1993

Elementary, Middle School, and Special Service Teachers' Attitudes toward School Psychologists and the Psychological Services They Provide

Terese L. Alexander
University of Northern Iowa

ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE SCHOOL, AND SPECIAL SERVICE TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES THEY PROVIDE

An Abstract

Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree

Specialist in Education

Terese L. Alexander

University of Northern Iowa

July 1993

ABSTRACT

Teachers' attitudes of school psychologists and the psychological services they provide have been under scrutiny since the inclusion of psychological services into the schools. Investigations of teacher attitudes imply that the working relationships between teachers and school psychologists are of considerable importance.

In this study, 207 (elementary, middle school, content area, and special service teachers) from a state in the Midwest were surveyed regarding their attitudes toward school psychologists and the psychological services they provide. The survey used measured several aspects of teachers' perceptions of school psychologists' (a) level of training, (b) their effectiveness, (c) qualifications to perform certain tasks, and (d) their usefulness when performing specific duties, and (e) their general attitude. Analysis of the data showed that middle school teachers reported making significantly fewer referrals than did elementary school teachers reported making. Teachers' gender, grade level taught, and referral group were not found to influence teachers general attitude toward school psychologists, or teachers' perceptions of effectiveness, qualifications, or usefulness of school psychologists. Overall, teachers reported having generally positive attitudes toward school psychologists.

These findings may be in part to the particular type of service delivery system known as Renewed Service Delivery System employed by school psychologists in the school district.

ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE SCHOOL, AND SPECIAL SERVICE TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES THEY PROVIDE

A Thesis

Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree

Specialist in Education

Terese L. Alexander

University of Northern Iowa

July 1993

This Study By: TERESE L. ALEXANDER

Entitled: ELEMENTARY TEACHERS, MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS AND SPECIAL SERVICE TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES THEY PROVIDE

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the Degree of Specialist in Education.

7/12/93 _____
Date Chair, Thesis Committee - Dr. Melissa L. Heston

7/12/93 _____
Date Thesis Committee Member - Dr. Constance J. Ulmer

7/12/93 _____
Date Thesis Committee Member - Dr. Charles V.L. Dedrick

7-25-93 _____
Date Dean, Graduate College - Dr. John W. Somervill

DEDICATION

This Thesis is dedicated to my uncle Philip Landry Sr. I can not express in words how much I appreciate your support, and the love you have given me throughout my life. Thank you for your prayers and blessings.

Terese L. Alexander

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

PSALMS 44:8

"In God we boast all day long, and praise thy name forever."

First, I would like to give thanks to my Heavenly Father for being my Alpha and Omega, second, for bestowing upon me the infinite wisdom throughout my educational endeavors, and finally for giving me the strength to endure.

I would like to thank my committee chairperson Dr. Melissa L. Heston for her guidance and patience. Most of all I would like to thank her for the use of her office. Dr. Heston has served me well throughout this process. Sincere thanks goes to Dr. Constance J. Ulmer, for her strong support and faith in me when I lost faith in myself. I would like to thank Dr. Charles Dedrick for his encouragement.

Special thanks goes to my parents Joan and Reynaud Alexander for their undying love and support. They are indeed excellent role models and have done a great job.

My gratitude goes to my sisters Reynell and Jolene for their love and support during my years as a graduate student.

To my godparents Jolene M. Jeff and Stephen J. Boyrd: Thank you for your love and support.

This is a shout out to my Nubian brother and sisters, Arthur, Patricia, and Adrienne. Without your friendship this process could not have been accomplished. Thanks for the laughter, hugs, and the support system we have built together.

Adrienne, you have been the greatest friend, roommate, and sister anyone could ask for; let's do it again. If you drive I'll steer.

Particular appreciation is given to my sorors, Kimberly D. Merritts and Tamiko M. Dunbar. I am very greatful to the help you have given me. TTBOD

To sorors Janet McClain, Dr. Annie Jones, and Dr. Scharron Clayton: being in your presence has helped me confirm that behind the doors of success are women of Delta Sigma Theta.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. John Somerville and Dr. Vivian Jackson. Thanks for the assistance through the storms.

Finally, I would like to thank Roland (Pedro) Flemings for being so special and most of all for being a friend. "There's something in my heart that's got me hooked on you."

To anybody I may have forgotten: Charge it to my head and not my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The field of school psychology can by no means be considered narrow in scope. Societal changes in the United States have forced school psychologists to examine critical new issues and questions. For example, the impact of changing societal institutions, racial discrimination, economic inequities, litigation and legislation, and the age of accountability have all exerted an influence on the practice of school psychology (Yesseldyke, 1982).

School psychologists have looked ahead to the future of education in the United States and have reviewed their existing roles and functions. Currently, the roles require school psychologists to be developmental experts, consultants, and strategists in the field of education, as well as prevention experts in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse (Batsche, 1992).

The competence with which school psychologists perform their present and future roles is most likely to be judged by a variety of school personnel. Among school personnel, perhaps the most significant appraiser of the performance of the school psychologist is the classroom teacher. Researchers have periodically surveyed teachers' perceptions of school psychologists and the psychological services they provide (Gilmore & Chandy 1973a, 1973b; Kahl & Fine, 1973;

Roberts, 1970; Severson, Pickett, & Hetrick 1985; Styles, 1965). In these studies, the researchers found no general consensus among teachers regarding their perceptions of school psychologists and psychological services they provide. Because psychologists render services to school personnel, particularly teachers, it is important that the relationship between these professionals be productive. Even though teachers perceptions of school psychologists are not consistent, these perceptions are important because the ultimate charge of both groups of professionals is to serve children. A poor relationship betweeen teachers and school psychologists may have a detrimental impact on children in need of service.

Teachers' attitudes regarding school psychologists and the services they provide are also a valuable source of information for the profession of school psychology. Teachers' views are likely to influence their choices of pupils to refer school psychologists, and these views also influence teachers' readiness to enter into various kinds of working relationships with school psychologists (Styles, 1965). That is, since teachers are the chief source of referrals, teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists and their recommendations for interventions and problem solving techniques would seem to have a critical impact on the psychologists' day to day functioning.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine elementary school, middle school and special services teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists and the psychological services they provide. The study addressed the following questions:

1. Do male and female teachers differ in the number of referrals they report having made to school psychologists?

2. Do elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and special services teachers (Chapter 1 and Special Education) differ in the number of referrals they reported having made to school psychologists?

3. Do male and female teachers differ in their overall attitudes towards school psychologists?

4. Do male and female teachers differ in their ratings of the effectiveness of school psychologists when working with children facing particular problems?

5. Do male and female teachers differ in their ratings of the qualifications of school psychologists to undertake various tasks?

6. Do male and female teachers differ in their ratings of the past usefulness of school psychologists in certain school-related activities?

7. Do elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and special services teachers (Chapter 1 and Special Education

teachers) differ in their overall attitudes toward school psychologists?

8. Do elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and special services teachers (Chapter 1 and Special Education) differ in their ratings of the effectiveness of school psychologists when working with children facing particular problems?

9. Do elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and special services teachers (Chapter 1 and Special Education) differ in their ratings of the qualifications of school psychologists to undertake various tasks?

10. Do elementary teachers, middle school teachers, and special services teachers (Chapter 1 and Special Education) differ in their ratings of the past usefulness of school psychologists in certain school related activities?

11. Does the number of referrals teachers report having made influence their overall attitude toward school psychologist?

13. Does the number of referrals teachers report having made influence their ratings of the effectiveness of school psychologists facing a particular problem?

14. Does the number of referrals teachers report having made influence their ratings of the qualifications of the school psychologists to undertake various tasks?

15. Does the number of referrals teachers report having made influence their ratings of the past usefulness of school psychologists in certain school related activities?

Significance of the Study

School psychologists and teachers must establish a cooperative and positive relationship in order to best serve children and assure that children experience optimal school success. Negative attitudes among teachers toward school psychologists would imply a non-productive working relationship, while positive attitudes would imply a substantially greater likelihood of quality service for those students in need of special care. Teachers' attitudes toward the school psychologist's qualification, effectiveness, and usefulness warrant investigation because of the influence these attitudes are likely to have on teachers and their professional relationship with school psychologists.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was conducted on a sample drawn from one midwestern school district. Consequently, the conclusions of this study may not be representative of teachers in other school districts.

2. The sample may have been somewhat biased since the researcher was familiar with several schools within the district.

3. Because of the administrative procedures used, the teachers' understanding of the questions could not be clarified. Not all responding teachers completed all ofthe survey questions.

Assumptions

1. The questionnaire was a valid and reliable measure of teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists and the psychological services they provide.

2. Teachers were honest in answering all questions.

Definition of Terms

1. Attitude: "Attitude may be defined as 'positive' or 'negative' affect towards a particular group, institution, concept, or social object" (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, 1990, p. 233). Attitudes are hypothetical constructs which cannot be measured or observed directly. However, attitudes can be inferred from the judgements and choices individuals make and their overt behavior.
The measurement of attitudes presumes the ability to place individuals in comparatively different positions along a continuum of favorableness / unfavorableness.

2. School Psychologist: The primary function of the school psychologist is to carry out service functions that

benefit learners, parents, educators, and professional functions which support the school psychology discipline.

3. Psychometrist: The primary function of the psychometrist is to conduct psycho-educational evaluations of children who have been referred because of learning and educational problems, and, may need to be placed in an educational setting.

4. Educational Facilitator: The primary function of the educational facilitator is to provide service for all children in schools, to administer psychological and psycho-educational evaluations and assessments, to assist classroom teachers in educational programming and behavior management, to provide school personnel with in-service training, and to act as a community liaison.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of literature related to the present study. The chapter has been subdivided into two topical sections. In the first section, historical influences on the development of present day school psychology are discussed. In the second section of this review, research on teachers' perceptions of school psychologists and the psychological services they provide are described and critiqued.

History of School Psychology as a Profession

The title, School Psychology, is derived from two sources: psychology and education (Bardon, 1982). Thus, the history of school psychology has reflected a merging of these two distinct yet related fields, which, in part, has led to great diversity in the field of school psychology.

