. School division W, with 6,500 students, might be expected to employ two or more full-time school psychologists. School Divisions X and Z, with 2,260 and 4,530 students respectively, also might be expected to employ a full-time practitioner(s). School Division Y, with 757 students, is the only school division which, because of the small number of students enrolled, might not be expected to employ a full-time school psychologist.

Contract Provisions

One commonality exists among the written contracts between the school divisions and the school psychologists. Each contract specifically outlines the major function of the psychologists -- psycho-educational assessments of students.

Three of the four contracts include eligibility meeting attendance as a condition of reimbursement. The fourth contract stipulates that the practitioner's attendance at two eligibility meetings replaces one assessment as a condition

of reimbursement. The fourth contract also specifically outlines the number of other duties which might be performed by the school psychologist during a school day.

Two of the contracts specify the number of days per month that the psychologists will be available. One outlines the number of evaluations per month expected. The fourth specifies (in detail) the evaluation components.

Three of the contracts provide reimbursement for mileage; two from the psychologists' private practice office, and one for distances traveled between schools. All of the practitioners are responsible for the typing of psychological reports.

Two of the contracted school psychologists are reimbursed \$180 for each day worked. One receives \$115 for each evaluation completed (with eligibility meeting attendance). The fourth contract provides \$90 per evaluation and eligibility meeting participation.

The contract data reveal that school psychologists who provide their services in this manner are well-compensated for their time. The contracts are primarily written to insure the completion of the psycho-educational assessment component of formal special education evaluations. Because school divisions have been able to meet the minimum requirements of state regulations by contractual arrangements, there exists no driving forces for expansion of these services.

Strengths of the Contracted Employment

The special education supervisor of School Division Y noted that his contracted school psychologist has the time to perform a wide range of functions aside from psycho-educational assessments. This school division is unique because of its small size, low number of referrals, and relatively small demand for school psychological services. In this case, contracted services ultimately have become part-time services, with the practitioner performing a full-range of school psychologist functions.

School Division W, although contracting primarily for assessment services, receives other school psychologist services. This is a result of the willingness of the contracted practitioner to go "above and beyond" contractual stipulations.

School Divisions X and Z are offered high quality psycho-educational assessments and the expertise of highly trained and experienced practitioners. These school divisions expend approximately one-half the cost of employing a full-time school psychologist.

The following additional strengths were noted by the supervisors of special education and/or the contracted school psychologists:

- a) time efficiency (two school divisions)
- b) less pressure from teachers to have children placed in special education programs (one school division)

- c) brings in outside specialists, e.g., occupational therapist (one school division)
- d) integrity - not afraid to disagree with school personnel (one school division)
- e) parents view as highly trained consultant and do not question psychologist's ability (one school division)
- f) provide services which could not be found elsewhere (one school division)

Weaknesses of the Contracted Employment

Each of the four school divisions which utilize the services of contracted school psychologists have specific problems associated with this employment. The following weaknesses were identified by the supervisors of special education, I.E.P. coordinator, and/or the contract school psychologists:

- a) limited or no student counseling available (four school divisions)
- b) not enough teacher consultation (three school divisions)
- c) lack of in-service for teachers (three school divisions)
- d) lack of time to consult with parents (three school divisions)
- e) more time needed to observe children (two school divisions)
- f) no time to help with behavior management of students (two school divisions)
- g) input needed during in-school screening evaluations (two school divisions)

- h) no time for planning and conducting research (one school division)
- i) evaluators do not attend the eligibility meetings (one school division)

The data indicate that although contracted services are an efficient means of providing psycho-educational assessments of students, many, if not all, other school psychologist functions are not offered.

Internal Resources Utilized

Two of the special education supervisors noted the use of teachers of learning disabled students as consultants who help regular classroom teachers with acting-out children. These LD teachers also develop behavior management schedules for children in need.

One school division utilizes the visiting teacher to help with crisis intervention tasks and work with the courts and social service agencies. This school division has a school psychology graduate student available to consult with teachers. The I.E.P. coordinator observes children in various settings and the school nurse offers informal counseling of children.

One school division's special education supervisor noted the use of educational diagnosticians. These individuals provide the educational component of formal evaluations and assess the perceptual functioning of children.

External Resources Utilized

The most common external resources used by these four school divisions to supplement the contracted school psychological services they receive are local mental health clinics. Three supervisors of special education indicated the use of these clinics for parenting skill sessions, counseling, triennial re-evaluations, and consultation.

The use of university personnel who provide in-service education for regular and special educators was mentioned by two supervisors. One supervisor noted the use of school personnel from a large city school division who provide in-service training for teachers.

Other external resources utilized include: 1) child evaluation clinic; 2) state hospital personnel; 3) technical assistance (pre-school handicapped specialists) personnel; and 4) substance abuse counselor.

Respondents' Summary

The three special education supervisors indicated that their school divisions would continue to contract for school psychological services next year. The I.E.P. coordinator was unsure about future arrangements.

Four of the six contracted practitioners noted that they will not continue contracting next year. Their reasons included: 1) desire to use all of their training; 2) inade-

quate services being provided; and 3) distances traveled were too great.

Summary

Only one of these four school divisions was able to offer fairly comprehensive services. This school division (School Division Y) receives more than assessment services because the small number of student referrals allows the school psychologist to perform other functions.

The remaining three school divisions with contracted school psychological services provide only assessment functions with extremely little school psychologist input in other areas. The primary restraining force appears to be money. These school divisions receive contracted assessment services for much less than the cost of a full-time practitioner's salary. Given the current economic climate, the expenditure of additional funds for improved psychological services for these school divisions appears unlikely.

CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS COMPARISON

Comparison of the part-time employment arrangements of school divisions A,B,C and D with the contracted employment of school psychologists in school divisions W,X,Y and Z reveals the following major differences:

- 1) Part-time school psychologists were more able to perform functions other than psycho-educational assessments of students (e.g., eligibility meeting attendance, individual counseling, parent and teacher consultation).
- 2) The written contracts developed by the school divisions and the contract school psychologists differed from the verbal agreements of the part-time school psychologists and their employing school divisions. While contracted practitioners were employed mainly to provide psycho-educational assessments, part-time school psychologists' working agreements noted practitioners' involvement in other functions.
- 3) Compensation for contracted school psychologists was provided on a per child basis, whereas part-time school psychologists were paid on a per diem basis. Thus, contracted practitioners, in order to meet the demands of their contracts, had to devote most of their time to psycho-educational assessments. Part-time school psychologists had more flexibility to devote their time to other school psychologist functions.
- 4) Although weaknesses of both types of employment were noted by the supervisors and the school psychologists, the employment of contracted school psychologists resulted in less psychologist involvement in student counseling, consultation with parents and teachers, student observation, and in-service education for teachers.

In summation, the majority of school divisions which employed part-time school psychologists received at least a limited degree of psychologist input in functions other than psycho-educational assessments of students. The majority of school divisions which employed contract school psychologists

did so to provide psycho-educational assessments of students only.

SECTION II

SERVICE DELIVERY COMPARISON

Introduction

This section compares rural part-time and contract school psychological service delivery to rural full-time school psychological service delivery. Questionnaire responses from participants in the present investigation (i.e., part-time and contract school psychologists) were compared to the responses of full-time rural school psychologists who participated in Merchant's (1982) study.

The data which follow were obtained from the responses of 31 full-time, six contract, and two part-time school psychologists. The present researcher, a part-time school psychologist, did not include his responses to the school psychologists' questionnaire in the following data. The researcher's questionnaire responses are found in Appendix E.

Demographic Variables

Full-time school psychologists. Participants were asked to indicate the highest degree they had earned. One respondent (3%) held a bachelor's degree, 22 (71%) held master's degrees, 7 (16%) held an educational specialist (CAGS) degree, and one (3%) held a doctorate (Ph.D.).

School psychology was the area of training in which 24 (77%) of the participants received their highest degrees.

One respondent (3%) noted clinical psychology, two (6%) indicated general psychology, and two (6%) received their highest degrees in education.

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years experience they had in other areas. Ten participants (32%) had no prior experience. Ten (32%) had worked as psychologists in other than a school setting. Five (16%) had taught regular education classes, and three (10%) had taught special education. Two participants (6%) noted instruction at the university level, and two (6%) indicated they had worked as special education supervisors. Six (19%) listed work experience in other areas. These positions were specified as librarian, mental health administrator, educational diagnostician, social worker, business manager, and guidance counselor.

Respondents noted they had from 1 to 17 years experience in the above areas. Specifically, those who had worked as psychologists in other than a school setting had experience ranging from 1 to 6 years ($\bar{X}=1.7$). Those with experience as a regular or special educator had worked 1 to 17 years ($\bar{X}=5.4$). University instruction experience ranged from 1 to 3 years ($\bar{X}=2$). Respondents with experience as special education supervisors were employed in that role from 1 to 2 years ($\bar{X}=1.5$). Finally, those who indicated other prior work experience were employed in those positions for 1 to 7 years ($\bar{X}=3.3$).

Respondents were asked to indicate areas of certification or endorsement by the Virginia Department of Education. Three (10%) were not certified. Twenty-seven (87%) were certified as school psychologists. One participant (3%) indicated certification as an elementary/secondary teacher. Six (19%) were certified as elementary/secondary teachers in addition to holding school psychology certification. One (3%) held an additional certification as a school counselor.

Respondents listed the total number of years they had been employed as a school psychologist. Their work experience in this role ranged from 1 to 18 years ($\bar{X}=5.3$).

Part-time school psychologists. Both of these practitioners held doctorates in education; one held an Ed.D. in school/clinical psychology; the other held a master's degree in school psychology and an Ed.D. in educational administration. Both of these respondents were certified as school psychologists by the Virginia Department of Education.

The prior work experience of one of these participants included five years as a classroom teacher; three as a regular educator and two as a special education teacher. The second part-time school psychologist had taught regular education classes for four years, worked as a special education director for one year, and as an educational consultant to a state rehabilitation center for two years. One of these respondents had been employed as a school psychologist for one year; the other for 16 years.

Contract school psychologists. Of these six participants, two held master's degrees in school psychology, and one held a master's degree in psychology. One held an educational specialist degree in school psychology. One of the respondents held an Ed.D. in counseling psychology, and one held a Ph.D. in child development and counseling.

Only one of these contract school psychologists was certified as a school psychologist by the Virginia Department of Education. Two were licensed professional counselors. Three were not certified, but were working under the supervision of a licensed psychologist.

One of these respondents listed no prior work experience. One was a psychologist in an other than school setting for 10 years. One was a mental health counselor in a community mental health center for two years. One participant had worked as a regular educator for six years, and as a school counselor for four years. One was a regular educator for five months. One respondent listed his prior experience as: 1) counselor for mental health clinic emergency services (18 months); 2) child care worker (one year); and 3) mental health worker (two years).

These contract practitioners had experience as school psychologists ranging from one-half to two years ($\bar{X}=1.3$). Three of these respondents listed their job title as "student psychological examiner" during their one-half year tenure.

Percentages of Time Devoted to Job Functions

Full-time school psychologists. Participants were asked to indicate the percentage of time they spent in the following activities: assessment; intervention; consultation; research and follow-up; and administration (report writing, etc.). Assessment activities comprised between 20% and 75% of the respondents' professional time ($\bar{X}=31\%$). Intervention activities were reported to take between 1% and 35% of their time ($\bar{X}=13\%$). Consultation tasks took between 3% and 30% ($\bar{X}=15\%$). Research and follow-up activities comprised 0% to 25% ($\bar{X}=6\%$). Administration tasks took 5% to 65% ($\bar{X}=23\%$) of the responding practitioners' professional time.

Part-time school psychologists. Each of these two practitioners noted different percentages of their time were devoted to the five activities. Assessment functions comprised 60% of one respondent's professional time and 40% of the other's ($\bar{X}=50\%$). Intervention tasks took 10% and 20% of their time ($\bar{X}=15\%$). Consultation duties also took 10% and 20% of their time ($\bar{X}=15\%$). Research and follow-up activities were not performed by one respondent, and took 10% of the other respondent's time ($\bar{X}=5\%$). Administration activities took 10% and 20% ($\bar{X}=15\%$) of these respondents' professional time.

Contract school psychologists. Assessment activities comprised between 26% and 75% ($\bar{X}=56\%$) of the respondents'

time. Intervention tasks took 0% to 60% ($\bar{X}=12\%$) of their time. Consultation activities were reported to take between 0% and 20% ($\bar{X}=5\%$). Research and follow-up comprised 0% to 13% ($\bar{X}=3\%$). Administration and follow-up activities took between 15% and 50% ($\bar{X}=24\%$) of the participants' professional time.

Time Devoted to Handicapped and Non-handicapped Children

Full-time school psychologists. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentages of time they devoted to handicapped and non-handicapped students. Participants indicated a range of 5% to 95% ($\bar{X}=76\%$) of their time was spent working with handicapped students. Working with non-handicapped children comprised between 5% and 95% ($\bar{X}=24\%$) of these respondents' professional time.

Part-time school psychologists. Both of these practitioners reported they spent 70% of their time with handicapped children and 30% with those who were non-handicapped.

Contract school psychologists. These respondents indicated they spent between 75% and 100% ($\bar{X}=96\%$) of their time with handicapped children. Five of the six participants noted they spent all of their time with handicapped youngsters. One respondent spent 25% of his time with non-handicapped children.

Restrictions Placed on Job Performance

Full-time school psychologists. Participants were asked to note any restrictions placed on their job performance and to comment on these restrictions. Eleven respondents (35%) indicated there were no restrictions in their job performance. Fourteen (45%) were restricted in conducting individual counseling, fifteen (48%) in group counseling, fifteen (48%) in program development for the gifted, six (19%) in work with preschool children, eighteen (58%) in regular classroom program development, sixteen (51%) in affective education, and five (16%) specified there were restrictions placed on their job performance in their work with parents. Twenty respondents (63%) noted more than one restriction.

Comments regarding the nature of these restrictions were classified into three groups: 1) time; 2) supervisors' demands or philosophy; and 3) primary emphasis on special education. Nineteen participants (61%) indicated time as the major restriction. Six (19%) indicated supervisors' demands or philosophy, and seven (23%) noted that an emphasis on special education tasks (evaluations) had restricted their job performance in the above areas.

Part-time school psychologists. Both part-time school psychologists listed the same restrictions. These included: group counseling; program development for the gifted; pro-

gram development for regular students; and classroom affective education. Their specific comments were:

- Simply not having enough time; some of these duties are subsumed under other school personnel.
- I have not found the time to perform the above functions. It's impossible to do everything.

Contract school psychologists. All of these respondents indicated restrictions in the following areas: group counseling; program development for the gifted; work with preschool children; program development for regular students; and classroom affective education. Four of the six respondents noted restrictions in individual counseling and work with parents. Comments regarding the nature of these restrictions included:

- Not in contract with county.
- Our contract only specifies assessment services for children referred for special education. No other services are included at this time.
- Due to the nature of my contract, I am not able to work in any of the above areas.
- These are areas that I do not have an opportunity to deal with.
- Not contracted to provide any of the above services.

Number of Students Served

Full-time school psychologists. Respondents were asked

to note the total number of students they served. Responses indicated a range of 1,200 to 4,000 students. The mean number of students served was 2,693.

Part-time school psychologists. The range of students served was between 435 and 2,540. The mean number of students served was 1,742.

Contract school psychologists. These practitioners served between 757 and 6,500 students. The mean number of students served was 3,511.

Psychologist-to-student Ratio

The ratio of psychologist-to-student for full-time practitioners ranged from 1:1,200 to 1:4,000 ($\bar{X}$ =1:2,693). For part-time practitioners, using the number of days worked compared to a full-time school psychologist's total days worked (200), the ratio of psychologist-to-student ranged from 1:2,170 to 1:14,998 ($\bar{X}$ =1:9,956). The psychologist-to-student ratio for contract school psychologists ranged from 1:3,785 to 1:13,000 ($\bar{X}$ =1:8,723). These contract ratios were calculated using the number of days a school psychologist was expected to be available compared to the number of days worked by a full-time practitioner.

Professional Development

Full-time school psychologists. Respondents were asked to indicate if their school system provided payment for the

attendance of in-service workshops, conferences and professional meetings. All thirty-one full-time school psychologists (100%) indicated that payment was provided. Ten respondents (32%) noted that a yearly allotment of money was provided for this purpose. Twenty-one participants (68%) indicated payment was provided on a conference-by-conference basis.

