Spring April 28th, 2017

Dynamic School Psychology: Perceptions Between School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators on School Psychology and Paradigm Shift Theory

Homero Flores
Seattle Pacific University

Dynamic School Psychology: Perceptions Between School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators on School Psychology Services and Paradigm Shift Theory

By

Homero Flores

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the

Graduate School of Education at

Seattle Pacific University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Doctor of Education Degree

Seattle Pacific University

August, 2017

Dynamic School Psychology: Perceptions Between School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators on School Psychology Services and Paradigm Shift Theory

by

Homero Flores

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirement of the degree of

Doctor of Education

Seattle Pacific University

2017

Approved by_____

(Dr. Cher Edwards., Chairperson of the Dissertation Committee)

_____

(Dr. Nyaradzo Mvududu., Committee Member)

_____

(Dr. Jorge Preciado., Committee Member)

Program Authorized to Offer Degree_____

Date _____

_____

(Dr. Rick Eigenbrood, Dean, School of Education)

Copyright Page

Signature _____

Date _____

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Seattle Pacific University

Abstract

Dynamic School Psychology: Perceptions Between School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators on School Psychology Services and Paradigm Shift Theory

By Homero Flores

Chairperson of the Dissertation Committee: Dr. Cher Edwards

School of Education

The purpose of this research paper is to gain current perceptions of school psychology services and paradigm shift theory in school psychology by school psychologists, teachers and administrators within public school systems. The paper will focus on the history of school psychology, federal legislation, and IDEA. Surveys were collected from school psychologists, teachers and administrators regarding perceptions of school psychology and paradigm shift theory in school psychology services. Although the results were non-significant, results of the surveys indicate similar results to previous perceptual surveys. While teachers and administrators would like more services in general from school psychologists, school psychologists remained split on actual versus preferred roles or duties.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Public schools of today are under increasing pressure and obligation to comply with federal legislative acts designed to serve students (Hosp & Reschly, 2002). Services by way of legislation include the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act* [(IDEIA), P.L. 108-446], *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* [(NCLB); P.L. 107- 110], and most recently, the U.S. Department of Education's competitive grant, Race to the Top (RTT). Increased violence including school shootings, campus assaults, and racial intolerance are realities faced by school children (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, & Hall, 2002). Due to legislative changes regarding school safety and academic accountability, expectations of schools and districts differ significantly than those of years past (Fagan, 1992). For example, according to Braden, Dimarino-Linnen, and Good (2001), in 1890, less than 7% of children between the ages of 14 and 17 years of age attended school regularly. The introduction of compulsory schooling laws would forever change the face of public schools both in student population and diversity (Braden et al., 2001; Fagan, 1992). Yet, the role of the school psychologist has remained fairly consistent, rooted in the psychometric world of standardized testing, individual psycho-educational evaluations, and consultation (Hosp & Reschly, 2002). This is not necessarily the preferred role of school psychologists' (Gilman & Medway, 2007) as surveys have indicated a strong desire by said professionals to expand on the existing delivery model by decreasing time spent on assessment and increasing time spent providing general education preventative interventions (Watkins, Crosby, & Pearson, 2001). Over the last several years, school psychology literature has suggested a paradigm

shift in school psychological services to support all children in academics and behaviors through school-wide evidence-based preventative interventions (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Sullivan, Long, & Kucera, 2011; Walker, 2004). Presently, there is little information on school psychologists', teachers, and administrators' perception of current school psychological services to determine if there has in fact been a marked change in school psychology's conceptual service delivery model. The aim of this study is to gain an understanding of perceptions related to the role of school psychologists and how those views relate to current school psychological services and the theoretical *paradigm shift* (role expansion) as proposed by leading scholars (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Braden et al., 2001; Bramlett et al., 2002; Meyers, Roach, & Meyers, 2009; Nelson et al., 2006; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Ysseldyke et al., 2006), specifically in consultation, intervention, and prevention services.

A multi-rater survey will help clarify current perceptions of school psychological services and how they correlate to views on *paradigm shift* theory. Furthermore, changes that have occurred, areas that are in need of additional attention, and how the future of school psychology and public schools may benefit from the proposed *paradigm shift* will be examined.

Significance of Study

The significance of this study is to determine the current perceptions between school psychologists, administrators, and teachers on school psychological services and their respective views on *paradigm shift* theory as described in school psychology literature over the last several decades (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Braden et al., 2001; Bramlett et al., 2002; Etscheidt & Knestin, 2007; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Nelson et al.,

2006; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Walker, 2004; Watkins et al., 2001). Past surveys have focused primarily on perceptions of the role of school psychologists in public schools by colleagues in the field, teachers, and administrators (Abel & Burke, 1985; Senft & Snider, 1980; Thielking & Jimerson, 2006) and actual versus preferred roles for school psychologists (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Gilman & Gabriel, 2004; Stollar, Poth, Curtis, & Cohen, 2006; Watkins et al., 2001). A dearth of literature exists relating to perceptions of school psychological services and how they correlate to views on a *paradigm shift* in school psychology's service delivery model. No perceptual surveys exist examining school psychologists, teachers, and administrators to support a marked change in school psychology's conceptual model. Data collected from this research will bring to light views on current school psychological services and any significant changes to the school psychology's service delivery and either support or rebuff a *paradigm shift* in school psychology as proposed by leading scholars.

Background

Founded on early psychological theory and intelligence testing, school psychology has retained many of the same practices established by early practitioners in the field (Braden et al., 2001; Craighead, 1982; Fagan, 1992; French, 1984; Thomas, 2009). As early as 1896, Lightner Witmer's psychological clinic in Pennsylvania began serving school children with physical and cognitive difficulties (French, 1984). In line with individualized education plans (IEP's) of today, Witmer's focus on the individual child's functionality within society has remained a steadfast goal of modern day special education (Thomas, 2009). In contrast, G. Stanley Hall, founder of the American Psychological Association (APA) and a contemporary of Witmer's, also left a lasting

impact on the field of school psychology. Influenced by the popular progressive movement of the time, Hall's attention was focused primarily on child study, normative education, and common patterns affecting schools (Fagan, 1992). Through G. Stanley Hall's nomothetic and qualitative educational theories on child development and Lightner Witmer's idiograhic and quantitative focus on individual children, some researchers propose that today's school psychology service delivery model is perhaps a combination of the two theorists service delivery (Braden et al., 2001; Fagan, 1992).

While there is a significant amount of literature advocating for alternative roles in school psychology (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Gilman & Gabriel, 2004; Nelson et al., 2006), others believe that the introduction of psychometric tools, especially the Stanford-Binet, forever changed the perception of school psychology (Braden et al., 2001) in public schools. Historically, surveys have indicated that psychologists wish to expand on service delivery, while the majority of teachers and administrators continue to view the primary role of the school psychologists as psychometrician's for special education evaluations (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Bramlett et al., 2002; Senft & Snider, 1980). Consequently and perhaps due to the infrequency of interaction, according to Gilman and Medway (2007), general education teachers tend to have a less favorable view of school psychologist when compared to school counselors, even though there are many areas of overlap in the two professions (e.g., consultation, group, individual and crisis counseling). This does not bode well for school psychologists wishing to expand on their professional service delivery model.

In modern day, aside from specific views on school psychology by noted theorist of the past, federal initiatives such as IDEA, NCLB, and RTT have significantly impacted

the practice of school psychology (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Stollar et al., 2006). School psychologists of today are expected to provide effective assessments and proper educational programs for children with learning difficulties while abiding by guidelines of federal mandates (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Stecker, 2010; Stollar et al., 2006; Sugai & Horner, 2006; Sullivan et al., 2011), a scenario perhaps never imagined by the founders of school psychology. Since the reauthorization of IDEA 1997, schools have experienced an increased demand for functional behavioral analysis and positive behavioral supports to better support children with behavioral difficulties across school environments (Sugai et al., 2000). Consequently, within the same timeline, public schools have also witnessed a dramatic increase in school violence (DuRant, Cadenhead, Pendergrast, Slavens, & Linder, 1994; Ehrhardt-Padgett, Hatzichristou, Kitson, & Meyers, 2004; Lane, 2007; Walker, 2004). In order to decrease the escalation of school violence and promote safe and positive social learning environments, interventions by way of Positive Behavioral Supports (PBIS) are expected be grounded in evidence-based practices (Chitiyo, May, & Chitiyo, 2012; Sugai & Horner, 2006; Sugai et al., 2000). Expectations of school psychologists continuously expand upon reauthorizations of legislation or the introduction of new federal mandates. Increased expectations and responsibilities have perhaps influenced leading scholars to advocate for a change in paradigm (Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995), or what others have referred to as educational reform (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004; Sansosti, Noltemeyer, & Goss, 2010; Stollar et al., 2006). As federal legislation increases its demands for evidence-based practices to improve general and special education student behavior and safer learning environments, school psychologists must contemplate the current paradigm

and decide if it is sufficient or in need of reform to meet future demands of school psychological services.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to obtain perceptual views of school psychologists, teachers, and administrators on current school psychological services and paradigm shift theory. The following research questions helped guide the research.

Question one: What are the perceptions of school psychological services by school psychologists, teachers, and administrators?

Question two: What are the perceptions of paradigm shift theory by school psychologists, teachers, and administrators?

Question three: Do perceptual differences exist between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators related to school psychological services?

H_o: There are no perceptual differences between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators related to school psychological services.

H_a: There are perceptual differences between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators related to school psychological services.

Question four: Do perceptual differences exist between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators related to a paradigm shift in school psychology service delivery model?

H_o: There are no perceptual differences between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators and a paradigm shift in school psychology's service delivery model.

H_a: There are perceptual differences between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators and a paradigm shift in school psychology's service delivery model.

Key descriptors of the study. This will be a causal-comparative study to help determine if there is a difference between school psychological services and views on a paradigm shift theory. The study will determine positive or negative correlations between perceptions of said educators on psychological services and the proposed *paradigm shift* as described by leading scholars.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

To best understand and grasp the role of school psychologists in public schools, it is necessary to review and analyze the professions early history. This literature review will describe the evolution of school psychology from its inception in psychological learning clinics at the end of the 19th century, to the profession's transition into the 1950's and its imminent relationship with federal legislations, specifically IDEA. Perceptual surveys by educational professionals regarding the role of school psychologists will be addressed along with views regarding a *paradigm shift* in school psychological services. Through this research, I will expand on current school psychology literature and address the ever-increasing demands on the profession by IDEA, a mandate specifically designed to improve the educational experience for children in public schools. Moreover, contemporary views by school psychologist, teachers and administrators of school psychological services and views on paradigm shift theory will be explored.