The historical development of school psychology can be divided into two periods: (a) the Hybrid years (1890-1969) and (b) the Thoroughbred Years (1970-present) (Fagan, 1990). According to Fagan the Hybrid years were a blend of different educational and psychological practitioners loosely mobilized around the dominant function of psycho-educational assessment for special class placement.

The Thoroughbred years were characterized by regulations, association growth, professional division, and reorganization of the field of school psychology.

Hybrid Years

The early origins of psychological services in schools can be traced to an era of social reform in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In 1896, Lightner Withmer established a counseling center for teaching, research, and service at Pennsylvania University (Gutkin, 1980). "Withmer's contributions to applied psychology were significant; indeed, he is acknowledged as the founding father of both school psychology and clinical psychology" (p. 5). One of the clinic's major goals was to train psychologists to help educators solve children's learning problems. Withmer's clinic served as a model for service delivery which many school systems emulated (Cutts, 1955).

The development of the individual intelligence test in 1905 by Alfred Binet and Theophile Simon marked the beginning of the intelligence testing movement. This movement was a great influence on the field of school psychology. The Binet-Simon Scale demonstrated that mental testing was possible and stimulated the development of many other tests, such as the Stanford-Binet-LM which evaluates intellectual abilities from birth to adulthood. These tests

also stimulated the public's acceptance of psychological tests (Sattler, 1989).

Another major influence on the field of school psychology was the emergence of the mental hygiene movement in 1908. This triggered a growing recognition of the significance of the childhood period in the development of behavior disorders. School personnel began to see children in a broader, more complex light. Children's affective, emotional, and social lives began receiving increased attention, and preventive mental health practices were incorporated onto many school curricula and programs.

The development of special education ran parallel to the testing movement. In the early part of the 20th century, schools became increasingly child-centered. This trend encouraged greater awareness of the individual learner, a premise which is the foundation of special education. State money was appropriated for the special education needs of children when a licensed psychologist performed an evaluation of the children's abilities prior to placement.

In 1915, the State Board of Connecticut hired Arnold Gesell in the capacity of a school psychologist to examine "mentally backwards" (Cutts, 1955 p. 39) children in towns and rural areas and to aid local school districts in making educational arrangements (Fagan, 1990). Schools and

non school-based clinics spread quickly throughout the United States between 1900 and 1930. Most large city school systems had access to clinical psychology services.

During the 1940s, the profession of school psychology developed a greater, more cohesive organizational identity, and national certification was established. During this period, training courses were organized at several institutions of higher education. In addition, examinations for employment by the state departments of education in New York and Pennsylvania were developed.

In the succeeding decade, school psychologists' professional identity was solidified. Although the profession was still centered primarily in urban areas, school psychology became accepted nationwide and its work force increased. During the 1960s, school psychologists began to develop their own professional literature unique to their field of study. Three psychological journals were founded and fourteen books were written concerning the confusion of roles and professional identity problems.

Trainer and practitioner growth also occurred during this time for school psychologists. There was a great need for school psychologists and psychological services in schools during this period. This need came about because special education programs were serving more than two million children by 1968.

By the end of the Hybrid years, school psychology was a significant entity in psychology and education (Fagan, 1990). At this time, school psychologists were placing extremly heavy reliance on standardized assessment.

Thoroughbred Years

During the 1970s, standardized testing began to affect statutory and decisional laws which in turn had tremendous impact on the field of school psychology. New laws focused heavily on children's rights to education and placement bias which indicated unfair or unjust treatment of the recipients of service. In 1971, two right-to-education cases, Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, served as catalysts for placement bias cases in almost every state. The rulings in these cases required school psychologists to provide comprehensive psycho-educational evaluations to all handicapped children, resulting in expanded assessment services (Ball, 1985).

The placement bias cases were Diana v. State Board of Education (1970) and Larry P. v. Riles (1979). Both cases focused on the over-representation of minority students in special education classes and the inherent bias of evaluative instruments (Sattler, 1989). These cases increased the concerns of many educators and legislators,

and ultimately brought about a significant piece of federal legislation, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142). The purpose of the law was to garauntee children with special educational needs, "a free, appropriate public education" (Public Law 94-142, 1975, Sec. 3,c).

Goldwasser, Meyers, Christenson, and Garden, (1981) investigated school psychologists' perceptions of the impact that PL 94-142 had on their role. Data were gathered from the members of the National Association of School Psychologists. Seventy-nine percent of the solicited practitioners responded to the survey and a total of 865 surveys were used for analysis purposes. Data indicated that PL 94-142 had little effect on the school psychologists' primary role which was that of a psychometrist.

School psychologists reported spending the greatest part of their time in testing activities, 20% in consultation, and 10% providing direct interventions to children. The respondents also indicated that there was no change in the use of evaluation procedures. The four most common procedures were standardized intelligence tests, educational tests, perceptual motor tests, and behavioral observations in the classroom. In summary, the data indicated that school psychologists still spent 70% of their

time performing psycho-educational diagnostic evaluations, with little or no change in their specific assessment techniques.

The impact of PL 94-142 on the field of school psychology has been perceived to be both positive and negative (Abramowitz, 1981). On the positive side, the law increased the visibility of school psychologists and provided more funding for a larger workforce. On the negative side, the law reinforced the role of a psychometrist that many school psychologists wanted to reduce.

The field of school psychology continued its heavy reliance on testing throughout the 1970s. However, as the 1980s approached, school psychologists began to shift from their traditional role as assessors of disabled children to a new roles as consultants for teachers on ways to deal with disabled children in the regular classroom. Mainstreaming disabled children into regular classrooms looked promising to educators and society as a whole. Educators began focusing their opposition to testing and placement. The Regular Education Initiative helped legislators and educators alike direct attention to the instability of the traditional special education model. This gave school psychologists a new outlook on their role within the school. Consultation became an important role for school

psychologists, and was a response to the growing demand for school psychologists to best meet the needs of teachers as well as students (Harmon, 1992). Research concerning the consultation services offered by school psychologists has provided some evidence that this expanded role required school psychologists and teachers to start anew. Gutkin (1986) found that success in consultation with teachers was dependent on the teachers' perceptions of the usefulness of consultation and the importance of psycho-educational principles in the classroom.

The newest developing role of school psychologists in the 1990s is that of problem-based consultation. This role has been defined by the Iowa School Psychologists Association as consisting of a problem-solving orientation toward the provision of direct and indirect services. The school psychologist must bring educational knowledge of child development as well as a problem-solving perspective to bear in theri efforts to help children through an array of services provided by the school.

Hyman and Kaplinski (1992) surveyed members of the National Association of School Psychologists and found that 48% of the school psychologists who consulted with teachers spent 11% to 25% of their time consulting. Only 5% of the school psychologists surveyed indicated that they spent more than 50% of their time consulting. However, 65% of the

respondents indicated that consulting resulted in better services to all children.

Teachers' Perceptions of School Psychologists and the Psychological Services They Provide

Researchers have repeatedly surveyed teachers on their attitudes toward school psychologists and the psychological services they provide schools since the mid 1960s. Styles (1965) surveyed teachers in four southwest Ohio school systems. Questionnaires were distributed to teachers in 28 schools (1 high school, 4 junior high schools, and 23 elementary schools). These schools were located in largely upper income urban and suburban areas.

Questionnaires were returned by 459 (52.3% of those surveyed) teachers. The questionnaires included six sections: (a) teachers were asked to estimate school psychologists' level of training, (b) teachers were asked to indicate similarities between the school psychologists and other fields of psychology and education, (c) teachers were asked to indicate whether school psychologists were qualified to undertake specific tasks, (d) teachers were asked to the rate effectiveness of school psychologists with different kinds of problem children, (e) teachers were asked open-end questions concerning the personality characteristics that were most suitable for a school psychologist, and (f) teachers were asked to indicate the

usefulness of school psychologists according to the services they provide.

Styles' findings indicated that teachers perceived school psychologists as most useful when working with children who had severe emotional disorders, and least useful when working with children who had speech problems and physical disabilities. When rating the qualifications of school psychologists, 84.3% of these respondents considered school psychologist not qualified to prescribe medication for nervous and distractible children. More than 50% of the teachers surveyed considered school psychologists qualified to hold conferences with parents in order to interpret the test results concerning childrens' abilities and to train teachers to administer intelligence tests. Teachers indicated that the most useful services performed by school psychologists were the written reports and individual conferences provided by the school psychologists. Teachers perceptions of school psychologists seemed to reflect an emphasis on a clinical orientation of school psychology. For example, teachers viewed school psychologists as counselors and psychotherapists. Teachers also indicated that they thought that school psychologists should be trained with a greater orientation toward educational intervention in order to be of value in solving classroom related difficulties.

Baker (1965), in a in an Ohio county school district, surveyed administrators, guidance counselors, and teachers on their attitudes toward psychological services in an effort to improve the services already in existence. The psychological services staff in the district consisted of a director, two field school psychologists, and an intern. At the time of the study psychological services had only been in existence for a total of 6 years.

The county school district consisted of 10 secondary schools and 28 elementary schools. Baker surveyed 479 school personnel and received 333 usable replies (67%). Eighty-six percent of the administrators, 66% of the elementary teachers, and 61% of the guidance counselors responded. Senior and junior high school teachers were eliminated since guidance counselors were required to carry out casework and act as the referring agent for these two groups.

A questionnaire was distributed to school personnel which covered five phases in the service delivery process: (a) referral procedure, (b) data gathering prior to diagnostic evaluation, (c) the evaluation, (d) dissemination of the information resulting from the evaluation, and (e) case follow up. Teachers were to indicate "yes" if they agreed about a statement regarding a service phase, and "no" if they disagreed with the statement. For example, teachers

were asked if psychological reports added anything to their knowledge of the problem.

A standard procedure was used to explain the questionnaires; Guidance counselors and secondary principals were contacted by a member of the psychological staff. Elementary principals and teachers were given a similar explanation by one of the psychologists not assigned to their school. The researcher indicated that these measures were taken in an attempt to secure unbiased responses from the subjects.