Part-time school psychologists. Both of these school psychologists indicated that no payment was provided for their attendance at professional development activities.

Contract school psychologists. Of the six respondents, only one indicated that she received payment for her attendance at professional development activities. This respondent noted that she was reimbursed on a conference-by-conference basis.

Salary

Full-time school psychologists. Respondents were asked to indicate their salary based on 12 month employment. Salaries ranged from \$13,500 to \$25,400. The mean yearly salary for rural full-time school psychologists was \$18,529.

Part-time school psychologists. The salaries of these practitioners based on full-time employment ranged from \$30,000 to \$48,000. The mean yearly salary of part-time school psychologists was \$39,000.

Contract school psychologists. The salary of these

practitioners based on a 200 day school year, ranged from \$24,000 to \$48,000. The mean yearly salary of contract school psychologists was \$35,625.

Job Satisfaction

To help determine the job satisfaction of full-time, part-time, and contract school psychologists, participants' responses to the final five items of the questionnaire were analyzed. For items 21, 22, 24 and 25, categorization of open-ended responses was accomplished by classifying each response as one of the nine determinants of job satisfaction listed in the literature review.

Full-time school psychologists. Item 21 requested respondents' comments regarding the most personally rewarding aspect of their school psychology practice. The following number and corresponding percentage of respondents' comments were classified according to the nine categories of job satisfaction determinants:

1. salary 1 (3%)
2. repititious tasks 0 (0%)
3. task variety 0 (0%)
4. job environment 4 (13%)
5. co-workers 2 (6%)
6. supervision 0 (0%)
7. advancement opportunities 2 (6%)
8. autonomy 6 (19%)
9. achievement 26 (84%)

Item 22 requested respondents' perceptions of the two greatest advantages of their present job. Participants noted advantages in the following categories:

1. salary 9 (23%)
2. repititious tasks 0 (0%)
3. task variety 2 (6%)
4. job environment 15 (48%)
5. co-workers 7 (23%)
6. supervision 0 (0%)
7. advancement opportunities 4 (13%)
8. autonomy 14 (45%)
9. achievement 4 (13%)

Item 22 requested the respondents to indicate the worst aspect of their present job. Responses were classified in the following manner:

1. salary 7 (23%)
2. repititious tasks 6 (20%)
3. task variety 5 (16%)
4. job environment 1 (3%)
5. co-workers 4 (13%)
6. supervision 5 (16%)
7. advancement opportunities 6 (20%)
8. autonomy 6 (20%)
9. achievement 3 (10%)

Item 23 requested a rating of respondents' present level of job satisfaction compared to their satisfaction five years ago. Because a large percentage of respondents were not employed five years ago, only their present level of satisfaction was analyzed. Respondents noted the following levels:

- very dissatisfied 1 (3%)
- moderately dissatisfied 4 (13%)
- ambivalent satisfaction 6 (20%)
- moderately satisfied 11 (37%)
- very satisfied 9 (27%)

Item 24 requested respondents' perceptions of the factors which most contributed to their present level of job satisfaction. Respondents' comments were classified according to the following nine determinants of job satisfaction:

1. salary 4 (13%)

2. repititious tasks 0 (0%)
3. task variety 2 (7%)
4. job environment 3 (11%)
5. co-workers 4 (13%)
6. supervision 3 (11%)
7. advancement opportunities 2 (7%)
8. autonomy 7 (25%)
9. achievement 4 (13%)

Item 25 requested whether the respondents would advise a bright, energetic young person to enter the school psychology profession. Sixteen (52%) indicated they would, nine (29%) noted they would not, and six (19%) were undecided. Respondents were also requested to indicate their reasons for advising or not advising. Examples of respondents' comments which would encourage a young person to enter the profession included:

- Enjoyable helping children.
- Sound training for other careers.
- I think school psychology is the most challenging branch of psychology.
- It offers rewards for the right person.
- After the economic scare, school psychology will continue to grow.

Examples of respondents' comments which would advise a young person against entering the profession included:

- The pay is not good.
- Many superintendents don't seem to want school psychologists.
- It's a lonely job in a rural area.
- I would advise private practice.

- I believe there will be fewer jobs with more restrictions in the future.
- For the amount of training, there is minimal payoff.

Part-time school psychologists. Because only two part-time practitioners participated in the investigation, all of their comments regarding items 21 through 25 will be listed. In regard to item 21, the most personally rewarding aspects of their school psychology practice, one respondent indicated "working with children". The other noted, "Being able to effect change in the students I work with."

The two greatest advantages of one participant's present job were noted as "the personnel I deal with" and "helping the child and his parents". The other part-time school psychologist viewed the advantages as "I'm paid well for what I do and people seem to appreciate my work." Both of these practitioners indicated they were "satisfied" with their part-time employment.

In response to the factors which have contributed to their current level of satisfaction, one respondent indicated, "The people with whom I work and the respect which is accorded to me." The other practitioner noted, "After working as a special education director, I find fewer problems with my present job. It also gives me time to do other things."

Both practitioners indicated they would advise a young

person to enter the school psychology profession. One noted "It's rewarding, offers a variety of tasks, and is an ever-changing field to enter." The other part-time school psychologist noted, "For someone who enjoys working with kids and solving problems, this is it."

Contract school psychologists. In response to item 21, the most personally rewarding aspects of their school psychology practice, the following comments were received:

- Discovering and placing a child with learning problems so that his/her education may be easier and more enjoyable.
- My contact with children, teachers and parents.
- Being able to adequately diagnose a problem and then follow a student's progress as remediation or treatment is provided.
- The times that I am able to facilitate a helpful change in a program or other intervention for a child who is experiencing distress due to academic, emotional, or behavioral problems.
- Being able to put my initial feelings about evaluations into practice and being able to be of assistance to teachers.
- Seeing children who were very unhappy in school placed in a program where they are getting help. Seeing these children blossom out and actually feel good about themselves.

The two greatest advantages of their present job were seen as:

- The main advantage of my present job is the flexibility and working hours. The pay is better than my previous full-time job so I feel adequately reimbursed for my work.
- Good experience in looking for a permanent job. Pay is good considering the circumstances of the contract.
- For a full-time student, this is an ideal situation since the time demands are not tremendous. The supervision and experience I am getting is extremely valuable for my stage of professional development.
- I like the variety and status of the job.
- Flexibility, status.
- Flexibility, freedom.

The worst aspects of their current employment were seen as:

- Lack of opportunity for follow-up.
- Amount of time, pay.
- Working out financial matters.
- Working on a contract basis which places restrictions on the development of a fuller role for the school psychologist would be very unpleasant as a long-range job. Doing only assessments is too restrictive for me and I would quickly become dissatisfied.
- Being unable to get to know the system. Being unable to attend eligibility meetings.
- Because I am new, I do not know everyone and all the appropriate norms.

In regard to their present level of job satisfaction, four of the respondents indicated they were satisfied; two were very satisfied. The following comments were received concerning factors which contributed to the respondents' level of satisfaction.

- Continued education, feelings of accomplishment, productivity and value.
- Being my own boss.
- My own willingness to learn new skills.
- Gaining experience.
- Everyone is so cooperative and really helpful. Everyone pulls together to do the best for the children. I also have a sense of independence; I do not feel pressured in my job. I felt a lot of pressure to conform in my previous job.

Four of the respondents indicated they would advise a young person to enter the profession. One would advise not entering the field. One participant did not respond to this item. Reasons for advising were:

- If interested, it's a good opportunity.
- The opportunity to effect change in young people. The flexibility of the position, and the opportunity to expand interests.
- I would encourage anyone who really is interested in working with kids and who is willing to accept the teacher as an equal professional.

- For someone who enjoys working with children, it's a great job.

The one contract school psychologist who would not advise a young person to enter the profession indicated:

- I'd recommend a doctoral degree in psychology with an emphasis in evaluation. I feel that counseling and intervention techniques are an important part of a school psychology position, however most programs don't provide enough training to conduct therapy and intervention with confidence and insure a good outcome.

Summary

The comparative data indicate that full-time school psychologists included in this study had approximately the same amount of academic preparation as the contracted practitioners. The two part-time school psychologists had doctoral degrees and were more highly educated than the majority of full-time and contract school psychologists.

Contracted practitioners held fewer school psychology certifications than did full-time or part-time school psychologists. Three of the contract psychologists, however, were completing the requirements for this certification.

In general, contract school psychologists had less prior experience than did their full-time and part-time counterparts. Two of the contracted practitioners had a great deal of prior experience. Thus, two groups of contract practitioners were seen; one with little prior experience, and one

with more prior experience than the majority of full-time school psychologists.

Part-time school psychologists spent more of their professional time on assessment functions than did full-time practitioners, and less than contract school psychologists. Part-time school psychologists also noted greater involvement in non-assessment functions than did contracted practitioners. Full-time school psychologists spent the greatest amount of professional time in non-assessment duties.

In regard to working with handicapped and non-handicapped students, contract practitioners worked almost solely with the handicapped. Full-time and part-time school psychologists spent approximately 30% of their time with non-handicapped students.

Full-time and part-time school psychologists noted little involvement in group counseling, program development for the gifted, work with preschool children, and regular classroom program development. Part-time school psychologists noted generally fewer restrictions placed on their individual counseling functions, and more restrictions placed on their ability to conduct affective education in classrooms, than did their full-time counterparts. Contracted school psychologists indicated restrictions in all of the above areas. In addition, restrictions were noted in individual counseling and working with parents. Con-

tractual stipulations were given as the reasons for these many restrictions.

Great differences between the three groups were found in regard to psychologist-to-student ratios. The average ratio for full-time school psychologists was 1:2,693. Part-time and contract ratios were 1:9,956 and 1:8,723 respectively.

All full-time school psychologists noted the availability of funds for professional development. None of the part-time and only one contract school psychologist indicated the availability of funds for this purpose.

The salaries of full-time school psychologists differed greatly from those of part-time and contracted practitioners. The average full-time yearly salary was \$18,529, while part-time school psychologists, if employed on a 200 day basis, would have earned approximately \$39,000. Contracted school psychologists, if employed for 200 school days, would have earned a yearly salary of approximately \$35,000.

The data collected regarding the job satisfaction of school psychologists was inconclusive partly because of the small numbers of school psychologists involved in the investigation, and because of little, if any, discernable differences in the respondents' comments. All groups considered their interaction with children as a factor lead-

ing to their job satisfaction. Salary and flexibility were mentioned as positive factors more often by part-time and contracted school psychologists than by full-time psychologists. Time and lack of involvement in non-assessment duties were more frequently referred to by part-time and contract practitioners as negative influences on their overall job satisfaction.

The data obtained through the questionnaire responses of part-time and contract school psychologists were discrepant in several areas with the data obtained during the personal interviews with these school psychologists and their supervisors. By comparing the case-study data with part-time and contract school psychologists' questionnaire responses, the following discrepancies were surfaced:

- 1) It was found through the interviews that the part-time school psychologist for school divisions B and C devoted almost all of his professional time to assessment functions. Questionnaire responses indicated approximately 50% of this practitioner's time was devoted to other functions (e.g. intervention and consultation).
- 2) The mean percentage of time devoted to the intervention activities of contract practitioners (12% reported in the questionnaires) was inflated. According to the results of the interviews, five percent or less of these contracted school psychologists' time was devoted to individual counseling and crisis intervention.
3. One part-time school psychologist indicated on his questionnaire that he spent approximately 30% of his professional time with non-handicapped children. Results of the

interviews indicated that almost all of his time was spent with handicapped children.

- 4) One contract school psychologist and one part-time practitioner failed to note individual counseling and work with parents as restricted activities. Interview results indicated that these school psychologists were restricted in those areas because of time limitations and contractual demands.
- 5) Questionnaire responses in regard to the job satisfaction of three contract school psychologists indicated overall satisfaction with their roles. Interview results indicated overall dissatisfaction and desire to terminate contracting after completion of the current year of employment.

These discrepancies might have been the result of misunderstandings regarding certain items on the questionnaire. Additionally, the interviews allowed the researcher to follow-up on participants' responses. The interview data are believed to be more accurate because of the reasons noted above and because the interview data were obtained from the special education supervisors as well as the part-time and contract school psychologists.

SECTION III

RURAL SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS

Response Rate

On January 18, 1983, survey materials were mailed to 86 rural school principals. By January 30, 1983, a total of 48 (56%) had been returned. Follow-up letters and survey materials were mailed to all non-respondents on January 31, 1983. This second mailing produced 19 additional returned questionnaires. Thus, questionnaires were received from 67 (78%) of the 86 principals who were sent survey materials.

Of the 67 returned questionnaires, 5 (6%) were not used in the data analysis because the principals had not performed that role during the 1981-82 school year. Two principals (2%) did not complete the questionnaire, but noted that the special education supervisors of their school divisions might help with the investigation. One principal (1%) from a school division which employed a contract school psychologist, and one principal (1%) from a school division which employed a part-time school psychologist, did not complete the questionnaire, but noted that their school divisions did not employ a school psychologist. Thus, 58 (67%) returned questionnaires were used in the data analysis.

The returned questionnaires used in the data analysis represented the perceptions of 32 (74% of the number

mailed) principals with full-time school psychologists; 16 (62%) principals with part-time school psychologists; and 10 (58%) principals with contracted school psychologists.

Demographic Information

The mean total student enrollment of responding principals' schools with full-time school psychological services was 553 (range 130-1,927). The principals' experience in their present role ranged from 2 to 23 years ($\bar{X}$ =8.88). Nineteen elementary school principals, five middle school principals, and eight high school principals returned questionnaires.

The mean total student enrollment for responding principals' schools representing school divisions employing part-time school psychologists was 361 (range 158-762). Responding principals' experience in their present position ranged from 2 to 19 years ($\bar{X}$ =7.25). Questionnaires were returned from principals of nine elementary schools and one middle school.

School divisions employing contract school psychologists were represented by school principals with experience in their current roles ranging from 2 to 16 years ($\bar{X}$ =6.5). The mean total student enrollment of their schools was 450 (range 150-1,000). Principals of 12 elementary schools and four high schools returned questionnaires.

These demographic data indicate that school divisions employing full-time school psychologists included in this study had schools with slightly larger student enrollments than school divisions employing part-time or contracted school psychologists. The responding principals of schools representing school divisions with full-time school psychologists were also slightly more experienced than the responding principals from school divisions employing part-time or contracted school psychologists.

Results

Rural school principals from school divisions employing full-time, part-time or contract school psychologists were asked to note which of 18 school psychologist functions were available to the parents, teachers and children of their schools. In addition to noting the availability of services, principals were asked to indicate which school psychologist functions were utilized. Finally, principals' perceptions regarding their level of satisfaction with the amount and quality of 18 school psychologist functions were sought.

Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests. As Table 1 illustrates, responding principals with full-time services almost universally (97%) indicated the availability of this function. Ninety-one percent of

TABLE 1			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Administering and Scoring Individual Diagnostic Tests.			
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	31 (97)	10 (100)
	Not Available	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	0 (0)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	29 (91)	10 (100)
	Not Utilized	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	1 (6)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	13 (41)	5 (50)
	Satisfied	15 (47)	4 (40)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	1 (10)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	1 (3)	0 (0)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	15 (47)	5 (50)
	Satisfied	13 (41)	4 (40)
	Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	3 (9)	1 (10)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

these principals noted this function was utilized in their schools. Eighty-eight percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

All participants with part-time services noted the availability and utilization of this function. Ninety percent of these principals indicated that they were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents with contracted services indicated the availability and utilization of this function. The same percentage (88%) noted their satisfaction with the amount of this function, while all of these principals indicated their satisfaction with this function's quality.

Administration of group tests. As evidenced in Table 2, 25% of the respondents with full-time services indicated the availability of this function. Three percent noted they utilized it. Thirty-one percent indicated their dissatisfaction with the amount, and 19% were dissatisfied with the quality of this function.

Thirty percent of the participants with part-time services noted the availability of this function; 20% indicated its utilization. Only 10% were dissatisfied with the amount, and none of the principals noted their dissatisfaction with the quality of this function.

The availability and utilization of this function was

TABLE 2
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists
Administering Group Tests

Item	<u>Type of Service *</u>		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	8 (25)	3 (30)
	Not Available	16 (50)	4 (40)
	Don't Know	3 (9)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	3 (30)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	1 (3)	2 (20)
	Not Utilized	17 (53)	4 (40)
	Don't Know	1 (3)	0 (0)
	No Response	13 (41)	4 (40)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Satisfied	6 (19)	3 (30)
	Dissatisfied	7 (22)	1 (10)
	Very Dissatisfied	3 (9)	0 (0)
	No Response	16 (50)	6 (60)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Satisfied	5 (16)	3 (30)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	No Response	20 (63)	7 (70)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

indicated by 25% of the responding principals with contracted services. Thirteen percent of these principals registered their dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of this function.