Early History

The origins of school psychology can be traced back to Lightner Witmer's Psychological clinic in the state of Pennsylvania (United States of America), first opening its doors in 1896 to a host a variety of children with diverse physical and cognitive difficulties (Craighead, 1982). Inspired by his mentor and early intelligence test designer James McKeen Cattell and German psychologist Wilhelm Wundt, Witmer pioneered several salient areas of school psychology, including teaching to children's deficits, improving children's functioning within society and creating the term *clinical psychology*

(French, 1984). Although significantly influenced by the mental testing movement of the time, including early psychometrician Sir Francis Galton, Witmer was critical of intelligence testing and more concerned with optimizing learning potential in all children, regardless of disability (Thomas, 2009). Witmer's influence on school psychology is directly observable in special education services today, particularly in areas of eligibility for specially designed instruction (i.e., Reading, Math, Writing, Social Emotional Skills, Adaptive / Self Help Skills, Communication (Speech) and Physical Development (IDEA, 2004). Additionally, the idiographic clinical psychologist steadfastly believed that education required a specialized psychology (Fagan, 1992) and went so far as to advocate applying psychology directly to people, mainly children in developmental stages exhibiting learning difficulties (Thomas, 2009).

In contrast, G. Stanley Hall, a contemporary of Witmer's and founder of the American Psychological Association (APA), proved to be another prominent leader of early school psychology in public schools with very distinct methodologies (Braden et al., 2001; Fagan, 1992; French, 1984; Thomas, 2009). A nomothetic researcher (Phillips, 2009), Hall's interest lay in generating information from populations in high volume, typical child development, and general problems affecting public schools; a marked distinction from Lightner Witmer's focus on idiographic characteristics in children (Bramlett et al., 2002; Fagan, 1992; Thomas, 2009). Hall's influence on school psychology's service delivery is apparent through the use of surveys and observations of individuals and groups, along with direct services specific to teachers, administrators and parents (Fagan, 1992). Championing the child study movement relevant to his era, Hall's commitment to the developmental stages of children is still evident in today's school

psychology service delivery, specifically through *Child Find* (Smith, 2005) and *Part C of IDEA's Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities* act (IDEA, 2004). The influence of these two early pioneers is also observable in the dual role school psychologist continue to practice to date; Witmer's applied clinical psychology approach and Hall's innovative experimental child study methodology (Fagan, 1992). At the turn of the 19th and early into the 20th century, with school psychology's theoretical foundations more or less established, public school experienced a significant increase in student populace. Created in response to child labor laws, compulsory education produced a steady wave of diverse, socioeconomically disadvantaged, immigrant children that poured into the public schools, few with formal education and many in poor health; America's views on child welfare had changed significantly (Braden et al., 2001; Fagan, 1992). Coincidentally at this time, the first special education classes began taking root in suburban cities and some rural parts of the country, with school psychologist providing (much as today) assessment through psychometric testing, observations, surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and diagnostic teaching (Fagan, 1992). By the 1930's, school psychology practitioners such as Samuel Orton and Marion Monroe expanded and improved instruction for learning disabled children by focusing primarily on *clinical teaching* and idiographic methodologies (Fuchs et al., 2010), orientations that are practiced today in special education classes in guise of specially designed instruction.

School Psychology from 1950's to the 1970's

In contrast to improvement of idiographic methodologies and clinical instruction of the 1930's, school psychology in the 1950's witnessed an increased focus on moral behavior and the overall psychological well-being of children in public schools (French,

1984). During this era, much of the therapy provided to children often relied on dated Freudian psychoanalysis techniques, a methodology found to be ineffective (and eventually phased out of public schools) by clinical psychologist Eugene E. Levitt (Craighead, 1982). According to Braden et al. (2001), the traditional image of school psychologist as cognitive psychometrician began to change with increased demands for student socialization and morality, a transformation that would affect school psychological services for the next 25 years. The effort to improve and promote behavioral services for children in public had begun in earnest (Braden et al., 2001).

As a scientific researcher in the late 1950's, educational psychologist Lee Cronbach spearheaded an ambitious 18-year study based on the two scientific psychology disciplines that continue to guide today's profession: correlational and experimental research (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995). Cronbach's *Aptitude by Treatment Interactions* (ATI) compared the interaction between individual differences in aptitude and the range of treatments available and would assign the treatment demonstrating the overall best results (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995). Unfortunately for Cronbach, ATI's scientifically rigid approach to school psychology proved to be unsuccessful, with results indicating weak interactions at best. Not to be deterred, Cronbach introduced two new goals for applied psychology: using problem solving techniques and explainable concepts through current literature to teach special education children (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995). However, during the 1970's, school psychological services in public school would have to reevaluate its service delivery and brace for legislative mandates designed to serve children with disabilities and in the process, encounter strict federal requirements and threats of litigation as never before (Zaheer & Zirkel, 2014).

Federal Legislation

In 1975, Public Law 94-142 *Education for All Handicapped Children Act* was passed by congress to address the estimated one million children in the United States being excluded from public schools and another three million being served inappropriately (Smith, 2005). P.L. 94-142 presented four main objectives: 1) provide free and appropriate public education, (FAPE) for all children with disabilities, 2) to provide protection of parental and children's rights, 3) ensure state and local support for special education services, and 4) monitor and assure proper assessment and program implementation (Smith, 2005). Due to public schools past ethical issues of underserving children with disabilities, P.L. 94-142 made it a point to ensure schools provide the following requirements: A) locate and serve young children with potential developmental delays through *Child Find*, B) every child with a disability requires an Individualized Education Program, (IEP) C) children with disabilities, to the maximum extent possible, should be educated in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) with typically developing peers, D) nondiscriminatory assessment practices to address overrepresentation of minority students in special education, E) Related Services (i.e., occupation therapy, transition and transportation) determined necessary for child's educational benefit in special education, F) parental and children's rights to Due Process to resolve IEP disagreements and complaints related to special education services in schools, G) a commitment by congress to fund at least 40% of over costs related to special education services (a goal yet to be met), and H) the provision of FAPE for every child identified with a learning disability, including assessment and program development with no incurring costs to parents (Smith, 2005). In comparison to P.L. 94-142, 1983's

reauthorization of P.L. 98-199 (including P.L. 101-457 and P.L. 101-476) experienced relatively minor changes such as; provision of incentives for states serving preschool children with disabilities; supporting student transition from school to post-school; serving children with developmental disabilities from ages 3-5; providing parents attorney fees when child's case prevailed; adding autism and traumatic brain injury to eligibility category of disabilities; changing the name of *Education for All Handicapped Children Act* to *Individual with Disabilities Education Act*, and requiring schools to begin transition services for children before turning 17 (Smith, 2005).

The reauthorization of IDEA 1997 experienced two minor changes including lowering requirement for transition plans to age 14 and for schools to provide behavioral intervention plans for children with social emotional difficulties (Smith, 2005).

Aside from updating the federal mandates title to the *Individual with Disabilities Education Improvement Act* (still referred to as IDEA), the mandate included a stipulation from (then) recently established (now defunct) federal mandate NCLB 2001[1], requiring all teachers, including special education teachers to be *highly qualified* (Smith, 2005; (Stollar et al., 2006).

In an attempt to reduce the amount of paperwork for special educators, the authors of IDEA 2004 no longer required teachers to address short-term objectives and also, rather than beginning transition planning at age 14, a statement of transition goals that will take affect when the student reaches 16 (Smith, 2004). The reauthorization of IDEA

[1]Initially known as the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*, NCLB mandated that schools provide evidence-based instruction for all students while monitoring progress through statewide achievement tests (Stollar et al., 2006). Other dimensions of NCLB will be discussed throughout this document.

2004 also afforded schools the same right to recoup attorney fees from parents and attorneys when schools prevailed in court cases and in effort to deter expensive frivolous and unwarranted lawsuits (Smith, 2004). Other IDEA 2004 requirements include: Manifestation determination suspension hearings for special education students suspended for more than 10 days, to determine if the disability is related to the behavioral incident in question; and lastly, the often used discrepancy model for determining learning disabilities expanded to include the students' response to intervention (RTI) (Smith, 2004). An evident pattern in federal legislation beginning with P.L. 94-142 is the commitment to improve educational accessibility, promote positive behaviors and create safe learning environments for all disabled and nondisabled children. Linked to these initiatives are several frameworks and programs such as response to intervention, evidence-based interventions (EVI's), and positive behavior intervention and supports (PBIS), designed to meet the requirements and promote the agenda of IDEA 2004.

Response to Intervention

As a result of escalating school violence and conflict in public schools, school psychology literature started addressing the need for an alternative intervention program shortly before the release of IDEA 1997, detailing a three-tiered intervention strategy (each level with increasing intervention intensity) to remedy the increasing problem of aggressive and violent behaviors in schools (Walker et al., 1996). Founded on the public health model from the 1950s to treat and prevent such illnesses as polio (Sugai, 2007; Walker, 2004; Walker et al., 1996), the 2001 federal mandate NCLB would adopt the model in response to low reading scores from across the country (especially within minority groups) and also as an alternative pre-referral method to assess response to

interventions for children with learning difficulties (Fletcher, Coulter, Reschly, & Vaughn, 2004). Although not required by federal mandates (Keller-Marguilis, 2012), NCLB advocates and IDEA proponents differ significantly on the purposes and ideals of RTI, especially on views directly related to special education identification and placement (Fuchs et al., 2010), while others question the effectiveness of RTI due to the lack of fidelity studies (Keller-Marguilis, 2012; Reynolds & Shaywitz, 2009). RTI has been viewed as an alternative service delivery model by leading scholars in the field of school psychology, as an opportunity to expand on the current role of the practitioner in public schools (Fletcher et al., 2004; Sullivan & Long, 2010). Moreover, RTI has been regarded by both NCLB and IDEA advocates as an opportunity to promote evidence based intervention and practices for achievement and behaviors (Danielson, Doolittle, & Bradley, 2007; Keller-Marguilis, 2012; Kovaleski, 2007; Sansosti, Goss, & Noltemeyer, 2011).