The teachers were divided into two categories: (a) experienced teachers who had 4 or more years of teaching experience or more and (b) inexperienced teachers who had less than 4 years of teaching experience. The researcher indicated that this division was made in order to identify differences in attitude between these two groups. Baker found that administrators and guidance counselors indicated that it took an average of two weeks for psychological services to take place. Guidance counselors and principals were satisfied with the process prior to evaluations. Counselors felt that they were an integral part of the process. Overall, guidance counselors and principals were satisfied with the services provided by school psychologists. Unlike principals and guidance counselors, teachers were dissatisfied with the service delivery time,

and felt they were seen by school psychologists as less important than other school personnel. Teachers reported that it took three and a half weeks before initial services could take effect. Teachers also they questioned the school psychologist's understanding of the nature of their problems. Teachers indicated that the recommendations contained in reports were found to be useful and appropriate only 50% of the time. There were significant differences between inexperienced and experienced teachers. The inexperienced teachers felt that they were not consulted after the evaluation, and that post evaluation conferences were held more often with the experienced teachers. However, experienced teachers felt that psychological reports did not add information to their knowledge, while inexperienced teachers reported that psychological reports did provide new and meaningful information.

Lucas and Jones (1970) surveyed 150 female and 36 male special education teachers (educable mentally retarded) and 19 male and 18 female school psychologists from an Ohio school district. Each psychologist was asked to indicate which schools he/she was assigned to within the district. The researchers then mailed questionnaires to those teachers with EMR students. Teachers and psychologists received an identical seven page questionnaire with the exception of

questions that solicited information about school psychologist and psychological reports.

The questionnaire contained four major sections: (a) a list of possible aspects of the psychologist's role as it related to EMR children; (b) a general information section which contained statements regarding the educational functioning of the EMR child, as well as psychological reports; (c) a rating form so teachers could indicate their attitudes towards psychological reports in terms of communication, recommendations, and school psychologists' "helpfulness," and (d) a data sheet including general background information (e.g. amount and type of interaction between teacher and psychologist).

The results indicated that demographically teachers and school psychologists differed greatly. Teachers tended to be older ($\underline{M}$ = 41.8) than school psychologists ($\underline{M}$ = 36.4) and more experienced ($\underline{M}$ = 11.7 years and 5.2 years respectively). The amount of contact between teachers and school psychologists varied. Fifty percent of the teachers surveyed had an average of 3.8 contacts with a school psychologist, and this contact was mainly for testing and placing students. School psychologists indicated that they saw EMR teachers at least four times a year for testing, and discussions of tests results and behavior problems.

Teachers and psychologists were to rank the ideal and present role of school psychologist in order of importance. Many teachers indicated that they were unable to respond since they were only familiar with the psychologists as psychometrists. Teachers indicated that they saw psychologists as responsible for making placement, interpreting results for parents and teachers, and giving suggestions for behavioral management. The teachers indicated that they would like to see school psychologists engage in more psychotherapy. Teachers tended to rate psychological services as moderately helpful. Teachers also wanted school psychologists to engage in psychotherapy which is similiar to those findings of Styles (1965).

Teachers also tended to credit school psychologists with having cosiderable knowledge about severe emotional disturbances. This finding is again similiar to that of Styles (1965) whose respondents indicated that school psychologists were more effective with children who had severe emotional disturbance.

This Lucas and Jones (1970) study has several limitations. The first limitation to this study is the length of the instrument. The questionnaire was so lengthy that respondents found it difficult to complete the sections that offered space for comments. Out of 186 returned questionnaires, only 81 teachers utilized the section. The

second limitation to this study is the complexity of questions. The respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the section that required them to have expert knowledge outside of their field. The third limitation was that only special education teachers were surveyed. Thus, these results may not be generalizable to other teacher populations.

Roberts (1970) investigated possible differences between (a) actual and desired job functions as these were perceived by school psychologists and (b) actual and desired job functions of school psychologists as these were perceived by teachers. Roberts solicited the participation of 135 school psychologists and 315 elementary teachers with five or more years of teaching experience. The return rate for school psychologists was 94% and the return rate for teachers was 74%. Utilizing a questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate items on a 7-point scale. These items were particular roles or activities performed by school psychologists.

Teachers and school psychologists both indicated that the actual role was quite psychometrist is important. However, on the 7 point continuum, teachers tended to mark the extreme portions on a 7-point scale. This conclusion is parallel to the findings of Lucas and Jones (1970) whose teacher respondents identified psychometry as an area in

which school psychologists were useful. Not only did teachers perceive this role to be important, but they desired more emphasis in the area of administration and interpretation of test results. On the other hand, 80% of the psychologists indicated that too much time was given to the role of psychometry in actual practice.

Teachers also indicated strong support for the notion that school psychologists had responsibilities as therapists and as researchers. This supports the findings of Styles (1965) and Lucas and Jones (1970) in regard to psychotherapy. Psychologists, however, were less inclined to pursue the responsibilities and roles of psychotherapist and researcher.

Psychologists tended to perceive their function as consultants of more importance, in actual practice, than did teachers. Both groups desired more emphasis be placed on the school psychologist as a consultant. This finding is parallel to the responses of inexperienced teachers in the investigation by Baker (1965) who indicated they did not receive an ample amount of consultation and desired more. Psychologists rated in-service training activities as of greater importance than teachers, although both groups agreed that liaison activities involving communication with outside facilities as a very important duty for school psychologists. Teachers and school psychologists were in

favor of school psychologists conducting parent groups, recommending academic programs, and advising school personnel concerning discipline and classroom management. In terms of effectiveness, school psychologists felt they were more effective in these areas than did responding teachers.

School psychologists also believed themselves to be more helpful than did teachers in both their actual and desired roles. Teachers believed school psychologists were less effective in areas involving academics such as classroom management and class placement, and that school psychologists should perform from a educational orientation. These responses indicated that teachers identified school psychologists with medical and clinical psycho-social models of school psychology, while school psychologists considered their role more closely related to the educational model of school psychology. These findings concur with those of Styles (1965) and Lucas and Jones (1970), whose respondents also recognized school psychologists as utlizing clinical models of practice with clinical models. A limitation to this study was that it only included elementary teachers, and thus findings may be difficult to generalize to teachers of other grades.

Gilmore and Chandy (1973b) interviewed 33 teachers using open-ended questions. The teachers were employed in

two southern schools within the same school district. One school served a majority Black population in an economically depressed section of the district, while the other served a lower middle class White population. Both schools were considered elementary by the researchers as one school served students in grades 1-6 and the other school served of students in grades 4-6.

Following the interviews, the teachers answered 26 questions which allowed them to give a single response on a 5-point scale. Questions were read to the teachers and both verbal and multiple choice responses were recorded by the interviewer. These questions were used in order to reveal teachers' perceptions of school psychologists' training and competencies, their role functions, as well as their usefulness. Teachers were classified on two independent variables, degree of contact with school psychologist (never used = no contact, 1 to 3 times a year = moderate, 4 or more times a year = high contact), and years of teaching experience (4 years or less inexperienced, 5 to 9 years = moderately experienced; 10 or more years = experienced).

Results of the first variable suggested that teachers wanted school psychologists to increase their involvement with students who were retarded, or were experiencing

emotional and behavioral problems, or low academic achievement. Children who were gifted and experiencing out-of-school problems were areas that teachers did not want to see school psychologists involved in. Teachers also believed that children's problems had to be at least moderately severe before seeking outside assistance from the school psychologists. Teachers also indicated that the primary work of the school psychologists was that of the psychometrist, and that extensive periods of time elapsed before action was taken on a referral. This concurs with the findings of Baker (1965) that the initial referral period was too long. Respondents also felt that school psychologists too often gave recommendations without becoming active participants in the treatment of students jointly with the classroom teacher or independently.

Compared to the average teacher, the respondents indicated that school psychologists were less skillful in the area of classroom management and knew less than the average teacher about teaching in general. Again, this similiar to the findings of Roberts (1970), whose respondents believed that school psychologists were unaware of the classroom management as well as other classroom procedures.

A comparison of teachers' attitudes by years of teaching experience revealed a slightly different pattern of

findings from those of Baker (1965). In Baker's study, inexperienced teachers expected more than recommendations, and credited the school psychologists more often as participating in treatment (curricular change and behavioral control techniques for use in the classroom) than did the experienced teachers. In this study, moderately experienced teachers expected more than just recommendations, while inexperienced and experienced teachers did not. However, teachers with a moderate amount of experience did expect the school psychologists to conduct treatment less often than did experienced teachers. When rating school psychologists, teachers who had no contact with psychologists credited them as being more helpful, and these teachers had more confidence in psychologists than those teachers with who had had contact with them.

A limitation to this study would be the small sample size, and that the schools were unequal in various areas. For example, the schools serviced different racial groups and somewhat different grade levels. Also, the use of interviews allows for threats to internal validity. In this case, a certain amount of unmeasured interviewer effect may have influenced the findings of (Gilmore & Chandy, 1973b).

In an expanded replication of an earlier study, Gilmore and Chandy (1973a) attempted to gather data that would be more generalizable, and they studied the effects of

additional variables such as the socioeconomic status of the student population, school size, and other school personnel. Teachers (N = 192), principals (N = 7), and school psychologists (N = 12) completed a group administered questionnaire. The questionnaire contained 37 multiple choice questions, each of which used a 5-point scale. Participants at 9 schools took part in the investigation; four schools were Title I schools, and located in poor sections of the district. The other 5 participating schools were located in middle and upper class sections of the district. School populations ranged in sizes from 260 to 800 students.

Teacher participants were grouped according to years of teaching experience. Teachers with 4 years or less were calssified inexperienced; teachers with 5-9 years of teaching were considered moderately experienced, while teachers with 10 or more years of teaching were deemed experienced. Teachers were also grouped according to frequency of contact with school psychologists (never used = no contact, 1 to 3 times per year = moderate, 4 or more = high contact). Teachers were also grouped by Title I status and by school size. A large school consisted of 590 to 800 students, and a small school consisted of less than 590.