Observations of children in various settings. As Table 3 displays, 97% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 84% indicated it was utilized. Eighty-five percent were satisfied with the amount, and 78% were satisfied with the quality of this function.

Ninety percent of the participants with part-time services indicated this function was available and utilized. Eighty percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents with contracted services noted this function was available and utilized. Forty-eight percent were satisfied with the amount, and 51% were satisfied with the quality.

Reviewing and researching records. As revealed in Table 4, 81% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 75% indicated it was utilized. Seventy-eight percent were satisfied with the amount, and 72% were satisfied with the quality.

Ninety percent of the participants with part-time services indicated this function was available and utilized.

TABLE 3			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Observing Children in Various Settings.			
Item	<u>Type of Service *</u>		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	31 (97)	9 (90)
	Not Available	1 (3)	4 (25)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	0 (0)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	27 (84)	9 (90)
	Not Utilized	3 (9)	4 (25)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	2 (13)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	7 (22)	1 (10)
	Satisfied	20 (63)	6 (38)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	1 (6)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	2 (6)	7 (44)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	9 (28)	4 (40)
	Satisfied	16 (50)	6 (38)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	1 (6)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	4 (13)	7 (44)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

Item	TABLE 4			
	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Reviewing and Researching Records			
	<u>Type of Service *</u>			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	26 (81)	9 (90)	9 (56)
	Not Available	2 (6)	0 (0)	4 (25)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	No Response	4 (13)	1 (10)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	24 (75)	9 (90)	9 (56)
	Not Utilized	2 (6)	9 (0)	4 (25)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	6 (19)	1 (10)	2 (13)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	6 (19)	2 (20)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	19 (59)	5 (50)	7 (44)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	1 (10)	1 (6)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	3 (9)	2 (20)	7 (44)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	7 (22)	4 (40)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	16 (50)	2 (20)	8 (50)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	1 (10)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	3 (30)	7 (44)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

Seventy percent were satisfied with the amount, and 60% were satisfied with the quality.

Fifty-six percent of the respondents with contracted services noted the availability and utilization of this function. Half of these principals were satisfied with the amount, and 56% were satisfied with the quality.

Conducting diagnostic interviews. Table 5 illustrates that 88% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 81% indicated it was utilized. Eighty-one percent were satisfied with the amount, and 75% were satisfied with the quality.

All of the participants with part-time services indicated this function was available; 90% noted it was utilized. Eighty percent were satisfied with the amount, and 70% were satisfied with the quality.

All of the respondents with contracted services indicated the availability and utilization of this function. Eighty-one percent were satisfied with the amount, and 75% were satisfied with the quality.

Preparation of written psychological reports. As revealed in Table 6, 97% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 94% indicated it was utilized. Ninety-four percent were satisfied with the amount, and 88% were satisfied with the quality.

TABLE 5			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Conducting Diagnostic Interviews			
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	28 (88)	10 (100)
	Not Available	2 (6)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	0 (0)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	26 (81)	9 (90)
	Not Utilized	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	1 (10)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	8 (25)	2 (20)
	Satisfied	18 (56)	6 (60)
	Dissatisfied	2 (6)	2 (20)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	4 (13)	0 (0)
			1 (6)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	9 (28)	4 (40)
	Satisfied	15 (47)	3 (30)
	Dissatisfied	2 (6)	1 (10)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	6 (19)	2 (20)
			2 (13)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

TABLE 6			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Preparing Written Psychological Reports			
Item	Type of Service *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	31 (97)	10 (100)
	Not Available	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	0 (0)	0 (0)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	30 (94)	10 (100)
	Not Utilized	1 (3)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	1 (3)	1 (6)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	17 (53)	6 (60)
	Satisfied	13 (41)	3 (30)
	Dissatisfied	2 (6)	1 (10)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	0 (0)	1 (6)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	16 (50)	6 (60)
	Satisfied	12 (38)	3 (30)
	Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	1 (10)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

All of the participants with part-time services noted the availability and utilization of this function. Ninety percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

All of the responding principals with contracted services indicated this function was available; 94% noted it was utilized. Eighty-seven percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Conducting interviews with parents. Table 7 illustrates that 94% of the participants with full-time services indicated the availability of this function; 88% noted it was utilized. Eighty-one percent were satisfied with the amount, and 85% were satisfied with the quality.

Of the participants with part-time services, 90% indicated the availability of this function; 80% noted it was utilized. Eighty percent were satisfied with the amount, and 70% were satisfied with the quality.

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents with contracted services indicated the availability and utilization of this function. Fifty-six percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Participating as a member of a special education evaluation team. As shown in Table 8, 94% of the responding principals with full-time services indicated the availability of this function; 84% noted it was utilized. Seventy-two percent were satisfied with the amount, and 82% were

Item	TABLE 7			
	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Conducting Interviews with Parents			
	<u>Type of Service</u> *			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	30 (94)	9 (90)	11 (69)
	Not Available	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (25)
	Don't Know	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	1 (3)	1 (10)	0 (0)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	28 (88)	8 (80)	11 (69)
	Not Utilized	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (19)
	Don't Know	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	3 (9)	2 (20)	1 (6)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	10 (31)	3 (30)	5 (31)
	Satisfied	16 (50)	5 (50)	4 (25)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	2 (20)	6 (38)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	12 (38)	4 (40)	5 (31)
	Satisfied	15 (47)	3 (30)	4 (25)
	Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	4 (13)	3 (30)	6 (38)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

Item	TABLE 8			
	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Participating as Members of Special Education Evaluation Teams			
	<u>Type of Service *</u>			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	30 (94)	10 (100)	14 (88)
	Not Available	2 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	27 (84)	10 (100)	12 (75)
	Not Utilized	2 (6)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	Don't Know	1 (3)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	2 (6)	0 (0)	2 (13)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	10 (31)	2 (20)	5 (31)
	Satisfied	13 (41)	7 (70)	3 (19)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	1 (10)	3 (19)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	6 (19)	0 (0)	4 (25)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	12 (38)	4 (40)	5 (31)
	Satisfied	14 (44)	5 (50)	5 (31)
	Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	1 (10)	4 (25)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

satisfied with the quality.

All of the participants with part-time services indicated the availability and utilization of this function. Ninety percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents with contracted services noted the availability of this function; 75% indicated it was utilized. Half were satisfied with the amount, and 62% were satisfied with the quality.

Serving as an Eligibility Committee member. As Table 9 indicates, 97% of the respondents with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 94% signified it was utilized. Ninety-one percent were satisfied with the amount and 94% were satisfied with the quality.

Ninety percent of the participants with part-time services indicated the availability and utilization of this function. Eighty percent were satisfied with the amount, and 70% were satisfied with the quality.

Eighty-one percent of the responding principals with contracted services noted the availability of this function; 75% indicated it was utilized. Sixty-nine percent were satisfied with the amount, and 63% were satisfied with the quality.

Actively participating in IEP development. As seen in Table 10, 75% of the responding principals with full-time services indicated the availability of this function; 66% noted it was utilized. Sixty-six percent were satisfied

TABLE 9				
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Serving as Eligibility Committee Members				
Item	Type of Service *			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	31 (97)	9 (90)	13 (81)
	Not Available	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	1 (3)	1 (10)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	30 (94)	9 (90)	12 (75)
	Not Utilized	1 (3)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Don't Know	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	1 (3)	1 (10)	2 (13)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	14 (44)	2 (20)	6 (38)
	Satisfied	15 (47)	6 (60)	5 (31)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	2 (20)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (19)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	16 (50)	4 (40)	6 (38)
	Satisfied	14 (44)	3 (30)	4 (25)
	Dissatisfied	0 (0)	1 (10)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	2 (20)	4 (25)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

TABLE 10			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Actively Participating in IEP Development			
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	24 (75)	7 (70)
	Not Available	4 (13)	1 (10)
	Don't Know	4 (13)	1 (10)
	No Response	0 (0)	1 (10)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	21 (66)	5 (50)
	Not Utilized	6 (19)	0 (0)
	Don't Know	4 (13)	1 (10)
	No Response	1 (3)	4 (40)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	6 (19)	2 (20)
	Satisfied	15 (47)	3 (30)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	2 (20)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	3 (30)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	7 (22)	3 (30)
	Satisfied	14 (44)	2 (20)
	Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	No Response	9 (28)	5 (50)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

with the amount and quality of this function.

Seventy percent of the participants with part-time services indicated the availability of this function; 50% noted its utilization. Fifty percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents with contracted services noted the availability of this function; 56% indicated it was utilized. Forty-four percent were satisfied with the amount, and 50% were satisfied with the quality of this function.

Offering follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placements. As Table 11 displays, 91% of the respondents with full-time services noted this function was available; 81% indicated it was utilized. Seventy-two percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Of the participants with part-time services, 80% indicated the availability of this function; 70% noted it was utilized. Seventy percent were also satisfied with the quality and amount of this function.

Sixty-three percent of the responding principals with contracted services indicated this function was available and utilized. Half of the respondents noted their satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function.

Conducting individual therapy or counseling with

TABLE 11				
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Offering Follow-up Consultation Regarding IEPs or Special Education Placements				
Item	Type of Service *			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	29 (91)	8 (80)	10 (63)
	Not Available	1 (3)	1 (10)	3 (19)
	Don't Know	1 (3)	0 (0)	3 (19)
	No Response	1 (3)	1 (10)	0 (0)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	26 (81)	7 (70)	10 (63)
	Not Utilized	1 (3)	1 (10)	2 (13)
	Don't Know	3 (9)	0 (0)	3 (19)
	No Response	2 (6)	2 (20)	1 (6)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	7 (22)	2 (20)	3 (19)
	Satisfied	16 (50)	5 (50)	5 (31)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	2 (20)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	1 (10)	6 (38)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	8 (25)	3 (30)	3 (19)
	Satisfied	15 (47)	4 (40)	5 (31)
	Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	6 (19)	3 (30)	6 (38)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

children. Table 12 reveals that 75% of the participants with full-time services noted this function was available; 69% indicated it was utilized. Fifty-nine percent were satisfied with the amount, and 63% were satisfied with the quality.

Sixty percent of the respondents with part-time services indicated the availability and utilization of this function. Twenty percent were satisfied with the amount, and 40% were satisfied with the quality.

Of the responding principals with contracted services, 25% noted the availability of this function; 19% indicated it was utilized. Twenty-six percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Conducting group counseling with children. As illustrated in Table 13, half of the responding principals with full-time services indicated this function was available; 28% noted its utilization. Forty-one percent were satisfied with the amount, and 44% were satisfied with the quality.

Thirty percent of the participants with part-time services indicated this function was available; 20% noted it was utilized. None of these principals was satisfied with the amount, and 10% were satisfied with the quality of this function.

None of the respondents with contracted services noted

TABLE 12			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Conducting Individual Therapy or Counseling with Children			
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	24 (75)	6 (60)
	Not Available	4 (13)	3 (30)
	Don't Know	3 (9)	0 (0)
	No Response	1 (3)	1 (10)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	22 (69)	6 (60)
	Not Utilized	4 (13)	2 (20)
	Don't Know	2 (6)	0 (0)
	No Response	4 (13)	2 (20)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	8 (25)	1 (10)
	Satisfied	11 (34)	1 (10)
	Dissatisfied	8 (25)	4 (40)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)
	No Response	4 (13)	4 (40)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	8 (25)	2 (20)
	Satisfied	12 (38)	2 (20)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	1 (10)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	No Response	6 (19)	5 (50)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

TABLE 13			
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Conducting Group Counseling with Children			
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	16 (50)	3 (30)
	Not Available	8 (25)	4 (40)
	Don't Know	5 (16)	1 (10)
	No Response	3 (9)	2 (20)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	9 (28)	2 (20)
	Not Utilized	14 (44)	2 (20)
	Don't Know	2 (6)	1 (10)
	No Response	7 (22)	5 (50)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	5 (16)	0 (0)
	Satisfied	8 (25)	0 (0)
	Dissatisfied	5 (16)	3 (30)
	Very Dissatisfied	4 (13)	0 (0)
	No Response	10 (31)	7 (70)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	6 (19)	1 (10)
	Satisfied	8 (25)	0 (0)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	1 (10)
	Very Dissatisfied	3 (9)	0 (0)
	No Response	12 (38)	8 (80)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

the availability or utilization of this function. None of these principals was satisfied with the amount or quality of this function.

Training parents through parent education classes.

As Table 14 reveals, 28% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 22% indicated its use. Twenty-two percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Of the respondents with part-time services, 30% noted this function was available; 20% indicated it was used. Ten percent were satisfied with the amount, and 20% were satisfied with the quality.

Only one respondent with contracted services (6%) indicated the availability and utilization of this function. This was the only respondent who was satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Conducting in-service training programs for school personnel. As shown in Table 15, 81% of the participants with full-time services indicated the availability of this function; 66% noted its use. Sixty-nine percent were satisfied with the amount, and 66% were satisfied with the quality.

Seventy percent of the respondents with part-time services indicated this function was available; 60% noted its use. Seventy percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

TABLE 14				
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Training Parents Through Parent Education Classes				
Item	<u>Type of Service *</u>			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	9 (28)	3 (30)	1 (6)
	Not Available	13 (41)	5 (50)	12 (75)
	Don't Know	6 (19)	1 (10)	2 (13)
	No Response	4 (13)	1 (10)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	7 (22)	2 (20)	1 (6)
	Not Utilized	14 (44)	4 (40)	11 (69)
	Don't Know	4 (13)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	7 (22)	4 (40)	3 (19)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	2 (6)	1 (10)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	5 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	2 (20)	3 (19)
	Very Dissatisfied	5 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	16 (50)	7 (70)	12 (75)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	2 (6)	2 (20)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	5 (16)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	0 (0)	3 (19)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	19 (59)	8 (80)	12 (75)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

TABLE 15				
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Conducting In-service Training Programs for School Personnel				
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	26 (81)	7 (70)	6 (38)
	Not Available	2 (6)	1 (10)	7 (44)
	Don't Know	3 (9)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	No Response	1 (3)	2 (20)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	21 (66)	6 (60)	5 (31)
	Not Utilized	4 (13)	1 (10)	7 (44)
	Don't Know	4 (13)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	No Response	3 (9)	3 (30)	2 (13)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	4 (13)	1 (10)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	18 (56)	6 (60)	5 (31)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	2 (20)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	5 (16)	1 (10)	8 (50)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	8 (25)	2 (20)	2 (13)
	Satisfied	13 (41)	5 (50)	4 (25)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	7 (22)	3 (30)	8 (50)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

Of the participants with contracted services, 38% noted the availability of this function; 31% indicated its use. Thirty-eight percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Consulting with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc. Table 16 illustrates that 88% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 81% indicated its use. Seventy-two percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Ninety percent of the participants with part-time services indicated this function was available; 70% noted its use. Seventy percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents with contracted services noted the availability and utilization of this function. Thirty-seven percent were satisfied with the amount, and 57% were satisfied with the quality.

Conducting research. As evidenced in Table 17, 19% of the respondents with full-time services indicated this function was available; 6% noted it was used. Twenty-two percent were satisfied with the amount, and 19% were satisfied with the quality.

