8-1976

The Role, Views, and Background Characteristics of Current Michigan School Psychologists

Sharon Sue Russell
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses

Part of the Special Education and Teaching Commons

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2374

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master’s Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.
THE ROLE, VIEWS, AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF CURRENT MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

by

Sharon Sue Russell

A Project Report
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Specialist in Education Degree

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1976
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the aid of Professor Galen J. Alessi during all phases of this project, its implementation and completion would not have been possible. I am also grateful to the invaluable advice on statistical analysis and interpretation provided by Professor Brad Huitema and to Professor Paul Mountjoy's helpful suggestions on the final manuscript. My thanks go to the many school psychologists, supervisors of school psychological services, and directors of special education who set aside the time to complete the questionnaires, thus providing the data for the present study. The financial assistance for graduate study provided by the Department of Psychology and the excellent training provided by the faculty of the Department of Psychology and the Department of Special Education all contributed significantly to making this project possible.

Sharon Sue Russell
INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed, the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeib Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Masters Thesis M-8791

Russell, Sharon Sue

The Role, Views, and Background Characteristics of Current Michigan School Psychologists.

Western Michigan University, Ed.S., 1976
Education, special

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II METHOD</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential Questionnaire for Michigan School Psychologists</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential Questionnaire for Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviated Questionnaire for Michigan School Psychologists</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviated Questionnaire for Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III RESULTS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of the Questionnaires</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Characteristics of the Two Respondent Groups</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present and Preferred Role of School Psychologists as Perceived by the Two Respondent Groups</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Role</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Role</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes Desired in the Present Role</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles to Changing the Role</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in Each Component of a Student Referral Work-Up</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors and Directors' Evaluations of the Accuracy of Their Estimates</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and Clinical Orientations of the Two Respondent Groups</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV DISCUSSION</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison with Previous Studies</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Data</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V REFERENCES</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI REFERENCE NOTES</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII APPENDICES</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Analysis of Professional Function: 1972-75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rankings by Relative Importance of Eight Major Activities in the Ideal Role of the School Psychologist</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Items from the Three Ideology Subscales</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University Degree Characteristics of the Respondent Groups</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Urban-Rural Characteristics of the Current Job Areas of the Respondent Groups</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age, Years of Teaching Experience, and Years of School Psychology Experience by the Respondent Groups</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reports of the Percentage of Weekly Time that School Psychologists Devote to the Designated Activities</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Preferred Percentages of Weekly Time for School Psychologists to Devote to the Designated Activities</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Percent of School Psychology Respondents Desiring to Increase or Decrease the Average Time Spent in the Designated Activities</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Percent of Supervisors and Directors Desiring School Psychologists to Increase or Decrease the Average Weekly Time Spent in the Designated Areas</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceptions of the Respondent Groups of the Major Obstacles to Changing the School Psychologist's Role from the Present Role to the Role Preferred by the Respondent</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Reports of the Average Hours Spent by School Psychologists in Each Component of a Student Referral Work-Up</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF TABLES  
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Responses by Both Respondent Groups to the Individual Items on the Three Ideology Subscales</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Average Ideology Subscale Scores of the School Psychologists and the Supervisors and Directors</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURE</td>
<td>TABLE OF FIGURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Present and Preferred Role of School Psychologists as Reported by School Psychologists and Supervisors and Directors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
INTRODUCTION

Background

School psychology has been a rapidly growing and changing field in Michigan over the past few years. The growth and change in the field have been due, at least in part, to recent legislation in Michigan, including the Mandatory Special Education Act of 1971 (Michigan State Legislature) and the Comprehensive School Psychology Services legislation of 1973 (Michigan Department of Education). Because of the apparent fast pace of changes, it seems worthwhile to attempt to update and supplement the information available concerning the school psychology role within the Michigan education framework.

The number of school psychologists employed by Michigan public schools has increased dramatically from 400 in the 1972-73 school year and 478 in the 1973-74 school year to 586 in 1974-75 and approximately 675 in the 1975-76 school year (Braccio, Notes 1, 2, 3, and 4). Furthermore, the number of school psychologists is expected to continue to increase for at least several more years (Alessi, 1975). This increasing number of school psychologists has been due, at least in part, to the Mandatory Special Education Act.

The Comprehensive School Psychology Services Legislation probably has not greatly affected the number of school psychologists employed in Michigan. Its primary purpose has been to broaden the legal definition of the role of the Michigan school psychologist. Prior to this
legislation, the school psychologist in Michigan functioned almost exclusively as a diagnostician for screening retarded students into special education programs. In the 1973 legislation, the Michigan school psychologist is described as providing comprehensive services to all students, parents, and teachers. Not only has the range of possible functions broadened beyond just "diagnosis", but also the school service population of the school psychologist has been expanded to include more than candidates for special education. Currently, Michigan school psychologists may legally provide long-term services to general education teachers, students, and parents, as well as to their special education counterparts. One of the primary questions of focus in this study is how much the actual role played by the school psychologist in Michigan has been affected by these legislative changes.

Although relatively little information has been gathered in this area in the past, a few surveys have provided important data concerning the role of the Michigan school psychologist during recent years. The "Summary Report of School Psychology Services" released annually by Dr. Braccio, Consultant for School Psychology at the Michigan State Department of Education, has provided records of the recent professional functions of Michigan school psychologists. Table 1 summarizes the Analysis of Professional Function data from the 1972-73, 1973-74, and 1974-75 Summary Reports (Braccio, Notes 1, 2, and 3). These data have been obtained by Braccio each spring by questionnaire surveys of all Michigan School psychologists reimbursed with state special education funds (100% return rate of questionnaires). For all three years presented in Table 1, Pupil Assessment is by far the dominant function,
Table 1: Analysis of Professional Function: 1972-75.
### TABLE 1

**ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTION: 1972-75**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percent of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Assessment</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Counseling</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice for Teachers and Others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aContinuing Education for Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Agencies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Reports</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Planning and Placement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aSupervision of Interns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aSupervision of Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Duties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** From the annual reports by Braccio (Notes 1, 2, and 3).

aThese categories were not included in the 1972-73 Summary Report by Braccio.
ranging from an average of 39% of the school psychologists' time in
1972-73 to 47.33% in 1973-74 and 46.64% in 1974-75. Educational
Planning and Placement, Parent Counseling, and Pupil Psych-Curricular
Planning follow Pupil Assessment in the highest proportion of time
spent.

In the Braccio data, the average percentage of time spent in the
categories does not appear to change across the three years, with one
exception. The only marked change in the time proportions across the
three years appears in the Records and Reports category, which dropped
from 20% in 1972-73 to 5.22% and 4.49% in 1973-74 and 1975, respectiv­
ely. However, the change in this category may have been due to a chang­
ing interpretation of the categories by respondents or to the addition
of several new categories on the 1973-74 and 1974-75 questionnaires.
It does appear that some of the time reported in the 1972-73 Records
and Reports category moved to the Pupil Assessment category in the 1973­
74 school year. This may have been due either to an actual shift in
how school psychologists spent their time or to a shift in the inter­
pretation of the two categories. In spite of these interpretation
difficulties, it is still interesting to note the apparent lack of
major changes in roles from 1972 to 1975, since two major pieces of
legislation took effect during this time period.

Another questionnaire study was conducted by Fridsma in 1974 by
surveying both Michigan school psychologists and directors of special
education to assess the present and ideal relative importance of eight
major activities and 55 specific activities in the role of the school
psychologist. Table 2 presents the rankings obtained by Fridsma of
Table 2: Rankings by Relative Importance of Eight Major Activities in the Ideal Role of the School Psychologist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Psycho-Educational Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parent Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School Program Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Administration of Special Education Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the relative importance of the eight major activities in the ideal role of the school psychologist. These rankings are based on the mean rankings by both respondent groups (school psychologists and directors of special education), since an extremely high correlation was observed in the rankings of the ideal role by the two groups. Also, the rankings of the eight major activities in the present role of the school psychologist correlated highly with the ideal role for both respondent groups. That is, Diagnosis and Psycho-Educational Planning were perceived as being dominant features of both the present and ideal role of school psychologists in the 1974 sample. Fridsma's conclusions were based on a 78% return rate of questionnaires from the Michigan school psychologists (318 questionnaires returned) and a 66% return rate from the directors of special education (99 questionnaires returned).

Differences in the categories used by Braccio and Fridsma in the studies just described make comparison of their results difficult. However, even though different categories were used, both studies found pupil assessment (diagnosis) to be the major actual professional role of the Michigan school psychologist.

The topic of job satisfaction of Michigan school psychologists is currently being investigated by Lesiak (Note 5), who has also used a questionnaire format. Lesiak, who currently coordinates the School Psychology Graduate Program at Central Michigan University, has received a 20 - 25% return rate, but the tabulated results of the questionnaire are not yet available. The conclusions will certainly be of special interest to the present study of the role and trends in
school psychology.

Purpose

The purpose of the present study was to obtain current information in three major areas concerning Michigan school psychology, in order to supplement and up-date the previous studies. The three areas of focus chosen for the present study were:

a) the current role performed by Michigan school psychologists, as viewed by the school psychologists and as viewed by their supervisors and directors,

b) the theoretical and clinical orientation of school psychologists and their supervisors and directors, and

c) the educational and professional background of current school psychologists.