Evidence-Based Interventions (EBIs) and Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS). The evidence-based and multi-tiered interventions movement can be traced back to the surge in school shootings, violence and an increase in antisocial behaviors when then surgeon general C. Everett Koop and associates proclaimed social relations between groups and individual as the leading public health problem in the country (Walker et al., 1996). In response to the escalation of violence in schools, two 1994 federal mandates *Improving Americas Schools Act* and the *Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act*, declared the need to create preventative and intervention programs to address behavioral and drug problems in public schools. Although originally developed as an alternative to aversive techniques for children with major behavioral problems and

founded on the science of human behavior, the language in the reauthorization of IDEA 1997 included the requirement of positive behavioral supports (PBIS) for all children and functional behavioral assessment (FBAs) for special education students in public schools (Sugai et al., 2000). Due to the continuing escalation of school violence, in 2001 the Surgeon General would once again reiterate the need for behavioral supports in public schools, and include the stipulation that interventions and preventative programs be based on evidence-based practices to decrease unwanted school behaviors and promote positive school social climates to improve student relations (Lane, 2007). Evidence-based interventions or practices can best be described as interventions that have proven to be effective in random trials within groups and fall within a three level based on effect size: findings of .80 and higher suggest a robust effect size, while findings between .50 and .80 are considered moderate and findings between .20 and .50 indicate a weak effect (Walker, 2004). Backed by the reauthorization of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 2001 (NCLB) and most recently IDEA 2004, the call for evidence-based interventions and practices has not been easy, with conflicts arising between the two factions, and both with differing views on the programs purpose (Fuchs et al., 2010; Sullivan & Long, 2010). With the many changes in federal legislation since IDEA 1997 (i.e., RTI, EVI, and PBIS), it is important to consider the perceptions of school psychologist, teachers and administrators on school psychological services and how those views impact the current service delivery model of school psychology.

Surveys. Determining perceptions of a professional service delivery model by its main stakeholders provides a valid perspective of school psychological services in public schools as well as a profile of strengths and weaknesses to draw inferences from for

future research. With the use of open-ended questions and a five-point Likert survey, early research on perceptions of school psychological services by teachers determined that veteran teachers found psychologists' treatments as more useful than teachers with less experience, while less experienced teachers tended to view school psychologists in a more positive light, indicating a decline in perception with experience gained (Gilmore & Chandy, 1973). This may also allude to hypothetical teachers dissatisfaction on rushing to assess students for placement in special education rather than consulting and implementing intervention strategies prior to referring, indicating a need to expand on school psychological service delivery and in the process also clarifying the role of the school psychologist (Gilmore & Chandy, 1973).

A decade later, a survey of school psychological services (superintendents and school psychologists) by researchers described two consistent themes in school psychological services: First, school psychologists spend approximately 50% of their time on assessment and 20% of their time on consultation; and second, school psychologist wish to spend less time on assessment and more time on consultation and other alternative activities (preferred versus actual role) (Benson & Hughes, 1985). Moreover, although there is a desire to expand on school psychology service delivery, it may be that school psychologists are aware of their own influence in schools but not to the proper degree as perceived by superintendents in public schools. In order to encourage role expansion and conciliate the call for preferred versus actual role by school psychologist, researchers recommend two different strategies: involving influential resources such as professional groups and organizations (e.g., NASP, APA, NEA, etc.) and defining the role of school psychologists for administration by way of explicit

frameworks or guidelines written by leading school psychology organizations (Benson & Hughes, 1985). Lastly, perceptions of school psychology trainers, teachers, and parents have indicated strong support for teachers to play a more prominent role in supporting the role expansion of school psychological services with explicit input from school psychologists to teachers and administrators expounding the benefits of preventative and intervention services (Benson & Hughes, 1985). It stands to reason that school psychology would significantly benefit from formal and explicit guidelines as suggested by Benson and Hughes (1985); additionally, other school-based professionals (i.e., school counselors, social workers) would benefit collaterally by taking advantage of the same opportunity as school psychologists and defining their own service delivery and the unique intricacies of each practice.

A 1999 study by Anthun attempted to clarify the descriptive contents that make up proper school psychological services, and shifting school psychology's service delivery from psychometric assessment to a more inclusive preventative intervention model. Individuals working in special education services appraised their collaboration with school psychology services and prioritized tasks offered by school psychologists and found that teachers were less satisfied with school psychology services than administrators (Anthun, 1999). Teachers and administrators appeared to be satisfied over the responsiveness of school psychological services, but dissatisfied with the timeliness of the services (Anthun, 1999). Results also indicated a significant difference in satisfaction levels in services between teachers and administrators, suggesting that teachers prefer more consultation and preventative services in the school than administrators. On the other hand, school psychologist wanted less and more time spent

on the following services: less time spent on student assessment, report writing and activities outside of school for children, and more time spent on preventative collaboration efforts, embedding social emotional intervention in the school, and consultation with teachers (Anthun, 1999). An issue that may be influencing administrators wanting less preventative intervention services by school psychologists may be the perception of overlap in services (e.g., consultation, individual, group and crisis counseling) between other school-based professionals (i.e., school counselors, social workers). Administrators may view the preferred role of school psychologists as redundant and unnecessary and already filled.

Teachers and school psychologists also had divergent views (teachers wanting more and school psychologists wanting less) on following four items: 1) treating students with direct services, 2) assisting family counseling, 3) helping plan educational programs, and 4) monitoring specific student cases in the school (Anthun, 1999). Furthermore, a correlation between teachers and administrators sharing positive views on collaboration with school psychology services predicted less demands on additional services by school psychologists, while personnel working directly in special education services ranked collaboration with school psychological services more positively than non special education personnel (Anthun, 1999). Consequently, special education personnel also asked for less extra services from school psychological services when compared to non special education personnel (Anthun, 1999).

A survey on school psychological services by Watkins et al. (2001) indicated that school personnel and school psychologists continue to hold very different views on actual versus preferred role. Initiated by district school psychologists, a program evaluation was

conducted to received feedback on the importance and need of school psychological services via a Likert staff questionnaire (Watkins et al., 2001). Results indicated a more favorable view of psycho-educational assessment by special education teachers when compared to general education counterparts, while elementary staff viewed the role of school psychologist in assessment, consultation and behavior management as more important than secondary education counterparts (Watkins et al., 2001). Most of the respondents wanted school psychologists at their schools an average of five days or more per week, and at the same time expressed appreciation for the work of school psychologist but dissatisfaction with systemic issues (e.g., litigation, federal legislation) preventing actual versus preferred role (Watkins et al., 2001). Lastly, Watkins et al. reported that consistent themes remained regarding the perception of school psychological services: school psychologists wish to explore alternative roles while teachers and administrators want more of the same resources along with additional services. While results of Watkins et al.'s survey line up with the views of previous studies, it seems that if school psychologists wish to expand current services, a systems change in perception of psychological services by teachers and administrators will have to be implemented by school psychologists in an inflexible environment (Anthun, 1999; Benson & Hughes, 1985; Gilmore & Chandy, 1973).

A multistate perceptual survey by Gilman and Gabriel (2004) of educational professionals on school psychological services and desired roles and functions of school psychologists found consistencies with previous studies, including the following perceptions by teachers: lower satisfaction with school psychological services than administrators and lower ratings on helpfulness for school psychologist when compared

to administrators. Moreover, school psychologists reported lower overall job satisfaction than teachers and administrators, lower scores than previously reported on a national level (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004). Furthermore, while teachers and administrators wanted more assessment and consultation, school psychologist wanted the same amount of both, pointing to a discrepancy between what is expected from school psychologists and what is desired by them; a discrepancy that may be adversely affecting school psychologists' job satisfaction. Lastly, while school psychologists and teachers agreed that school psychological services should be more involved in individual counseling, group counseling, and with general education students, administrators did not share the same views (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004). Subsequently, the role expansion of school psychological services perceived by teachers and school psychologists may be too closely associated with the role of school counselor or other school-based professionals (i.e., social workers), a scenario that may be perceived as problematic and unnecessary by administrators.

Consistent with past findings, Gilman and Gabriel (2004) encouraged school psychologists concerned with actual versus preferred roles to collaborate with their "most valued ally" (Benson & Hughes, 1985, p. 73), the teacher, while also educating administrators on the benefits of expanding school psychological services in accordance with federal legislative expectations without disrupting their positive perceptions of school psychology services.

A recent international survey by Thielking and Jimerson (2006) of school psychological services in Australia examined the perception of school psychologists, teachers, and administrators regarding which roles and functions were viewed as essential

professional responsibilities. As a group, school psychologists, teachers, and administrators viewed counseling students, psychometric testing, providing contemporary research, developing and implementing group interventions and school workshops as important roles for school psychological services, while also agreeing that school psychologists should not discipline children, provide instruction, or rework test results to qualify children for services (Thielking & Jimerson, 2006). This aligned with what researchers found specific to perceptual differences between the three groups relating to ethical concerns in four separate areas: 1) role boundaries- teachers and administrators are reticent toward school psychologists' advice on children with behavioral difficulties, 2) dual relationships- ethical questions regarding teacher, student, and family counseling by school psychologists, 3) confidentiality- psychologists agree that providing counseling information to teachers should require parent consent and be provided on a need to know basis, and 4) informed consent- teachers supported mandatory counseling for some students and counseling for some disciplinary procedures, which in turn may create a negative and punitive perception of counseling services (Thielking & Jimerson, 2006). The need for school psychologists to clarify roles to teachers and administrators appears to be a common theme found not only in American public schools, but in international settings such as Australia, as well (Thielking & Jimerson, 2006).

A follow up on Gilman and Gabriel's 2004 multistate study on perceptions of teachers and administrators of school psychological services used the same collected data to analyze perceptions of school psychologists and counselors by special education and general education teachers (Gilman & Medway, 2007). Findings of the survey indicated that general education teachers reported significantly lower requests for assistance from

school psychologists as well as lower perceptual ratings on 1) knowledge of school psychology, 2) school psychology's helpfulness to teachers (but not students), and 3) overall satisfaction with school psychological services when compared to special education teachers (Gilman & Medway, 2007). According to Gilman and Medway, teachers perceptions of school psychological services may be less than satisfactory compared to special education counterparts due to lack of contact, and the perception as a less than active participant in a supposed collaborative process. On the other hand, positive perceptions of school psychologists by special education teachers may be impacted due to deeper breadth of knowledge and closer proximity with special education issues and school psychology services than their general education counterparts (Gilman & Medway, 2007). However, Gilman and Medway pointed out that although special education teachers generally had favorable views of school psychologists, they continue to view their role in traditional terms (i.e., assessor, behavioral and academic consultant), similar to general education teachers and largely ignoring other important aspects of school psychological services (i.e., curriculum development, individual and group counseling). Moreover, general education and special education teachers saw only two differences between school psychologists and school counselors: both perceived school psychologists as assessor and while general education teachers viewed school counselors as more effective consultants (special education teachers perceived both as equally competent) (Gilman & Medway, 2007). Gilman and Medway argued that while a shortage of school psychologists and high caseloads may be preventing the expansion of the profession, they also suggested that general education and special education teachers' restrictive perceptions of school psychologists are equally impactful. On the other hand,

Gilman and Medway argued that while school psychologists wish to expand on their service delivery model, school counselors are also bidding to further develop their own profession. Considering the overlap in the two professions (e.g., consultation, group and individual counseling, and crisis intervention) (Gilman & Medway, 2007) and their historical ties to famous psychologists and their respective counseling theories (i.e., Freud's psychoanalytic theory and Rogers client-centered model) (Craighead, 1982), teachers, administrators, and other school-based professionals may view the role expansion of school psychology as redundant and unnecessary. The expansion of school psychological services (i.e., paradigm shift, school reform) as mentioned by Gilman and Medway and several leading scholars will be examined and discussed in the next section.