None of the participants with part-time services indicated the availability or utilization of this function. One principal (10%) indicated his satisfaction with the

Item	TABLE 16			
	Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Consulting with School Personnel Regarding Individual Children, Classroom Management, etc.			
	<u>Type of Service *</u>			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	28 (88)	9 (90)	12 (75)
	Not Available	2 (6)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Don't Know	2 (6)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	No Response	0 (0)	1 (10)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	26 (81)	7 (70)	12 (75)
	Not Utilized	2 (6)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Don't Know	2 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	3 (30)	2 (13)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	9 (28)	3 (30)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	14 (44)	4 (40)	5 (31)
	Dissatisfied	5 (16)	2 (20)	5 (31)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	2 (6)	1 (10)	5 (31)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	10 (31)	4 (40)	3 (19)
	Satisfied	13 (41)	3 (30)	6 (38)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	0 (0)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	4 (13)	3 (30)	5 (31)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

TABLE 17
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists
Conducting Research

Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *		
	Full-Time ₁ N (%)	Part-Time ₂ N (%)	Contract ₃ N (%)
AVAILABILITY	Available	6 (19)	0 (0)
	Not Available	5 (16)	3 (30)
	Don't Know	16 (50)	3 (30)
	No Response	5 (16)	4 (40)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	0 (0)	3 (19)
	Not Utilized	7 (22)	2 (20)
	Don't Know	13 (41)	2 (20)
	No Response	10 (31)	6 (60)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	Satisfied	5 (16)	1 (10)
	Dissatisfied	5 (16)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	1 (10)
	No Response	19 (59)	8 (80)
			11 (69)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	2 (6)	0 (0)
	Satisfied	4 (13)	1 (10)
	Dissatisfied	3 (9)	0 (0)
	Very Dissatisfied	2 (6)	1 (10)
	No Response	21 (66)	8 (80)
			11 (69)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

amount and quality of this function.

Nineteen percent of the responding principals with contracted services noted the availability and utilization of this function. One respondent (6%) was satisfied with the amount, and three respondents (19%) were satisfied with the quality of this function.

Following-up results of intervention strategies. As displayed in Table 18, 66% of the responding principals with full-time services noted the availability of this function; 56% indicated its use. Sixty percent were satisfied with the amount, and 57% were satisfied with the quality of this function.

Seventy percent of the participants with part-time services noted this function was available; 60% indicated its utilization. Forty percent were satisfied with the amount and quality.

Of the respondents with contracted services, only 19% noted the availability and utilization of this function. Twelve percent were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

Interpretations

The data revealed differences in the availability, utilization and level of satisfaction of the principals for many of the 18 school psychologist functions analyzed.

TABLE 18				
Principals' Perceptions of School Psychologists Following-up Results of Intervention Strategies				
Item	<u>Type of Service</u> *			
	Full-Time ₁	Part-Time ₂	Contract ₃	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
AVAILABILITY	Available	21 (66)	7 (70)	3 (19)
	Not Available	3 (9)	0 (0)	9 (56)
	Don't Know	4 (13)	1 (10)	3 (19)
	No Response	4 (13)	2 (20)	1 (6)
UTILIZATION	Utilized	18 (56)	6 (60)	3 (19)
	Not Utilized	1 (3)	0 (0)	7 (44)
	Don't Know	6 (19)	1 (10)	3 (19)
	No Response	7 (22)	3 (30)	3 (19)
SATISFACTION AMOUNT	Very Satisfied	5 (16)	0 (0)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	14 (44)	4 (40)	1 (6)
	Dissatisfied	6 (19)	3 (30)	2 (13)
	Very Dissatisfied	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	7 (22)	3 (30)	12 (75)
SATISFACTION QUALITY	Very Satisfied	5 (16)	2 (20)	1 (6)
	Satisfied	13 (41)	2 (20)	1 (6)
	Dissatisfied	4 (13)	1 (10)	1 (6)
	Very Dissatisfied	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	No Response	9 (28)	5 (50)	13 (81)

1-N=32; 2-N=10; 3-N=16

*Percentages
Rounded

Full-time school psychologists provided the greatest number of available and utilized functions. Their services also received, in general, the highest level of satisfaction ratings for the amount and quality of these functions.

Part-time practitioners, although not able to provide as many functions as full-time school psychologists, offered more available and utilized functions than did contracted practitioners. Additionally, principals' level of satisfaction with the amount and quality of part-time school psychologists' functions was higher than that of the contracted school psychologists.

Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests was available and utilized by almost all of the principals. Their level of satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function did not differ according to the method of service delivery (i.e., full-time, part-time or contracted).

In regard to group test administration, the data showed only slight differences in the principals' perceptions. In the majority of the respondents' school divisions, this function was either not available or not utilized. It was difficult to perceive any differences in the participating principals' level of satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function because of its limited availability and use.

The data revealed differences in the principals' perceptions regarding school psychologists' observation of children in various settings. This function was available and utilized in approximately one-third fewer schools with contracted services than in schools with full-time or part-time services. Furthermore, responding principals with contracted school psychological services indicated less satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function. Thus, full-time and part-time employment of a school psychologist appeared to be superior to contracted employment in regard to offering this function.

Similar differences were disclosed by the data concerning school psychologists' reviewing and researching records of students. Contracted practitioners were able to provide less of this function than full-time or part-time school psychologists. Responding principals also noted less satisfaction with the amount of this function provided by contracted school psychologists compared with the amount provided by full-time or part-time practitioners.

The data showed no differences in regard to comparing the methods of service delivery concerning the conduction of diagnostic interviews by school psychologists. A majority of the respondents indicated availability and use of this function. No outstanding differences surfaced in regard to the principals' level of satisfaction with the amount

or quality of this function. Hence, the employment of a full-time, part-time or contracted school psychologist made little or no difference in the principals' perceptions of school psychologists' conduction of diagnostic interviews.

No differences could be drawn from the data in regard to school psychologists' preparation of written psychological reports. Most of the respondents receiving each of the types of service delivery methods indicated availability and utilization of this function. Also, a majority of the respondents noted their satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function. Contracted practitioners were less likely to conduct interviews with parents, than were full-time or part-time practitioners. Additionally, the data indicated that a smaller percentage of principals with contracted services were satisfied with the amount and quality of this function, compared to the satisfaction of principals with full-time or part-time services.

The data disclosed only slight differences in the availability and utilization of a school psychologist to participate as a member of a special education evaluation team. Contracted practitioners were less likely to be available or utilized for this function than were full-time or part-time school psychologists. A greater difference was revealed in the principals' satisfaction with this

function. Principals with contracted services noted less satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function than did those with full-time and part-time services.

Although the data regarding school psychologists serving as eligibility committee members did not show any differences in availability of this function between the groups of respondents, principals with contracted services noted less use of this function than did principals with full or part-time services. In addition, the principals with contracted services were less satisfied than those with part-time services, and much less satisfied than the principals with full-time services in regard to the amount and quality of this function.

The data showed differences between the service delivery types regarding school psychologists' active participation in IEP development. Principals with full-time services noted slightly more availability and use of this function than did respondents with part-time or contracted services. A greater difference in the principals' perceptions of the amount and quality of this function was found. Respondents with full-time services were more satisfied in this regard than were those with part-time or contracted services. Thus, it appeared that full-time services were superior to part-time and contracted services for the inclusion of a practitioner in the development of IEPs.

Principals with full-time services indicated greater availability and use of a school psychologist to offer follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placements than did the respondents with part-time or contracted services. Although the data revealed no outstanding differences between the level of satisfaction of principals with full or part-time services regarding the amount and quality of this function, principals with contracted services indicated less satisfaction in this regard. Hence, it appeared that schools with part-time or contracted services had less availability and use of a school psychologist for follow-up on IEPs or special education placements. Additionally, principals with contracted services were least satisfied with the amount and quality of this function.

The data showed great differences in the principals' perceptions of school psychologists conducting individual therapy or counseling with children. Clearly, principals with full-time services had more availability and use of this function than did those with part-time or contracted services. Additionally, respondents with full-time services were more satisfied with the amount and quality of this function. Therefore, the data indicated that full-time employment of a school psychologist was superior to part-time or contracted employment in regard to offering individual therapy or counseling to children.

School psychologists' conduction of group counseling with students was viewed differently by the respondents. None of the principals with contracted services indicated the availability of this function. A greater percentage of respondents with full-time services indicated the availability and use of this function than did those with part-time services. Satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function was registered by a much higher percentage of principals with full-time services than those with part-time or contracted services. Thus, the group counseling function of school psychologists was better provided through full-time employment of a practitioner.

Training parents through parent education classes was a school psychologist function not readily available or utilized by the majority of the respondents. Although principals with full and part-time services noted more availability and utilization of this function than those with contracted services, the data did not reveal any differences in the respondents' level of satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function. The data revealed therefore, limited use of school psychologists to train parents through parent education classes by school divisions employing full-time, part-time, or contracted practitioners.

The percentage of responding principals with contracted services which indicated the availability and utilization

of a school psychologist to conduct in-service training programs for school personnel was approximately half as large as the percentage of principals with full or part-time services which responded to this item. Additionally, principals with contracted services were much less satisfied with the amount and quality of this function than those with full or part-time services. Hence, contracted employment of a school psychologist resulted in less availability, utilization and principals' satisfaction with school psychologists' conduction of in-service training for school personnel.

Responding principals' perceptions of school psychologists consulting with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc., differed only according to their satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function. The percentages of respondents which noted the availability and utilization of this function did not differ according to the type of service they received. Principals with contracted services, however, were less satisfied with the amount and quality of this function than were those who received full or part-time services. Thus, contracted employment of a school psychologist resulted in less principal satisfaction with practitioners' consultation role.

Conducting research was a school psychologist function which was not available or utilized according to the principals with each of the three types of service. The level of

satisfaction data did not differ because of the limited availability of this function. Apparently, most school psychologists, regardless of type of employment, do not conduct much research within the parameters of the public schools.

Principals' perceptions regarding school psychologists following-up the results of intervention strategies differed according to the type of service the principals received. Principals with contracted services noted much less availability and utilization of this function than those with full or part-time services. In addition, a lower percentage of respondents with contracted services indicated satisfaction with the amount and quality of this function than the percentage of participants with full or part-time services. Again, contracted employment of a school psychologist resulted in less availability, utilization and principals' satisfaction.

Table 19 illustrates the areas of weakness surfaced by the principals' responses. The data indicated that full-time employment of a school psychologist was superior to part-time or contracted employment in the areas noted.

Principals' Comments

The final item on the principals' questionnaire asked for a listing of specific barriers which might restrict the school psychologist(s) from conducting any of his/her functions.

TABLE 19 (Continued)

Weaknesses of Part-time and Contracted Employment
Compared to Full-time Employment
Principals' Perceptions

School Psychologist Function	<u>Type of Employment</u>							
	<u>Part-Time</u>				<u>Contract</u>			
	Availability	Utilization	Satisfaction Amount	Satisfaction Quality	Availability	Utilization	Satisfaction Amount	Satisfaction Quality
10. Actively participating in IEP development			X	X			X	X
11. Follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placement	X	X			X	X	X	X
12. Conducting individual therapy or counseling with children	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
13. Conducting group counseling with children	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
14. Training parents through parent education classes					X	X		
15. Conducting in-service training programs for school personnel					X	X	X	X
16. Consultation with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc.							X	X
17. Conducting research								
18. Following-up results of intervention strategies				X	X	X	X	X

TABLE 19

Weaknesses of Part-time and Contracted Employment
Compared to Full-time Employment
Principals' Perceptions

School Psychologist Function	<u>Type of Employment</u>							
	<u>Part-Time</u>				<u>Contract</u>			
	Availability	Utilization	Satisfaction Amount	Satisfaction Quality	Availability	Utilization	Satisfaction Amount	Satisfaction Quality
1. Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests								
2. Group test administration								
3. Observations of children in various settings					X	X	X	X
4. Reviewing and researching records					X	X	X	
5. Conducting diagnostic interviews								
6. Preparing written psychological reports								
7. Conducting interpretative interviews with parents					X	X	X	X
8. Participating as a member of a special education evaluation team							X	X
9. Serving as an Eligibility Committee member				X		X	X	X

Because of their importance to the present investigation, a total listing of these barriers follows.

Principals with Full-time Services

- The school division employs one psychologist for 5 schools. This, of course, prevents her from spending as much time as needed at each school.
- Too heavy work load and not enough time.
- Case load of referrals to number of available psychologists is so great that preventative strategies cannot be addressed.
- Two psychologists, 6,800 students!
- Works with six schools.
- Our psychologist is outstanding in every respect. We feel very fortunate to have her assigned to our school.
- Major problem centers around psychologist being tied up with special education requirements. Little time for other problems. Administering psychologicals to candidates for eligibility committees is far too demanding.
- I personally am most pleased and satisfied with the services provided to my school by our psychologist. She goes the extra mile with extra time to satisfy our needs.
- Our school psychologist does an excellent job of relating to students and staff. Often she is limited in amount of time she has to give to group or individual counseling because she is involved with eligibility meetings and administrative activities for special education.
- Not enough time to do all these functions. The state guidelines for psychologist to enrollment is unrealistic. Should be one psychologist for every 1,000 students A.D.M.
- Time spread too thin. Could use another psychologist.

- Not enough psychologists for the division. Too much wasted time in writing detailed, meaningless reports. Lack of ability to communicate with many teachers. Lack of understanding of children. Impractical solutions.
- Time, number of children served, administrative directives, government agency regulations, paper work, inadequate staffing, complexity of school system, priorities.
- The major barrier is that our school system has but one school psychologist to share between three schools with a total enrollment of just under 2,000 students. Thus, this individual's time is severely limited in the areas of group and individual counseling.
- Parents in an extreme case or two. Working with federal guidelines, workload much too heavy.
- Lack of parent cooperation and lack of time.
- Hampered by the interpretation of various laws and regulations and by certain central office personnel. Are we to be guided by what the pupils need or what the system will provide?
- None. We are satisfied with our fine psychological department.

Principals with Part-time Services

- The amount of services available is restricted by the part-time nature of the school psychologist's work.
- Have a part-time psychologist - need full-time.
- A full-time division psychologist is needed in order that services can be rendered in group counseling, parent training program and group testing. Financial reasons seem to restrict the employment of a full-time psychologist.
- On a tight schedule for only a few hours a month. Very limited service.
- Our school psychologist is employed for 1 day a week

to serve three schools; a primary, elementary, and high school.

Principals with Contracted Services

- It seems to me that the biggest barrier we have is the parent. They seem to be on the defensive when you ask them to see a psychologist (school).
- Our psychologist is employed 2 days per week.
- No personal counseling, etc., or assistance with sudden, major problems. - Money.
- Our psychologist works on a contract basis. She is only available on a limited basis.
- Our psychologists work on a contractual basis. When the need arises to schedule tests, the psychologists are brought in to test as many as three or four students in a school day. The psychologist seldomly has time to talk to the classroom teacher or to observe the student. As special ed. coordinator for this school, I have difficulty arranging time to discuss a case with the psychologist because he or she must leave, or the school day is gone. Also, after the testing, they leave and we only have their reports to go by when meeting with the parents and teachers in eligibility meeting and IEP meeting. The psychologists never attend eligibility or IEP conferences. To my knowledge, parent and psychologists conference have not taken place concerning any of our ED/LD or EMR students. I promote getting a full-time school psychologist for our county.
- We contract a psychologist on a per-student basis for testing only.
- Part-time services only - used only for special ed.
- Our school division employs a school psychologist on a part-time basis. Responsibility is to administer and score individual diagnostic tests and serve as an Eligibility Committee member. We have very limited services.
- We have no school psychologists available in our county. All testing is done by contract. Because of the short time these people spend in our schools

(when they are testing) they are unable to function in many of these ways that would be desirable.

- Testing, etc. is being accomplished. However, we do not have anyone available to counsel students or meet with parents.
- Time is a factor in the amount of service received. At present, budget problems hinder the employment of a full-time psychologist. Testing services are contracted.

These principals' comments highlight the limitations of the part-time and contracted services they receive. Principals with part-time services indicated that tight schedules and limited availability of the part-time school psychologist were barriers to the delivery of a full-range of services. Principals receiving contracted services indicated that contractual stipulations severely restricted all non-assessment functions.

It should be noted that these principals with part-time and contract school psychological services noted by their responses on the questionnaire more availability and utilization of most of the 18 school psychologist functions than the data presented in the case studies indicated. Additionally, there were high percentages of non-respondents for many of the 18 functions in which participants were asked to note availability, utilization and satisfaction. Finally, respondents' indications of the level of satisfaction with the quality of services they received were, at times, discrepant with the availability and utilization data. For several

school psychologist functions, a greater number of respondents noted their satisfaction with the quality of services received than indicated that the functions were available or utilized.

As expected, some of the school psychologist functions were not available or utilized (e.g., part-time school psychologists conducting research). In addition, many of the cells (i.e., availability, utilization and satisfaction) contained less than five responses. Thus, the Chi-square test was not appropriate for determining weaknesses.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the present investigation was to examine the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time and contract school psychologists. In addition, data were obtained which facilitated comparison of full-time school psychological service delivery with the services obtained through these alternative employment arrangements.