It was felt that this information might be immediately useful to undergraduate and graduate students in deciding whether to enter the school psychology profession in Michigan. Students already pursuing a school psychology graduate degree might benefit from the information for planning their course of studies, formulating realistic future role expectations, and formulating realistic expectations about the characteristics of their future colleagues.

Future studies of the role and orientation of Michigan school psychologists might also find a practical use for the results of the present study. The results of the present study could be used as baseline data for comparison with similar future data in order to assess changes in these factors over the next few years.
METHOD

Confidential Questionnaire for Michigan School Psychologists

An eight-page questionnaire entitled "Confidential Questionnaire for Michigan School Psychologists" (Appendix A) was mailed to the 433 current members of the Michigan Association of School Psychologists (MASP). The membership list and addresses were provided by the MASP Membership Chairperson. The MASP membership list was chosen as the sample population for this questionnaire because of the lack of a complete, up-to-date list of currently employed Michigan school psychologists from the Michigan Department of Education. Although the questionnaire was mailed to all MASP members, the final data summary and analysis of completed questionnaires utilized only those questionnaires from MASP members who reported being currently employed as Michigan school psychologists.

Several additional items accompanied each questionnaire mailed to MASP members. A cover letter (Appendix A) explained the purpose of the study. A postcard allowed the subject to indicate his desire to receive a summary of the obtained data. Also included with each questionnaire was an unstamped pre-addressed envelop in which to return the completed questionnaire.

The format of the questionnaire included fill-in-the-blank, multiple choice, item ranking, and short narrative response items. Items were printed on both sides of the page. Identification of questionnaires by the name of the respondent was not done by the experimenter either covertly or overtly. Each respondent was given the option of
either writing his name on a line provided at the top of the question-
naire or of completing it anonymously.

Part (A) of the questionnaire was based completely on the break-
down of categories used by Braccio (Notes 2 and 3), except that the
category of "Teacher Consulting" was added.

The first 17 items in Part (H) of the questionnaire were based
on the final items from three ideology subscales used in data analy-
sis by Garfield and Kurtz (1976) when they studied the views of clin-
ical psychologists. The wording of the items used by Garfield and
Kurtz was modified only slightly to make them more suitable for school
psychologists. Table 3 lists the 17 items grouped by the three ideo-
logy subscales; and on items where the wording used by Garfield and
Kurtz was modified, their original wording appears in parenthesis
next to the wording used in the present study. Underlining indicates
which exact words were used in the present study to replace the words
used by Garfield and Kurtz. All items required respondents to circle
a number from one to five, where each "1" was labeled "Strongly disa-
gree" and each "5" was labeled "Strongly agree". Items from the sub-
scales were in a mixed order corresponding to the order used in the
Garfield and Kurtz study.

As in the Garfield and Kurtz study, some items in the present
study were rescored before the data analysis was conducted so that a
high score on a subscale indicated either a pro-behavior modification
view (Subscale I), a pro-intuitive view (Subscale II), or a pro-
psychoanalytic psychodynamic view (Subscale III). For example, in
the behavior modification subscale, the subscale raw score for each
Table 3: Items from the Three Ideology Subscales.
### TABLE 3

ITEMS FROM THE THREE IDEOLOGY SUBSCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Ideology Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Behavior Modification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>In the etiology of students' school problems (mental illness), recent events are almost always much more important than early childhood experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learning theory is the most useful framework in which to view the etiology of students' problems (mental illness).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>In the etiology of students' problems (mental illness), intrapsychic factors tend to be less important than biological or social environmental factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Remove the symptoms, and one has essentially eliminated the neurosis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>When a student's problem (patient's) symptom is improved, he may develop other symptoms to deal with his underlying problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The best way to improve the programs in most schools (treatment in most mental hospitals) would be to focus on various forms of behavior modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>For a large percentage of emotionally disturbed students (neurotic cases), behavior modification (behavior therapy) would be ineffective and inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Intuitive-Objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The time which graduate students of school psychology (clinical psychology) now spend learning research methods would be more profitably spent in obtaining more first-hand experience in schools (clinical experience).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 3
(Continued)

#### II. Intuitive-Objective (Continued)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Current experimental methods cannot be applied successfully to school (clinical) problems, and new scientific approaches must be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>One good test of statistical significance is more convincing than a lot of clinical intuitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Clinically relevant concepts cannot be studied effectively under the artificial conditions of the laboratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The flexibility of clinical thinking creates excellent hypotheses, but these hypotheses can only be established as true by controlled studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>All really sound knowledge comes from the findings of experimental research studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. Psychoanalytic-Psychodynamic

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Intensive individual psychotherapy is the best method of treatment for most forms of psychological disorder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Maladaptive behavior cannot be treated directly because it results from underlying causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ordinarily, students with emotional problems (patients) cannot be expected to show real improvement without slow and careful psychological exploration of their underlying conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The best criterion to use in clinical research is the judgment of an experienced and sensitive clinician.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The subscales in Table 3 are based on those used by Garfield and Kurtz (1976). Where their original items were modified for the present study, the original wording is provided in parenthesis and the wording which was substituted is underlined.
respondent was calculated by two steps:

(1) The actual numbers circled on items 2, 3, 7, 8, and 13 were added together.

(2) On items 11 and 15, the scale was reversed for each item. Then the resulting numbers were added to the total from procedure (1) above to obtain the final subscale raw score for that individual respondent. To reverse the scale for items 11 and 15, a circled "1" was counted as a "5", a "2" was counted as a "4", a "3" as a "3", a "4" as a "2", and a "5" was counted as a "1".

The intuitive-objective subscale raw score for each individual was calculated in the same manner by using procedure (1) above for items 1, 6, and 12, and then using procedure (2) for items 9, 12, and 17. The psychoanalytic-psychodynamic subscale utilized procedure (1) on all items (4, 5, 10, and 16) and then added these together to obtain the subscale raw score for each individual.

The information solicited on the questionnaire included not only questions related to the topics of interest to the present study, but also included questions related to an ongoing program evaluation of the Western Michigan University School Psychology Program. However, the data summary and analysis of these program evaluation items will not be presented or discussed in this paper, as they do not relate to the purpose of the present study.

Confidential Questionnaire for Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education

A six-page questionnaire entitled "Confidential Questionnaire for Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education" (Appendix B) was mailed to 196 Michigan Directors of Special Education and 18 Michigan Supervisors of School Psychology...
Services. Names and addresses of these two groups were taken from two sources. Names and addresses of directors were taken from the "1975-76 Directory: Special Education Contact Persons for Intermediate and Local School Districts" (Note 6). Names of supervisors were provided by a list compiled by Braccio in September, 1975 (Note 7). The 13 names on the supervisor list were supplemented by five additional names and addresses of professionals in southwestern Michigan known to be school psychology supervisors. Although the questionnaire was mailed to all 196 directors and 18 supervisors in the above two lists, the data analysis of completed questionnaires utilized only those questionnaires which reported current status as supervisor or director of at least one half-time school psychologist.

A cover letter (Appendix B), an unstamped, pre-addressed envelope for returning the completed survey, and a postcard accompanied each questionnaire. The postcard could be used by the respondent to indicate his desire to receive a copy of the summary of results of the present study.

The format and content of most of the items in this questionnaire for supervisors and directors (Appendix B) were similar to that used in the questionnaire for Michigan school psychologists (Appendix A). However, a few items present on the school psychologists' questionnaire which were inappropriate for supervisors and directors were modified or omitted for the supervisors and directors' questionnaire. Two brief items not included on the psychologists' questionnaire were added to the questionnaire for supervisors and directors [See items (D) and (I)8 in Appendix B]. Each respondent was given the option of
either writing his name on a line provided at the top of the question-
naire or of completing it anonymously.

Abbreviated Questionnaire for Michigan School Psychologists

In order to evaluate the representativeness of the data already
obtained by the original questionnaire, an abbreviated, one-page version
of the original questionnaire for Michigan school psychologists was
mailed to 30 members of MASP approximately seven weeks after the origi-
nal mailing of the long questionnaire (Appendix C). The 30 school psy-
chologists receiving the abbreviated questionnaire were selected random-
ly from the original mailing list of MASP members sent the original
survey. To make the random selection, first, all the MASP members
were assigned a three-digit number. Then a table of random numbers
was used to select 30 names from the list of 433. Only those respond-
ents completing the abbreviated questionnaire who reported being cur-
rently employed as Michigan school psychologists were included in the
subsequent data analysis.

The purpose of the abbreviated questionnaire was to obtain some
basis for evaluation of the representativeness of the sample of school
psychologists who completed and returned the original questionnaire
(Appendix A). Since only 20% (86 of 433) of the questionnaires in
the original mailing to MASP members had been completed and returned
within seven weeks, the representativeness of the questionnaire data
was uncertain. There was some concern that the summary statistics
based on this 20% return sample might be significantly different from
those statistics that would have been obtained if a higher percentage
of the MASP group had completed and returned the questionnaire. By making the abbreviated questionnaire very brief and by only including the most important items in it, it was hoped that a high percentage of the questionnaires would be returned completed.