A discriminate analysis was used to compare group responses to the eight variables: (a) type of child learning

problem, (b) diagnostic activities, (c) types of treatment, (d) treatment management, (e) psychometrist's skills compared to the average teacher, (f) recommendations, (g) helpfulness to children, and (h) helpfulness to school personnel. Analyses of variances were used when significant differences were reported using the discriminate analysis procedure. The results indicated that teachers of all experience levels perceived the school psychologist as most useful in cases of behavior problems, and they agreed that there was little school psychologist involvement with recommendations or interventions (e.g. behavioral treatment control). Thus, teaching experience in and of itself did not appear to be a critical variable in these results; rather, prior contact with the school psychologist was found to be a significant factor affecting teachers' perceptions. Teachers with high school psychologist contact viewed the psychologist in a more restricted role, that of a psychometrician, while teachers with low psychologist contact perceived school psychologists as psycho-educational consultants (Baker, 1965; Gilmore & Chandy 1973b).

Educators in the Title I schools perceived school psychologists as possessing fewer skills and performing a more restricted role than did teachers in non Title I schools. These findings may be due the fact that since some low SES school populations consist of perdominatly minority

children and because these children may be overrepresented in special education classes, school psychologists may tend to test and place a minority child rather than develop an intervention strategy as may be more likely to occur in a higher SES school. As a comparison between teachers, principals, and school psychologists, principals and psychologists attributed greater utility and skills to the psychologists than teachers did, and they felt that school psychologists had more knowledge in classroom management and understood children's abilities.

Kahl and Fine (1978) surveyed 54 teachers from a Midwestern metropolitan school district who were classified on two dimensions: years of teaching experience (4 years or less = inexperienced; 5 to 9 years = moderately experienced; 10 years or more = experienced) and frequency of contact (1 or fewer times per year = low contact; 2 to 3 times per year = moderate contact; 4 or more times per year = high contact). Teachers from eight schools (4 low SES and 4 upper SES) participated in the investigation. Teachers were given questionnaires that contained three scales measuring, (a) role functions, (b) general attitudes towards school psychologists, and (c) helpfulness of school psychologists to various types of students. The general attitude scale consisted of 10 multiple choice items, 9 of which used a

5-point scale. The role functions and the helpfulness scales included 12 and 15 items respectively; items on role functions were rated as from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Items on the helpfulness scale were rated very helpful to no help. In general, teachers viewed school psychologists less knowledgeable about children's abilities. This contradicts the findings of Roberts (1970) who found that psychologists were viewed as knowledgeable about children's abilities. In addition, teachers with experience and with higher levels of contact with school psychologists found that the psychologists provided adequate services within the community, and they believed that the psychologists were more helpful to learning disabled and underachieving children with emotional maladjustments and home problems. In addition, high contact upper income teachers from upper income schools viewed the school psychologist as more helpful to more types of children than did any other groups of teachers. Teachers in the upper income-high contact group may have rated the school psychologists as more effective because psychologists may do a limited amount of testing and thaus may be available to provide interventions for students as well as consultation with teachers.

Ford and Migles (1979) surveyed 150 teachers from De La Warr school district in New Castle, Delaware. This district

is located in an area where there is a high percentage of low income families (40%) and minority populations that is mostly Black (53%). Teachers in this study represented grades K-12 with a return rate of 40% (N = 60). In this study a questionnaire was used to obtain responses from teachers.

This study was designed to assess teacher requirements for school psychologists using, (a) grade, (b) gender, (c) teaching experience, (d) content area, and (e) teaching method, as independent variables. Results indicated that teachers preferred school psychologists to provide services that would place students in optional special education programs. Teachers also considered the role of the psychometrist as important. Teachers rated the role of the school psychologists as liaisons to community service programs, and their roles as consultants and providing prevention skills as unimportant. Teachers also rated in-service training, group facilitation, and teacher consultant regarding parent meetings as unimportant.

These findings indicated that teachers placed great value on psychological services that give teachers immediate relief in problematic situations. Teachers were more accepting of school psychologists wh0 acted in a test and place mode. The limitations to this study include the low return rate, which possibly biased the sample, and the fact

that the study was conducted in only one school district used.

In an attempt to control contact with school psychologists, Dean (1980) chose participants from a group of inservice and preservice teachers (undergraduate students enrolled in an educational psychology course). The inservice teachers (N = 32; 17 females) were chosen from a random sample of elementary teachers who reported a total of five to eight contacts with school psychologists and had three to five years of teaching experience. The preservice teachers were N = 32; second semester juniors 17 females who were preparing to student teaching in the next semester. The subjects were given a three part questionnaire in which they were asked to (a) rank a number ancillary school personnel (psychologists, guidance counselors, school nurse, and school principal) and their importance, (b) rate school psychologists on 11 dimensions, and (c) assign a number of common referral problems to the ancillary personnel best suited to handle them. Dean's results paralleled those of The number of contacts between teachers and school psychologists was a factor in teacher ratings. For example, teachers based their decisions of school psychologists ratings in areas of helpfulness, effectiveness, and competencies by the frequency of contact that occurred. Results indicated that both preservice and experienced

teachers believed that school psychologists were appropriate referral sources for children with emotional problems (Gilmore & Chandy, 1973b; Lucas & Jones, 1970; Roberts, 1970; Styles, 1965).

Preservice teachers viewed the school psychologists' effectiveness most positively when handling classroom behavior problems. This counters the findings of Gilmore and Chandy (1973b) whose respondents indicated psychologists were less knowledgeable about classroom behavior problems. Experienced teachers had lower ratings about the services provided than did novice teachers, who often had idealistic and unrealistic expectations. For example, novice teachers considered school psychologists qualified in areas in which they did not usually perform.

Severson et al. (1985) surveyed 181 inservice teachers and 189 preservice teachers regarding their attitudes toward school psychologists using a modified scale similar to Styles (1965). The first section of the scale consisted of demographic data: gender, age, grade level, years of teaching experience, and number of contacts with school psychologists. The second section asked teachers to indicate which of the several professionals had training like school psychologists. In the third section, subjects indicated which of 10 categories of student referral types (e.g. students with severe emotional problems, students with

problems in the home) they had ever referred to school psychologists. The survey consisted of three subscales: (a) effectiveness, (b) qualifications, and (c) usefulness. The first subscale measured the effectiveness of school psychologists in dealing with children with certain problems. The second subscale measured the qualifications of school psychologists of school psychologists to perform specific tasks. The last subscale measured the past usefulness of school psychologists in certain school-related activities.

Results indicated that experienced teachers most commonly referred students who lacked adequate control over their behavior (80%), and they were least likely to refer a student who was physically handicapped (23%). Junior high teachers ask frequently referred students with problems in the home (64%), and delinquent children (45%). Experienced teachers perceived school psychologists to be most similar in training to a clinical psychologist (84%), and least like a psychiatrist (12%), while preservice group generally saw school psychologists to be similiar both clinical psychologists (56%) and a school guidance counselor (55%). Preservice teachers saw little similarity in training to a psychometrist, and perhaps these teachers were unfamiliar with this term.

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of school psychologists in dealing with particular referral problems. When elementary teachers and middle school teachers ratings were combined, the effectiveness data indicated that experience teachers rated school psychologists as more effective with physically handicapped or culturally deprived students than did inexperienced teachers. In the area of qualifications, experienced teachers felt that school psychologists were qualified to hold conferences to interpret a child's ability (59.2%), train teachers to administer group intelligence test (61.2%), recommend specific school programming for students (40.5%), and consult with teachers at their request about their classroom problems and referring them to further sources for help (61%). When asked to rate the usefulness of school psychologists' services, experienced teachers responded that the most useful services were holding individual conferences, providing staff with written reports on the evaluation of students, interpreting specific test results, such as IQ scores, and providing specific ideas or programs to use with referred children. A correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between perceived effectiveness and the amount of contact between teachers had had with school psychologists. The

results indicated that teachers with more contact perceived school psychologists to be less effective.

Conclusion

The field of school psychology was developed from other existing disciplines to create a profession that serves children and adolescents in need of special services in a variety of school settings. In doing so, many attitudes have been formed regarding school psychologists and the services they have provided to other professionals.

School psychologists and psychological services have been appraised and viewed in such an ambiguous manner by other professionals, that the clarity of the school psychologists' roles are still considered confusing by a number of school professionals. The literature revealed that there were various and inconsistent ideas and opinions about school psychologists among teachers even within the same regions of the United States. To discover if these inconsistencies are still present, it is important to investigate the current beliefs of teachers. The study described in the next chapter was an attempt to do just that.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Respondents

The respondents participating in this study were 207 elementary, middle school, Chapter 1, and Special Education teachers from a school district in a Midwestern state. The sample size included 420 teachers from 16 schools (11 elementary schools and 5 junior high schools). High school teachers were not included in this study because of the possibility that they may not have had contact or have had little contact with school psychologists. Most school psychologists function primarily at the elementary school level, whether they assume consultant, therapeutic, and/or assessment roles (Medway & Nagle, 1982). Participation in this study was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from the participants (see Appendix A).

Instrument

Teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists and psychological services were measured by using a modification of a survey (see Appendix B) created by Severson et al. (1985). The survey consisted of a six-part questionnaire addressing specific issues related to school psychologists. In Part 1, respondents were asked to provide various demographic data, including their gender, age, years of teaching experience, years at that particular school, as

well as years in the district. In Part 2, teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions of a school psychologists' background and training. A list of common student problems were presented in Part 3, and teachers were asked to indicate each type of referral which they had made. In addition, the respondents were asked to give the total number of referrals made in each category. In Part 4, teachers responded to 10 items regarding school psychologists' effectiveness when working with particular kinds of children or performing particular kinds of tasks. A five point, Likert-type scale was used. The responses were scored from "extremely effective" (5) to "not effective" (1). Examples of the items included "students with severe emotional problems," and "students lacking adequate controls over their behavior." In Part 5, teachers were asked to rate the degree to which school psychologists were qualified to undertake various kinds of tasks, using a Likert-type scale. The responses were scored from "not qualified" (1) to "very qualified" (4). In addition, teachers could also indicate that they did not know whether school psychologists were qualified to perform certain tasks. Examples of these items included "hold conferences with parents to interpret their children's ability," and "prescribe medication for nervous and distractible children." In the final part of the survey, teachers used a

Likert-type scale to rate the perceived usefulness of typically performed duties by school psychologists. Examples of these items included "individual conferences with teachers regarding pupils," and "written reports regarding evaluations of individual pupils."