Questionnaires were completed by two part-time and six contract school psychologists employed by school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The supervisors of these school psychologists also completed questionnaires. Both groups of respondents participated in a 40 minute personal interview with the researcher. Additionally, questionnaires were completed by 58 school principals from rural school divisions in Virginia which employed full-time, part-time, and contract school psychologists. Other data analyzed in the study were questionnaire responses from 31 rural school psychologists who had participated in Merchant's (1982) study of the professional practices of full-time school psychologists in Virginia.

Part-time and contract school psychologists were found to be involved primarily in psycho-educational assessments of children. In general, part-time school psychologists

performed more functions than contracted practitioners (e.g., eligibility meeting attendance and individual counseling), but both groups did not perform as many functions as full-time school psychologists.

The average psychologist-to-student ratio of school divisions employing part-time or contract school psychologists was four to five times larger than the average ratio for school divisions with full-time practitioners. These extremely high psychologist-to-student ratios were found to be a major barrier to the delivery of a full range of services.

Specific problems with part-time or contracted employment of a school psychologist were identified by the supervisors of special education and the part-time or contracted school psychologists. These problems included: 1) very little accessibility to the school psychologist by parents and school personnel; 2) limited student counseling; 3) limited or no input for in-school screenings of children; 4) no crisis intervention availability; 5) limited in-service education offerings; 6) limited consultation with parents and teachers; 7) no program development input; and 8) no research and evaluation involvement.

Supervisors of part-time and contract school psychologists and the psychologists themselves perceived several advantages of the employment arrangements. These advantages were: 1) less local funds expended; 2) parents and

teachers viewed the psychologist as impartial; 3) efficient use of school psychologist time; 4) a high degree of expertise resulted in quality psycho-educational assessments and placement recommendations; and 5) referral and contact with outside agencies was possible.

One school division which utilized a part-time school psychologist, and one with a contracted practitioner were found to offer comprehensive school psychological services. Both of these school divisions had small student enrollments which resulted in a psychologist-to-student ratio at or near the professionally recognized ideal (i.e., 1:2,500). The school division with a contracted school psychologist benefitted because of the willingness of the practitioner to perform functions which were not contractually stipulated.

School divisions were found to utilize several internal resources which supplemented the limited part-time or contracted psychological services they received. These included: 1) learning disabilities teachers for consultation with school staff and screening committee activities; 2) school principals to help reduce the rate of inappropriate referrals reaching central offices; 3) visiting teachers and school nurses to offer informal counseling; and 4) special education supervisors to consult with parents and school staff.

Several external resources were identified by the

supervisors of special education as supplementary to their part-time or contract psychological services. These included: 1) local mental health clinics for individual counseling of students and their parents; 2) university personnel for in-service education for regular and special class teachers; 3) personnel from various clinics, state hospitals or large city school divisions for in-service activities and follow-up evaluations; 4) consortium arrangements for low incidence handicapped programs and educational consultants; and 5) technical assistance personnel for consultation with teachers of preschool handicapped children. Most of these external resources were paid for by the school division. Their use, in the majority of the school divisions studied, was sporadic and limited.

The level of education of the full-time and contracted school psychologists who participated in this study was comparable, with the exception of two doctoral level contracted practitioners. Part-time school psychologists were found to be more highly educated than the average full-time or contracted school psychologist.

In general, the contracted practitioners had less prior related work experience than did the full-time or part-time school psychologists. Again, the two doctoral level contract school psychologists were the exception.

Contracted school psychologists held fewer school psychology certifications than did full or part-time practi-

tioners. Three of the contract school psychologists were completing certification requirements and two were licensed professional counselors. Both part-time school psychologists were certified as school psychologists. Ten percent of the full-time school psychologists included in the study were not certified.

The contract school psychologists worked primarily with handicapped children. Full and part-time school psychologists spent approximately 30% of their time with non-handicapped students.

Only one contract school psychologist was reimbursed for attendance at professional development meetings, conferences, etc. None of the part-time practitioners was reimbursed for professional development. All of the participating full-time school psychologists indicated reimbursement was available for this purpose.

A striking difference was noted concerning the salaries of the participants. The average yearly salary for full-time school psychologists was \$18,529. Part-time and contract school psychologists earned \$39,000 and \$35,000 respectively, based on a 200 day school year.

Although contracted school psychologists were well-compensated, four of the six participants indicated they would not continue with contracted school psychology employment next year. Both part-time school psychologists indicated they would continue to work on a part-time basis

next year.

The job satisfaction data collected revealed only slight differences between the groups. Stress on assessment functions was more often negatively referred to by part-time and contract practitioners than full-time school psychologists. Conversely, salary and flexibility were noted more frequently by part-time and contract school psychologists as positive influences on their overall job satisfaction.

Data collected through responding rural school principals' questionnaires indicated specific weaknesses of part-time and contract school psychologist employment. Compared to the principals' perceptions of the availability, utilization and level of satisfaction with the amount and quality of full-time school psychological services, principals with part-time services indicated the following weaknesses:

- less availability and use for follow-up consultation regarding I.E.P.'s or special education placements.
- less availability and use for conducting individual therapy or counseling with children.
- less availability for conducting group counseling with children.
- less satisfaction with the quality of Eligibility Committee participation.
- Less satisfaction with the amount and quality of participation with I.E.P. development.

- less satisfaction with the amount and quality of individual therapy or counseling of children.
- less satisfaction with the amount and quality of group counseling of children.
- less satisfaction with the quality of follow-up regarding the results of intervention strategies.

Principals with contracted services indicated an even greater number of weaknesses resulting from that employment. Those weaknesses included:

- less use for Eligibility Committee participation.
- less availability and use for follow-up consultation regarding I.E.P.'s or special education placements.
- less availability and use for conducting individual therapy or counseling with children.
- less availability and use for conducting group counseling with children.
- less availability and use for training parents through parent education classes.
- less availability and use for conducting in-service training programs for school personnel.
- less availability and use for following-up results of intervention strategies.
- less satisfaction with the amount and quality of all of the above functions (excluding parent education classes).
- less satisfaction with the amount and quality of consultation with school personnel.

Discussion

The data provided by this research supported Fagan's (1982) comments that contracted school psychologists were used primarily for assessments and, at times, assess no less than three or four children per day. Fagan's contention that these contracting school divisions actually paid more for services because of the additional expenses they faced for counseling, consultation and in-service education were not supported by the results of this study. Although the contracting school divisions examined in the present investigation utilized several external resources to provide the above services, the extent of this utilization was limited. Indeed, the overriding reasoning behind contracting was found to be cost efficiency.

Trenary's (1981 b) finding that parents, teachers and school administrators had little understanding of the potential role of school psychologists was supported by the results of this investigation. Several supervisors of school psychologists, particularly those without special education training or experience, failed to see the importance of offering a full range of school psychological services. Parents and teachers from school divisions with long histories of part-time or contracted services had unquestionably formed the perception of the school psychologist as a "test-giver" only. This was reflected by their

acceptance of the extremely limited services they received.

The use of rural school psychologists' assessment functions as primary reasoning for employment was a concern noted by Fagan and DeVore (1979; 1980). Trenary (1981 A) found that full-time rural school psychologists spent approximately 63% of their time on assessment-related activities. The full-time rural school psychologists who participated in this study spent approximately 54% of their professional time on these assessment duties. The part-time practitioners spent 65%, and contracted school psychologists reported spending 80% of their time on assessments, report writing, etc. Thus, part-time school psychologists had 35% of their time to devote to other functions, while contract practitioners had only 20%.

With such a small percentage of professional time remaining after completion of assessment functions, the majority of part-time and contract school psychologists were not able to adequately provide consultation to parents and teachers. Decreasing assessment-related time and increasing consultation time has been advocated by many authors in the field (Ebert, Dain and Philips, 1970; Hops, 1971; Reschly, 1976; Alpert and Trachtman, 1978; Ysseldyke, 1978; Gibbons, 1978).

The inclusion of a part-time or contract school psychologist on screening and eligibility meetings was also found to be limited because of a shortage of professional

time. The importance of having a school psychologist present to provide input at these meetings is well-documented in the literature (Kuriloff, 1975; Yoshida, et.al., 1976; Ysseldyke, 1978; Pryzwanski; 1981).

Part-time and contract school psychologists, because of time limitations imposed by assessment functions, could not be adequately involved in other activities which have been stressed in the literature. These included: student counseling (Singer, et. al., 1970; Kohlberg, 1972); in-service training for teachers (Barclay, 1973; Gilmore and Chandy, 1973; Hyman and Meyers, 1973); crisis intervention (Singer et. al, 1970; Kohlberg, 1972); preventative strategies (Singer et. al., 1970; Kohlberg, 1972; Cowen et. al., 1976); group screenings (Cowen et. al., 1976); program development (Ysseldyke, 1978); career and vocational education (Pfeffer, 1978; Hohenshil, 1981; Shepard, 1982). Clearly, the assessment-dominated role of the part-time and contracted school psychologists included in this investigation severely limited potential role expansion which would enable these practitioners to adequately perform many of the above functions.

The psychologist-to-pupil ratios of school divisions utilizing part-time or contracted psychological services were found to be alarmingly high. Compounding the problems associated with high psychologist-to-pupil ratios were other factors. Monroe (1979) referred to these other

factors as "the characteristics of the population served, the density of the population, and the availability of other professional staff" (p. 27). The school divisions examined in the present investigation, because of their rural nature, had low population densities, few professionals who could supplement the work of their school psychologists, and student populations in need of a full range of services. Thus, in order to provide adequate psychological services these school divisions might be expected to provide low psychologist-to-student ratios (i.e., less than 1:2,500).

Several researchers have found that rural school psychologists were more often able to perform a wider range of services (Hughes and Clark, 1981), had a broader role (Trenary, 1981 A), or were more able to follow children through the whole process from referral to re-evaluation (Goldwasser, 1979) than were urban school psychologists. The majority of rural contract or part-time school psychologists included in this investigation had limited roles, provided primarily assessment services, and infrequently had the opportunity to follow-up on a child's progress.

The results of the study conducted by Demers, Cohen and Fontana (1981), which indicated rural school psychologists had more buildings to serve, fewer colleagues available, and higher psychologist-to-student ratios than did their urban and suburban counterparts were partly sub-

stantiated by the results of this investigation. Although no effort was made to compare part-time or contracted school psychological services with those provided by full-time urban or suburban practitioners, the rural part-time and contracted school psychologists included in the present investigation indicated they had many buildings to serve, few colleagues available and very high psychologist-to-student ratios.

The literature contains many references concerning the legislative impact of increasing services to handicapped children while decreasing services to non-handicapped students (Bardon, 1976; Kabler, 1977; Hunter, 1977; Hyman, 1978; Mason, 1978; Goldwasser, 1979; Abramowitz, 1981). The results of the present investigation indicated that rural full-time and part-time school psychologists devoted approximately three-fourths of their professional time to working with handicapped children and only one-fourth to working with non-handicapped children. Of even greater concern, it was found that contracted school psychologists spent almost all (96%) of their time with handicapped children. The needs of the non-handicapped students in the school divisions with contracted services were apparently not being met. These school divisions provided only the minimum services to handicapped children which enabled them to meet legislative and regulatory requirements (i.e., psycho-educational assessments).

Hughes (1981) determined that the turnover rate for rural school psychologists in Virginia was four times as large as the rate of their urban counterparts. Hughes indicated that one of the possible reasons for this high rate of turnover was the job characteristics of school psychological employment in rural areas. The data collected in the present investigation supported this finding. Four of the six (67%) rural contract school psychologists included in the present study indicated they would not continue to work as contracted practitioners next year. The job characteristics of these school psychologists were almost solely psychometric in nature.

Conclusions

The majority of school divisions which utilized part-time or contract school psychologists did so to conserve local funds. This employment resulted in extremely limited school psychological services to handicapped and non-handicapped students, parents, and school personnel.

Part-time school psychologists were able to provide, on a limited basis, more services such as counseling, consultation and in-service programs for school personnel than were contracted school psychologists. Part-time practitioners' roles, however, were limited because of high psychologist-to-student ratios and time constraints.

Contracted school psychologists functioned mainly as

test-givers only. Their input in other potential school psychological services was minimal or non-existent.

Thus, it was found that rural school psychological services are best offered through the employment of a full-time school psychologist(s). Part-time employment of a practitioner results in less availability of a full range of services than does full-time employment. The employment of a contract school psychologist(s) is least desirable because of the restrictiveness of the contract itself; usually resulting in services consisting of psycho-educational assessments only.

Program Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, school psychological services are best delivered in rural areas through the employment of a full-time school psychologist(s). School divisions with small student enrollments (i.e., less than 2,500) might benefit by sharing the services of a full-time school psychologist with another school division. Through this type of employment, the shared practitioner would be available on a regular basis, could be viewed as a member of each school division's professional staff, and could provide more services than a school psychologist that was available only a few days per month.

The employment of a part-time school psychologist by one school division is less desirable because of the tendency

of the practitioner to be used primarily for psycho-educational assessments with little involvement in other functions. Least desirable is contracted employment. This employment arrangement most often results in extremely limited services (i.e., psycho-educational assessments only).

There appears to be a need for the state educational agency to become involved in monitoring the appropriateness of school psychological services in rural areas. Perhaps the Virginia Association of School Psychologists (VASP) could develop a position paper outlining professionally acceptable psychologist-to-student ratios, working agreements, etc., in order to facilitate adequate school psychological services in rural areas.

It appears that the underlying problem of inadequate school psychological services in rural areas stems from the failure of the profession to inform the public of the benefits of a full-range of school psychological services. Before expansion of school psychological services can be expected, the public must be made aware of the services a highly trained school psychologist could provide. This increased public awareness would hopefully result in demands for improved services and/or legislative mandates requiring the inclusion of a school psychologist in a wider range of school functions.

Finally, institutions involved in the training of school psychologists should provide students with an under-

standing of the potential shortcomings of part-time and contracted employment. In this regard, school divisions might be more inclined to employ a full-time practitioner if job applicants for school psychologist positions were to relate their understanding of the potential shortcomings of part-time and contracted employment to their potential employers.

Research Recommendations

This research was able to provide data relevant to contract and part-time school psychologists who were the primary providers of school psychological services for rural school divisions. No attempt was made to include those school psychologists who supplement the work of full-time school psychologists in other divisions. Future research might compare the functioning of the part-time and contracted school psychologists included in this investigation with the work of those supplementary school psychologists.

Studies using larger samples (i.e., more than one state) might provide greater insight concerning the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time or contract school psychologists from a regional or national perspective. Additionally, differing state regulations concerning the inclusion of a school psychologist in various functions might be found to impact on the strengths and weaknesses of these alternative employment arrangements.

Research on recruitment and retention of rural school psychologists also appears to be in need. Such research would prove valuable for training institutions involved in preparing school psychologists for employment in areas with unique characteristics and needs.

Finally, there exists a need for research which would investigate the perceptions of other consumers of part-time and contracted school psychological services. Parents and teachers might be able to add a further dimension of understanding of the strengths and weakness of part-time and contracted school psychological services.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth. 334 F. Supp. 1257 (E. D. Pa. 1971); 343 F. Supp. 279 (E. D. Pa. 1972).
2. Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia. Civil Action No. 1939 - 71 (D. D. C. 1971).
3. Hobson v. Hansen, 269 F. Supp. 401 (D. D. C. 1967).
4. Diana v. California State Board of Education. Case No. C-70-37 RFP, (ND Cal. 1970 and 1973).
5. Guadalupe Organization, Inc. v. Tempe Elementary School District, Stipulation and Order (January 24, 1972).
6. Larry P. et. al. v. Wilson Riles et. al. United States District Court Northern District of California, Case No. C-71-2270 RFP, (1972, 1974, 1979).
7. Regulations and Administrative Requirements for the Operation of Special Education Programs in Virginia. Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia, 1978.
8. Parents in Action on Special Education v. Joseph P. Hannon, 3 EHRLR 552:108, 1980.
9. County and City Data Book, 1977, Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau.