Paradigm Shift Theory. After reviewing current literature, it is clear that school psychologists of today continue to be perceived by teachers and administrators primarily as assessors and for good reason: Beginning with early practitioners and throughout its history, school psychology has consistently relied on psychometric tools to identify and treat learning difficulties in children. Some researchers have argued that school psychology experienced its first *paradigm shift* at the turn of the 19th century due to compulsory schooling laws and a change in public attitudes toward children's social welfare, which in turn created a need for immediate school psychological services in public schools (Braden et al., 2001; Fagan, 1992). However, viewed primarily as psychometricians by teachers and administrators, school psychologists have continually expressed a desire to perform additional alternative duties, or actual versus preferred duties (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Waters, 1973). Possibly spearheaded by Lee Conbach's early frustrations of applying oft-rigid experimental and

correlation sciences (psychological sciences that make up school psychology) to educational interventions for children with learning difficulties in public schools (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995), some scholars have argued that a paradigm shift began in earnest with the Spring Hill (1980) and Olympia (1981) conferences which addressed the future of school psychological services in public schools (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Ysseldyke, Burns, & Rosenfield, 2009; Ysseldyke et al., 1997). From these landmark conferences spawned a series of publications titled *School Psychology: A Blueprint for Training and Practice* (referred to as *Blueprint*), created to influence a in the training and practice of future of school psychologists and graduate programs in universities (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Ysseldyke et al., 1997). The most recent publication *School Psychology: A Blueprint for Training and Practice III* detailed two major competencies, each with four separate domains that permeate the practice of school psychology. The first *foundational competency* included the following domains: 1) interpersonal and collaboration skills, 2) diversity and sensitivity training, 3) technological abilities, and 4) professional, legal, ethical and social issues; while the second set of *functional competencies* included: 5) data driven decisions, 6) systems-based service delivery, 7) improvement of cognitive and academic skills, and 8) improvement of early wellness, social emotional skills, mental well-being and life skills (Ysseldyke et al., 2006). Although Ysseldyke et al. (2006) presented the eight domain competency areas as a new (alternative) *paradigm* to advance school psychology's service delivery model, others have been critical of the latest updates on *Blueprint* literature, especially the authors' endorsement of the unpopular and controversial NCLB policies (Meyers et al., 2009). While Meyers et al. agreed that *Blueprint* has indeed been influential in coursework for

training school psychologists', they countered that an increase in alternative service delivery methods (i.e., consultation, prevention, and intervention) has yet to materialize in actual practice. The authors argued that the eight competency domains identified by Ysseldyke et al. (2006) in the most recent literature lack evidence-based research and should be properly examined before implementing the competencies into graduate study programs. Still, Meyers et al. (2009) agreed that once the Blueprint is properly developed and conceptualized across contextual settings, it may be implemented as an *artifact* to help determine effective practice, guide the development of graduate courses and, enhance research to determine best practices for school psychologists.

A final review of literature from Greeley-Evans Public Schools in Chicago examined a 12-year study on integrated school psychological services to determine the effects of an alternative school psychology program with emphasis on consultation, prevention and intervention (areas previously identified on *Blueprint*) (Nelson et al., 2006). Arranged as a combination of traditional and alternative school psychology, the Greeley-Evans project expanded the role of school psychologist (educational specialist) to include social work, counseling, and administrative duties while implementing (with fidelity) a three-tiered intervention model for behaviors and academics (Nelson et al., 2006). Rather than have school psychologists serve in itinerate roles in several different buildings, the role was changed to directly meet the needs of children in more comprehensive manner by having the school psychologist work in one building. According to Nelson et al., the Greeley-Evans integrated services project for school psychologists met the goals set by its examiners, specifically concerning the over-identification of children with emotional disturbances, and ultimately, an effective cost

measure for public schools. However, not all stakeholders were pleased with the integrated services; some of the surveyed school psychologists felt overwhelmed with time-consuming administrative duties required from the alternative service delivery, and while the Greeley-Evans project proved effective for over-identification of children with emotional difficulties, other areas were not monitored to determine if identification increased in the different eligibility categories (Nelson et al., 2006). Along with improving services for children with emotional difficulties, Nelson et al., (2006) indicated that the district participating in the Greeley-Evans project experienced an increase in reading scores that could not be determined due to the current educational atmosphere focused on high standards and testing. The Greeley-Evans project is an encouraging research catalyst that considered the perception of school psychology's service delivery by vested stakeholders and has offered an integrative alternative practice for advancing the study for *paradigm shift* theory in school psychological services.

Chapter 3

Method

Research Design

The research design consisted of a causal-comparative approach. By incorporating both qualitative and quantitative, I hoped to identify several different viewpoints and similarities on the perception of psychological services between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators. Although difficult to designate in specific terms, scholars have agreed that a mixed method approach is a pragmatic approach for describing multiple points of views of a specific subject (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). Information collected from a survey will be entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and analyzed for differences in perception between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators on school psychological services and views on the theoretical *paradigm shift* and any existing correlational effects.

Participants

For the purpose of this study, participants (school psychologists, teachers, and administrators) were selected from listservs of various school district website throughout southwest Washington. Approximately 1,000 emails were distributed with an additional incentive; a $100 gift card was offered to improve overall participation.

Survey Instrument

The instrument used to measure perceptions of school psychological services is the School Psychology Perceptions Survey (SPPS) developed by Gilman and Gabriel (2004). The survey was developed to identify specific markers unique to school psychology and how the overall service delivery is perceived by vested stakeholders

(Gilman & Gabriel, 2004). An additional domain was added to the survey to address views or perceptions specific to *paradigm shift* theory in school psychological services. Questions making up the additional domain relate exclusively to paradigm shift theory. The survey consists of a series of questions using various types of nominal Likert scales. Question one ranks each raters level of knowledge based on a 4-point scale (1 = *No Knowledge*, 2 = *Somewhat Knowledgeable*, 3 = *Pretty Knowledgeable*, 4 = *Extremely Knowledgeable*). Question two asks how serious a student's problem should be before referring to a school psychologist. Answers are based on a nominal 5-point rating scale (1 = *Quite Severe*, 2 = *Serious*, 3 = *Moderate*, 4 = *Less Serious*, 5 = *Mild*). Question three asks educational professionals to rate the helpfulness of school psychological services to children within the last year. Question four asks about the helpfulness of school psychological services to teachers, administrators and student support personal and for question five, administrators and teachers are asked to evaluate the helpfulness of school psychology services for children and educators alike. Questions three through five all use the same scale format, using a 4-pont nominal Likert rating scale (1 = *No Help*, 2 = *Slightly Helpful*, 3 = *Moderately Helpful*, 4 = *Very Helpful*).

Lastly, the participants rated the level of school psychology services involvement desired across 12 separate functions (*less, same,* or *more*). A copy of the survey is included in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for this study included descriptive statistics. The use of frequencies and percentages will help determine perceptions among the three groups (school psychologists, teachers and administrators) and a crosstab analysis will be

performed to determine how the variables (school psychological services and *paradigm shift* theory) correlate between groups. There will be one independent variable relating to the role of the participant, with three levels (school psychologists, teacher and administrators). The dependent variables include perceptions of psychological services and the *paradigm shift* in school psychology.

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter will focus on the results of four research questions and proposed hypothesis covered at the end of chapter one. The questions and tested hypothesis will be answered in the same order as previously presented.

What are the Perceptions of School Psychological Services by School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators?

To identify current perceptions of school psychological services among the groups, descriptive statistics were used to assess the distribution of responses between participants and 12 different variables. Based on basic understanding of school psychological services by psychologists, teachers, and administrators, a series of 12 items were examined to determine if said professionals desired more or less overall school psychology involvement in students lives.

Results for item one, *assessment for special education*, indicated similar views between the groups, with 72% of the total participants agreeing that involvement in school psychological assessment should remain the *same*. Individually, 80% of school psychologist agreed that school psychology services should keep the same amount of assessment for special education, followed by administrators with 78%, and teachers with 69%. Twenty percent of total participants agreed school psychology services should have more involvement in assessment for special education. Twenty-three percent of teachers agreed for more assessment for special education, followed by 22% of administrators and 10% of school psychologists. Fifty-six percent of total participants agreed the school psychologist should decrease involvement in assessment for special education. Fifty-

seven percent of teachers and 10% of psychologist also responded to decrease involvement.

Table 1

School Psychology Services and Assessment for Special Education

			Role			Total
			Administrator	Teacher	Psychologist	
school psych assessment for special education	No involvement	*n* (%)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.9)
	Decrease involvement	*n* (%)	0 (0.0)	2 (57.0)	1 (10.00)	3 (56.0)
	Same level	*n* (%)	7 (77.8)	24 (68.6)	8 (80.0)	39 (72.2)
	More involvement	*n* (%)	2 (22.2)	8 (22.9)	1 (10.0)	11 (20.4)
Total		*N* (%)	9 (100.0)	35 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	54 (100.0)

Item two asked the participants whether there should be more or less psychology service involvement in working general education. While 52% percent of total participants agreed with *more involvement*, 78% percent of administrators, 47% of teachers, and 40% of school psychologists made up the overall percentages. Thirty-nine percent of participants agreed with the same level of involvement, while 50% of psychologist agreed, along with 40% of teachers and 22% of administrators made up the overall percentages. Six percent of teachers believed there should be a decrease in school

psychology services involvement in working with general education students, while 10% of school psychologists and 6% of teachers responded *do not want involvement*.

Table 2

Working with Students in General Education Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Administrator	Teacher	Psych.	
more or less psych involvement with gen ed students	Do not want involvement	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within Role	0.0%	5.7%	10.0%	5.6%
	Decrease involvement	Count	0	2	0	2
		% within Role	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%	3.7%
	Same level	Count	2	14	5	21
		% within Role	22.2%	40.0%	50.0%	38.9%
	More involvement	Count	7	17	4	28
		% within Role	77.8%	48.6%	40.0%	51.9%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For item three, the participants were asked whether school psychology services should have more or less crisis intervention involvement. Sixty-one percent of the participants agreed that school psychology services should have *more involvement* in crisis intervention. Overall, 67% of administrators, 63% percent of teachers, and 50% of

psychologists accounted for the total percentage. Thirty-nine percent of participants wanted the *same* level of school psychology services involvement in crisis intervention, while 50% of participants consisted of school psychologists, 37% of teachers and 33% of administrators.

