Survey of School Psychologists' Actual and Preferred Roles, and Job Satisfaction in Wisconsin

By

Krystle A. Kaifesh

A Thesis Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Educational Specialist in School Psychology
Department of School Psychology

At

The University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

December, 2013

Graduate Studies

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of

Krystle Kaifesh presented on November 27, 2013

Dr. Jeffrey Goodman, Chair

Dr. Vicki Samelson

Dr. Michael Axelrod

APPROVED: _____
Dean of Graduate Studies

Survey of School Psychologists' Actual and Preferred Roles, and

Job Satisfaction in Wisconsin

By

Krystle Kaifesh

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, 2013
Under the Supervision of Dr. Jeffrey Goodman

School psychologists try to balance between what school districts need, what they prefer to do, and what current initiatives suggest for practitioners. The purpose of this study was to survey school psychologists in Wisconsin about their roles and job satisfaction. One-hundred and sixty-four school psychologists in Wisconsin were surveyed about actual hours and preferred hours spent in 7 roles. Participants reported reasons for increasing or decreasing preferred hours and they rated their level of job satisfaction. Participants reported engaging in psychoeducational assessment activities most often across 3 school settings (rural, urban, and suburban). They reported they would prefer to reduce time in psychoeducational assessment and increase time in other roles. Participants reported everyday practice options (number of referrals and caseload) as important reasons for increasing or decreasing preferred hours. Practitioners in rural and suburban school settings rated their satisfaction in the satisfied range and those in urban settings in the dissatisfied range. Future directions for research are discussed.

Jeffrey A Goodman 12/9/13

Dr. Jeffrey Goodman (Signature) Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES vi
INTRODUCTION 1
THE PREFERRED ROLES OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS 2
Assessments 3
Consultation 5
Prevention and Other Roles 7
COMPARING DIFFERENT SCHOOL LOCATIONS (RURAL, SUBURBAN, URBAN) 10
JOB SATISFACTION 11
SUMMARY 12
PRESENT STUDY 14
METHOD 16
Participants 16
Survey 16
Procedure 17
RESULTS 18
Participants (Demographics) 18
Actual and Preferred Roles 21
Reasons for Preference 24
Job Satisfaction 25
DISCUSSION 28
Interpretations 28
Limitations 35

Future Directions 36
BIBLIOGRAPHY 38
APPENDICES 44
Appendix A: Electronic Survey 45
Appendix B: Postcard 54
Appendix C: Reminder Postcard 55
Appendix D: Cover Letter and Statement of Consent (Electronic Survey) 56

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Participants' Current Level of Degree 19

Table 2. Participants' Current School Setting 20

Table 3. Specialized Roles. 21

Table 4. Actual Hours, Preferred Hours, Discrepancy, and Paired Samples T Test. 22

Table 5. Actual Hours Spent in Psychoeducational Assessment By School Setting 24

Table 6. Mean Ratings and Paired Samples T Test for Everyday and Other Practice. 25

Table 7. Mean Job Satisfaction Rating by School Setting. 26

Table 8. Multiple Regression Actual Hours and Mean Rating Job Satisfaction. 27

Table 9. Multiple Regression Discrepancies and Mean Rating Job Satisfaction. 28

INTRODUCTION

School psychology as a career field has been changing, adjusting, and evolving. The current shift occurring in the field involves movement towards response to intervention, prevention, and evidence-based problem-solving. The Response to Intervention (RTI) model describes the role of the school psychologist as being engaged with identifying students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitoring student progress, providing evidence-based interventions, and adjusting intensity of interventions depending on the student's responsiveness (www.rti4success.org). Prevention efforts are focused on preventing academic failure, school violence, and bullying. Evidence-based problem solving includes using a consultation model to identify problems, analyze problems, implement evidence-based interventions, and evaluate the results.

Other changes in the field often stem from policies. The criteria for No Child Left Behind and the reauthorization of IDEA 2004 have increased the emphasis on accountability, high-stakes testing, evidence-based practice, and integration and consistency between general and special education (Ysseldyke & Rosenfield, 2009).

The National School Psychology In-service Training Network (NSPITN) and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) developed task forces to define competence and guide practice and training in school psychology (Ysseldyke & Rosenfield, 2009). Collectively, these task forces created multiple editions of *Blueprint* in an attempt to map out recommended competencies for those practicing in the field and

for graduate programs to develop competent professionals. Currently, *Blueprint* is in its third version and addresses contemporary issues shaping the profession including a three-tiered model of service delivery (RTI), multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving, and more indirect services (consultation).

Currently, a disconnect exists between what *Blueprint III* suggests, the preferences of practitioners, and what practitioners are actually doing when it comes to the role of the school psychologist (Ysseldyke, Burns, & Rosenfield, 2009). For example, Conoley, Conoley, and Reese (2009) point out the disparity between consultation research, the development of school-based consultation, and how it is actually conducted in the schools. Models for consultation and instructions for implementation are available, but Conoley and his associates point out that the practice of consultation itself is slow moving in terms of using consultation in the schools. Thus, the practice of school psychologists lags behind research.