REFERENCES

- Abramowitz, E. A. School psychology: A historical perspective. School Psychology Review, 1981, 10 (2), 121-126.
- Alpert, J. and Trachtman, G. School consultation in the eighties. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, New York City, March, 1978.
- Anderson, W. T. Job satisfaction among school psychologists, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1982.
- Barbanel, L. and Hoffenburg-Rutman, J. Attitudes toward job responsibilities and training satisfaction of school psychologists: A comparative study. Psychology in the Schools, 1975, 11, 425-429.
- Barbash, J. Job satisfaction attitudes surveys. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1976.
- Barclay, J. R. Multiple input assessment and preventative intervention. The School Psychology Digest, 1973, 2, 13-18.
- Bardon, J. I. The state of the art (and science) of school psychology. American Psychologist, 1976, 31, 785-791.
- Bennett, V. C. Who is a school psychologist? (And what does he do?) Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8, 166-171.
- Bersoff, D. N. P. v. Riles: Legal perspective. School Psychology Review, 1980, 9 (2), 112-122.
- Bina, M. J. Teacher morale in rural areas: Implications for administrators regarding teacher burn-out and attrition, Newsletter, National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project, Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky, 1981, 3 (1), 2.
- Blai, B. An occupational study of job satisfaction and need satisfaction. Journal of Experimental Education, 1964, 32, 381-388.
- Brown, D. T. Graduate training in school psychology. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14, (7), 378-379.

- Buss, W. What procedural due process means to a school psychologist: A dialogue. Journal of School Psychology, 1975, 13, 298-310.
- Carson, M. R. A descriptive study of roles: Elementary school counselors, psychologists and social workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1969.
- Cowen, E. L. and Lorion, R. P. Changing Roles for the mental health professional. Journal of School Psychology, 1976, 14, 131-138.
- Cramer, S. H. A collation of the roles of the secondary counselor and the secondary school psychologist as perceived by educators of counselors and by educators of school psychologists, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.
- Cutts, N. E. School Psychology at Mid-Century, Washington D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1955.
- DeMers, S. T., Cohen, D. W., and Fontana, R. J. Demographic job setting and attitudinal characteristics of a national sample of urban, suburban and rural school psychologists. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Annual Convention, Houston, Texas, April 15, 1981.
- DeVore, J. E. and Fagan, T. K. Availability of professional, non-teaching pupil services in rural and urban Tennessee school districts. Educational Quest, 1979, 23 (1), 9-12.
- DeVore, J. E. and Fagan, T. K. Priority Functions of the school psychologist as judged by school administrators in rural and urban Tennessee. Educational Quest, 1980, 24 (2), 10-13.
- Ebert, D. W., Dain, R. N. and Phillips, B. N. The involvement of school community personnel in psychoeducational interventions. Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8, 191-195.
- Fagan, T. K. School psychology in rural areas: Problems and promising developments, Newsletter, National Rural Research and Personnel Project, Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky, 1981, 3 (1), 6-7.

- Farris, G. F. A predictive study of turnover. Personnel Psychology. 1971, 24, 311-328.
- Fitts, L. D. The school psychologist as perceived by superintendents of education in Alabama. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972.
- Flax, J. W., Wagenfeld, M. O., Ivens, R. E., and Weiss, R. J., Mental Health and Rural America: An Overview and Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Mental Health. United States Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Fridsma, N. B. The role of the school psychologist in Michigan as perceived by school psychologists and directors of special education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Garlow, L. The school psychologist as expert witness in due process hearings. Journal of School Psychology, 1975, 13, 311-316.
- Gelerinter, A. A study of the consensus of expectations for the role of the school psychologist in New York State among elementary school principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1967.
- Gibbons, S. Public Law 94-142: An impetus for consultation. The School Psychology Digest, 1978, 8, 18-25.
- Gibson, J. Involvement and cooperation: Keys to problem solving. Newsletter, National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project, Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky, 1981, 3 (1), 12.
- Gilmore, G. E. and Chancy, J. Teachers' perceptions of school psychological services. Journal of School Psychology, 1973, 11, 1973, 139-146.
- Goldwasser, E. B. The effect of recent legislation for handicapped children on school psychological service in New York State. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1979.
- Good, C. V., (ed.), Dictionary of Education (2nd Ed.) New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

- Goshorn, D. H., Jr. Duties of Virginia school psychologists: Desired and actual. Unpublished directed study, Radford College, 1973.
- Graen, G. B. and Hulin, C. L. Addendum to "an empirical investigation of the two-factor theory of job satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 341-34.
- Grimley, L. K. Identity crisis in school psychology. The Journal of School Health, 1978, 11, 538-540.
- Guidubaldi, J. Editorial introduction to families: Current status and emerging trends. The School Psychology Review, 1980, 9, 4.
- Guidubaldi, J. The status report extended: Further elaborations on the American family. The School Psychology Review, 1980, 9 (4), 347-379.
- Guidubaldi, J. School psychology: Current status and future directions in a responsive and caring profession. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14 (7), 375-377.
- Gunter, N. C. Self-role perception and cross role perception of school social workers, and school psychologists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1969.
- Gutkin, T. and Myers, J. The school psychologist's consultation role. Position paper prepared for Division 16 (APA) Corresponding Committee on Consultation. The School Psychologist (Division of School Psychology) Newsletter, 1978, 33 (2), 5.
- Hayes, M. E. and Clair, T. N. School Psychology: Why is the profession dying? Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 518-521.
- Helge, D. I. Problems in implementing comprehensive special education programming in rural areas. Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 514-520.
- Heller, J. R. Assessment of elementary school principals' perceptions of school psychologists' functions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973.

- Herson, J. L. II. An exploration of the role expectations of the school psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1967.
- Hohenshil, T. H. The vocational school psychologist: A specialty in quest of a training program. Psychology in the Schools, 1974, 11, 16-18.
- Hohenshil, T. H. Roles for school psychology in vocational education programs for handicapped students. In T. H. Hohenshil and W. T. Anderson (eds.), School Psychological Services in Secondary Vocational Education, Conference Proceedings, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1981.
- Hoppock, R. Job satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935.
- Hops, H. The school psychologist as a behavior management consultant in a special class setting. Journal of School Psychology, 1971, 9, 478-483.
- Hughes, J. N. Consistency of administrators' and psychologists' actual and ideal perceptions of school psychologists' activities. Psychology in the Schools, 1979, 16 (2), 234-239.
- Hughes, J. N. and Clark, R. M. Differences between urban and rural school psychology: training implications. Psychology in the Schools, 1981, 18 (2), 191-196.
- Hughes, J. N. Manpower needs in rural school psychology. Virginia Association of School Psychology. Newsletter, Fall, 1982, 4-5.
- Hulin, C. L. and Smith, P. C. A linear model of job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 209-216.
- Hunter, C. The role of the school psychologist in identifying and planning for exceptional children. The School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 29-36.
- Hyman, I. A. President's message. The School Psychologist: Newsletter of Division of School Psychology of the American Psychological Association, 1978, 32 (2), 1.

- Hyman, I. and Meyers, J. Training for change: A university supervised internship in a single setting. Journal of School Psychology, 1973, 11, 161-166.
- Jackson, J. H. Psychoeducational therapy as a primary activity of school psychologists. Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8, 186-190.
- Jolles, I. A Handbook for the Qualified Psychological Examiner in the Illinois Plan for Special Education of Exceptional Children, No. 12, Springfield, Illinois, Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954.
- Kabler, M. L. Public Law 94-142 and school psychology: Challenges and opportunities. The School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 19-30.
- Kaplan, M. S., Hill, B. and Ownby, R. L. Fair, rational, open shared decision-making: Due process in the schools. The School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6 (1), 39-45.
- Kasl, S. W. Work and mental health: Contemporary research evidence. In W. J. Heisler and J. W. Houck (Eds.), A matter of dignity. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Keogh, B. K., Kukic, L. D., Becker, L. D., McLoughlin, R. J. and Kukic, M. B. School psychological services in special education programs. Journal of School Psychology, 1975, 13, 142-148.
- Kravitz, S. M. Graduate training of school psychologists: Meeting the needs of teachers and principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1973.
- Kicklighter, R. J. School psychology in the U.S.: A quantitative survey. Journal of School Psychology, 1976, 14, 151-156.
- Kuriloff, P. Law, educational reform, and the school psychologist. Journal of School Psychology, 1975, 13, 335, 348.
- Lesiak, W. J. and Lounsbury, E. Views of school psychological services. A comparative study. Psychology in the Schools. 1977, 14, 184-188.

- Merchant, C. M. An investigation of the practice of school psychology in Virginia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1982.
- Monroe, V. Roles and status of school psychology. In G. D. Phye and D.J. Reschly (eds.), School Psychology: Perspectives and Issues, New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Mowder, B. A. and Demartino, R. A. Continuing education needs in school psychology. Professional Psychology, 1978, 6, 143-161.
- Murray, P. A. An analysis of the role of the school psychologist in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1975.
- Pfeffer, R. A. Proposed functions for school psychologists in career education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1978.
- Phillips, E. and Hays, J. R. Job satisfaction and perceived congruence of attitude between workers and supervisors in a mental health setting. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1978, 47, 55-59.
- Porter, J. and Holzberg, B. C. From theory to practice: The changing role of the school psychologist within programs for exceptional children. American Annals of the Deaf, 1979, 124, 444-449.
- Portugal, A. H. Towards the measurement of work satisfaction. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1976.
- Pryzwansky, W. B. Mandated team participation: Implications for psychologists working in the schools. Psychology in the Schools, 1981, 18, 460-466.
- Ramage, J. C. Litigation and legislation effects on the school psychologists' role. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1981, 14 (7), 380-382.
- Reschly, D. J. School psychology consultation: "Frenzied, faddish or fundamental?" Journal of School Psychology, 1976, 14, 105-113.

- Reschly, D. J. Nonbiased assessment and school psychology. Des Moines, Iowa: Department of Public Instruction, 1978.
- Reschly, D.J. and Phye, G. D. School psychology perspectives and issues. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Reschly, D. J. Psychological evidence in the Larry P. opinion: A case of right wing problem - wrong solution. School Psychology Review, 1980, 9 (2), 123-135.
- Roberts, R. D. Perceptions of actual and desired role functions of school psychologists and teachers and critical behavior in role fulfillment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1969.
- Romig, C. W. Attitudes of classroom teachers toward the role of the school psychologist and other personnel of a psychological service center for children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1970.
- Ronan, W. W. Relative importance of job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 192-200.
- Sarata, B. P. and Jeppensen, J. C. Job design and staff satisfaction in human service settings. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1977, 5, 229-236.
- Sher, J. P. A proposal to end federal neglect of rural schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 60, 280-282.
- Shepard, J. W. Career development functions of school psychologists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1982.
- Singer, D. L., Whiton, M. D. and Fried, M. L. An alternative to traditional mental health services and consultation in schools: A social systems and group process approach. Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8, 172-179.
- Sodenberg, L. O. The elementary teacher's conception of the school psychologist's role. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

Sontag, E., and Button, J. Office of Special Education briefing paper. February, 1980, 22 pp.

Tan, J. S. B. Role of the school psychologist as perceived by Illinois school psychologists and directors of special education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1968.

Tindall, R. H. School psychology: The development of a profession. In G. D. Phye and D. J. Reschly (Eds.), School Psychology Perspectives and Issues. New York: Academic Press, 1979, 3-24.

Trachtman, G. M. On such a full sea. School Psychology Review, 1981, 10 (2), 147-154.

Trenary, D. S. Survey of urban, suburban, and rural school psychologists. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Convention, Houston, Texas, April 15, 1981. (a)

Trenary, D. S. "Inside" view of the problems of rural school psychologists. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Convention, Houston, Texas, April 15, 1981. (b)

Turnbull, H. R., III. Accountability: An overview of the impact of litigation on professionals. The School Psychology Digest, 1977, 6, 46-52.

Turnbull, H. R., III and Turnbull, A. P. Free appropriate public education: Law and implementation. Denver: Love Publishing Company, 1978.

U. S. Congress, House. Education of the handicapped amendments of 1974. Education Amendments of 1974, Sections 611-621, Public Law 93-380 (Sen. J. Res. 40), 93rd Congress, 2nd session, 1974.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Family educational rights and privacy act of 1974. Educational Amendments of 1974, Section 513, Public Law 93-380 (Sen. J. Res. 40) 93rd Congress, 2nd session, 1974.

U. S. Congress. Senate. Education for all handicapped children act of 1975. Public Law 94-142 (S. C.), 94th Congress, 1st session, 1975.

- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Title 45 of the code of federal regulations amendments. Federal Register, 1976, 41 8605-8607.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. BEH data notes, 1977.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education of handicapped children: Implementation of Part B of the education of the handicapped act. Federal Register 1977, 42, 42474-42518.
- Wallin, J. W. and Ferguson, D. G. The development of school psychological services. In J. F. Magary (Ed.), School Psychological Services, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Weintraub, F. J. and Abeson, A. New education policies for the handicapped: The quest revolution. In F. J. Weintraub, et. al. (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, Virginia: The council for Exceptional Children, 1976.
- White, M. A. Will school psychology exist? Journal of School Psychology, 1969, 7, 53-57.
- Willand, R. G. A comparative study of the duties performed regularly by school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers working together in selected school systems. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.
- Wilson, S. How to keep them in rural Appalachia. Newsletter, National Rural Research and Personnel Preparation Project, Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky, 1981, 3 (1), 13.
- Yoshida, R. K., Fenton, K. S., Maxwell, J. P. and Kaufman, M. J. Group decision making in the planning team process: Myth or reality? United States Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the handicapped, 1976.
- Ysseldyke, J. E. Who's calling the plays in school psychology? Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 373-378.
- Zampardi, M. New Jersey school psychologists and contemporary issues of records access. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1977.

APPENDIX A

School Psychologists' Questionnaire

PERSONAL DATA

Please answer the following questions based on your experience as a school psychologist.

1. Age: _____ 2. ___M___F 3. Marital Status: ___S___M___D/Sep.

4. Ethnicity: ___ Afro-American ___ Spanish-Surname
 ___ Asian ___ Native American
 ___ Caucasian ___ Other (Specify _____)

5. Highest Degree earned: ___ B.A./B.S. ___ M.A./M.Ed/M.S. ___ Ed. Spec. (CAGS)
 ___ Ph.D. ___ Ed.D.

Indicate degree area: ___ School Psychology ___ Education
 ___ Clinical Psychology ___ Other (Specify _____)
 ___ General Psychology

Approximate number of Graduate hours earned beyond highest degree: _____ Sem. Hrs.
 _____ Qtr. Hrs.

6. Training Institutions and Degree(s) Conferred: Please list.

7. Currently enrolled in program of academic training: ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please indicate expected degree, area of specialization, and training institution:

8. Membership in Professional Organizations: ___ APA
 ___ Division 16 (Division of School Psychology, APA)
 ___ NASP
 ___ VPA
 ___ VASP
 ___ Other (Please specify)

9. Prior experiences: Please indicate number of years experience in each area appropriate for you.

___ Classroom teacher: ___ Regular ___ Special
 ___ Psychologist in other than school setting
 ___ Other (Specify _____)

10. Areas of Certification or Endorsement by the Virginia Department of Education:

___ Not Certified ___ Elementary/Secondary Teacher
 ___ School Psychologist ___ Special Education Teacher
 ___ Visiting Teacher ___ Administrator/Supervisor
 ___ Counselor

11. Title of Present Position(s): _____
12. Number of Years Experience as a school psychologist: _____
 Number of school psychology positions you have held: _____
 Number of times you have changed positions in the last 10 years: _____
 Please indicate the primary reason for job changes:
 _____ Higher salary _____ More role flexibility
 _____ Family concerns _____ Disagreement with philosophy of employer
 _____ Other (Specify _____)
13. Endorsement or Certification as a school psychologist in any state(s) other than Virginia: _____
 _____ Yes _____ No
 What state(s)? _____
14. Licensed Psychologist: _____ Yes _____ Clinical _____ School _____ Generic
 _____ No: Do you intend to become licensed? _____ Yes _____ No
 If yes, please indicate states where licensed: _____
 Estimated number of hours per week spent in private practice: _____
15. Licensed counselor: _____ Yes _____ No
16. Name of School District where currently employed: _____
 If employed by more than one district, indicate names of all districts served:

17. Title of Direct Supervisor: _____ Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent
 _____ Pupil Personnel Director
 _____ Special Education Supervisor
 _____ Chief Psychologist
 _____ Director of Psychological Services
 _____ Other (Specify _____)
- Training Background of supervisor:
 _____ Psychology _____ Regular Education
 _____ Special Education _____ Vocational Education
 _____ Social Work _____ Counselor Education
 _____ Other _____
- Has your supervisor ever been employed as a school psychologist? _____ Yes _____ No
18. Number of years you have been employed in your present position: _____
 Total number of years employed by your present school system: _____
 When employed in the position of school psychologist, did you have other job alternatives to choose from:
 _____ Yes _____ No

19. Salary: Please indicate the appropriate range for the salary you receive, based on full-time employment as a school psychologist.