If close to 100% of the abbreviated questionnaires in the random sample were returned, then this data could be compared to the corresponding data obtained from the 20% return sample to see if the two samples appeared similar. If the two samples were similar on the comparison items available, then this would give some support for considering the rest of the data available from the 20% sample to be reasonably representative of the whole MASP population.

Each of the abbreviated questionnaires mailed to MASP members was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix C), a postcard for requesting a summary of the results, and a stamped pre-addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire.

Abbreviated Questionnaire for Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education

In order to evaluate the representativeness of the already-obtained supervisor and director data, an abbreviated one-page questionnaire similar to the one just described was mailed to a random sample of 30 supervisors and directors (Appendix D). The 30-member random sample was selected from the original mailing list of supervisors and directors by the use of a table of random numbers.

Each of the abbreviated questionnaires mailed to supervisors and directors was accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix D), a postcard
for requesting a copy of the results, and a stamped pre-addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire.

The purpose of this abbreviated questionnaire was identical to that of the previously-described abbreviated questionnaire for Michigan school psychologists. That is, since only 29% (66 out of 214) of the six-page questionnaires mailed to supervisors and directors was completed and returned within seven weeks, the representativeness of the data obtained was uncertain. If close to 100% of the abbreviated questionnaires was returned, it would allow comparison on some items with the data from the 29% sample. If the summary statistics from these two samples were similar, then this evidence would give some support for considering the rest of the data from the 29% sample to be reasonably representative of the entire population of Michigan supervisors and directors.
RESULTS

Return of the Questionnaires

Out of 433 eight-page questionnaires mailed to members of MASP, 86 were completed and returned within seven weeks (20% return rate). The return rate for the six-page questionnaire for supervisors and directors was slightly higher at 29% within seven weeks (66 completed and returned out of 214).

The return rates of the abbreviated questionnaires of both groups were higher than on the original questionnaires. However, the return rates were still not high enough to allow use of the abbreviated questionnaire data for evaluating the representativeness of the data from the long questionnaires. Out of the random sample of 30 MASP members, only 11 completed and returned the abbreviated questionnaire (37% return rate) within three and one-half weeks. Within the same time period, only 67% of the random sample of 30 supervisors and directors completed and returned their abbreviated questionnaires. Although these return rates were higher than those obtained for the long questionnaires, they were not close enough to the 100% return rate needed. In order to confidently assume that the abbreviated questionnaire data were representative of the respective populations, a much higher return rate was needed. Since the assumption of representativeness could not be made, it was not felt that a comparison of the abbreviated questionnaire data with the long questionnaire data would be valid. Therefore, the data obtained from the abbreviated questionnaire were not tabulated.
and will not be presented in this study, as was originally planned.

Background Characteristics of the Two Respondent Groups

Within the school psychology group that returned the original eight-page questionnaire, 54.22% of the respondents were male and 45.78% were female (N = 83 on this item). The most common highest degree for the school psychology respondents (Table 4) was the M.A. degree (48.84%), followed by the Ed.S. degree (29.07%) and the Ph.D. degree (8.14%). By far the most common field for the school psychologists' highest degrees (Table 4) was School Psychology (70.59%), and the average time since receipt of these degrees was five years (1971).

The school psychologists' current job areas were about evenly distributed between urban, rural, and mixed areas (Table 5). They averaged 5.07 years of experience as school psychologists and 2.42 years of experience as teachers (Table 6). Approximately 56% held a teaching certificate (N = 86 on this item). Of those who held a teaching certificate, the mean years of experience as teachers was 4.33 years. Although the mean age for the group was 33.84 years, the group was relatively heterogeneous with respect to age, as indicated by a standard deviation of 8.11 years (Table 6).

Within the group of supervisors and directors that returned the original questionnaire, 83.33% were male and 16.67% were female (N = 60 on this item). They supervised an average of 4.74 school psychologists each, although the actual number supervised ranged from a minimum of one to a maximum of 50 (SD = 6.96, N = 61). For the supervisors and directors, the most common highest degree (Table 4) was the M.A.
Table 4: University Degree Characteristics of the Respondent Groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest University Degree</th>
<th>% of School Psychologists</th>
<th>% of Supervisors and Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>48.84</td>
<td>54.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>21.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 86</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Highest Degree</th>
<th>School Psychologists</th>
<th>Supervisors and Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean of Year</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD (Years)</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 72</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Highest Degree</th>
<th>% of School Psychologists</th>
<th>% of Supervisors and Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>21.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>37.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of Highest Degree (Continued)</td>
<td>% of School Psychologists</td>
<td>% of Supervisors and Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>34.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 85</td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 5: Urban-Rural Characteristics of the Current Job Areas of the Respondent Groups.
TABLE 5

URBAN–RURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CURRENT JOB AREAS OF THE RESPONDENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reported Characteristic of Current Job Area</th>
<th>% of School Psychologists(^a)</th>
<th>% of Supervisors and Directors(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily Urban</td>
<td>34.88</td>
<td>38.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily Rural</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(N = 86\)

\(^b\)\(N = 60\)
Table 6: Age, Years of Teaching Experience, and Years of School Psychology Experience by the Respondent Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Years of School Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 6

**AGE, YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE, AND YEARS OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY EXPERIENCE BY THE RESPONDENT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>School Psychologists(^a)</th>
<th>Supervisors and Directors(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>33.84</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience as a School Psychologist</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(N = 86\)

\(^b\)\(N = 60\)

The means for years of teaching experience for the two groups were 2.42 and 8.52. However, if the means were calculated using only those respondents in the two groups who held teaching certificates, the means for years of teaching experience were 4.33 years for school psychologists and 8.96 years for supervisors and directors.
degree (54.10%) followed by the Ed.S. degree (21.31%), and the Ph.D.
degree (13.11%). The most common field for the supervisors and directors' 
degrees (Table 4) was Special Education (37.70%). School Psychology 
was the highest degree for 21.31% of the group, and 34.43% of the degrees 
fell in the "Other" category, which included Administration, Guidance 
and Counseling, Psychology, etc. (Table 4). The average time since re­ 
ceipt of the highest degree (Table 4) was 11 years (1965).

The supervisors and directors' job areas were approximately evenly 
distributed between urban, rural, and mixed areas (Table 5). They 
averaged 3.10 years of experience as school psychologists and 8.52 years 
of experience as teachers (Table 6). Within the group, 95.00% held a 
teaching certificate (N = 60 on this item). Of those who held a teach­
ing certificate, the mean years of experience as teachers was 8.96 years. 
The mean age for the group was 42.85 years, but the ages were relatively 
heterogeneous, as indicated by a standard deviation of 7.86 years (Table 
6).

The two groups were similar in many of the background character­
istics. However, a larger percentage of males were respondents in the 
supervisor and director group than in the school psychology group (83.33% 
versus 54.22%). Also, the supervisors and directors most frequently 
held degrees in Special Education (37.07%), whereas the school psycho­
logists most frequently held degrees in School Psychology (70.59%). The 
supervisors and directors tended to be slightly older (42.85 versus 33.84 
years) and to have held their highest degrees somewhat longer (11 years 
versus 5 years). Markedly more supervisors and directors than school 
psychologists held teaching certificates (95.00% versus 56.00%). Also,
the supervisors and directors averaged more years of teaching experience than the school psychologists (8.52 versus 2.42 years) and averaged slightly fewer years of school psychology experience (3.10 versus 5.07 years).

Present and Preferred Role of School Psychologists as Perceived by the Two Respondent Groups

**Present Role**

According to the reports of the school psychology respondents, their primary professional role (Table 7) was Pupil Assessment (47.39% of weekly time), followed by Teacher Consulting (12.21%), Educational Placement and Planning Meetings (EPPC) (10.66%), and Parent Counseling (6.49%). As can be seen in Table 7, the variability in the percentages was markedly high in all activity categories, however. For all activity categories except Pupil Assessment, the standard deviation was almost as high or higher than the mean percentage of weekly time itself.

According to the reports by the supervisors and directors, the role of the school psychologists that they supervised (Table 7) was primarily Pupil Assessment (47.35% of weekly time), followed by EPPC Meetings (11.32%), Teacher Consulting (9.76%), and Parent Counseling (7.53%). However, the variability in the percentages was high. In almost all activity categories, the standard deviation was almost as high or higher than the mean percentage of weekly time for that activity category.

The percentages of weekly time reported by the two groups were very similar. Out of the four largest time percentages of the two
Table 7: Reports of the Percentage of Weekly Time that School Psychologists Devote to the Designated Activities.
TABLE 7

REPORTS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF WEEKLY TIME THAT SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS DEVOTE TO THE DESIGNATED ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Reports by School Psychologists&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Reports by Supervisors and Directors&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Assessment</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>17.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Counseling</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Counseling</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consulting</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice for Teachers and Others</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education for Self</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Agencies</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appropriate)</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Interns</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other duties</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><sub>N = 85</sub>

<sup>b</sup><sub>N = 62</sub>

<sup>c</sup>Educational Planning and Placement Meetings
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groups, four out of the four were identical activity categories. Also, the mean percentages of the two groups were very similar to each other in the other activity categories. There was no activity category in which the mean preferred percentage of the supervisors and directors fell outside the $\pm 1$ SD range around the mean percentage of the school psychologists. The variability of both groups was similarly high in relation to the mean percentages. That is, the standard deviation for each category was usually as high or higher than the mean percentage for that category.