Table 3

School Psychology Involvement with Crisis Intervention Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more or less psych involvement with crisis intervention	Same level	Count	3	13	5	21
		% within Role	33.3%	37.1%	50.0%	38.9%
	More involvement	Count	6	22	5	33
		% within Role	66.7%	62.9%	50.0%	61.1%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

On item four, the participants were asked if school psychology services should have more or less involvement with teacher consultation. While 67% of the participants agreed that there should be *more involvement*, 100% of administrators agreed with this response, along with 60% of teachers and school psychologists. Thirty-three percent of participants also responded that the level of involvement of school psychology services in

teacher consultation should remain the same. Forty percent of teachers and psychologist agreed with this response.

Table 4

Consultation with Teachers Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less consult with teachers	Same level	Count	0	14	4	18
		% within Role	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	33.3%
	More involvement	Count	9	21	6	36
		% within Role	100.0%	60.0%	60.0%	66.7%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Item five asked participants whether school psychology should have more or less involvement in consultation services for parents. Fifty seven percent of total participants responded that school psychology services should have the same level of involvement with parent consultation. Seventy percent of school psychologist responded that levels of involvement should remain the same, followed by 60% of teachers and 33% of administrators. Forty-three percent of participants responded that school psychology services should have more involvement in consultation with parents. Sixty-seven percent of administrators agreed with this response, followed by 40% of teachers, and 30% of school psychologists.

Table 5

Consulting with Parents Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less consult with parents	Same level	Count	3	21	7	31
		% within Role	33.3%	60.0%	70.0%	57.4%
	More involvement	Count	6	14	3	23
		% within Role	66.7%	40.0%	30.0%	42.6%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Item six asked participants whether psychology services should have more or less involvement with in-service trainings. Sixty-three percent of the participants agreed that school psychologists should have *more involvement* with in-service training. Seventy-eight percent of administrators, and 60% of teachers and psychologists agreed with this response. Also, 37% of participants agreed that the involvement of school psychology services with in-service training should remain at the *same* level. Forty percent of teachers and psychologists, and 22 percent of administrators agreed with this response.

Table 6.

School Psychology In-Service Training Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less in-service training by psychs	Same level	Count	2	14	4	20
		% within Role	22.2%	40.0%	40.0%	37.0%
	More involvement	Count	7	21	6	34
		% within Role	77.8%	60.0%	60.0%	63.0%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

On item seven, participants were asked if school psychology services should involve more or less time on parent workshops. Fifty-nine percent of the participants agreed there should be more involvement. Of said participants, 78% were administrators, 57% teachers, and 50% school psychologists. Thirty-nine percent of participants also responded that school psychology services should have the *same* level of involvement. This included 43% of teachers, 40% school psychologists, and 22% of administrators. Ten percent of school psychologist responded *do not want involvement* with parent workshops.

Table 7

School Psychology Services and Parent Workshops Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less parent workshops	Do not want involvement	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Role	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	1.9%
	Same level	Count	2	15	4	21
		% within Role	22.2%	42.9%	40.0%	38.9%
	More involvement	Count	7	20	5	32
		% within Role	77.8%	57.1%	50.0%	59.3%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Item eight asked participants if school psychology services should spend more or less time on curriculum development. Sixty-one percent of the participants believed there should be the *same* amount of involvement. This included 70% school psychologists, 67% administrators and 57% of teachers. Twenty percent of the participants wanted more involvement from school psychology services and curriculum development, which includes 33% of administrators, 20% teachers, and 10% school psychologists. Nineteen percent of participants also responded do not want involvement. This includes 23% of teachers and 20% of school psychologists.

Table 8

School Psychology and Curriculum Development Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less psych involvement with curriculum development	Do not want involvement	Count	0	8	2	10
		% within Role	0.0%	22.9%	20.0%	18.5%
	Same level	Count	6	20	7	33
		% within Role	66.7%	57.1%	70.0%	61.1%
	More involvement	Count	3	7	1	11
		% within Role	33.3%	20.0%	10.0%	20.4%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For item nine the participants were asked if school psychology services should have more involvement with administrative activities. Sixty one percent of participants agreed that the level of involvement should remain the *same*. Sixty seven percent of administrators, 66% of teachers and 40% of teachers agreed with this response. Twenty two percent of participants responded do not want involvement of school psychology services with administrative activities. This included 30% school psychologists, 23% teachers and 11% of administrators. Eleven percent of participants also responded that they wanted more involvement of school psychology services with administrative

activities. This included 22% of administrators, 20% of school psychologists, and 6% of teachers. Lastly, 6% of participants responded that school psychology services should *decrease involvement* with administrative activities. This included 10% of school psychologists, and 6% of teachers.

Table 9

School Psychology and Administrative Activities Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less psych involvement with admin activities	Do not want involvement	Count	1	8	3	12
		% within Role	11.1%	22.9%	30.0%	22.2%
	Decrease involvement	Count	0	2	1	3
		% within Role	0.0%	5.7%	10.0%	5.6%
	Same level	Count	6	23	4	33
		% within Role	66.7%	65.7%	40.0%	61.1%
	More involvement	Count	2	2	2	6
		% within Role	22.2%	5.7%	20.0%	11.1%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

On item 10, participants were asked if school psychology services should have more or less involvement with RTI services. Fifty-nine percent of participants agreed that

there should be *more involvement*, which consisted of 80% of school psychologists, 78% of administrators and 49% of teachers. Forty-one percent of participants believed the amount of time spent on RTI services by school psychology services should remain the *same*, including 51% of teachers, 22% of administrators and 20% of school psychologists.

Table 10

School Psychology and Response to Intervention (RTI) Crosstabulation

			Role			**Total**
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less psych involvement with RTI	Same level	Count	2	18	2	22
		% within Role	22.2%	51.4%	20.0%	40.7%
	More involvement	Count	7	17	8	32
		% within Role	77.8%	48.6%	80.0%	59.3%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

On item 11, the participants were asked whether school psychology services should have more or less involvement with pre-referral intervention services. Fifty-six percent of participants responded that the amount of involvement should remain at the *same* level, including 60% of teachers, 56% of administrators and 40% of school psychologists. Forty-one percent of participants responded that school psychology should have *more involvement* in pre-referral intervention. This included 60% of school

psychologists, 44% of administrators and 34% of teachers. Two percent of participants or 3% of teachers, responded to *decrease involvement* while the remaining 2% responded *do not want involvement*. This included 3% of teachers.

Table 11

School Psychology and Pre-Referral Services (RTI) Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less pre-referral intervention	Do not want involvement	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Role	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	1.9%
	Decrease involvement	Count	0	1	0	1
		% within Role	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	1.9%
	Same level	Count	5	21	4	30
		% within Role	55.6%	60.0%	40.0%	55.6%
	More involvement	Count	4	12	6	22
		% within Role	44.4%	34.3%	60.0%	40.7%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Finally, item 12 asked the participants if school psychology services should spend more or less time on preventative interventions. Seventy percent of participants agreed that there should be *more involvement*, including 78% of administrators, 70% of school

psychologists, and 69% of teachers. Thirty percent of participants agreed the level of involvement by school psychology services on preventative interventions should remain the *same*.

Table 12

School Psychology and Preventative Interventions Crosstabulation

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
more/less preventative interventions	Same level	Count	2	11	3	16
		% within Role	22.2%	31.4%	30.0%	29.6%
	More involvement	Count	7	24	7	38
		% within Role	77.8%	68.6%	70.0%	70.4%
Total		Count	9	35	10	54
		% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

According to a reliability analysis, when pooled together, the 11 items provided a measure of school psychologists' perceptions across a range of activities (r = .71). When summed together, the 11 items resulted in a single measure of "involvement". These scores were then compared across the three roles (school psychologists, teachers, and administrators'). Based on ANOVA results, a statistically significant difference (F = 3.18, p = .05, $\eta 2$ = .11) was found between school psychologists (M = 36.80), teachers (M = 36.83), administrators (M = 40), and their desirability for school psychologist

involvement. Upon further analysis of the data, Tukey HSD found the difference to be between teachers and administrators (p = .045).

What are the Perceptions of Paradigm Shift Theory by School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators?

Survey participants were asked if to respond to the statement *there appears to be paradigm shift in school psychology services* with a choice of three responses: *agree*, *disagree*, *don't know*. Fifty-two percent of participants responded *agree*, including 80% of school psychologists, 67% of administrators, and 40% of teachers. Thirty-seven percent of participants responded *don't know*, including 51% of teachers, 11% of administrators and 10% of school psychologists. Lastly, 11% of participants responded *disagree* to a paradigm shift in school psychology services. This included 22% of administrators, 10% of school psychologists, and 9% of teachers.

Table 13

School Psychology Services and Paradigm Shift Theory Crosstabulation

			Role			**Total**
			Admin.	Teacher	Psych.	
Paradigm shift theory in psych services	Agree	Count	6	14	8	28
		% within Role	66.7%	40.0%	80.0%	51.9%
	Disagree	Count	2	3	1	6
		% within Role	22.2%	8.6%	10.0%	11.1%
	Don't know	Count	1	18	1	20
		% within	11.1%	51.4%	10.0%	37.0%

	Role				
Total	Count	9	35	10	54
	% within Role	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Do Perceptual Differences Exist Between School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators Related to School Psychological Services?

According to crosstabs and Pearson Chi-Square on SPSS, the findings to question three agreed with and sustained the null hypotheses: There is insufficient evidence to conclude that there is significant differences between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators related to school psychological services. An individual review of each of the twelve items designed to measure perceptual differences between school psychologists, teachers and administrators indicates nonsignificant results. Therefore, I failed to reject the null hypotheses for each of the twelve individual cases due to insufficient evidence that perceptions of school psychology services differ significantly according to role of educator.

Table 14

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 1: Assessment for Special Education

	Value	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	2.236[a]	6	.897
Likelihood Ratio	3.108	6	.795
Linear-by-Linear Association	.718	1	.397

***N* of Valid Cases**	54

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

Table 15

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 2: Working With General Education Students

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.424[a]	6	.619
Likelihood Ratio	5.465	6	.486
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.328	1	.127
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .33.

Table 16

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 3: Crisis Intervention

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.681[a]	2	.711
Likelihood Ratio	.671	2	.715
Linear-by-Linear Association	.565	1	.452
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.50.