The present researcher modified the Severson et al. (1985) survey by rewriting certain items. Specifically, the questionnaire did not include various content areas. The researcher added a column for respondents to indicate with a check to each type of referral they may have made. Also, the researcher added a fifth rating category on the effectiveness subscale as well as the headings "extremely effective" and "marginally effective." New rating categories were added to added to sections 4 and 5: "somewhat qualified," was added to Section 4, and "somewhat useful" was added to Section 5.

Procedure

The researcher met with each of the 16 building principals and explained the purpose and details of the research project. Each principal was asked individually to allow the project to be performed in the building using their entire teaching staff. The researcher assured the building principals of the brevity of the survey and the anonymity of teachers' responses.

Copies of the informed consent form and the survey (see Appendix C) were provided to each principal. The informed consent form assured respondents of confidentiality and informed them that they could withdraw from the project at any time without penalty (see Appendix A). The principals were also asked to comment on any sections of the survey that they found uncertain or questionable.

After receiving verbal clearance from the building principal, the researcher distributed one survey and one informed consent form to the mailbox of each teacher in the school. Teachers were given 5 school days to complete the survey. Teachers were asked to return the surveys to a tightly secured drop-box located in each school's mailroom. The secured drop-box was created and provided by the researcher. The informed consent forms were signed and returned separately to the school secretary who placed these forms in a manilla envelope.

The researcher had no contact with the respondents during the study. However, respondents who experienced any problems with the survey were advised to contact the researcher or the director of the project at the telephone numbers provided on the consent form.

While these basic procedures were followed at most schools, there were schools where different procedures were followed, at the principal's request. One participating

building principal requested that the researcher attach a brief note (see Appendix D) to the informed consent form as a reminder to the respondents of their familiarity with the researcher. Another building principal redistributed the surveys and consent forms at a scheduled teacher meeting.

After five working days, the researcher returned to each school to collect completed questionnaires and informed consent forms. Follow up letters were distributed to all participants. Thank you letters were sent to those participants who responded to the questionnaire, while requests were sent to those who did not respond asking them to return the questionnaire as soon as possible (see Appendix E). Three days after the reminder, a final collection of surveys was performed.

Data Analysis

Teachers were classified into the three referral groups based on the number of referrals having made. Teachers who reported having made no more than 1 referral were classified as members of the Low Referral Group. Teachers who reported having made 4 to 7 referrals were classified as members of Medium Referral Group, while teachers who reported having made 9 or more referrals were classified as members of the High Referral Group. Teachers who reported having made either 2, 3, or 8 referrals were excluded from these referral groups in order to create groups that were

relatively equal in size, and to maximize the distinction between groups. The dependent variables were Effectiveness, Qualification, Usefulness, and General Attitude. Respondents' scores on these dependent variables were computed in the following manner. Respondents' ratings were totaled on each of the three subscales, Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness. Then, respondents' scores were totaled across subscales to yield the respondents' scores for General Attitude.

Mean and standard deviation values were computed for the teachers' age, years of teaching experience, number of years teaching within the district, number of years at their current school, and number of contacts with a school psychologist during the last year, and last two years. In addition, means and standard deviations were computed for teachers' ratings on each item in the three subscales, Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness, and on the total number of referrals. Cronbach's alpha reliability values were computed for the General Attitude Scale as well as for each of its three subscales, Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness. Correlations analyses were performed to determine the interrelatedness of the subscales.

Data reflecting teachers' beliefs concerning the similarity of training between school psychologists and

other professionals were analyzed using percentages. Percentages were also found for teachers' ratings of each item on the Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness subscales

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed to determine the relationships between each independent variable and each dependent variable. Specifically, four separate ANOVAs were performed to determine the influence of gender on teachers' General Attitude scores as well as subscale scores. These analyses were then repeated, first using Grade as the independent variable and then using Referral Group as the independent variable. A final one-way ANOVA was performed to determine the influence of Gender on the dependent variable Referrals. The decision to perform a series of one-way analyses rather than a factorial analysis was made because of the extremely unequal cell sizes that would have resulted in a factorial analysis. In order to protect against an excessively high experimentwise error rate, alpha was set .01. Post-hoc analyses using Scheffe's S test were performed in order to identify specific differences between group means following the attainment of significant $\underline{F}$ values.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The respondents ranged in age from 22 to 58 years (yrs), with a mean age of 40.1 yrs (SD = 8.60 yrs). Respondents reported having 1 to 29 years of teaching experiences with a mean of 13.1 yrs of experience (SD = 7.18 yrs). Teachers' reported number of years in the school district ranged from 1 year to 29 years with a mean of 9.0 yrs (SD = 7.1 yrs). Respondents also reported having spent from 1 to 29 years at their current school. Respondents reported having had from 0 to 38 contacts with school psychologists within the past year ($\underline{M}$ = 4.6 contacts, SD = 5.4 contacts). The respondents reported their number of contacts with school psychologists within the past 2 years as ranging from 0 to 60 contacts with a mean of 7.3 contacts (SD = 8.9 contacts).

School Psychologists' Training and Background

Teachers were asked to indicate whether they believed a school psychologist's training and background were similar to that of each of the following professionals: Classroom Teacher, Guidance Counselor, Clinical Psychologist, Psychiatrist, and Psychometrist. Respondents were allowed multiple responses, but only on these items of the scale.

School psychologists are trained to administer psychological and educational assessments to children and

adolescents within a school setting. School psychologists provide direct and indirect services to these students. These services may include consultations with parents, teachers, and administrators, developing interventions (e.g. behavior modifications) as well as executing these interventions. The overall goal of school psychologists is to enhance the effectiveness of children's learning processes.

Classroom Teachers

Thirty-one percent of the teachers surveyed indicated that a school psychologist's background and training were similar to that of a classroom teacher. Since school psychologists' background and training are not like that of classroom teachers, teachers may become discontent with the service school psychologists provide. For example, teachers may expect school psychologists to have expertise in areas where they have never been trained, such as the preparation of course objectives, and the teaching of specific academic, social, and motor skills.

Guidance Counselors

Fifty-three percent of teachers indicated that a school psychologist's background and training were similar to that of a guidance counselor. School psychologists are not generally trained like guidance counselors, and therefore teachers may become dissatisfied with the work of school

psychologists. For example, teachers might expect school psychologists to counsel individuals and provide group educational guidance services. School psychologists are not trained nor are they qualified in this area.

Clinical Psychologists

Fifty-four percent of the teachers surveyed reported that the background and training of school psychologists were similar to that of clinical psychologists. Clinical psychologists are trained to diagnose mental and personality disorders, whereas school psychologists are not trained in these areas. Therefore, teachers who wish school psychologists to counsel their emotionally or mental ill students may become dissatisfied with the services school psychologists actually do provide.

Psychiatrists

Fourteen percent of the responding teachers reported that they believed psychiatrists and school psychologists received similar training. This belief may indeed lead to problems between teachers and school psychologists, particularly when teachers expect school psychologists to prescribe medication for students with nervous or distractible behaviors. School psychologists receive little, if any training, that resembles the preparation of medical doctors. Some teachers may look for help in this area from school psychologists because they are the only

professionals in schools that at least superficially appear to be qualified to take on this task.

Psychometrists

Psychometry is the area in which school psychologists receive most of their training. Forty-five percent of the teachers surveyed indicated that a school psychologist's training is similar to that of a psychometrist. The background and training of these two professionals are generally similar since both are trained to administer IQ tests.

In summary, these findings are similar to those of Severson et al. (1985) in which preservice teachers indicated that school psychologists' background and training were similar to that of clinical psychologists and guidance counselors. Teachers may be assuming that the training of school psychologists and clinical psychologists are similar because both professions refer to themselves as psychologists. Although this conclusion may be a logical one, school psychologists are not trained to diagnose or treat students experiencing mental health disorders.

Teachers also may consider school psychologists as quite similar to guidance counselors. Since both groups of professionals serve students within the school, this again is an understandable assumption. On the other hand, school psychologists are rarely in the same working relationship

with the school staff and student body that guidance counselors are. Guidance counselors may only service one school, whereas school psychologists often service several schools within the district.

Some school psychology training programs may follow the clinical model of practice. In this model of practice, the primary focus is on testing students and then identifying appropriate placements for students lacking various skills and abilities. For example, a student may lack skills in an academic area which requires that the student to receive services outside of the classroom. This placement would occur after a battery of educational and intellectual assessments were given. Therefore, teachers may indeed perceive a certain degree of similarity between school psychologists and clinical psychologists because both use a clinical model to guide their practice, and both administer psychology assessments. However, clinical psychologists do not place students in special education programs, although they do use assessment instruments to place clients into clinically diagnosed categories (e.g. Attention Deficit Disorder, Separation Anxiety Disorder).

There are school psychology training programs that employ a psycho-educational model of practice. This model may consist of implementing educational interventions, providing behavioral consulting, and serving as a community

liaison between school and home. Perhaps teachers view these duties of a school psychologist as similar to those of a guidance counselor. (See Appendices G-I for a complete presentation of teachers' responses.)

Reliability

Cronbach alpha values were calculated to determine the internal consistency of the General Attitude Scale and the Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness subscales. The obtained Cronbach's alpha value for the General Attitude Scale was .85. The obtained alpha values were .87, .67, and .87 for the Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness subscales, respectively. These alpha values indicated that the instrument and its subscales were reliable measures of teachers' attitudes. (See Table 1). Pearson's *r* was employed to determine if the subscale scores correlated significantly with each other at the .01 level. These correlations have been presented in Table 2. Clearly, there was at least a moderate level of interrelatedness among the subscales, and these findings provide additional support for the internal consistency of the scale as a whole.