**Preferred Role**

When asked to state the percentage of weekly time they would prefer to spend on the various activities (Table 8), the school psychologists cited the highest percentage for Pupil Assessment (30.15% of weekly time), followed by Teacher Consulting (15.41%), Parent Counseling (9.58%), and Pupil Counseling (9.39%). The variability in the time percentages for all activity categories except Pupil Assessment was almost as high or higher than the mean time percentage itself, however, indicating marked heterogeneity of roles preferred by the school psychology respondents.

When the supervisors and directors were asked to state the percentages of weekly time they would prefer their school psychologists to devote to the various activities (Table 8), they reported the highest percentage for Pupil Assessment (41.37% of weekly time), followed by Teacher Consulting (12.18%), Parent Counseling (9.84%), and EPPC Meetings (9.26%). The variability was high, however, with each SD
Table 8: Preferred Percentages of Weekly Time for School Psychologists to Devote to the Designated Activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Preferred by School Psychologists&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Preferred by Supervisors and Directors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Assessment</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>41.37</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Counseling</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Counseling</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consulting</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice for Teachers and Others</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education for Self</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Agencies</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appropriate)</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Interns</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other duties</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup><sub>N = 85</sub>  
<sup>b</sup><sub>N = 62</sub>  
<sup>c</sup>Educational Planning and Placement Meetings
except the SD for Pupil Assessment being almost as high or markedly higher than the corresponding mean time percentage.

The reports of preferred role by the two groups were very similar. Out of the four largest time percentages of each of the two groups, three of the four categories were identical: Pupil Assessment, Teacher Consulting, and Parent Counseling. The means for all the other categories were also similar across the two groups. There was no activity category in which the mean preferred percentage of the supervisors and directors fell outside the ± SD range around the mean preferred percentage of the school psychologists. The variability of both groups was similar in that it was high for both.

**Changes Desired in the Present Role**

The mean percentages reported for the present role (Table 7) were compared with the mean percentages reported for the preferred role (Table 8) in order to analyze what changes were desired in the present role by the two groups. Figure 1 presents all the mean percentages shown previously in Tables 7 and 8 to make visual comparison easier. As can be seen from Figure 1, the category which showed the most obvious difference between the present and preferred role reported was Pupil Assessment. For both groups, the mean for the preferred percentage of weekly time in Pupil Assessment was markedly lower than the mean for the present percentage of weekly time. This difference in present and preferred time percentages in Pupil Assessment was larger for the school psychologists than for the supervisors and directors, however.
Figure 1: Present and Preferred Role of School Psychologists as Reported by School Psychologists and Supervisors and Directors.
FIGURE 1

PRESENT AND PREFERRED ROLE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AS REPORTED BY SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND SUPERVISORS AND DIRECTORS

- Present role reported by school psychologists
- Preferred role reported by school psychologists
- Present role reported by supervisors and directors
- Preferred role reported by supervisors and directors

Note: N = 85 for school psychologists and 62 for supervisors and directors
Although differences existed between the means for present and preferred time in the other categories in Figure 1, the most noticeable characteristic about the means plotted for each category other than Pupil Assessment was their consistent similarity.

This comparison of present and preferred roles from Figure 1 was supplemented by an alternate method of analyzing what changes were desired in the present role. The Figure 1 analysis only compared group means for the present and preferred time percentages in each of the activity categories. Tables 9 and 10 present the percent of respondents whose data indicated a desire to increase or decrease (by any amount of time) the weekly time spent in each of the activities (Table 9 for school psychologists and Table 10 for supervisors and directors). These figures were obtained by comparing the present time reported with the preferred time percentages reported for each respondent individually. Using this method of analysis, it was found that the majority of school psychology respondents (Table 9) desired to decrease the time spent in Pupil Assessment (80% of the respondents) and EPPC Meetings (54.12%). The majority of school psychology respondents also wanted to increase the time spent in Pupil Counseling (62.35%), Parent Counseling (60.00%), Inservice for Teachers and Others (60.00%), Continuing Education for Self (54.12%), and Teacher Consulting (52.94%). Although the majority of school psychology respondents reported wanting changes in these categories, the actual mean preferred percentages of weekly time were not markedly different from the mean present percentages (Figure 1).

A large number of supervisors and directors (Table 10) reported present and preferred time percentages which indicated a desire to
Table 9: Percent of School Psychology Respondents Desiring to Increase or Decrease the Average Weekly Time Spent in the Designated Activities.
TABLE 9
PERCENT OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY RESPONDENTS DESIRING TO INCREASE OR DECREASE THE AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SPENT IN THE DESIGNATED ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Reporting the View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefers to Spend Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Assessment</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Counseling</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Consulting</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consulting</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice for Teachers and Others</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education for Self</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Agencies</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports)</td>
<td>36.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appropriate)</td>
<td>54.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Interns</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other duties</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 85
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Table 10: Percent of Supervisors and Directors Desiring School Psychologists to Increase or Decrease the Average Weekly Time Spent in the Designated Activities.
### TABLE 10

PERCENT OF SUPERVISORS AND DIRECTORS DESIRING SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS TO INCREASE OR DECREASE THE AVERAGE WEEKLY TIME SPENT IN THE DESIGNATED ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Prefers School Psychologists to Decrease Time in this Role</th>
<th>Prefers School Psychologists to Spend the Same Time as Now Spent</th>
<th>Prefers School Psychologists to Increase Time in this Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Assessment</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Counseling</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Counseling</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>45.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consulting</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>46.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice for Teachers and Others</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>48.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education for Self</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>64.52</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with Agencies</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>70.97</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>56.45</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports)</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>69.35</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appropriate)</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>59.68</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Interns</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>88.71</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>93.55</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other duties</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>74.19</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** N = 62
decrease the amount of time their school psychologists spent in Pupil Assessment (50.00% of the respondents). A large number of the supervisors and directors also wanted to increase the amount of time their school psychologists spent in Pupil Counseling (50.00% of the respondents), Inservice for Teachers and Others (48.39%), Teacher Consulting (46.77%), and Parent Counseling (45.16%). However, as was seen previously in Figure 1, the magnitude of these desired changes was not large.

**Obstacles to Changing the Role**

On the questionnaires, school psychologists were given the opportunity to give three brief narrative answers to the question, "What do you feel are the major obstacles to changing from your present role (above) to your preferred role (above)?" After the responses were reviewed by the investigator, 17 categories were created and the number of times each of the categories was cited as an obstacle was tabulated (Table 11). The obstacles cited by the most school psychologists were "Too few staff, not enough time, or case load too high" (cited by 33 of 86 respondents), "Administrative policy, philosophy, and/or expectations" (cited by 30 of 86 respondents), and "public Act 198 and other legal restraints" (cited by 20 of 86 respondents).

The supervisors and directors were given an opportunity to respond also with three short narrative answers to the question, "What do you feel are the major obstacles to changing the roles of the school psychologists you supervise from their present one (above) to the one you would prefer (above)?" The same 17 categories were used in
Table 11: Perceptions of the Respondent Groups of the Major Obstacles to Changing the School Psychologist's Role from the Present Role to the Role Preferred by the Respondent.
TABLE 11

PERCEPTIONS OF THE RESPONDENT GROUPS OF THE MAJOR OBSTACLES TO CHANGING THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST'S ROLE FROM THE PRESENT ROLE TO THE ROLE PREFERRED BY THE RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles Cited</th>
<th>School Psychologists</th>
<th>Supervisors and Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who cited this obstacle</td>
<td>% of total obstacles cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Act 198 and other legal constraints</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative policy, philosophy, and/or expectations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover of traditional school psychology role (school psychologist expected to just be a &quot;tester&quot;)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attitudes or behaviors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes, skills, experience, and/or training of school psychologists</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too few staff, not enough time, or case load too high</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate referrals or poor referral process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity of school psychologists writing too many detailed reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of social workers in schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for better training of school personnel in general</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities, programs, or other financial resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles Cited</td>
<td>School Psychologists</td>
<td>Supervisors and Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number who cited this obstacle</td>
<td>% of total obstacles cited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adequate time available in teachers' schedules for meeting with school psychologists during the day, taking data, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of school psychologists too low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time takes too much time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel no need or desire to change or perceive no significant obstacles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous obstacles not appropriate for any of the above categories</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Out of the 86 school psychologists who returned completed questionnaires, 85 cited at least one category in the table. Out of 62 supervisors and directors who returned completed questionnaires, 57 cited at least one category in the table. It should be noted that the number of obstacles cited by each respondent varied between one and three. Therefore, the % figures for each group and obstacle category were calculated by dividing the number of respondents citing the obstacle by the total number of obstacles. The total number of obstacles was 169 for the school psychologists and 91 for the supervisors and directors.
tabulating the obstacles cited by supervisors and directors as were used for the school psychologists. The categories most frequently cited (Table 11) were "Attitudes, skills, experience, and/or training of school psychologists" (cited by 20 of 62 respondents) and "Too few staff, not enough time, or case load too high" (cited by 12 of 62 respondents).