Table 17

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 4: Consultation with Teachers

	Value	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	5.400[a]	2	.067
Likelihood Ratio	8.172	2	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.128	1	.077
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.00.

Table 18

Chi-Square Test Results for Item: Consulting with Parents

	Value	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	2.878[a]	2	.237
Likelihood Ratio	2.885	2	.236
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.482	1	.115
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.83.

Table 19

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 6: School Psychology In-Service Training

	Value	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	1.016[a]	2	.602
Likelihood Ratio	1.083	2	.582
Linear-by-Linear Association	.589	1	.443

***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.33.

Table 20

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 7: Parent Workshops

	Value	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	5.880[a]	4	.208
Likelihood Ratio	4.928	4	.295
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.997	1	.083
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

Table 21

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 8: School Psychology and Curriculum Development	**Value**	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	3.572[a]	4	.467
Likelihood Ratio	5.210	4	.266
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.919	1	.166
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.67.

Table 22

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 9: Administrative Duties

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.160[a]	6	.523
Likelihood Ratio	5.611	6	.468
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.216	1	.270
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .50.

Table 23

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 10: School Psychology and Response to Intervention

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.716[a]	2	.095
Likelihood Ratio	4.963	2	.084
Linear-by-Linear Association	.036	1	.850
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.67.

Table 24

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 11: School Psychology and Pre-Referral Services

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.944[a]	6	.816

Likelihood Ratio	3.540	6	.739
Linear-by-Linear Association	.373	1	.541
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .17.

Table 25

Chi-Square Test Results for Item 12: School Psychology Preventative Interventions

	Value	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	.292[a]	2	.864
Likelihood Ratio	.305	2	.859
Linear-by-Linear Association	.123	1	.726
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.67.

Do Perceptual Differences Exist Between School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators in Relation to a Paradigm Shift in School Psychology Services?

The aim of this question is to gain an understanding of perceptions of school psychologists, teachers, and administrators in relation *paradigm shift theory* (role expansion) as proposed by leading scholars (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Braden et al., 2001; Bramlett et al., 2002; Meyers et al., 2009; Nelson et al., 2006; Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000; Ysseldyke et al., 2006). Of the 54 participants surveyed, 52% agreed with the statement *there appears to be a paradigm*

shift in school psychology services. Thirty-seven percent of the participants were unaware of a paradigm shift in school psychology services, answering *don't know* and 11.1% of the participants responded with *disagree*.

Table 26

Perceptions of Paradigm Shift Theory and School Psychology

			Role			Total
			Admin.	Teacher	Psychologist	
Paradigm shift theory in	Agree	*n* (%)	6(66.7)	14 (40.0)	8 (80.0)	28 (51.9)
psych services	Disagree	*n* (%)	2 (22.2)	3 (8.6)	1 (10.0)	6 (11.1)
	Don't know	*n* (%)	1 (11.1)	18 (51.4)	1 (10.0)	20 (37.0)
Total		*N* (%)	9 (100.0)	35 (100.0)	10 (100.0)	54 (100.0)

Results on the Chi-Square indicated significant findings to the proposed hypothesis (X^2 =9.636[a], df=4, p=.047), suggesting that there is a difference in perception between participants and paradigm shift theory, therefore effectively rejecting the null hypotheses: There are perceptual differences between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators and a paradigm shift in school psychology's service delivery model. According to Table 17, 67% of administrators, 40% of teachers and 80% of psychologists agree that there is indeed a paradigm shift in psychology services. Upon squaring the Phi statistic for effect size, 22% of the variance was explained.

Table 27

Perceptual Differences and Paradigm Shift Theory	**Value**	***df***	**Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)**

Pearson Chi-Square	9.636[a]	4	.047
Likelihood Ratio	10.484	4	.033
Linear-by-Linear Association	.205	1	.651
***N* of Valid Cases**	54		

a. 6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.00.

In order to determine if the statistical analysis is true, it is necessary to test the assumptions of the Pearson Chi-Square. The first assumption of the Pearson Chi-Square test is to assess if individual observations are independent of each other. In this case, the assumption has been met. Secondly, the Pearson Chi-Square assumes that there are no less than five observations in each cell. If the amount of cells with a frequency of less than 5 is greater than 20%, the assumption has been violated (Fields, 2013). In this case, six of the cells (66.7%) have a cell count of less than five, well beyond the limit of 20%. As a result, we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gain insight on current perceptions by school psychologists, teachers, and administrators on school psychological services and *paradigm shift theory* (role expansion of school psychology services). Still, there are several innate variables within the design of the study that created limitations to overall generalizability. The first limit of the study is the overall number of participants surveyed and the ratio between psychologists, teachers, and administrators. As expected, there were many more teacher participants when compared to school psychologists and administrators. Given the discrepant breakdown and smaller pool of participants, school and administrator responses to survey questions have much more impact on the overall study when compared to teachers.

Second, the pools of participants surveyed are from rural and urban schools in southwest Washington State. The role of educational professionals varies significantly from region to region throughout the United States (Hosp & Reschly, 2002), especially when comparing rural schools with their urban counterparts. Third, although significant information may be obtained through quantitative research, the questions of the survey inadvertently limit and relegate the participants' answers to simplistic and contrite Likert type responses. Participants are complex individuals. Therefore, qualitative analysis such as personal interviews may provide beneficial and significant information when considering future research studies. Lastly, although the survey was optional to participants, a raffle for a $100-dollar VISA gift card was offered to encourage participation. The gift card offer may have created an element of participants to complete the survey merely to enter the raffle or other underlying factors. Responses may have

been completed hastily, or with low interest. With said limitations in mind, a decent number of perceptual findings from psychologists, teachers and administrators were obtained to compare and contrast similar and differing points of view.

What are the Perceptions of School Psychological Services by School Psychologists, Teachers, and Administrators?

In order to obtain perceptions of school psychology services by school psychologists, teachers, and administrators, a series of 12 items were administered to participants. The first item asks survey participants whether school psychological services should have more or less involvement in assessment for special education. The perception between the three groups was similar and unremarkable, with all three agreeing that school psychological services should retain the same amount of assessment for special education. However, 22% of teachers and 23% of administrators believed that school psychologists should have more involvement in assessment for special education, while only 10% of psychologist believed there should be more. This majority of teachers and administrators continue to view the primary role of the school psychologists as psychometricians for special education evaluations supports the theory the (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Bramlett et al., 2002; Senft & Snider, 1980). Item two asks whether school psychology services should have *more* or *less involvement* in working with general education students. While 52% of the participants surveyed agreed that school psychology services should have *more involvement* in working with general education students, administrators made up the majority of the category at 78%, teachers at 49%, and school psychologists at 40%. As mentioned in Chapter 2, PBIS has played a more integral role in school psychology especially in the reauthorization of IDEA 1997 which

included the requirement of positive behavioral supports (PBIS) for all children and functional behavioral assessment (FBA's) for special education students in public schools (Sugai et al., 2000). Moreover, for item three of the survey, *should school psychology services have more or less involvement in crisis intervention*, 61% of the participants agreed that more involvement is necessary. While 67% of administrators and 63% of teachers wanted more involvement, 50% of school psychologists wanted more involvement. On the other hand, 50% of school psychologists wanted the same level of involvement, while 33% of administrators and 37% of teachers wanted the same level of involvement. All participants focused answers in the *same* level to *more involvement* category. The response to this question may be related, as earlier mentioned, to 1997s IDEA call for PBIS in public schools for all children. Moreover, due to the continuing escalation of school violence, the need for behavioral supports in public schools have significantly increased in the name of promoting positive school climates to improve student relations (Lane, 2007). This may be associated to 67% of participants wanting for *more involvement* by school psychology services with teacher consultation, possibly suggesting that frequent consultation may help prevent problems behaviors from occurring. For item five, *should school psychological services have more or less involvement in consulting with parents*, 57% of the participants agreed that school psychologist should have the same level of involvement, while 43% of participants want more involvement. Of the 57% participants that wanted the same level of involvement, 70% were school psychologists; on the other hand, 67% of administrators wanted more involvement from school psychological services and parent consultation. The high administrator response rate for *more involvement* for school psychology services and

parent consultation may be related to the administrators' interest in providing PBIS in the home, as well as in the school. On the other hand, expectations of the school psychologist may be strictly limited to providing proper intervention programs for children receiving special education services, in order to meet and satisfy parent expectations. For item six, 63% of participants wanted *more involvement* by school psychology services with in-service trainings. Seventy-eight percent of administrators overwhelmingly agreed with this response, while 60% of teachers and school psychologist wanted more involvement as well. Similarly, for question seven, 78% administrators wanted more involvement by school psychology services with parent workshops while 10% of school psychologists responded do not want involvement. For item eight, 61% of participants agreed that they wanted the same level of involvement in curriculum development by school psychology services, with 70% of psychologist creating the majority of participants. On the other hand, 23% of teachers wanted and 20% of school psychologist responded *do not want involvement*. For question nine, 61% of participants agreed that school psychology services should have the same level of involvement in administrative activities, with 67% of administrators making up for the majority of participant responses. Moreover, 30% of school psychologists responded *do not want involvement* with administrative activities. On the other hand, 22% of administrators and 20% of school psychologists wanted *more involvement* in administrative activities. School psychologists' wide range of perceptions on the topic of more or less involvement with administrative activities remains complicated. For example, while 30% responded do not want involvement, 40% wanted the same level, 20% wanted more involvement and 10% responded to decrease involvement. As mentioned in the literature review, school psychologists continue to hold

very different views on actual versus preferred role (Watkins et al., 2001). On item 10, 59% of participants agreed that school psychology services should have more involvement with RTI in schools. Eighty percent of psychologists and 78% of administrators agreed with this response. Fifty-one percent of teachers felt that school psychology services should have the same amount of involvement with RTI in schools. For item 11, *should school psychology services have more or less involvement with pre-referral intervention*, 41% of participants and 60% of teachers agreed that involvement should remain the *same*. On the other hand, 41% of participants agreed that school psychology should have more involvement in pre-referral interventions, with 60% of school psychologist making up the majority of responders. This may be related to role expansion and actual versus preferred roles relating to school psychologists currently practicing in the field (Watkins et al., 2001). Lastly, for item 12, 70% of participants agreed that school psychology services should have more involvement with preventative interventions, with 78% of administrators, 69% of teachers and 70% of school psychologist making up the overall percentages. Thirty percent of participants wanted the *same* level of school psychology services involvement with preventative interventions. Overall, while perceptions of the school psychology services by school psychologists, teachers, and administrators are similar, they are unremarkable or not significant. Still, by analyzing each question through a historical lens, relationships between participants become more evident. For instance, although school psychologists wish to explore alternative roles, teachers and administrators want more of the same resources along with additional services (Watkins et. al., 2001). This is in line with results of the 12 items on the participant survey: item 2, *school psychology involvement in with general education*

students, item 3, *school psychology involvement in crisis intervention*, item 4, *school psychology services and consultation with teachers*, item 6, *school psychology services and in-service training*, item 7, *school psychology services and parent workshops*, item 12, *school psychology services and preventative interventions*. Additionally, school psychologists remain split on actual versus preferred roles (Benson & Hughes, 1985) as mentioned in Chapter 2's literature review. For example, responses by school psychologists on item 10 of the survey indicate that psychologists have differing view on role expansion pertaining to administrative activities. School psychology participant responses ranged from 40% desiring the *same* involvement, 30% responding *do not want involvement*, 20% wishing for *more involvement* and 10% responding *decrease involvement*.