☐ Below \$10,000	☐ \$22,000 to \$24,999
☐ \$10,000 to \$12,999	☐ \$25,000 to \$27,999
☐ \$13,000 to \$15,999	☐ \$28,000 to \$30,999
☐ \$16,000 to \$18,999	☐ \$31,000 to \$33,999
☐ \$19,000 to \$21,999	☐ \$34,000 or over

Please indicate the funding source for your salary:

☐ Local funds	☐ Special grant
☐ Federal Flow-Thru funds	☐ State funds
☐ Regional cooperative	☐ Other (Specify _____)

How is your salary determined? Please indicate.

☐ Teacher salary schedule	☐ Other (Describe _____)
☐ Administrator salary schedule	

20. Length of employment contract: ☐ 10 months
☐ 11 months
☐ 12 months
☐ Other (Specify _____)
21. Are you reimbursed for mileage? ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If yes, does the mileage accrue from:
☐ Your residence ☐ Central school location
22. Is secretarial service included in your working agreement to type reports, etc.?
☐ Yes ☐ No

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

Listed below are several activities often included in the job responsibilities of school psychologists. Using the following scale, please rate each activity in two ways:

First, determine a rating according to the importance of the activity in your present job situation;

Second, determine a rating according to your opinion about the importance of the activity in your own conceptualization of the ideal role for the school psychologist.

Rating Scale

Circle the number under each heading corresponding to your rating of the importance of each activity:

- 1 - The activity is absolutely essential
- 2 - The activity is important
- 3 - The activity is of questionable importance
- 4 - The activity is unimportant
- 5 - The activity is not a responsibility

ACTIVITY	ACTUAL IMPORTANCE	IDEAL IMPORTANCE
1. Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Group test administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Observations of children in various settings	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Reviewing and researching records	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Conducting diagnostic interviews	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Preparing written psychological reports	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Conducting interpretative interviews with parents and teachers	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Participating as a member of a special education evaluation team	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Serve as an Eligibility Committee member	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Actively participate in IEP development	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. Follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placements	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12. Conduct individual therapy or counseling with children	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13. Conduct group counseling with children	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
14. Training parents through parent education classes	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

15. Conducting in-service training programs for school personnel	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
16. Consultation with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
17. Consultation with supervisor	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
18. Conducting research	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
19. Follow-up results of intervention strategies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
20. Administrative activities (Preparation for meetings, correspondence, attending meetings, traveling to appointments)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Please indicate below the percentage of time you spend each week in the following activities:

Assessment _____
 Intervention _____
 Consultation _____
 Research and Follow-up _____
 Administration
 (Report writing, etc.) _____

Total= 100%

Please estimate the percentage of time you spend each week in activities related directly to:

Handicapped children _____

Non-handicapped children _____

Total= 100%

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL ISSUES

1. Are there restrictions placed on your job performance in the areas of:

_____ Individual counseling	_____ Program dev. for regular students
_____ Group counseling	_____ Classroom affective education
_____ Program development for the gifted	_____ Work with parents
_____ Preschool Handicapped	_____ Other (Specify _____)

For any checked area, please indicate what these restrictions are:

2. In your opinion, does the personality and orientation of your division superintendent influence your role as a school psychologist: _____ Yes _____ No
 Please explain briefly:

3. For placement of students into E.D. programs, what additional evaluations (beyond the four basic components--educational, medical, social, psychological) are obtained for review by the Eligibility Committee?

☐ Psychiatric Evaluation ☐ Clinical Evaluation from a licensed psychologist
☐ Other (Specify _____)
☐ No other evaluations are obtained.

4. Who has the major responsibility for establishing the diagnoses of handicapped children in your school system?

☐ School Psychologist ☐ Other (Specify _____)
☐ Eligibility Committee ☐ Don't Know

If you checked Eligibility Committee, is the determination of a diagnosis, such as emotional disturbance or mental retardation, a democratic process where each member's input (principal, classroom teacher, etc.) is equal to that of the school psychologist's? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please explain:

5. Please indicate the diagnosis most frequently disputed by Eligibility Committees in your district:

☐ Mental Retardation	☐ Hearing Impaired
☐ Emotional Disturbance	☐ Physically Handicapped
☐ Learning Disability	☐ Other Health Impaired
☐ Visual Impaired	☐ Multihandicapped

6. Have you ever disagreed with a special education eligibility or placement decision?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please estimate the number of times this has occurred within the past year: _____

Please describe your course of action following the disagreement:

7. Please indicate the type of special education placement most frequently disputed by Eligibility Committees in your district:

☐ Mental Retardation	☐ Hearing Impaired
☐ Emotional Disturbance	☐ Physically Handicapped
☐ Learning Disability	☐ Other Health Impaired
☐ Visual Impaired	☐ Multihandicapped

8. Which of the following do you consider to be your primary client as a school psychologist:

☐ the Child ☐ the Parent ☐ the School System

According to your superintendent, who is considered the primary client of the school psychologist?

☐ the Child ☐ the Parent ☐ the School Division

Is there an explicit ☐ or implicit ☐ policy establishing the primary client?

9. Following an evaluation, does the school system adjust programs to accommodate the individual child ☐ OR is it expected that recommendations will be made to "fit" the child into existing programs ☐?

10. In your opinion, have federal legislation (PL 94-142) and subsequent Virginia special education regulations altered your functioning as a school psychologist?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please indicate how your functioning has been altered:

11. What aspects of PL 94-142 are most helpful to children?

What aspects do you consider detrimental to children?

12. Do you as a school psychologist have any role in planning and establishing special education programs? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please describe your role:

13. If you have been provided a contract, does the contract include any reference to the Standards of Practice for Providers of School Psychology or the Code of Ethics for psychologists?

☐ Yes ☐ No

14. In reference to the activities list in the survey of Professional Practices (P. 4), are you forced to perform functions for which you feel untrained? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please list those functions:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

15. Are you expected to participate in any practices (such as signing blank eligibility forms) that create moral and/or ethical difficulties for you?

☐ Yes ☐ No. Please explain:

16. Currently, what is the most controversial issue in your school system?

17. Are you operating under a test quota? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, is this quota written into your contract ☐ OR a verbal agreement with your employer? ☐

Indicate the number of evaluations and time limitations set by the quota (for example, 5 evaluations per week): _____

Does the quota force you to practice in a manner which is unsatisfactory to you? ☐ Yes ☐ No. Please explain:

18. Are you provided with adequate facilities to conduct individual evaluations?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please describe your best and worst facility:

Estimate the number of evaluations conducted by you this year, which may have been invalidated by a poor testing environment: _____

19. Are you provided with adequate office space and equipment to conduct your practice of school psychology satisfactorily? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Please explain:

20. Professional Development: Does your school system provide payment for the attendance of in-service workshops, conferences, and professional meetings?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Is this provided through a yearly allotment of a set amount of money? ☐
OR on a conference basis? ☐

How many days have you spent in attendance at conferences, etc. within the past year? _____

21. What are the most personally rewarding aspects of your school psychology practice?

22. Considering the status, pay, and career opportunities, list the two greatest advantages of your present job:

Name the worst aspect of your present job:

23. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate blanks, your level of career satisfaction today and five years ago:

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Today	_____	_____	_____	_____
5 Years Ago	_____	_____	_____	_____

24. Please indicate the factors that have most contributed to your present level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction:

25. If you were in a position to advise a bright, energetic young person in making a career choice, would you encourage him (her) to enter the school psychology profession: ____ Yes ____ No

Why or why not?

26. Comments:

Thanks for your time and patience in completing this questionnaire. I look forward to meeting with you.

Clyde Meyer
Star Route B, Box 75
Millboro, Va. 24460

APPENDIX B

School Psychologists' Interview Guide

1. Why did you choose to work as a part-time or contract school psychologist?
2. How have you been received by the staff of your school division?
3. Having been employed as a part-time or contract school psychologist, would you prefer to work on a full-time basis (within one school division)? Why?
4. What aspects of your employment do you find the most frustrating?
5. Do you feel you would like to continue to work within the parameters of your present employment after this year?
6. What areas of your professional training do you perceive as most valuable to you in your present position?
7. Which areas of your training (if any) are not tapped by your present employment?
8. What changes would you like to see in regard to your present duties as a school psychologist?
9. Why doesn't your school division hire a full-time school psychologist?
10. Do you ever feel professionally isolated?
11. How do you feel about the distances you must travel to work and between schools?
12. Were you raised in an urban, suburban or rural environment?
13. How is your present role defined?
14. What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of your employment from the perspective of the school division?
15. Have you ever felt your perceptions of the manner in which school psychological services should be delivered differ from the administration's?
16. What sort of conflicts has this brought about for you?

APPENDIX C

School Psychologists ' Supervisors' Questionnaire

SECTION I

Based on your experience as a supervisor of school psychologists, please answer the following questions:

1. School division _____
2. Total student population _____
3. Total number of identified handicapped students _____
4. Your title(s) _____
5. How many years has your school division employed a part-time or contract school psychologist? _____
6. Have you ever supervised a full-time school psychologist in your present school division? _____
7. Please estimate the total number of referrals received by your office during the 1981-1982 school year _____
8. Do you feel that the current number of days you have a school psychologist available is adequate? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Please explain:

SECTION II

Listed below are times in the referral and evaluation processes when school psychologists' services are often utilized.

Based on your experience supervising a part-time or contract school psychologist, please indicate with an "X" those occasions in the referral and evaluation process which might have created a problem because of the lack of a full-time school psychologist on staff.

1. Initial referral received _____
2. In-school evaluation _____
3. Action by screening committee _____
4. Formal evaluation _____
5. Eligibility meeting _____
6. IEP meeting _____
7. Triennial re-evaluation _____
8. Others (please note.) _____

Listed below are functions commonly performed by school psychologists.

Based on your experience supervising a part-time or contract school psychologist, please indicate with an "X" those school psychologist functions which might have been performed more satisfactorily if you had had a full-time school psychologist on staff.

1. Assessment ____
2. Intervention ____
3. Consultation with parents ____
4. Consultation with staff ____
5. In-service ____
6. Research ____
7. Others (please note)

SECTION III

What do you perceive as the specific strengths of your school division's employment of a part-time or contract school psychologist?

What weaknesses do you perceive?

Thank you for your time and patience in completing this questionnaire.
I look forward to meeting with you.

Clyde Meyer
Star Route B, Box 75
Millboro, Va. 24460

APPENDIX D

Rural School Principals' Questionnaire

Note: If you have not served as the principal of this school for one full year, please do not complete this questionnaire. Simply check this box ☐ and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

PART I

Directions:

As the principal of your current school, please answer the following questions:

1. What is the total enrollment of your school?

2. What grade levels, e.g., elementary K-6, middle 6-8, does your school contain?

3. How many years have you been the principal of this school?
 _____ years.

4. Did your school division employ a full-time school psychologist during the 1981-1982 school year?
 _____ yes, _____ no, _____ don't know

5. Does your school division currently employ a full-time school psychologist?
 _____ yes, _____ no, _____ don't know

6. Do you perceive any differences in the school psychological services your school receives this year (1982-1983) compared with those received last year (1981-1982)?
 _____ yes, _____ no. If yes, please explain.

PART II

Directions:

Listed are some functions performed by school psychologists.

1. Please indicate with an "X" those functions which are available to the parents, teachers and children of your school (Column I).

2. Please indicate with an "X" those functions which have been utilized by the parents, teachers and children of your school during the time between January, 1982 and January, 1983 (Column II).

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST FUNCTION	COLUMN I AVAILABILITY			COLUMN II UTILIZATION		
	Available	Not Available	Don't Know	Utilized	Not Utilized	Don't Know
1. Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests						
2. Group test administration						
3. Observations of children in various settings						
4. Reviewing and researching records						
5. Conducting diagnostic interviews						
6. Preparing written psychological reports						
7. Conducting interpretative interviews with parents						
8. Participating as a member of a special education evaluation team						
9. Serving as an Eligibility Committee member						
10. Actively participating in IEP development						
11. Follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placement						
12. Conducting individual therapy or counseling with children						
13. Conducting group counseling with children						
14. Training parents through parent education classes						
15. Conducting in-service training programs for school personnel						
16. Consultation with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc.						
17. Conducting research						
18. Following-up results of intervention strategies						
19. Other (please list)						

PART III

Directions:

For those school psychologist functions which have been utilized in your school during the time period between January, 1982 and January, 1983, please mark an "X" in the appropriate columns to indicate your levels of satisfaction with the amount of service (Column I), and the quality of service (Column II).

FUNCTIONS	COLUMN I LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH <u>AMOUNT</u> OF SERVICE				COLUMN II LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH <u>QUALITY</u> OF SERVICE			
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1. Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests								
2. Group test administration								
3. Observations of children in various settings								
4. Reviewing and researching records								
5. Conducting diagnostic interviews								
6. Preparing written psychological reports								
7. Conducting interpretative interviews with parents								
8. Participating as a member of a special education evaluation team								
9. Serving as an Eligibility Committee member								
10. Actively participating in IEP development								
11. Follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placement								
12. Conducting individual therapy or counseling with children								
13. Conducting group counseling with children								
14. Training parents through parent education classes								
15. Conducting in-service training programs for school personnel								
16. Consultation with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc.								
17. Conducting research								
18. Following-up results of intervention strategies								
19. Other (please list)								

Please list any specific barriers which would restrict your school psychologist(s) from conducting the above functions. These may be related to your school, your school division, or the school psychologist(s).

Thank you for your time and patience. The results of the study will be available for distribution in June.

Clyde Meyer
Star Route B, Box 75
Millboro, Va. 24460

APPENDIX E

Researcher's Perceptions

Researcher's Questionnaire

At the time of the investigation, the researcher was completing his first year of part-time employment as a school psychologist for School Division D. He was employed on a half-time basis (i.e., 10 days per month) to provide psychological services. Prior to this employment, he worked as a part-time, contract, and full-time school psychologist in Virginia, West Virginia, and Massachusetts respectively.

The researcher's perceptions regarding the weaknesses of this employment paralleled those of the supervisor of special education. Specifically, problems existed because: 1) most of the practitioner's time was devoted to psycho-educational assessments; 2) the psychologist-to-student ratio was 1:6,200; and 3) few supplementary internal and external resources existed. Extremely limited time was given to parent and teacher consultation, individual counseling, in-service education for teachers, attendance at eligibility meetings, and crisis intervention. Functions such as group counseling, program development for regular and gifted students, group screenings, etc., were not offered.

The researcher recommended the budgeting of a full-time school psychologist for this school division for the next school year. The superintendent and the special education supervisor agreed with this recommendation and subsequently attempted to recruit a full-time practitioner.

PERSONAL DATA

Please answer the following questions based on your experience as a school psychologist.

1. Age: 31 2. ☒ M ☐ F 3. Marital Status: ☒ S ☐ M ☐ D/Sep.

4. Ethnicity: ☐ Afro-American ☐ Spanish-Surname
☐ Asian ☐ Native American
☒ Caucasian ☐ Other (Specify _____)

5. Highest Degree earned: ☐ B.A./B.S. ☐ M.A./M.Ed/M.S. ☒ Ed. Spec. (CAGS)
☐ Ph.D. ☐ Ed.D.

Indicate degree area: ☐ School Psychology ☐ Education
☐ Clinical Psychology ☒ Other (Specify Sp. Ed. Admin)
☐ General Psychology

Approximate number of Graduate hours earned beyond highest degree: _____ Sem. Hrs.
70 Qtr. Hrs.