The most striking difference between the obstacles cited by the supervisors and directors and the obstacles cited by the school psychologists was found in the category of "Attitudes, skills, experience, and/or training of school psychologists". In the group of supervisors and directors, 22% of the obstacles cited fell in this category, whereas only 3.6% of the school psychologists' obstacles fell in this category. It was also noted that the school psychologists cited "Administrative policy, philosophy and/or expectations" as an obstacle more frequently than the supervisors and directors. Also, "Teacher attitudes or behaviors" was cited more frequently by the supervisors and directors than by the school psychologists.

Time Spent in Each Component of a Student Referral Work-Up

Both the school psychology and the supervisor and director groups reported similar figures for the average hours spent by school psychologists in each component of a student referral work-up (Table 12). The most time-consuming component of a student referral work-up was "Assessing (testing, observations, getting information, etc.)", according to the reports of both groups. The variability of time spent in each component was high for the reports of both groups, however. The
Table 12: Reports of the Average Hours Spent by School Psychologists in each Component of a Student Referral Work-Up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of the Student Referral Work-up</th>
<th>Reports by School Psychologists</th>
<th>Reports by Supervisors and Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing (testing, observations, getting information, etc.)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing the report</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent conferences on the student</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics (travel, scheduling, conferences, etc.)</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total average per-student assessment time</td>
<td>7.65\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a_{N} = 82\)

\(b_{N} = 57\)
standard deviation for each mean was almost as high as the mean itself for all component means, indicating a large degree of heterogeneity in the reports (Table 12). Total average per-student assessment (work-up) time was reported by school psychologists as 7.65 hours and by supervisors and directors as 6.90 hours (Table 12).

An attempt was made to determine with the present questionnaire what methods (particular types of tests, observations, interviews, etc.) were typically used by school psychologists to assess students [see Section (D) of the questionnaire in Appendix A]. However, most of the respondents left several of the items in this section blank. It was impossible to determine whether a blank in each case meant zero or whether in some cases it merely indicated that the respondent was unsure what number to write. Because of this difficulty, this data will not be presented. It was felt that any calculation of means for this section after an arbitrary decision defining the meaning of a "blank" would be misleading and invalid.

Supervisors and Directors' Evaluations of the Accuracy of Their Estimates

Table 13 presents the percentage of supervisors and directors who circled each of the possible five responses to the question, "How close do you think your estimates of how your school psychologists spend their time (Items A and C above) are to the ACTUAL way they spend their time?" The majority of respondents (54.39%) in the group circled a "2", an answer between the categories of "1 - Almost Perfect Estimate" and "3 - Somewhat Inconsistent With The Actual Time Spent". The distribution of the remaining responses fell primarily on "1" (14.04%)
Table 13: Supervisors and Directors' Evaluations of the Accuracy of their Estimates of the Time Spent by School Psychologists in the Various Activities and Work-Up Components.
TABLE 13

SUPERVISORS AND DIRECTORS' EVALUATIONS OF THE ACCURACY OF THEIR ESTIMATES OF THE TIME SPENT BY SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS IN THE VARIOUS ACTIVITIES AND WORK-UP COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Almost Perfect Estimates</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>54.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Somewhat inconsistent with the actual time spent</td>
<td>28.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 -</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Could be very discrepant with the actual time spent</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 57
and "3" (28.07%), thus indicating that the supervisors and directors, in general, felt that their estimates were relatively accurate.

It should be noted that it would be invalid to judge the accuracy of the supervisors and directors' estimates by comparing their responses with the school psychologists' responses on corresponding items. For example, it would not be valid to judge the accuracy of the present role of school psychologists reported by the supervisors and directors by comparing it with the role reported by school psychologists. Both respondent groups constituted only a relatively small percentage of the target populations mailed the questionnaires. Thus, any discrepancies between the present school psychology roles reported by the two groups could have been due to the respondent groups' having come from different school districts, rather than to any inaccuracy of the supervisors and directors' reports.

Theoretical and Clinical Orientation of the Two Respondent Groups

Two methods were used for data analysis and summary of the 17 ideology subscale items, an item-by-item analysis and a subscale score analysis. In the item-by-item analysis, which was done for the school psychologists and supervisors and directors separately (Table 14), the percentage of each group that circled a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 was calculated for each item. Then a difference index was calculated between the percentage of the group agreeing with the item (responses 4 or 5) and the percentage of the group disagreeing with the item (responses 1 or 2). This was calculated by subtracting the percentages on categories 1 and 2 from the percentages on categories 4 and 5, and taking the
Table 14: Responses by Both Respondent Groups to the Individual Items on the Three Ideology Subscales.
TABLE 14
RESPONSES BY BOTH RESPONDENT GROUPS TO THE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ON THE THREE IDEOLOGY SUBScales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number on the Original Questionnaires</th>
<th>% of the Group Who Gave This Response&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference Index&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Behavior Modification Subscale

2. In the etiology of students' school problems, recent events are almost always much more important than early childhood experiences.
   - 8 26 31 31 3
   - 7 15 34 31 13
   - 0

3. Learning theory is the most useful framework in which to view the etiology of students' problems.
   - 7 29 28 28 8
   - 11 25 38 23 3
   - 0

7. In the etiology of students' problems, intrapsychic factors tend to be less important than biological or social environmental factors.
   - 7 19 30 36 8
   - 3 20 47 22 8
   - 18

8. Remove the symptoms, and one has essentially eliminated the neurosis.
   - 23 31 14 28 3
   - 33 33 15 16 3
   - 47

11. When a student's problem symptom is improved, he may develop other symptoms to deal with his underlying problem.
   - 2 25 22 41 9
   - 5 15 30 45 5
   - 23 30

13. The best way to improve the programs in most schools would be to focus on various forms of behavior modification.
   - 15 22 34 21 7
   - 5 16 41 30 8
   - 9 17
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TABLE 14
(Continued)

15. For a large percentage of emotionally disturbed students, behavior modification would be ineffective and inappropriate.

II. Intuitive-Objective Subscale

1. The time which graduate students of school psychology now spend learning research methods would be more profitably spent in obtaining more first-hand experience in schools.

6. Current experimental methods cannot be applied successfully to school problems, and new scientific approaches must be developed.

9. One good test of statistical significance is more convincing than a lot of clinical intuitions.

12. Clinically relevant concepts cannot be studied effectively under the artificial conditions of the laboratory.

14. The flexibility of clinical thinking creates excellent hypotheses, but these hypotheses can only be established as true by controlled studies.

17. All really sound knowledge comes from the findings of experimental research studies.

III. Psychoanalytic-Psychodynamic Subscale

4. Intensive individual psychotherapy is the best method of treatment for most forms of psychological disorder.
5. Maladaptive behavior cannot be treated directly because it results from underlying causes.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Ordinarily, students with emotional problems cannot be expected to show real improvement without slow and careful psychological exploration of their underlying conflicts.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The best criterion to use in clinical research is the judgement of an experienced and sensitive clinician.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* N for school psychologists' data varied between 84 and 86 for the various items, while N for the supervisors and directors varied between 57 and 61 for the various items. Next to each subscale item are two rows of numbers separated by a line. For each subscale item, the row of numbers over the dotted line gives the data for the group of school psychologists. The row of numbers under the dotted line provides the data for the supervisors and directors.

*b* The difference index was calculated for each item by taking the absolute value of the number obtained after subtracting the percentages on categories 1 and 2 from the percentages on categories 4 and 5. A high difference index thus indicated a large degree of homogeneity in the opinions of the group.
absolute value of this difference. A high difference index thus indicated a large degree of homogeneity within the group, homogeneity in either agreeing or disagreeing with that particular item. A low index (near zero) indicated that the opinions of the group were about evenly divided between agreement and disagreement with the item (large degree of heterogeneity within the group).

As was indicated by the item-by-item analysis, the school psychologists' opinions were highly homogeneous on Items 4, 5, and 6. On Items 2, 3, and 13, the opinions of the group were about evenly distributed between agreement and disagreement with the item. Of those three items which indicated relatively homogeneous orientations of school psychologists, two items (Items 4 and 5) indicated an anti-psychoanalytic-psychodynamic opinion of the respondents; and the other item (Item 6) indicated a pro-objective opinion of the respondents (Table 14). All three items with a marked heterogeneity of school psychologists' responses (Items 2, 3, and 13) were items which made strongly pre-behavior modification statements.

The item-by-item analysis for the supervisors and directors revealed responses which were highly homogeneous on Items 4, 5, and 17. On Items 3, 7, and 12, the responses of the group were about evenly distributed between agreement and disagreement with the item. Of those three items which indicated relatively homogeneous orientations of the group, two items (Items 4 and 5) indicated an anti-psychoanalytic-psychodynamic opinion of the respondents; and the responses on the other item (Item 17) indicated a anti-objective orientation of the supervisors and directors (Table 14). Two of the items with marked
heterogeneity of responses were items which made strongly pro-behavior modification statements (Items 3 and 7). The third item with heterogeneous responses (Item 12) made a pre-intuitive statement.