Paradigm Shift Theory

Upon reviewing historical literature regarding early school psychology, it is apparent that psychologists continue to be viewed mainly as psychometricians by teachers and administrators due to early historical (and current) ties to intelligence testing (Craighead, 1982; French, 1984). However, according to the review of literature in Chapter 2, school psychologists have continually expressed a desire to perform additional alternative duties, or actual versus preferred duties (Benson & Hughes, 1985; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Waters, 1973). Beginning with Spring Hill (1980) and Olympia (1981), conferences that addressed the future of school psychology services in public schools (Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995; Ysseldyke et al., 2009; Ysseldyke et al., 1997), leaders in school psychology have continuously made attempts to adapt to an ever-changing landscape of public education (Ysseldyke et al., 2006). Some scholars argue that there

has been little change to the actual practice of school psychology, especially regarding consultation, prevention and intervention services (Meyers et al., 2009). Question 33 on the teacher and administrator survey and question 30 on the school psychology survey ask the participants if "there appears to be a shift in school psychology services." Fifty-two percent of the overall 54 participants responded that they *agree* that there is a paradigm shift in school psychology services. Thirty-seven percent of the participants responded *don't know*; while the remaining 11% responded *disagree* with a paradigm shift in school psychology services. Of the 52% of the participants whom *agreed* with a paradigm shift in school psychology services, 80% were school psychologists, 67% administrators and 40% teachers. However, 51% of teachers responded that *do not know* regarding a paradigm shift in school psychology services. These results were found to be significant according to Chi-Square test results. Therefore, although not generalizable to population as a whole, the results of this study indicate that school psychologists, teachers, and administrators in Southwestern Washington State agree that school psychology has gone through a paradigm shift. What does this mean of the future of school psychology? There are several issues that have yet to be answered regarding school psychology services and paradigm shift theory. First, this study will have to be conducted with a significantly higher number of participants before generalizing results to the rest of the population. Moreover, although results indicate that school psychology has gone through a paradigm shift of sorts, school psychologists remain split on several of the issues pertaining to *paradigm shift theory*. This is especially true for actual versus preferred role for school psychologists. For example, and as previously mentioned, on item 12 school psychologist remained divided on more or less involvement for school

psychology services in administrative activities. Furthermore, although the results indicate a *paradigm shift* in school psychology services, variables that produce successful and effective special education programs is yet to be determined.

References

Abel, R. R., & Burke, J. P. (1985). Perceptions of school psychology services from a staff perspective. *Journal of School Psychology*, *23*, 121–131.

Anthun, R. (1999). Quality and improvement potential in school psychology services. *School Psychology International*, *20*(2), 163–175. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143034399202001

Benson, A. J., & Hughes, J. (1985). Perceptions of role definition processes in school psychology: A national survey. *School Psychology Review*, *14*(1), 64–74.

Braden, J. S., Dimarino-Linnen, E., & Good, T. L. (2001). Schools, society, and school psychologists' history and future directions. *Journal of School Psychology*, *39*(2), 203–219.

Bramlett, R. K., Murphy, J. J., Johnson, J., Wallingsford, L., & Hall, J. D. (2002). Contemporary practices in school psychology: A national survey of roles and referral problems. *Psychology in the Schools*, *39*(3), 327–335. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.10022

Craighead, W. E. (1982). A brief clinical history of cognitive-behavior therapy with children. *School Psychology Review*, *11*(1), 5–13.

Chitiyo, M., May, M. E., & Chitiyo, G. (2012). An assessment of the evidence-base for school-wide positive behavior support. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *35*(1), 1–24.

Danielson, L., Doolittle, J., & Bradley, R. (2007). Professional development, capacity building, and research needs: Critical issues for response to intervention implementation. *School Psychology Review*, *36*(4), 632–637.

DuRant, R. H., Cadenhead, C., Pendergrast, R. A., Slavens, G., & Linder, C. W. (1994). Factors associated with the use of violence among urban black adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health*, *84*(4), 612–617.

Ehrhardt-Padgett, G. N., Hatzichristou, C., Kitson, J., & Meyers, J. (2004). Awakening to a new dawn: Perspectives of the future of school psychology. *School Psychology Review*, *33*(1), 105–114.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, P.L. 94-142, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq. (1975).

Etscheidt, S., & Knestin, K. (2007). A Qualitative analysis of factors influencing the interpersonal dynamics of a prereferreal team. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *22*(2), 264–288.

Fagan, T. K. (1992). Compulsory schooling, child study, clinical psychology, and special education origins of school psychology. *American Psychologist*, *47*(2), 236–243.

Fields, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. *Thousand Oaks, CA*.

Fletcher, J. M., Coulter, W. A., Reschly, D. J., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Alternative approaches to the definition and identification of learning disabilities: Some questions and answers. *Annals of Dyslexia, 54*(2), 304–331.

French, J. L. (1984). On the conception, birth, and early development of school psychology: With special reference to Pennsylvania. *American Psychologist*, *39*(9), 976–987.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Stecker, P. M. (2010). The "blurring" of special education in a new continuum of general education placements and services. *Exceptional Children*, *76*(No. 3), 301–323. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001440291007600304

Gilman, R., & Gabriel, S. (2004). Perceptions of school psychology services by education professionals: Results from a multi-state survey pilot study. *School Psychology Review*, *33*(2), 271–286.

Gilman, R., & Medway, F. J. (2007). Teachers' perceptions of school psychology: A comparison of regular and special education teacher ratings. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *22*(2), 145–161. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1045-3830.22.2.145

Gilmore, G. E., & Chandy, J. (1973). Teachers' perceptions of school psychological services. *Journal of School Psychology*, *11*(2), 139–147.

Hosp, J. L., & Reschly, D. J. (2002). Regional differences in school psychology practice. *School Psychology Review*, *31*(1), 11–29.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997, P.L. 105-17, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq. (1997).

Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004, P.L. 108- 446, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq. (2004).

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*, 112-133. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

Keller-Marguilis, M. A. (2012). Fidelity of implementation of framework: A critical need for response to intervention models. *Psychology in the Schools*, *49*(4), 342–352.

Kovaleski, J. F. (2007). Response to intervention: Consideration for research and systems change. *School Psychology Review*, *36*(4), 638–646.

Lane, K. L. (2007). Identifying and supporting students at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders within multi-level models: Data driven approaches to

conducting secondary interventions with an academic emphasis. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *30*(4), 135–164.

Meyers, J., Roach, A. T., & Meyers, B. (2009). Engaging in the debate: A critique of blueprint III. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *19*(3), 197-223.

Miller, L. E. (1994). Correlations: Description or inference? *Journal of Agricultural Education*, *35*(1), 5–7.

Nelson, R. B., Hoover, M., Young, M., Obrzut, A., D'Amato, R. C., & Copeland, E. P. (2006). Integrated psychological services in the Greeley-Evans Public Schools. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *21*(4), 445-467.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2002).

Phillips, D. C. (2009). Empirical educational research: Charting philosophical disagreements in an undisciplined field. In H. Siegel (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the philosophy of education.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195312881.003.0022

Reschly, D. J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1995). School psychology paradigm shift. *Best Practices in School Psychology III* (3rd ed.) (pp. 17–31). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Reynolds, C. R., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2009). Response to intervention: Ready or not? Or, from wait-to-fail to watch-them-fail. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *24*(2), 130–145.

Sansosti, F. J., Goss, S., & Noltemeyer, A. (2011). Perspectives of special education directors on response to intervention in secondary schools. *Contemporary School Psychology: Formerly“ The California School Psychologist,” 15*(1), 9–20.

Sansosti, F. J., Noltemeyer, A., & Goss, S. (2010). Principals' perceptions of the importance and availability of response to intervention practices within high school settings. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(2), 286.

Senft, L. B., & Snider, B. (1980). Elementary school principals assess services of school psychologists nationwide. *Journal of School Psychology*, *18*(3), 276–282.

Sheridan, S. M., & Gutkin, T. B. (2000). The ecology of school psychology: Examining and changing our paradigm for the 21st century. *School Psychology Review*, *29*(4), 485–502.

Smith, T. E. (2005). IDEA 2004: Another round in the reauthorization process. *Remedial AND Special Education*, *26*(6), 314–319.

Stollar, S. A., Poth, R. L., Curtis, M. J., & Cohen, R. M. (2006). Collaborative strategic planning as illustration of the principles of systems change. *School Psychology Review*, *35*(2), 181–197.

Sugai, G. (2007). Promoting behavioral competence in schools: A commentary on exemplary practices. *Psychology in the Schools*, *44*(1), 113–118.

Sugai, G., Horner, R. H., Dunlap, G., Hieneman, M., Lewis, T. J., Nelson, C. M., … Ruef, M. (2000). Applying positive behavior support and functional behavioral assessment in schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *2*(3), 131–143.

Sugai, G., & Horner, R. R. (2006). A promising approach for expanding and sustaining school-wide positive behavior support. *School Psychology Review*, *35*(2), 245–259.

Sullivan, A. L., & Long, L. (2010). Examining the changing landscape of school psychology practice: A survey of school based practitioners regarding response to intervention. *Psychology in the Schools*, *47*(10), 1059–1070. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20524

Sullivan, A. L., Long, L., & Kucera, M. (2011). A survey of school psychologists' preparation, participation, and perceptions related to positive behavior interventions and supports. *Psychology in the Schools*, *48*(10), 971–985. https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20605

Thielking, M., & Jimerson, S. R. (2006). Perspectives regarding the role of school psychologists: Perceptions of teachers, principals, and school psychologists in Victoria, Australia. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *16*(02), 211–223.

Thomas, H. (2009). Discovering Lightner Witmer: A forgotten hero of psychology. *Journal of Scientific Psychology*, (April), 3–13.