Table 1

Reliability Indexes of Subscales and Total Scores

General Attitude Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
30 Item Attitude Scale	.85
10 Item Effectiveness Scale	.87
12 Item Qualifications Scale	.67
8 Item Usefulness Scale	.87

Table 2

Correlation Values among Subscale Scores and Total Scores

	Effectiveness	Qualifications	Usefulness	General Attitude
Effectiveness	1.00	.20**	.45**	.78**
Qualifications	--	1.00	.34**	.65**
Usefulness	--	--	1.00	.81**
General Attitude	--	--	--	1.00

Note. ** significant at the .01

Teachers' Ratings of School Psychologists

Effectiveness

In judging the effectiveness of school psychologists, the respondents were asked to rate how effective they thought school psychologists would be when working with students experiencing various problems. Results indicated relatively little variability in the effectiveness ratings across categories; 75% of the teachers rated school psychologists as effective to extremely effective when working with students experiencing each of the specified problems. Teachers rated school psychologists most effective when working with students who lacked adequate control over their behavior, who were not working up to their abilities, or who had severe emotional problems. Since students experiencing these kinds of problems are the students who are most commonly referred, one would expect school psychologists to receive high ratings in these areas (see Appendix F).

The finding that teachers rated school psychologists as effective when working with underachieving children may be interpreted in at least two ways. First, it may be that school psychologists in this school district have worked closely with these kinds of students by employing a variety of learning strategies or interventions. Alternatively,

school psychologists may be recommending that these students be placed in special education programs such as a resource room. Such placement decisions could be viewed as effective by classroom teachers who prefer to have such students removed from their class.

Qualifications

When asked how qualified school psychologists were to perform particular kinds of tasks, most teachers indicated that these psychologists were qualified to hold conferences (91%) and recommended specific programming for students (92%). However, a large percentage of teachers (87%) did not consider school psychologists qualified to advise teachers on classroom disciplinary procedures. This appears to be in conflict with the previous finding that school psychologists were considered effective when working with students with inadequate control over their behavior. These results may imply that teachers demand territorial control. For example, it's acceptable for school psychologists to make recommendations as long as these recommendations pertain to activities outside the regular classroom.

In addition, 70% of the teachers reported that school psychologists were either marginally qualified, or not qualified, to conduct prolonged psychotherapy with individual students, and 81% indicated that school psychologists were marginally qualified, or not qualified,

to determine whether a particular child could be labeled psychotic. These data are somewhat in conflict with the teachers' beliefs regarding the similarity of training received by clinical and school psychologists. (See Appendix H).

Usefulness

In the area of usefulness, teachers found school psychologists to be useful in those areas where school psychologists generally practice. For example, 75% of the teachers surveyed indicated that school psychologists were useful in writing reports regarding evaluations of individual pupils and interpreting results from specific tests such as IQ scores. These results may be a good indication of how school psychologists choose to manage their day to day functioning in which they apparently attempt to accommodate teachers' needs. (See Appendix G).

Referrals

Among school psychologists, there appears to be an implicit belief that females make more referrals than males. The means and standard deviations for the number of self-reported referrals were computed for all subjects as a group and for males and females separately. These values have been reported in Table 3. Females made an average of 6.80 referrals (SD = 7.85), while males made an average of 4.92 referrals (SD = 5.26).

Table 3

Summary of Self-Reported Referral Means and Standard Deviations for Males and Females

	Referral by Gender		
Respondents	N	M	SD
Female	142	6.22	7.85
Males	63	4.92	5.26
Combined	205	6.22	7.20

Note. Two respondents' self-reports were eliminated due to unusable data, leaving a total N = 205.

The results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using gender as the independent variable and number of referrals as the dependent variable have been presented in Table 4. There was no significant difference ($F(1, 203) = 3.01$, $p > .01$.) between males and females in the number of referrals they reported having made. Thus, these data contradict the findings of McIntyre (1988) in which results indicated that when students with high levels of behavior problems were considered for referral, male teachers were much less likely than female teachers to decide not to refer such students.

Table 4

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Referral using Gender as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Square	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Gender	154.59	1	154.59	3.01	.084
Error	10421.08	203	51.33		
Total	10575.67	204			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

The means and standard deviations for the number of referrals reported by teachers in each grade level group and were computed. Elementary teachers made an average of 7.80 referrals (SD = 8.1), while middle school teachers and special service teachers made an average of 6.0 referrals (SD = 5.18), and 3.3 referrals (SD = 3.06) respectively. A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine if there were significant differences between the mean number of referrals made by each grade level group. Results of this analysis have been presented in Table 5. A significant F value was obtained for the grade level effect ($F(2, 182) = 7.64$, $p \leq .01$). A post hoc Scheffe S test of pairwise means was conducted with alpha set at .01 (see Table 6). These

results revealed that elementary teachers made significantly more referrals than did middle school teachers.

The elementary teachers in this study participated in an early referral program. This program encourages teachers to identify children who are experiencing problems in school-related activities. Therefore, if the teachers are following the guidelines of the program, elementary teachers should be reporting more referrals than their middle school colleagues. Researchers have found that almost 60% of students are initially referred by the time they exit third grade, and another 25% are initially referred by the time they reach sixth grade (Kavale & Reese, 1987).

Special service teachers did not report significantly different numbers of referrals than either elementary or middle school teachers. This finding could be because special service teachers regularly refer their students to school psychologists for re-evaluations and regular education reintegration.

Table 5

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Referral using Grade as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Grade	717.13	2	358.56	7.646	.000
Error	8534.65	182	46.89		
Total	9251.78	184			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability = .01

Table 6

Scheffe S Test of Means

	Grade		
	Elementary	Special Services	Middle
Means	7.8061	5.1818	3.0698
7.8061	--	2.62	4.73*
5.1818		--	2.11
3.0698			--

Influence of Referral Groups

Teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists and the services they provide are likely to be influenced in part by the amount of contact teachers have had with school psychologists. Teachers with greater numbers of referrals seem likely to have had substantially more contact with school psychologists than teachers making few or no referrals. Thus, three referral groups were created by classifying respondents according to the number of referrals they reported having made. In the Low Referral Group, respondents reported making no more than one referral. In the Moderate Referral Group, respondents reported making 4 to 7 referrals, while in the High Referral Group, respondents reported making 9 or more referrals.

A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine if there were any significant differences between the mean General Attitude scores of teachers in the three referral groups. The presence of differences between the three referral groups in mean Effectiveness, Qualifications, and Usefulness subscale scores was also assessed using one-way ANOVAS. These results have been presented in Tables 7-10. No significant *F* values were found in any of these analyses.

Perhaps there is a high degree of uniformity in the manner with which school psychologists deliver their services. This uniformity, if it does exist, may

substantially reduce any impact that differences in contact level might have on teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists. It is also possible that the quality of the psychological services delivered within this school district were unusually high. Thus, the teachers in this study may have experienced considerable satisfaction with these services regardless of the frequency with which these services were used.

Alternatively, the number of referrals that teachers report having made may not be an accurate indirect measure of the amount of contact teachers have had with school psychologists. Therefore, no relationship between teachers' referral rates and their attitudes toward school psychologists can be expected to exist.

Table 7

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable General Attitude using Referral Groups as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Referrals	308.37	2	154.18	.8927	.411
Error	24007.74	139	172.71		
Total	24316.10	141			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 8

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Effectiveness using Referral Groups as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Referrals	55.42	2	27.71	.8590	.425
Error	4483.85	139	32.25		
Total	4539.27	141			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 9

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Qualifications using Referral Groups as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Referrals	53.84	2	26.92	1.04	.354
Error	3578.88	139	25.57		
Total	3632.73	141			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom ** exact probability

Table 10

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Usefulness using Referral Groups as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Referrals	55.40	2	27.71	.8590	.425
Error	4483.85	139	32.25		
Total	4539.27	141			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom ** exact probability

Influence of Gender

Previous researchers have not considered gender as a factor in their studies when examining teachers' perceptions of school psychologists and the services they provide. This researcher found it pertinent to consider gender when investigating the general attitude of teachers as well as their ratings of the effectiveness, qualifications, and usefulness of school psychologists. Since female teachers have presumably been found to make more referrals than male teachers, and perhaps have had more contact with school psychologists, it seems reasonable to expect that male and female teachers might differ in their attitudes toward school psychologists.

Therefore, to determine if there were significant differences between the attitudes of male and female teachers, a one-way ANOVA was conducted on their general attitude scores toward school psychologists. A series of one-way ANOVAs were also used to determine if significant gender differences were present in effectiveness, and qualifications, usefulness mean scores (see Tables 11-14). No significant *F* values were found in these analyses. Seemingly both groups found school psychologists to be effective when working with students. Also, male and female teachers rated school psychologists and their services similarly in the areas of qualifications and usefulness.

Table 11

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable General Attitude Score Using Gender as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	*F* Value	**p
Gender	754.72	1	754.72	4.99	.026
Error	30968.04	205	151.06		
Total	31722.76	206			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 12

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Effectiveness using Gender as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Gender	130.14	1	130.14	3.45	.064
Error	7720.07	205	37.65		
Total	7850.21	206			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 13

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Qualification using Gender as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Gender	62.31	1	62.31	2.61	.107
Error	4876.73	205	23.78		
Total	43939.05	206			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 14

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Usefulness using Gender as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Gender	66.75	1	66.75	2.19	.139
Error	6629.98	205	30.39		
Total	6296.73	206			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Influence of Grade

Grade level taught has been found to have an effect on the number of referrals reported by teachers. Teachers with greater numbers of contact with the school psychologists are in a position to more frequently appraise the school psychologists and psychological services. Researchers in previous studies did not utilize grade level as a factor when examining teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists. In this study, one-way ANOVAs were performed to determine if there were any significant differences in general attitude, effectiveness, qualifications, and usefulness mean scores grade level by group (see Tables 15-18). The analyses indicated no significant difference.

These findings may be due, in part, to the psychological services delivery system that is provided to some schools within the districts. For nearly three years this district has been involved in reforming the way Special Education is delivered. The Renewed Service Delivery System (RSDS) has been practiced by some school psychologists in this district. Not all school psychologists take part in this system, but it is being gradually introduced in anticipation of all schools receiving this manner of service.

The purpose of RSDS is to improve delivery of educational services to students with diverse academic and behavioral needs. For example, in utilizing this system school psychologists are required to (a) assist and provide inservice activities to regular educators, (b) provide intervention alternatives that will broaden the pre-referral process, and (c) provide intervention alternatives that will assist teachers in helping students with disabilities to remain in the regular education (Reed, 1990). This delivery system service could have had a positive effect on the working relationships between regular educators and the school psychologists in this district.