The second method of data analysis of the 17 ideology items, the subscale score analysis, was done for both the school psychology group and the supervisor and director group (Table 15). The means for each subscale were very similar for the two groups. Independent sample t-tests were done comparing the two groups on each of the three subscales separately. However, none of the three t-tests were significant at $p = .05$. 
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Table 15: Average Ideology Subscale of the School Psychologists and the Supervisors and Directors.
### TABLE 15

**AVERAGE IDEOLOGY SUBSCALE SCORES OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND THE SUPERVISORS AND DIRECTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subscale Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Behavior Modification II. Intuitive-Objective III. Psychoanalytic-Psychodynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologists(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors and Directors(^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest-Highest Possible Subscale Score(^c)</td>
<td>7-35 6-30 4-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(N = 80\)

\(^b\)\(N = 53\)

\(^c\)Since the number of items on each subscale was not the same, the minimum and maximum possible scores for each of the subscales were different. A high score on a subscale indicated a pro-behavior modification view, a pro-intuitive view, or a pro-psychoanalytic-psychodynamic view for subscales I, II, and III, respectively.
DISCUSSION

Comparison with Previous Studies

In spite of the major legislation in Michigan in 1971 (Michigan State Legislature) and 1973 (Michigan Department of Education), no evidence was found in the present study for the existence of any marked changes in the role of the Michigan school psychologist. The reports of weekly time spent in various activities by school psychologists in the present study (Table 7) were basically the same as those reported by Braccio annually since 1972 (Notes 1, 2, and 3; and Table 1). The presence of an additional category (Teacher Consulting) in the present study, which was not included in Braccio's questionnaires, merely seemed to "borrow" a little time from the other categories previously included by Braccio, but did not significantly effect the distribution of time percentages reported. The comparison of present and preferred roles of school psychologists (Tables 7 and 8) in the present study also agreed with the previous results of Fridsma (1972), in that the two roles (present and preferred) were found to be highly similar.

Limitations of the Data

The results reported in the present study came from self-selected samples of the original two target populations mailed the questionnaires. Since the return rates were relatively low, caution was felt in order in assuming that the results obtained in the present study were applicable to members of the original populations who did not complete and
return the questionnaires. Also, only school psychologists who were members of MASP were included in the target population of Michigan school psychologists. It was not known whether any systematic selection factors were operating which might have resulted in the present data being different if a higher return rate had been obtained or if the whole population of Michigan school psychologists had been targeted. However, in spite of these cautions, the high degree of similarity between the past data of Braccio (Notes 1, 2, and 3) and the present data gave some confidence to assuming a moderate degree of representativeness for the current data. In conclusion, although no foolproof evidence was available to support generalizing the sample data to the target populations, some indications were available to support "cautious generalization".

Another question regarding the generalization of the present data involved whether the written responses given on the questionnaires concerning role, activities, etc. really correspond to the actual job behaviors of the respondents. This question could not be answered by the present study. Research employing both mediums of data gathering, questionnaire and field behavior samples, will be needed to evaluate this question.

Implications

The information gathered in the present study gave rise to three implications which might be of some interest to either students trying to decide whether to enter the school psychology profession in Michigan or Michigan school psychology graduate students trying to plan their
courses and practicums.

The first implication for these students was that the present role of the school psychologists in Michigan appears to continue to be dominated by Pupil Assessment (Table 7), in spite of the 1973 legislative changes which broadened the legal role definition. Although a relatively high variability was found in the role reported by the various respondents (as indicated by the high SD's in the activity categories in Table 7), Pupil Assessment still stood out as taking by far the largest percentage of weekly time for many of the school psychologists. With Pupil Assessment such a major function of Michigan school psychologists, it seems appropriate for school psychology graduate students to make sure they have adequate training and experience to meet this facet of the current role. Strategies for using the Pupil Assessment function most effectively for increasing student achievement should be developed and studied by school psychology graduate students. Also, familiarity with the legal ramifications of the use of standardized tests and familiarity with the use of the criterion-referenced and informal tests would appear to be essential.

Although Pupil Assessment dominated the current role reported by the respondents, a second implication arose from the present study which indicated some desire and support by respondents for broadening the school psychologists' role in Michigan. Both school psychologists and supervisors and directors indicated their desire to decrease the amount of time spent in Pupil Assessment and to increase the amount of time spent in Pupil Counseling, Parent Counseling, and Teacher
Consulting (Tables 9 and 10). However, the small difference between the means for the present and preferred weekly time percentages (Tables 7 and 8) indicated that the respondents did not desire any abrupt changes in the role, even in these categories. A school psychology graduate just entering the field in Michigan should probably expect to find some receptivity from colleagues and supervisors for fresh ideas and small changes in the role, but should not, in general, expect support for a major shift in role at present. It may be that small, gradual changes each year will result in a major role change for school psychologists, but the present study found no evidence for any obvious role change since 1972. It is hoped that data from the present study will be useful in the future as a baseline for investigating whether any delayed changes in the school psychologist’s role have taken place as a result of the 1971 and 1973 legislation.

The third implication of the present study for prospective school psychologists was that school psychology graduate students should get extensive practicum and internship experience in teacher consulting, pupil psych-curricular planning, etc., if they wish to spend more than the current time averages in these "non-assessment" activities. Twenty out of 57 supervisors and directors cited "Attitudes, skills, experience, and/or training of school psychologists" (Table 11) as a major obstacle to changing their role. Both the credentials (courses, practicum experience, and internship experience) and actual ability of school psychologists to succeed in field applications of the broadened role will surely influence the support or non-support of supervisors and directors for broadening the role of school psychologists even further in the future.
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APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS
March 19, 1976

Dear School Psychologists:

As part of my thesis project I am attempting to assess the professional environment of school psychologists in Michigan. Much of the information obtained will have direct implications for evaluating the WMU School Psychology Program. I would like to encourage your taking the time required to complete it. We are anxious to obtain a realistic view of your needs and opinions concerning the training of school psychologists in Michigan. A similar questionnaire is also being mailed to Michigan supervisors or directors of Special Education.

Please give forthright answers. All individual responses will be kept strictly confidential and will be reported only as part of group descriptions and comparisons. Also, for reasons of statistical validity, it would be better if you did not discuss items on the questionnaire with others before completing it.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration of these issues. By gathering information like this, we hope the School Psychology Program at Western Michigan University will be better able to serve the needs of the state.

I look forward to sharing the results of the study with you. We hope to be able to present the results and conclusions at a MASP state meeting in the near future. If you would like a summary of the results of the questionnaire please fill and return the enclosed card with the completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Susi Russell
WMU School Psychology Program

Enc.
CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

(A) *What % of your week do you spend in this activity on the average?_________  *What % of your week would you prefer to spend in this activity?_________

1) Pupil Assessment (incl. report) __________ __________
2) Pupil Counseling __________ __________
3) Parent Counseling __________ __________
4) Teacher Consulting __________ __________
5) Inservice for Teachers and Others __________ __________
6) Continuing Education for Self __________ __________
7) Contact with Agencies __________ __________
8) Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning __________ __________
9) Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports) __________ __________
10) EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appro.) __________ __________
11) Supervision of Interns __________ __________
12) Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting) __________ __________
13) Other duties __________ __________

**Total in each column above should be approximately 100%.

(B) What do you feel are the major obstacles to changing from your present role (above) to your preferred role (above)?

1. __________________________________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________________________________

(C) For the average individual student referral, about how much time do you spend----
1) Assessing (testing, observations, getting info, etc.) __________
2) Writing the report __________
3) Subsequent conferences on the student __________
4) Logistics (travel, scheduling conferences, etc.) __________

Total average per-student assessment time: __________
(D) Out of all the pupils you assess individually, please indicate below with what percentage of those students you use each of the following assessment activities:

I give an intelligence tests to ___ % of the students I assess.
......a personality test to ___ %
..standardized academic test ___ %
..criterion-referenced academic test ___ %
...informal academic tests _________%  
...perceptual-motor test _________% 
..classroom behavior observations..... _________ %
...interview relevant persons........... _________ %
...other activity - specify: ________% 

(E) If Michigan law were changed so that school psychological services were not required for certifying children for Special Education, do you feel that---

1) Fewer
2) The same number of
3) More

school psychologists would be employed in Michigan? (Circle one)

(F) If Michigan law were changed as stated above, do you feel that you would spend---

1) Less time
2) The same amount of time
3) More time

in assessing individual students? (Circle one)

(G) Circle the number preceding the 3 following areas you feel are MOST in need of increased and improved emphasis in graduate school psychology training. (You may add an area we have omitted under "Other" and circle your addition, if desired.)