Walker, H. M. (2004). Commentary: Use of evidence-based interventions in schools: Where we've been, where we are, and where we need to go. *School Psychology Review*, *33*(3), 398–408.

Walker, H. M., Horner, R. H., Sugai, G., Bullis, M., Sprague, J. R., Bricker, D., & Kaufman, M. J. (1996). Integrated approaches to preventing antisocial behavior

patterns among school age children and youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4*(4), 194–209.

Waters, L. G. (1973). School psychologists as perceived by school personnel: Support for a consultant model. *Journal of School Psychology*, *11*(1), 40-46.

Watkins, M. W., Crosby, E. G., & Pearson, J. L. (2001). Role of the school psychologist: Perceptions of school staff. *School Psychology International*, *22*(1), 64–73.

Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M., Dawson, P., Kelley, B., Morrison, D., Ortiz, S., … Telzrow, C. (2006). *School psychology: A blueprint for training and practice III*. Bethseda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M. K., & Rosenfield, S. (2009). Blueprints of the future of training and practice in school psychology: What do they say about education and psychological consultation. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *19*(3), 177–196.

Ysseldyke, J., Dawson, P., Lehr, C., Reschly, D., Reynolds, M., & Telzrow, C. (1997). *School psychology: A blueprint for training and practice II.* Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Zaheer, I., & Zirkel, P. A. (2014). The legal content of school psychology journals: A systematic survey. *Psychology in the Schools*, *51*(10), 999–1016.

Appendix A

DISCLOSURES

Email Disclosure Form

Why am I being asked to participate in this study?

The aim of the study is to gain an understanding of perceptions related to the role of school psychologists, and how those views relate to current school psychological services and the theoretical paradigm shift (role expansion) as proposed by leading scholars. Several of the largest school districts in Washington State have been selected to participate in this study.

How many people will be participating in the study?

Approximately 800 will people will be asked to take part in the study.

How will the study be conducted?

You will receive and electronic email to participate in a study. An email link will be provided for the participant to learn more about the study. At this point, the individual will decide whether or not to participate in the study. If the individual decides to participate and complete the survey (approximately 10 minutes), the information will be kept anonymous and confidential. Once the survey is complete, you may enter your email to participate in a raffle for a $100 VISA gift card. If, (at any time) during the completion of the survey the participant decides to forfeit the survey, the participant may simply exit the website without further obligations.

Am I at putting myself at risk for participating in this survey?

There is no known adverse history associated to participating in an anonymous perceptual survey. Participation is strictly voluntary. While the principal examiner has attempted to arrange the survey and questions as straightforward and professionally as possible, there exists the probability of participants finding certain questions to cause discomfort or unease. You may choose to skip a question. Please contact the Principal Investigator at floresh1@spu.edu with any questions, comments or concerns.

If you have any questions on the rights of human subjects, please contact IRB office at IRB@spu.edu.

Potential benefits to participants

This survey is strictly voluntary and has monetary and professional benefits. By choosing to partake in the survey, the participant will be automatically entered in a random raffle with the possibility to win a $100 gift card (monetary).

Professionally, the survey and dissertation will add to the existing research of school psychology and the services that the profession provides to children with learning difficulties.

What are the alternatives for participation of the study?

The survey is strictly voluntary; therefore, the alternative is to not participate in the study.

Is there any cost associated to the participating in the study?

Participation is strictly voluntary and free.

Will I be compensated for participating in the study?

The study is strictly voluntary. By choosing to participate in the study, the participant will automatically be entered into a raffle to win a $100 gift card.

Will there be any audio / video recordings regarding participation in the survey?

No.

What will happen to the information that is collected from the survey?

The information will be kept strictly confidential with the Principal Investigator having sole access to the records. By choosing to participate in the raffle, the participants' email will be stored separately from the answers for purposes of anonymity. All identifying information will be destroyed after the raffle.

Statement for procurement of consent by principal investigator

I, Homero Flores (Principal Investigator), certify that an explanation of the purpose and process of the survey / study has been provided to the participant, including potential risks / benefits associated to said study via telephone, website, and / or electronic mail.

Homero Flores, M.A., Ed.S.

Name of study personnel / Study personnel e-Signature

DISCLOSURES

Secondary Email Disclosure Form

Prior to beginning the survey, the participant has mandatorily read the disclosure form included in the original email, agreeing to participate in this study. By agreeing to participate in the survey and providing your email, you will automatically be entered into random raffle drawing for a $100 VISA gift card. Participation is strictly voluntary and confidential.

If you have any questions, please contact the Principal Investigator, Homero Flores at floresh1@spu.edu.

Disclosure form summary from original email

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this research is to determine the current perceptions between school psychologists, administrators, and teachers on school psychological services and how they correlate to views on *paradigm shift* theory.

Why am I being asked to participate in this study?

The aim of the study is to gain an understanding of perceptions related to the role of school psychologists, and how those views relate to current school psychological services and the theoretical paradigm shift (role expansion) as proposed by leading scholars. Several of the largest school districts in Washington State have been selected to participate in this study.

How many people will be participating in the study?

Approximately 800 will people will be asked to take part in the study.

How will the study be conducted?

You will receive and electronic email to participate in a study. An email link will be provided for the participant to learn more about the study. At this point, the individual will decide whether or not to participate in the study. If the individual decides to participate and complete the survey (approximately 10 minutes), the information will be kept anonymous and confidential. Once the survey is complete, you may enter your email to participate in a raffle for a $100 VISA gift card. If, (at any time) during the completion of the survey the participant decides to forfeit the survey, the participant may simply exit the website without further obligations.

Do you wish to take part in this study? (If no, you may exit website now.

Yes, I agree to take part in this study. By answering, “Yes”, you agree that you have read the Disclosure Form included in the original email and that you are taking part in a strictly voluntary and confidential survey, with little risk. By answering, “Yes”, this form will be considered your anonymous electronic signature to participate in this study. Upon signing this consent form, you may print a copy for your records. Thank you!

Signature_____

Appendix B

School Psychology Perceptions Survey (Gilman & Gabriel, 2004)

School Psychologist Form

Directions

This survey is created to identify perceptions between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators on school psychology services and paradigm shift theory. The results of the survey are confidential and participants are encouraged to be answer as honestly as possible. Please do not discuss the survey or your answers with others.

Demographics (strictly used for research purposes)

Gender

Male

Female

Ethnicity

African American or Black

American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native

Asian

Latino or Hispanic

Pacific Islander

European American (not Hispanic or Latino)

Highest degree held

Bachelors

Masters

Specialist

Doctorate

How long did you work as a school psychologist? (Respond with numeral, rounding up to the nearest whole for partial years)

Teaching Background

Number of years worked as a teacher in general education

Number of years worked as a special education teacher

Approximate school enrollment

Number of years employed as an educator (respond with numeral, rounding up to the nearest whole for partial years)

At what type of school do you work?

Elementary School

Middle School

High School

Other

Approximate school enrollment (enter numeral)

School Psychology Questions

How serious would you say a student's problem has to be before involving school psychological services?

Quite severe

Serious

Moderate

Less serious, but noticeable

Mild

Within the past year, how would you rate your level of job satisfaction as a school psychologist?

Very unsatisfied

Somewhat unsatisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Very satisfied

How helpful are school psychological services to teachers, administrators and student support personnel?

No help

Slightly helpful

Moderately helpful

Very helpful

In the last 12 months, how satisfied were you with overall teacher follow through with your recommendations?

Very unsatisfied

Somewhat unsatisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Very satisfied

Considering school psychological services at your school, in what areas would you like to see more or less involvement? (Do not want involvement, Decrease involvement, Same level, More involvement).

Assessment for special education

Working with students in general education

Crisis intervention

Consulting with teachers

Consulting with parents

In-service training

Parent workshops

Curriculum development

Administrative activities

Response to intervention

Pre-referral services

Preventative interventions

Paradigm Shift in School Psychological Services

School psychology has evolved significantly in the past 15 years

No change

Slight change

Moderate change

Significant change

As a school psychologist, I participate in pre-referral and response to intervention services in my school

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

There appears to be a paradigm shift in school psychology services

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

School Psychology Perceptions Survey (Gilman & Gabriel, 2003)

Teacher / Administrator Form

Directions

This survey is created to identify perceptions between school psychologists, teachers, and administrators on school psychology services and paradigm shift theory. The results of the survey are confidential and participants are encouraged to be answer as honestly as possible. Please do not discuss the survey or your answers with others.

Demographics (strictly used for research purposes)

Gender

Female / Male

Ethnicity

African American or Black

American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native

Asian

Latino or Hispanic

Pacific Islander

European American (not Hispanic or Latino)

Highest degree held

Bachelors

Masters

Specialist

Doctorate

Type of teacher

General Education / Special Education

Are you currently an administrator?

Yes / No

How long have you been an administrator? (Respond with numeral, rounding up to the nearest whole for partial years)

Number of years worked as a teacher in general education

Number of years worked as a special education teacher

Approximate school enrollment

<u>Teaching Background</u>

Number of years employed as an educator (respond with numeral, rounding up to the nearest whole for partial years)

At what type of school do you teach?

Elementary School

Middle School

High School

Other

Approximate school enrollment (enter numeral)

School Psychology Questions

How knowledgeable do you consider yourself to be about school psychology?

No knowledge

Somewhat knowledgeable

Pretty knowledgeable

Extremely knowledgeable

How serious would you say a student's problem has to be before involving school psychological services?

Quite severe

Serious

Moderate

Less serious, but noticeable

Mild

Generally speaking, how helpful to children are school psychological services?

No help

Slightly helpful

Moderately helpful

Very helpful

How helpful are school psychological services to teachers, administrators and student support personnel?

No help

Slightly helpful

Moderately helpful

Very helpful

In the last 12 months, how satisfied were you with the overall performance of your school psychologist(s)?

Not applicable

Very unsatisfied

Somewhat unsatisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Very satisfied

Given your understanding of school psychological services at your school, in what areas would you like to see more or less of their involvement? (Do not want involvement, Decrease involvement, Same level, More involvement).

Assessment for special education

Working with students in general education

Crisis intervention

Consulting with teachers

Consulting with parents

In-service training

Parent workshops

Curriculum development

Administrative activities

Response to intervention

Pre-referral services

Preventative interventions

Paradigm Shift in School Psychological Services

School psychology has evolved significantly in the past 15 years

No change

Slight change

Moderate change

Significant change

My school psychologist participates in pre-referral and response to intervention services in my school

Agree

Disagree

Don't know

There appears to be a paradigm shift in school psychology services

Agree

Disagree

Don’t know