Table 15

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable General Attitude using Grade as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Grade	362.06	2	181.03	1.21	.298
Error	27194.26	183	148.60		
Total	27556.32	185			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 16

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Effectiveness using Grade as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Grade	136.06	2	68.03	1.77	.173
Error	7031.38	183	38.42		
Total	7167.44	185			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 17

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Qualifications using Grade as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Grade	28.88	2	14.44	.5979	.551
Error	4420.24	183	24.15		
Total	4449.12	185			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

Table 18

ANOVA Results for the Dependent Variable Usefulness using Grade as the Independent Variable

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	*df	Mean Squares	F Value	**p
Grade	16.45	2	8.22	.3044	.737
Error	4947.00	183	27.03		
Total	4963.46	186			

Note. *df = degrees of freedom **exact probability

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

In this study, elementary, middle school, and special service teachers were surveyed regarding their attitudes toward school psychologists and the psychological services they provide. Teachers were asked to indicate whether they perceived the background and training of school psychologists similar to that of several other professionals. The results indicated that teachers identified school psychologists as having training similar to that of guidance counselors and clinical psychologists, while having training different from that of psychiatrists.

Cronbach alpha values were calculated to determine the internal consistency of the General Attitude Scale and the effectiveness, qualifications, and usefulness subscales. The alpha values indicated that the subscales were reliable measures of teachers' attitudes. A Pearson *r* clearly indicated that there was interrelatedness among subscales. This provided additional support for the internal consistency of the scale as a whole.

The independent variables in this study were gender, grade level, and referral group, while the dependent variables were the teachers' general attitude scores along

with their subscale scores for effectiveness, qualifications, and usefulness. Number of referrals also served as a dependent variable. For this dependent variable, one-way ANOVAs were employed on the independent variables gender and grade level. There was no significant F value for the independent variable gender, but when utilizing grade level as the independent variable. A significant F value was found. Results indicated that elementary teachers made significantly more referrals than middle school teachers. This finding may be due to the early referral programs implemented in this district. Gender, grade level and referral group were not found to be significant factors in teachers general attitude scores or their subscale scores.

Conclusion

As a whole, teachers' attitudes toward school psychologists and the psychological services they rendered were quite positive. Teachers considered school psychologists to be effective and qualified to deal with students with specific needs. Teachers also believed that school psychologists were useful when providing teacher in-service as well as interpreting the IQ scores of students. Since many of the respondents in this study were involved in the Renewed Services Delivery System, these results may be due to this new delivery system. The call

for reform in the practice of school psychology has focused on a need to shift from emphasizing the diagnosis of child pathology to the identification relevant of environmental influences in efforts to solve learning problems. It appears that teachers' responses may be due to the influence of the reformation of the delivery system implemented in the school district. These may findings support school psychologists who provide services using problem solving approaches.

Recommendations

The findings of this study indicate that teachers are aware of school psychologists' qualifications and find their services useful and effective. However, previous research has indicated that teachers are divided in their preference for the delivery services provided by school psychologists. Thus, the present study should be replicated using teachers experiencing two types of delivery systems clinical and psycho-educational.

Several of the studies within the review of literature as well as this study used a survey. Researchers have indicated that they were unable to fully explore clarity in teachers' responses. Therefore this study should also be replicated using a qualitative approach.

Implications

Because of the importance of the working relationship between teachers and school psychologists, it is essential that school psychologists and teachers find a common ground when assessing students with special needs. In doing so teachers and psychologists should try to work together in increasingly diverse ways. Since teachers displayed a positive attitude toward school psychologists, it may utimately be to children's advantage when these groups of professionals work together jointly in other areas. For example, teachers and school psychologists are experts in two distinct fields; sharing professional knowledge with each other may be beneficial to students. Perhaps this unity may significantly reduce the rate of teacher referrals, yet still allow teachers and school psychologists to work together in solving students' problems.

REFERENCES

Abramowitz, E. A. (1981). School psychology: A historical perspective. School Psychology Review, 10, 121-126.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1990). Introduction to research in education. (4th ed.). Forth Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Baker, H. L. (1965). Psychological services: From the school staff's point of view. Journal of School Psychology, 3, 36-42.

Ball, L. (1985). Parental perception of the ability and usefulness of nine school psychological roles. Unpublished specialist in education thesis, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.

Bardon J. I. (1982). The psychology of school psychology. In C. Reynold & T. Gutkin (Eds.), Handbook of school psychology (pp.3-14). New York: Wiley.

Batsche, G. (1992, February). Presidential statement: America 2000. Communique, 20 (5), 3-4.

Cutts, N. (1955). School psychologist at mid-century: Report on the Thayer Conference. Washington, DC: American Psychologist Association.

Dean, R. S. (1980). A comparison of pre-service and experienced teachers' perceptions of the school psychologist. Journal of School Psychology, 18, 283-289.

Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, 20 U.S.C. S 401 (1975).

Fagan, T. (1990). A brief history of school psychology in the United States. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), Best practices in School Psychology--II, Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Ford, J. D., & Migles, M. (1979). The role of school psychologists: Teacher's preferences as a function of personal and professional characteristics. Journal of School Psychology, 17, 372-377.

Gilmore, G. E., & Chandy, J. M. (1973a). Educators describe the school psychologists. Psychology in the Schools, 10, 397-403.

Gilmore, G. E., & Chandy, J. M. (1973b). Teachers' perceptions of school psychological services. Journal of School Psychology, 2, 139-147.

Goldwasser, E., Meyers, J., Christenson, T., & Garden, R. (1981). The impact of PL94-142 on the practice of school Psychology: A national survey. Psychology in the Schools, 12, 153-165.

Gutkin, T. (1980). Learning disabled issues in nonbiased assessment. Journal of Special Education, 14, 93-105.

Gutkin, T. (1986). Consulates' perceptions of variables relating to outcomes of school based on consultations interactions. School Psychology Review, 15(3), 375-382.

Harmon, T. (1992). An analysis of basic assumptions about psychology of teachers and school psychologists. Unpublished specialist in education thesis, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.

Hyman, I. A., & Kaplinski, K. (1992). Will the real school psychologist please stand up: Does the past offer a prologue for the future of school psychology. Paper presented at the 24th Annual Conventions of the National Association of School Psychologist, Nashville, TN.

Kahl L. J., & Fine, M. J. (1978). Teachers' perceptions of the school psychologist as a function of teaching experience, amount of contact, and socioeconomic status of the school. Psychology in the Schools, 15, 577-582.

Kavale K. A., & Reese, J. H. (1987). The character of learning disabilities: An Iowa profile. Learning Disability Quarterly, 13, 142-148.

Lucas, M. S., & Jones, R. L. (1970). Attitudes of teachers of mentally retarded children toward psychological reports and services. Journal of School Psychology, 8, 122-130.

McIntyre, L. (1988). Teacher gender: A predictor of special education referral? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 382-383.

Medway, F. J., & Nagle, R. J. (1982). Issues in providing psychological services at the high school level. School Psychological Review, 11(4), 359-364.

Reed, J. (1990, May). NASP update. Iowa School Psychologists Association Newsletter, 7 (4), 5.

Roberts, R. D. (1970). Perceptions of actual and desired role functions of school psychologists by psychologists and teachers. Psychology in the Schools, 7, 175-178.

Sattler, J. M. (1989). Assessment of children, (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Sattler.

Severson, H., Pickett, M., & Hetrick, D. (1985). Comparing pre-service, elementary and junior high teachers perceptions of school psychologists; two decades later. Psychology in the Schools, 22, 179-186.

Styles, W. A. (1965). Teachers' perceptions of the school psychologists' role. Journal of School Psychology, 3, 23-27.

Yesseldyke, J. E. (1982). Current practices in making psycho-educational decisions about learning disabled students. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 16, 226-233.

Appendix A
Informed Consent Form

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Teacher,

I am a University of Northern Iowa student seeking a degree as school psychologist. As a future school psychologist I am very interested in understanding how school psychologists can assist teachers needs, and be of useful service to teachers as well as special needs students.

I am asking your permission to participate in this study by answering this three page questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed as a result of my literature search. Hopefully the results of the study will have implications for improved psychological services as well as for better communications between the professional groups.

I will collect the surveys 5 days after its distribution. Should you wish, please feel free to make any comments about the questionnaire items or my project in general. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time and will not be penalized for not participating.

If you have any questions regarding your participation in this study you may contact me or the project advisor Dr. Melissa L. Heston at:

Terese L. Alexander (319) 277-6520
Melissa L. Heston (319) 273-3323

For additional questions about this study and your rights you may contact:

Human Subjects Coordinator
University of Northern Iowa
phone : 273-2748

If you agree to participate, please sign and return the consent form along with your survey.

I am fully aware of the nature and the extent of my participation in this study. I agree to participate in this study.

_____ _____

Signature Date

Appendix B
Teacher Attitude Scale

TEACHER ATTITUDE SURVEY

Survey about School Psychologists

I. Information about yourself:

1. Years of teaching prior to Fall 1981: _____
2. Male _____ Female _____
3. Your age: 20-29 _____ 30-39 _____ 40-49 _____ 50-59 _____ over 59 _____
4. The number of contacts that you have had with a school psychologist regarding any student in the last two years: _____

Does your school have access to a school psychologist?

Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____

II. 1. A school psychologist's background includes training similar to a (check as many as you feel are true):

a. classroom teacher _____
b. guidance counselor _____
c. clinical psychologist _____
d. psychiatrist _____
e. psychometrist _____

III. Part 1.

Have you ever referred students in the following categories?
Check these catagories where referrals have taken place. When possible, put the number of such referrals in each blank.

Students with severe emotional problems ..... _____
Students lacking adequate controls over their behavior ..... _____
Students who are socially withdrawn ..... _____
Students who are not working up to their ability ..... _____
Students who are delinquent ..... _____
Students who are victims of cultural deprivation ..... _____
Students who are gifted ..... _____
Students who are mentally retarded ..... _____
Students who are physically handicapped ..... _____
Students who are having problems in the home ..... _____

Part 2.

Please use the following scales to evaluate the effectiveness of school psychologists in dealing with each of the following situations.
5 — extremely effective 4 — very effective 3 — effective 2 — marginally effective 1 — not effective.