1. Use and interpretation of standardized tests.
2. Use of criterion-referenced and informal tests.
4. Classroom and individual behavior management techniques.
5. Regular and special education curriculum materials.
6. Regular and special education teaching techniques.
7. Teacher consultation techniques.
8. Parent consultation techniques.
9. Child consultation and/or therapy techniques.
10. School staff and parent inservice programs (design and delivery).
11. Various models for delivery of special school services (case management, mainstreaming, teaming, etc.).
12. Legal and ethical issues and procedures in school psychology and education.
14. Interpersonal skills (school politics, warmth, empathy, etc.).
15. Development of professional role (joining professional organizations, reading journals, attending professional meetings, etc.).
16. Research methods (experimental design and data analysis).
17. Other (please specify) __________________________.

Now please go back and draw a line through the numbers before the three (3) items you feel as LEAST in need of increased and improved emphasis in graduate school psychology training.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1)</strong> The time which graduate students of school psychology now spend learning research methods would be more profitably spent in obtaining more first-hand experience in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2)</strong> In the etiology of students' school problems, recent events are almost always much more important than early childhood experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3)</strong> Learning theory is the most useful framework in which to view the etiology of students' problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4)</strong> Intensive individual psychotherapy is the best method of treatment for most forms of psychological disorder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5)</strong> Maladaptive behavior cannot be treated directly because it results from underlying causes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6)</strong> Current experimental methods cannot be applied successfully to school problems, and new scientific approaches must be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7)</strong> In the etiology of students' problems, intrapsychic factors tend to be less important than biological or social environmental factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8)</strong> Remove the symptoms, and one has essentially eliminated the neurosis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) One good test of statistical significance is more convincing than a lot of clinical intuitions.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

10) Ordinarily, students with emotional problems cannot be expected to show real improvement without slow and careful psychological exploration of their underlying conflicts.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

11) When a student's problem symptom is improved, he may develop other symptoms to deal with his underlying problem.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

12) Clinically relevant concepts cannot be studied effectively under the artificial conditions of the laboratory.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

13) The best way to improve the programs in most schools would be to focus on various forms of behavior modification.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

14) The flexibility of clinical thinking creates excellent hypotheses but these hypotheses can only be established as true by controlled studies.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

15) For a large percentage of emotionally disturbed students, behavior modification would be ineffective and inappropriate.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

16) The best criterion to use in clinical research is the judgement of an experienced and sensitive clinician.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree
17) All really sound knowledge comes from the findings of experimental research studies.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

18) A competency based training program instead of a required course sequence is best suited for preparing school psychologists.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

19) Doctoral level training in school psychology will be very important for practice in the future.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

20) Doctoral training in school psychology should emphasize practical field experiences leading to a Psy. D. degree instead of research experiences leading to a Ph.D. degree.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

(I) Professional Information

1) What is your highest University degree? (Circle highest degree)
   B.A. B.S. M.A. Ed.S. Ph.D. Ed.D. Other__________Year awarded__________

2) In what field was your highest University degree? (School Psychology, Special Education, Teacher Education, etc.) Degree field____________________

3) From what University was your highest University degree?
   ______________________________
   (city and state) ______________________________

4) Do you have full or temporary approval as a Michigan School Psychologist?
   Temporary   Full   Other certification is: ______________________________

5) How many School Psychology Interns have you personally supervised within the last 3 years (since September, 1973)?
   ______________________________

6) Were any of the interns counted above students in the Western Michigan University School Psychology Program?
   Yes  No  (Circle one)
   If yes, how many of those counted above? ________
7) Are you presently employed? Yes No (Circle one)
   If Yes, are you presently employed as a School Psychologist? Yes No, employed as a

8) If you presently work as a School Psychologist, please indicate whether the area in which you work is primarily urban or rural.
   Primarily Urban Mixed Primarily Rural (Circle one)
   Other (specify) ______________________

9) Have you taken a School Psychology-related course since September, 1975? Yes No
   Do you plan to take a graduate course related to School Psychology sometime soon (Before May, 1977)?
     Yes No Not sure (Maybe)

10) What is your age? ________ Male Female (Circle one)

11) Do you have a teaching certificate? Yes No

12) How many years have you taught school? __________

13) How many years have you been employed as a school psychologist? __________
14) From the list below, please rank order (A,B,C,D) the four items you feel to be the most important factors contributing to a successful career as a school psychologist. (Review all the items before ranking). Next, circle four items you consider least important as factors contributing to a successful career as a school psychologist.

___ 1. The University at which the school psychologist was trained. 1.____
___ 2. Amount of practicum and internship experience in the school psychology training program. (Number of hours) 2.____
___ 3. Quality of University and field supervision of internship and practicum experiences. 3.____
___ 4. Number of graduate credit hours completed in Psychology. 4.____
___ 5. Number of graduate credit hours completed in Education. 5.____
___ 6. Number of graduate credit hours completed in other areas. (Please specify area):_______________________ 6.____
___ 7. Amount of previous professional experience in school psychology or related area. (Which related area________ 7.____

___ 8. Amount of previous classroom teaching experience. (Number of years) 8.____
___ 9. Possession of teaching certificate. 9.____
___ 10. Validation of a set of specified skills as evidence of competency in school psychology. 10.____
___ 11. Membership and active participation in professional organizations. 11.____
___ 12. Research and publications. 12.____
___ 13. Other (please specify).__________________________ 13.____
___ 14. Other (please specify).__________________________ 14.____

From the list above, please rank order in the right-hand margin (1,2,3,4) the four important factors you would consider if you were to make the decision to hire a school psychologist to work with you in your organization. Next, on the right-hand margin circle the four areas you would consider of least importance in making your decision to hire a school psychologist.

15) Do you plan to obtain a doctoral degree in school psychology or a related area in the future?

   Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____ Already have or am in a doctoral program_____.

16) a. What type of doctoral degree program would you prefer to enter:

   1. Ph.D.
   2. Psy. D.
   3. Ed.D.
   4. Other _________(which)

b. To emphasize training in:

   1. research
   2. application and practice
   3. administration
   4. college level teaching
   5. other (what)__________.
17) List the professional organizations you currently belong to, including MASP:

For those organizations you have listed above, please rank order them by placing a number in the right hand column. (1 = the organization you feel has been the most important to your professional career.)

How often do you attend --- MASP Regional Meetings? _____ per year average

MASP State Meetings? _____ per year average

(J) From your experience with the Western Michigan University School Psychology Program graduates, what do you perceive to be the program's greatest strength?

...greatest weakness?

Thanks so much for your help in this project. We hope to have the opportunity to present a summary of the results and conclusions at a future MASP meeting in order to communicate the findings to you.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Susi Russell
WMU School Psychology Program

Enc.
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUPERVISORS OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
March 19, 1976

Dear Supervisor of School Psychologists or Director of Special Education:

As part of my thesis project I am attempting this assessment of the roles, needs, and professional environment of school psychologists in Michigan. We are anxious to obtain a realistic view of your opinions and the comments of educators from different parts of Michigan employing school psychologists. Much of the information obtained will have direct implications for evaluating the WMU School Psychology Program. I would like to encourage your taking the time required to complete it. A similar questionnaire is also being mailed to Michigan school psychologists.

Please give forthright answers. All individual responses will be kept strictly confidential and will be reported only as part of group descriptions and comparisons. Also, for reasons of statistical validity, it would be better if you did not discuss items on the questionnaire with others before completing it.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration of these issues. By gathering information like this, we hope the School Psychology Program at Western Michigan University will be better able to serve the needs of the state. If you would like a summary of the results of the questionnaire, please fill out and return the enclosed card with the completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Susi Russell
WMU School Psychology Program

Enc.
CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR
SUPERVISORS OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

(A) *What % of the week do you think your school psychologists spend on this activity, on the average? *What % of the week would you prefer them to spend on this activity, on the average?

1) Pupil Assessment (incl. report) __________ _______
2) Pupil Counseling __________ _______
3) Parent Counseling __________ _______
4) Teacher Consulting __________ _______
5) Inservice for Teachers and Others __________ _______
6) Continuing Education for Self __________ _______
7) Contact with Agencies __________ _______
8) Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning __________ _______
9) Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports) __________ _______
10) EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appro.) __________ _______
11) Supervision of Interns __________ _______
12) Supervision of Professionals (not including teachers consulting) __________ _______
13) Other duties _____________________ _______

**Total in each column above should be approximately 100%.

(B) What do you feel are the major obstacles to changing the roles of the school psychologists you supervise from their present one (above) to the one you would prefer (above)?

1. _____________________________________________________________________________
2. _____________________________________________________________________________
3. _____________________________________________________________________________

(C) For the average referral, about how much time do you think your school psychologists spend---

1) Assessing (testing, observations, getting info, etc.) __________
2) Writing the report __________
3) Subsequent conferences on the student __________
4) Logistics (travel, scheduling conferences, etc.) __________

Total average per-student assessment time: __________
(D) How close do you think your estimates of how your school psychologists spend their time (Items A and C above) are to the ACTUAL way they spend their time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost perfect estimates</td>
<td>Somewhat inconsistent with the actual time spent</td>
<td>Could be very discrepant from the actual time spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E) If Michigan law was changed so that school psychological services were not required for certifying children for Special Education services, do you feel that---

1) Fewer
2) The same number of
3) More

school psychologists would be employed in Michigan. (Circle one)

(F) If Michigan law was changed as stated above, would you hire---

1) Fewer
2) The same number of
3) More

school psychologists in your area (if the decision was yours alone). (Circle one)

(G) Circle the number preceding the 3 following areas you feel are MOST in need of increased and improved emphasis in graduate school psychology training. (You may add an area we have omitted under "Other" and circle your addition if desired.)