6. Training Institutions and Degree(s) Conferred: Please list.

Westfield State College, MA B.S.Ed., M.S., CAGS
VPI & SU CAGS

7. Currently enrolled in program of academic training: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please indicate expected degree, area of specialization, and training institution: Ed.D./Adm. & Super. Sp. Ed./VPI & SU

8. Membership in Professional Organizations: ☐ APA
☐ Division 16 (Division of School Psychology, APA)
☒ NASP
☐ VPA
☐ VASP
☒ Other (Please specify)
CEC

9. Prior experiences: Please indicate number of years experience in each area appropriate for you.

☒ Classroom teacher: 5 Regular 1 Special
☐ Psychologist in other than school setting
☐ Other (Specify _____)

10. Areas of Certification or Endorsement by the Virginia Department of Education:

☒ Not Certified ☐ Elementary/Secondary Teacher
☐ School Psychologist ☐ Special Education Teacher
☐ Visiting Teacher ☐ Administrator/Supervisor
☐ Counselor

11. Title of Present Position(s): Part-time School Psychologist
12. Number of Years Experience as a school psychologist: 3
 Number of school psychology positions you have held: 4
 Number of times you have changed positions in the last 10 years: 4
 Please indicate the primary reason for job changes:
- ☐ Higher salary ☐ More role flexibility
☐ Family concerns ☐ Disagreement with philosophy of employer
☒ Other (Specify Advanced Degrees)
13. Endorsement or Certification as a school psychologist in any state(s) other than Virginia:
☒ Yes ☐ No
 What state(s)? Massachusetts, West Virginia
14. Licensed Psychologist: ☐ Yes ☐ Clinical ☐ School ☐ Generic
☒ No: Do you intend to become licensed? ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If yes, please indicate states where licensed: _____
 Estimated number of hours per week spent in private practice: N.A.
15. Licensed counselor: ☐ Yes ☒ No
16. Name of School District where currently employed: Alleghany Highlands
 If employed by more than one district, indicate names of all districts served:
Monroe County, W. Va.
17. Title of Direct Supervisor: ☐ Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent
☐ Pupil Personnel Director
☒ Special Education Supervisor
☐ Chief Psychologist
☐ Director of Psychological Services
☐ Other (Specify _____)
- Training Background of supervisor:
- ☐ Psychology ☒ Regular Education
☒ Special Education ☐ Vocational Education
☐ Social Work ☐ Counselor Education
☒ Other School Psych.
- Has your supervisor ever been employed as a school psychologist? ☐ Yes ☒ No
18. Number of years you have been employed in your present position: ½
 Total number of years employed by your present school system: ½
 When employed in the position of school psychologist, did you have other job alternatives to choose from:
☒ Yes ☐ No

19. Salary: Please indicate the appropriate range for the salary you receive, based on full-time employment as a school psychologist.

☐ Below \$10,000	☐ \$22,000 to \$24,999
☐ \$10,000 to \$12,999	☐ \$25,000 to \$27,999
☐ \$13,000 to \$15,999	☐ \$28,000 to \$30,999
☐ \$16,000 to \$18,999	☐ \$31,000 to \$33,999
☒ \$19,000 to \$21,999	☐ \$34,000 or over

Please indicate the funding source for your salary:

☒ Local funds	☐ Special grant
☐ Federal Flow-Thru funds	☐ State funds
☐ Regional cooperative	☐ Other (Specify _____)

How is your salary determined? Please indicate.

☐ Teacher salary schedule	☒ Other (Describe <u>Bargained</u>)
☐ Administrator salary schedule	

20. Length of employment contract: ☒ 10 months
☐ 11 months
☐ 12 months
☐ Other (Specify _____)
21. Are you reimbursed for mileage? ☒ Yes ☐ No
 If yes, does the mileage accrue from:
☐ Your residence ☒ Central school location
22. Is secretarial service included in your working agreement to type reports, etc.?
☒ Yes ☐ No

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

Listed below are several activities often included in the job responsibilities of school psychologists. Using the following scale, please rate each activity in two ways:

First, determine a rating according to the importance of the activity in your present job situation;

Second, determine a rating according to your opinion about the importance of the activity in your own conceptualization of the ideal role for the school psychologist.

Rating Scale

Circle the number under each heading corresponding to your rating of the importance of each activity:

- 1 - The activity is absolutely essential
- 2 - The activity is important
- 3 - The activity is of questionable importance
- 4 - The activity is unimportant
- 5 - The activity is not a responsibility

ACTIVITY	ACTUAL IMPORTANCE	IDEAL IMPORTANCE
1. Administration and scoring of individual diagnostic tests	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
2. Group test administration	1 ② 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 ⑤
3. Observations of children in various settings	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
4. Reviewing and researching records	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
5. Conducting diagnostic interviews	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
6. Preparing written psychological reports	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
7. Conducting interpretative interviews with parents and teachers	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
8. Participating as a member of a special education evaluation team	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
9. Serve as an Eligibility Committee member	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
10. Actively participate in IEP development	1 2 3 4 ⑤	1 ② 3 4 5
11. Follow-up consultation regarding IEPs or special education placements	1 ② 3 4 5	1 ② 3 4 5
12. Conduct individual therapy or counseling with children	① 2 3 4 5	① 2 3 4 5
13. Conduct group counseling with children	1 2 3 4 ⑤	① 2 3 4 5
14. Training parents through parent education classes	1 2 3 4 ⑤	1 ② 3 4 5

15. Conducting in-service training programs for school personnel	(1) 2 3 4 5	(1) 2 3 4 5
16. Consultation with school personnel regarding individual children, classroom management, etc.	(1) 2 3 4 5	(1) 2 3 4 5
17. Consultation with supervisor	(1) 2 3 4 5	(1) 2 3 4 5
18. Conducting research	1 2 3 4 (5)	(1) 2 3 4 5
19. Follow-up results of intervention strategies	1 (2) 3 4 5	(1) 2 3 4 5
20. Administrative activities (Preparation for meetings, correspondence, attending meetings, traveling to appointments)	1 (2) 3 4 5	1 (2) 3 4 5

Please indicate below the percentage of time you spend each week in the following activities:

Assessment	<u>60</u>
Intervention	<u>5</u>
Consultation	<u>10</u>
Research and Follow-up	<u>5</u>
Administration (Report writing, etc.)	<u>20</u>

Total= 100%

Please estimate the percentage of time you spend each week in activities related directly to:

Handicapped children	<u>90</u>
Non-handicapped children	<u>10</u>

Total= 100%

SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL ISSUES

1. Are there restrictions placed on your job performance in the areas of:

<u>X</u> Individual counseling	<u>X</u> Program dev. for regular students
<u>X</u> Group counseling	<u>X</u> Classroom affective education
<u>X</u> Program development for the gifted	<u>X</u> Work with parents
<u>X</u> Preschool Handicapped	Other (Specify _____)

For any checked area, please indicate what these restrictions are:

Lack of time

2. In your opinion, does the personality and orientation of your division superintendent influence your role as a school psychologist: X Yes No
Please explain briefly:

Influences funding for school psychologist time

3. For placement of students into E.D. programs, what additional evaluations (beyond the four basic components--educational, medical, social, psychological) are obtained for review by the Eligibility Committee?
- X Psychiatric Evaluation X Clinical Evaluation from a licensed psychologist
 Other (Specify _____)
 No other evaluations are obtained.
4. Who has the major responsibility for establishing the diagnoses of handicapped children in your school system?
- School Psychologist Other (Specify _____)
 X Eligibility Committee Don't Know
- If you checked Eligibility Committee, is the determination of a diagnosis, such as emotional disturbance or mental retardation, a democratic process where each member's input (principal, classroom teacher, etc.) is equal to that of the school psychologist's? X Yes No
- Please explain: Realistically, the psychologist's input carries more weight.
5. Please indicate the diagnosis most frequently disputed by Eligibility Committees in your district:
- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> Mental Retardation | <u> </u> Hearing Impaired |
| <u> X </u> Emotional Disturbance | <u> </u> Physically Handicapped |
| <u> </u> Learning Disability | <u> </u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u> </u> Visual Impaired | <u> </u> Multihandicapped |
6. Have you ever disagreed with a special education eligibility or placement decision?
- Yes X No
- If yes, please estimate the number of times this has occurred within the past year: _____
- Please describe your course of action following the disagreement:
7. Please indicate the type of special education placement most frequently disputed by Eligibility Committees in your district:
- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u> </u> Mental Retardation | <u> </u> Hearing Impaired |
| <u> X </u> Emotional Disturbance | <u> </u> Physically Handicapped |
| <u> </u> Learning Disability | <u> </u> Other Health Impaired |
| <u> </u> Visual Impaired | <u> </u> Multihandicapped |
8. Which of the following do you consider to be your primary client as a school psychologist:
- X the Child the Parent the School System
- According to your superintendent, who is considered the primary client of the school psychologist?
- X the Child the Parent the School Division
- Is there an explicit or implicit X policy establishing the primary client?
9. Following an evaluation, does the school system adjust programs to accommodate the individual child X OR is it expected that recommendations will be made to "fit" the child into existing programs X ? Some of both.

10. In your opinion, have federal legislation (PL 94-142) and subsequent Virginia special education regulations altered your functioning as a school psychologist?

☐ Yes ☐ No N.A.

If yes, please indicate how your functioning has been altered:

Did not work as a school psychologist prior to these.

11. What aspects of PL 94-142 are most helpful to children?

Right to appropriate education for all children
Procedural safeguards

What aspects do you consider detrimental to children?

Labelling

12. Do you as a school psychologist have any role in planning and establishing special education programs? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Please describe your role:

Indirectly -- Consultation with Supervisor regarding needs.

13. If you have been provided a contract, does the contract include any reference to the Standards of Practice for Providers of School Psychology or the Code of Ethics for psychologists?

☐ Yes ☐ No N.A.

14. In reference to the activities list in the survey of Professional Practices (P. 4), are you forced to perform functions for which you feel untrained? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Please list those functions:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

15. Are you expected to participate in any practices (such as signing blank eligibility forms) that create moral and/or ethical difficulties for you?

☐ Yes ☒ No. Please explain:

16. Currently, what is the most controversial issue in your school system?

Benefits of school consolidation

17. Are you operating under a test quota? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes, is this quota written into your contract ☐ OR a verbal agreement with your employer? ☐

Indicate the number of evaluations and time limitations set by the quota (for example, 5 evaluations per week): _____

Does the quota force you to practice in a manner which is unsatisfactory to you? ☐ Yes ☐ No. Please explain:

18. Are you provided with adequate facilities to conduct individual evaluations?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Please describe your best and worst facility:

Best - private office

Worst - Principal's office (telephone rings)

Estimate the number of evaluations conducted by you this year, which may have been invalidated by a poor testing environment: 0

19. Are you provided with adequate office space and equipment to conduct your practice of school psychology satisfactorily? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Please explain:

I visit many schools with abundant space.

I have an excellent assessment inventory.

20. Professional Development: Does your school system provide payment for the attendance of in-service workshops, conferences, and professional meetings?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Is this provided through a yearly allotment of a set amount of money? _____
OR on a conference by conference basis? _____

How many days have you spent in attendance at conferences, etc. within the past year? 0

21. What are the most personally rewarding aspects of your school psychology practice?

Interaction with children and professionals.

22. Considering the status, pay, and career opportunities, list the two greatest advantages of your present job:

Time flexibility

autonomy

Name the worst aspect of your present job:

travel

23. Please indicate, by checking the appropriate blanks, your level of career satisfaction today and five years ago:

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Today	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
5 Years Ago	_____	_____	_____	_____

24. Please indicate the factors that have most contributed to your present level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction:

As a doctoral student working on this dissertation, my position allows me to devote a great deal of time to my professional development.

25. If you were in a position to advise a bright, energetic young person in making a career choice, would you encourage him (her) to enter the school psychology profession: X Yes No

Why or why not?

For those who enjoy working with children and being constantly challenged, it's a dynamic field.

26. Comments:

Thanks for your time and patience in completing this questionnaire. I look forward to meeting with you.

Clyde Meyer
Star Route B, Box 75
Millboro, Va. 24460

APPENDIX F

Letter Sent to School Psychologists



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

January 18, 1983

As I briefly explained during our telephone conversation, my doctoral research is concerned with the services part-time or contract school psychologists offer. Although the literature in school psychology contains many references to school psychologists who are employed on a full-time basis, our particular roles have never been explored. Your input in this investigation is extremely important considering the small number of us who offer our services on a part-time or contract basis.

Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. You can be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence and only group data will be reported. I will be contacting you shortly by telephone to schedule a personal interview. The purpose of this interview will be to clarify and expand your responses to the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and support.

Most sincerely,

Clyde Meyer
School Psychologist
(703) 862-7143

CM/bt
Enclosures

APPENDIX G

Letter Sent to School
Psychologists' Supervisors



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

January 18, 1983

As I have explained during our brief telephone conversation and subsequent letter, my doctoral research is involved with investigating the services part-time or contract school psychologists provide. As a school psychologist, I am aware of the difficulties encountered by rural school divisions in attempting to offer comprehensive school psychological services. This study is the first of its kind. The results should be extremely helpful for supervisors, like yourself, who are concerned with the most practical and efficient means of serving children, parents and the community.

Considering the small number of school divisions which employ part-time or contract school psychologists, your input in this study is imperative. Please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. You can be assured that your responses will be held in strict confidence and only group data will be reported. I will be contacting you shortly to schedule a personal interview. The purpose of this interview will be to clarify and expand your responses to the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Most sincerely,

Clyde Meyer
School Psychologist
(703) 862-7143

CM/bt
Enclosures

APPENDIX H

First Letter Sent to Principals



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

January 18, 1983

Dear Principal:

As the principal of your school you observe and interact with many professionals. While employed as a school psychologist, I have spoken with a number of school principals who were extremely pleased with the amount and quality of services they have received from school psychologists. On the other hand, some principals have noted gaps in service delivery or poor quality of existing school psychological functions.

As a doctoral student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, I am involved in investigating the amount and quality of school psychological services offered to school divisions such as yours. I'd like to ask for your participation in this endeavor. The accompanying questionnaire was designed to take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. It seeks primarily your perceptions of the services you have received and your level of satisfaction with these services. I hope you will participate in this study by promptly responding and returning the questionnaire.

Your responses will be held in strict confidence and only group data will be reported. An abstract of the completed study will be made available to you later in this school year.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Most sincerely,

Clyde Meyer
School Psychologist
(703) 862-7143

CM/bt
Enclosures

APPENDIX I

Follow-up Letter Sent to Principals



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

January 31, 1983

Dear Principal:

Two weeks ago I mailed to you some survey materials regarding your perceptions and level of satisfaction with the school psychological services you receive. I realize, as a school principal with so many duties, how easily such a questionnaire could be misplaced or put aside. At this time I have not received your copy of the questionnaire. Your responses are extremely valuable and your participation in this study is eagerly awaited.

I am enclosing with this letter a second copy of the questionnaire and a self-addressed, stamped envelope in the event the original has been lost. I hope you will take a brief time out (10-15 minutes) to complete the questionnaire and send it back as soon as possible.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (703) 862-7143 before 8:30 A.M. or after 6:00 P.M. any day or evening.

Your time, effort and cooperation in this research endeavor is appreciated.

Most sincerely,

Clyde Meyer
School Psychologist

CM/bt
Enclosures

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

AN INVESTIGATION OF PART-TIME AND CONTRACTED
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICE DELIVERY IN
RURAL VIRGINIA

by

Clyde Meyer
(Abstract)

This study examined the strengths and weaknesses of employing part-time or contract school psychologists as primary providers of school psychological services for eight rural school divisions. In addition, data were obtained which facilitated comparison of full-time rural school psychological service delivery with the services obtained through these alternative employment arrangements.

Questionnaires were completed by two part-time and six contract school psychologists employed by rural school divisions in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The supervisors of these school psychologists also completed questionnaires. Both groups of respondents participated in a 40 minute personal interview with the researcher. Additionally, questionnaires were completed by 58 school principals from rural school divisions in Virginia which employed full-time, part-time, or contract school psychologists. Other data analyzed in the study were questionnaire responses from 31 rural school psychologists who had participated in Merchant's (1982) study of the professional practices of full-time school psychologists in Virginia.

Results indicated that for the majority of school divisions employing part-time or contract school psychologists, the strengths

of the employment were: 1) cost efficiency; 2) impartiality of the school psychologist; and 3) high quality psycho-educational assessments and recommendations. Weaknesses of the employment arrangements were: 1) high psychologist-to-student ratios; 2) lack of school psychologist time to perform non-assessment functions; and 3) lack of accessibility to the school psychologists by parents and school personnel.

Contracted school psychologists were found to devote almost all of their professional time to working with handicapped children. Full and part-time school psychologists spent approximately 30% of their time with nonhandicapped students.

Salaries of part-time and contracted school psychologists were higher than those of full-time practitioners. Part-time school psychologists, based on a 200 day school year, earned an equivalent of \$39,000. Contract school psychologists earned an equivalent of \$35,000, while the average yearly salary of full-time practitioners was approximately \$18,500.

Recommendations included the need for research on contracted and part-time employment of school psychologists in other settings. Additionally, it was recommended that the school psychology profession become actively involved in public awareness activities geared to improving school psychological services in rural areas.