Students with severe emotional problems ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students lacking adequate controls over their behavior ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are socially withdrawn ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are not working up to their ability ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are delinquent ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are victims of cultural deprivation ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are mentally retarded ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Gifted students ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are physically handicapped ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____
Students who are having problems in the home ..... 1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____

IV. Do you feel that a school psychologist is qualified to undertake the following tasks?

	fully qualified	in certain cases	not qualified
1. Hold conference with parents to interpret their children's ability.			
2. Train teachers to administer group intelligence tests.			
3. Recommend specific school programming for students.			
4. Consult with teachers, on their request, about their classroom problems, and refer them to further sources for help.			
5. Serve on curriculum planning committees.			
6. Conduct prolonged psychotherapy with individual students.			
7. Help select teachers of special classes.			
8. Determine whether a particular child could be labeled psychotic.			
9. Advise teachers regarding classroom disciplinary procedures.			
10. Give neurological examinations to students.			
11. Provide administration with evaluations of the mental health of teachers.			
12. Prescribe medication for nervous or distractible children.			

V. Which activities by a school psychologist would be useful to you as a classroom teacher?

	very useful	useful	somewhat useful	of little or no use
1. Individual conferences with teachers regarding a pupil.				
2. Written reports regarding evaluations of individual pupils.				
3. Specific test results, such as IQ scores.				
4. Case-study conferences (involving small groups of concerned persons).				
5. Giving general guidelines without specific application.				
6. Giving specific ideas or programs to use with referred children.				
7. Giving work-shops or in-services.				
8. Doing individual or group counseling.				

— Thank you —

Appendix C
Teacher Attitude Scale

Teacher Attitude Survey

Survey about School Psychologists

I. Information about yourself:

1. Years of teaching experience _____
2. Male _____ Female _____
3. Your age _____
4. Grade level _____
   a. Chapter 1 _____
   b. Special Ed. _____
   c. Content area _____
5. Your school size _____
6. Your class size _____
7. Number of years at this school _____
8. Number of years in this district _____
9. The number of contacts that you have had with a school psychologist regarding any student in the last two years _____
10. Approximate the total number of contacts you have with a school psychologist within a school year _____

II. A school psychologist's background includes training similar to a (check as many as you feel are true):

1. classroom teacher _____
2. guidance counselor _____
3. clinical psychologist _____
4. psychiatrist _____
5. psychometrist _____

III. Part 1.

Have you ever referred students in the following categories?
Check those categories where referrals have been made. When possible, put the number of such referrals in the second blank.

check here		number of referrals
_____	Students with severe emotional problems	_____
_____	Students lacking adequate control over their behavior	_____
_____	Students who are socially withdrawn	_____
_____	Students who are not working up to their ability	_____
_____	Students who are delinquent	_____
_____	Students who are victims of cultural deprivation	_____
_____	Students who are gifted	_____
_____	Students who are mentally retarded	_____
_____	Students who are physically handicapped	_____
_____	Students who are having problems in the home	_____

Part 2.

Please use the following scale to evaluate how effectively you think school psychologists are when dealing with each of the following situations. Circle the appropriate number.

	extremely effective	very effective	effective	marginally effective	not effective
Students with severe emotional problems	5	4	3	2	1
Students lacking adequate control over their behavior	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are socially withdrawn	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are not working up to their ability	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are delinquent	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are victims of cultural deprivation	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are gifted	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are mentally retarded	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are physically handicapped	5	4	3	2	1
Students who are having problems in the home	5	4	3	2	1

IV. How qualified do you believe school psychologists are to undertake the following tasks? Circle the appropriate number.

	very qualified	somewhat qualified	marginally qualified	not qualified	don't know
1. Hold conferences with parents to interpret their children's ability	4	3	2	1	0
2. Train teachers to administer group intelligence tests	4	3	2	1	0
3. Recommend specific school programming for students	4	3	2	1	0
4. Consult with teachers, at their request, about their classroom problems, and refer them to other sources for help	4	3	2	1	0
5. Serve on curriculum planning committees	4	3	2	1	0
6. Conduct prolonged psychotherapy with individual students	4	3	2	1	0
7. Help select teachers to special education classes	4	3	2	1	0
8. Determine whether a particular child could be labeled psychotic	4	3	2	1	0
9. Advise teachers regarding classroom disciplinary procedures	4	3	2	1	0
10. Give neurological examinations to students	4	3	2	1	0
11. Provide the school administration with evaluations of the mental health of students	4	3	2	1	0
12. Prescribe medication for nervous or distractible children	4	3	2	1	0

V. Rate how useful school psychologists have been to you as a teacher in the following activities? Circle the appropriate number.

	extremely useful	quite useful	somewhat useful	of little or no use	never used
1. Individual conferences with teachers regarding a pupil.	4	3	2	1	0
2. Written reports regarding evaluations of individual pupils.	4	3	2	1	0
3. Results from specific tests, such as IQ scores.	4	3	2	1	0
4. Case-study conferences (involving small groups of concerned persons).	4	3	2	1	0
5. Giving general guidelines without specific application.	4	3	2	1	0
6. Giving specific ideas or programs to use with referred children.	4	3	2	1	0
7. Giving work-shop or in-services.	4	3	2	1	0
8. Doing individual or group counseling.	4	3	2	1	0

- Thank You -

Appendix D
Re-Introduction

Re-Introduction

May 17, 1993

Dear Teachers,

I would like to reintroduce myself to the faculty here at Taylor Elementary School. I am Terese Alexander, a former University of Northern Iowa school psychology practicum student. I worked at Taylor School in the Fall of 1992 under the supervision Rose Gabe. I would kindly appreciate your assistance in my research project.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at the number located on the consent form. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Appendix E
Reminder

Reminder

May 23, 1993

Dear Teacher,

Five days ago, you received a questionnaire entitled "Survey About School Psychologist". If you have already returned your responses to the questionnaire, thank you and I appreciate your time.

If you have not yet returned the questionnaire, an additional questionnaire is enclosed. I would appreciate if you would return your responses along with the informed consent to the drop-box located in your school's mailroom. I will return in three days upon you receiving this letter. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Terese L. Alexander

School Psychology Graduate Student

Appendix F
Percentages of Teachers Reporting School Psychologists Training as Similar to Various Professionals

Percentages of Teachers Reporting School Psychologists Training as Similar to Various Professionals

Training Similar to:	% Respondents
Classroom Teacher	31
Guidance Counselor	53
Clinical Psychologist	54
Psychiatrist	14
Psychometrist	45

Appendix G
Percentages of Teachers' Ratings of School Psychologists' Effectiveness

Percentages of Teachers' Ratings of School Psychologists' Effectiveness

Referral Category

%Teachers

	extremely effective 5	very effective 4	effective 3	marginally effective 2	not effective 1
1. Students with severe emotional problems.	7.2	27.5	43.5	18.8	2.4
2. Students lacking adequate control over their behavior.	3.9	26.6	52.7	15.0	1.9
3. Students are socially withdrawn.	4.3	25.6	47.8	18.4	2.9
4. Students who are not working up to their ability.	5.3	22.7	50.7	18.8	2.4
5. Students who are delinquent.	2.4	17.9	55.1	19.3	4.8
6. Students who are victims of cultural deprivation.	1.0	18.4	50.2	23.7	6.3
7. Students who are gifted.	1.0	19.3	46.4	25.6	7.2
8. Students who are mentally retarded.	---	20.8	45.9	24.2	8.7
9. Students who are physically handicapped.	1.0	18.8	50.7	15.0	14.0
10. Students who are having problems in the home.	1.4	14.0	45.4	17.4	21.3

Appendix H
Percentages for teachers Ratings of School Psychologists' Qualifications for Specific Tasks

Percentages for teachers Ratings of School Psychologists' Qualifications for Specific Tasks

Task Category

	Teachers' Ratings				
	very qualified 4	somewhat qualified 3	marginally qualified 2	not qualified 1	don't know 0
1. Hold conferences with parents to interpret children's ability.	49.3	37.2	13.3	---	---
2. Train teachers to administer group intelligence.	21.7	16.9	7.7	50.2	3.4
3. Recommend specific school programming for students.	21.7	40.1	29.5	7.7	1.0
4. Consult with teachers, at their request, about their classroom problems, and refer them to other sources for help.	12.1	36.7	42.0	8.2	1.0
5. Serve on curriculum planning committees.	6.3	30.4	43.5	16.9	2.9
6. Conduct prolonged psychotherapy with individual problems.	3.4	27.1	26.1	37.7	5.8
7. Help select teachers to special education.	3.9	17.9	25.1	48.3	4.8
8. Determine whether a particular child could be labeled psychotic.	4.3	14.0	26.6	50.7	4.3
9. Advise teachers regarding classroom disciplinary procedures.	3.4	10.1	30.9	55.6	---
10. Give neurological examinations to students.	1.9	5.3	8.7	79.7	4.3
11. Provide the school administration with evaluations of the mental health of the students.	1.9	3.4	10.1	81.2	3.4
12. Prescribe medication to nervous of distractible students.	2.9	5.3	86.5	5.3	

Appendix I
Percentages for Teachers' Usefulness Ratings of School Psychologists' Services and Psychological Services

Percentages for Teachers' Usefulness Ratings of
School Psychologists' Services and Psychological Services

	% Teachers				
	extremely useful 4	quite useful 3	somewhat useful 2	of little or no use 1	never used 0
1. Individual conferences with teachers regarding a pupil.	26.6	48.8	21.7	1.9	1.0
2. Written reports regarding evaluations of individual pupils.	27.5	46.4	22.7	2.4	1.0
3. Results from specific tests, such as IQ scores.	26.6	48.8	19.3	4.3	1.0
4. Case-study conferences (involving small groups of concerned persons)	17.9	37.7	31.9	9.7	2.9
5. Giving general guidelines without specific application.	14.0	41.1	26.6	12.6	5.8
6. Giving specific ideas of programs to use with referred children.	13.0	42.5	31.4	8.7	4.3
7. Giving in-service workshops.	9.2	44.4	23.2	9.7	13.5
8. Doing individual or group counseling.					