1. Use and interpretation of standardized tests.
2. Use of criterion-referenced and informal tests.
4. Classroom and individual behavior management materials.
5. Regular and special education curriculum materials.
6. Regular and special education teaching techniques.
7. Teacher consultation techniques.
8. Parent consultation techniques.
9. Child consultation and/or therapy techniques.
10. School staff and parent inservice programs (design and delivery).
11. Various models for delivery of special school services (case management, mainstreaming, teaming, etc.).
12. Legal and ethical issues and procedures in school psychology and education.
14. Interpersonal skills (school politics, warmth, empathy, etc.)
15. Development of professional role (joining professional organizations, reading journals, attending professional meetings, etc.).
16. Research methods (experimental design and data analysis).
17. Other (please specify). _____________________________.

Now please go back and draw a line through the numbers before the three (3) items you feel as LEAST in need of increased and improved emphasis in graduate school psychology training.
(H) Professional Views—Please circle one number for each question.

1) The time which graduate students of school psychology now spend learning research methods would be more profitably spent in obtaining more first-hand experience in schools.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

2) In the etiology of students' school problems, recent events are almost always much more important than early childhood experiences.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

3) Learning theory is the most useful framework in which to view the etiology of students' problems.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

4) Intensive individual psychotherapy is the best method of treatment for most forms of psychological disorder.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

5) Maladaptive behavior cannot be treated directly because it results from underlying causes.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

6) Current experimental methods cannot be applied successfully to school problems, and new scientific approaches must be developed.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

7) In the etiology of students' problems, intrapsychic factors tend to be less important than biological or social environmental factors.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree

8) Remove the symptoms, and one has essentially eliminated the neurosis.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly disagree Strongly agree
9) One good test of statistical significance is more convincing than a lot of clinical intuitions.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

10) Ordinarily, students with emotional problems cannot be expected to show real improvement without slow and careful psychological exploration of their underlying conflicts.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

11) When a student's problem symptom is improved, he may develop other symptoms to deal with his underlying problem.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

12) Clinically relevant concepts cannot be studied effectively under the artificial conditions of the laboratory.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

13) The best way to improve the programs in most schools would be to focus on various forms of behavior modification.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

14) The flexibility of clinical thinking creates excellent hypotheses, but these hypotheses can only be established as true by controlled studies.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

15) For a large percentage of emotionally disturbed students, behavior modification would be ineffective and inappropriate.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree

16) The best criterion to use in clinical research is the judgement of an experienced and sensitive clinician.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly     Strongly
   disagree     agree
17) All really sound knowledge comes from the findings of experimental research studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) A competency based training program instead of a required course sequence is best suited for preparing school psychologists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I) Professional Information

1) What is your highest University degree? (Circle highest degree).
   B.A. B.S. M.A. Ed.S. Ph.D. Ed.D. Other ______ Year awarded ______

2) In what field was your highest University degree? (School Psychology, Special Education, Teacher Education, etc.) Degree field ________________.

3) From what University was your highest University degree? ________________
   (City and state) ________________

4) Do you have full or temporary approval as a Michigan School Psychologist?
   Temporary Full Other certification(s) ________________

5) How many School Psychology Interns have you personally supervised within the last 3 years (since September, 1973)? ________________

6) Were any of the interns counted above students in the Western Michigan University School Psychology Program? Yes No (Circle one)
   If Yes, how many of those counted above? ________________

7) Please indicate whether the area in which you work is primarily urban or rural.
   Primarily Urban Mixed Primarily Rural Other (specify) ________________
   (Circle one)

8) How many school psychologists do you presently supervise? ________________
   Of these, how many are past graduates of the School Psychology Program at Western Michigan University? ________________

9) What is your age? ________ Male Female (Circle one)

10) List the professional organizations you currently belong to, including the Michigan Association of School Psychologists, if applicable:

     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________
     ________________________________________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
For those organizations you just listed on the previous page, please rank order them by placing a number in the right-hand column. (1 = the organization you feel has been most important to your professional career).

11) Do you have a teaching certificate? Yes No

12) How many years have you taught school? _______________

13) How many years have you been employed as a school psychologist? _______

14) From the list below, please rank order (A,B,C,D) the four items you feel to be the most important factors contributing to a successful career as a school psychologist. (Review all the items before ranking). Next, circle four items you consider least important as factors contributing to a successful career as a school psychologist.

   1. The University at which the school psychologist was trained.
   2. Amount of practicum and internship experience in the school psychology training program. (Number of hours)
   3. Quality of University and field supervision of internship experiences.
   4. Number of graduate credit hours completed in Psychology.
   5. Number of graduate credit hours completed in Education.
   6. Number of graduate credit hours completed in other areas. (Please specify area)
   7. Amount of previous professional experience in school psychology or related area. (Which related area)
   8. Amount of previous classroom teaching experience.
   10. Validation of a set of specified skills as evidence of competency in school psychology.
   11. Membership and active participation in professional organizations.
   12. Research and publications.
   13. Other (please specify).
   14. Other (please specify).

From the list above, please rank order in the right-hand margin (1,2,3,4) the four important factors you would consider if you were to make the decision to hire a school psychologist to work with you in your organization. Next, on the right hand margin circle the four areas you would consider of least importance in making your decision to hire a school psychologist.

15. Do you plan to obtain a doctoral degree in school psychology or a related area in the future?

   Yes_________ No_________ Don't know_________
   Already have or am in a doctoral program__________
Thanks so much for your help in this project. We hope to have the opportunity to present a summary of the results and conclusions at a future state meeting of Michigan School Psychologists.

Again, thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Susi Russell

WMU School Psychology Program

Enc.
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER AND ABBREVIATED QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS
Dear School Psychologists:

We need your help. A little over a month ago, a comprehensive questionnaire titled "Confidential Questionnaire for Michigan School Psychologists" was mailed to you.

In order to check the validity of the data that we have already received from the previous questionnaire, we must get 100% return on the revised brief questionnaire enclosed with this letter.

Please take 3-5 minutes to complete the enclosed brief version of the previous questionnaire. We need your response, even if you completed and returned the previous questionnaire (bless you).

Thank you so much for your aid! If you would like a summary of the results of the questionnaire and have not already indicated this to us, then fill our and return the enclosed card with the re.

Sincerely,

Susi Russell

Susi Russell
WMU School Psychology Program

Enc.
ABBREVIATED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

*What % of your week do you spend in this activity on the average?  *What % of your week would you prefer to spend in this activity?

1) Pupil Assessment (incl. repott) ___________________  __________________
2) Pupil Counseling _________________________________  __________________
3) Parent Counseling ________________________________  __________________
4) Teacher Counseling ______________________________  __________________
5) Inservice for Teachers and Others ___________________  __________________
6) Continuing Education for Self ______________________  __________________
7) Contact with Agencies ____________________________  __________________
8) Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning _____________________  __________________
9) Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports) _______________  _______________
10) EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appro.) _______________  _______________
11) Supervision of Interns ____________________________  __________________
12) Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting) _______________  _______________
13) Other duties _________________________________  __________________

**Total in each column above should be approximately 100%.

Are you presently employed?  Yes  No  (Circle one)
If Yes, are you presently employed as a School Psychologist?  Yes  No, employed as a __________________

How many years have you been employed as a School Psychologist?  ____________

Did you complete and return the previous questionnaire mailed to you approximately a month ago?

Yes  No  (Circle one)
APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER AND ABBREVIATED QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR SUPERVISORS OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS
AND DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
Dear Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education:

We need your help. A little over a month ago, a comprehensive questionnaire titled "Confidential Questionnaire for Supervisors of Michigan School Psychologists and Directors of Special Education" was mailed to you.

In order to check the validity of the data that we have already received from the previous questionnaire, we must get 100% return on the revised brief questionnaire enclosed with this letter.

Please take 3-5 minutes to complete the enclosed brief version of the previous questionnaire. We need your response, even if you completed and returned the previous questionnaire (bless you).

Thank you so much for your aid! If you would like a summary of the results of the questionnaire and have not already indicated this to us, then fill out and return the enclosed card with the completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Susi Russell
WMU School Psychology Program

Enc.
ABBREVIATED QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR
SUPERVISORS OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

*What % of the week do you think your school psychologists spend on this activity, on the average?*  
*What % of the week would you prefer them to spend on this activity, on the average?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Prefer</th>
<th>Think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Pupil Assessment (incl. report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Pupil Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Parent Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Teacher Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Inservice for Teachers and Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Continuing Education for Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Contact with Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Pupil Psych-Curricular Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Records and Reports (other than pupil assessment reports)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) EPPC Meetings (scheduling and attending, travel time if appro.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Supervision of Interns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Supervision of Professionals (not including teacher consulting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Other duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total in each column above should be approximately 100%.

How many school psychologists do you presently supervise? __________________________

Did you complete and return the previous questionnaire mailed to you approximately a month ago?

Yes No (Circle one)