THE PREFERRED ROLES OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Interest surrounding the role of the school psychologist is at a high point right now as we begin implementing new service delivery models in school systems. These models outline new roles for the school psychologist and require the current role to change to meet demands in training and practice. School psychologists are expected to go beyond traditional duties such as psychometric testing for special education eligibility, while indirect services like consultation are being emphasized (Bradley-Johnson & Dean, 2000). Compared to the past, there is now a higher demand for schools to act in a preventative manner in response to violence, bullying, and academic deficits (Sheridan & Gutkin, 2000). School psychologists are being turned to for program evaluation efforts

such as using data to document program effectiveness (Ysseldyke, Burns, & Rosenfield, 2009). In summary, contemporary changes in the profession describe a focus on expanding the school psychologist's role to include the entire school system while still emphasizing individual psychoeducational evaluations.

The research discussed in the next sections describes the school psychologists' actual roles and their preferred roles. The actual role describes the common activities or roles the school psychologist currently engages in. The preferred roles are the activities in which the school psychologist would like to engage in or perceive an increased need to engage in these roles. Previous research has used similar terms such as 'ideal role' to describe the preferred roles or amount of time preferred to be spent in various activities (Dillon, 1989). The trend that emerges from past research is that current school psychologists' actual roles do not match their preferred roles.

Assessments

Before the publication of *Blueprint III* or the introduction of RtI, school psychologists were expressing their views about their role, including evaluations for determining special education eligibility. An early study about the role of school psychologists by Dillon (1989) found that school psychologists did not agree that their primary role should be that of an evaluator of students who have "unusual educational problems." Their actual role included frequent administrations of assessments and they reported wanting to give assessments and write reports less. They described a desire to move into more consultations and screening assessments to eliminate unnecessary evaluations. Thirty years ago, there were professionals expressing their concern about the gap between the actual role and their preferred role. They were asking for a less

narrow role in the schools. This desire to expand the role into other areas beyond testing has continued and has gained increased attention from researchers.

The direction in which the profession is expected to develop is detailed and informative. As previously mentioned, the field is being directed by policies and national organizations to address new concerns. Research has shown that school psychologists spend a majority of their time (50%) conducting IQ assessments or determining eligibility for special education (Agresta, 2004; Curtis, Hunley, Walker, & Baker, 1999; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Lewis, Truscott, & Volker, 2008; Reschly & Wilson1995). Other research reports that school psychologists spend at least a third of their time conducting IQ assessments or determining eligibility for special education (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, & Hall, 2002; Huebner, 1993). Powers, Hagans, and Busse (2008) reported 79% of those surveyed administered a cognitive test at least once a week. The actual role (current role) of the school psychologist includes spending a large portion of their time conducting assessments.

Practicing school psychologists have reported that they are eager to go beyond psychometric testing for special education eligibility and would prefer to reduce the amount of time they spend performing these roles (Brown, Holcombe, Bolen, & Thompson, 2006; Dillon, 1989; Reschly & Wilson, 1995). Their preferred role includes using assessments less. Reschly & Wilson (1995) found school psychologists wished to decrease their time spent in assessment from 50% down to 32%. The emphasis in that study was on involvement with direct interventions and problem-solving consultation, with a reduced, but still significant emphasis on assessment. A recent report indicated that the percentage of time school psychologists devote to other areas such as

intervention, preventive services, and team collaboration has increased (Larson & Choi, 2010).

Reschly (2000) discussed that a lesser emphasis on cognitive assessment is accompanied by an increased emphasis on functional assessments and related direct (intervention) and indirect services (consultation). It would appear that school psychologists are expanding their assessment procedures and moving towards a more comprehensive evaluation of a student, one that goes beyond cognition and intelligence and includes behavior analysis and problem-solving.

School psychologists do not wish to end testing and identification for learning difficulties. In fact, professionals conducting assessments expressed a desire for additional training in areas related to their day-to-day practice, including assessment, diagnosis, and identification (Wnek, Klein, & Bracken, 2008). Overall, it appears that practicing school psychologists spend a large amount of their time administering assessments and writing reports. However, they would prefer to do less and dedicate more time to other roles.

Consultation

Consultation involves indirectly working with students. School psychologists might consult with teachers to address academic or behavioral concerns. During consultation, the problem is defined, desired outcomes are discussed, and a plan is developed to improve academics or address behavior. A general goal of consultation is to assist teachers in addressing student concerns.

Increasing the use of consultation is an emphasis from *Blueprint III* (Ysseldyke, Burns, & Rosenfield, 2009). The amount of time reportedly spent in consultation varies.

A survey by Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, and Hall (2002) found that school psychologists estimated they spent 16% of their time engaged in consultative roles. An earlier study from Curtis, Hunley, Walker, and Baker (1999) reported 45.9% of school psychologists surveyed served between 1-25 students through consultation during the school year. Although the actual role in consultation appears less often than assessing, there are slight increases observed.

Consultation is viewed as a preferred role and professionals have expressed a desire to move into more consultative roles (Argesta, 2004; Dillon, 1989; Stoiber & Vanderwood, 2008). Findings indicated that school psychologists value consultation, but they are not implementing consultation models completely. They also would like to spend more time in these consultative roles with teachers and parents. A national study from Hosp and Reschly (2002) found there is an overall interest in spending more time providing problem-solving consultation. Survey respondents reported they would prefer spending more hours per week on consultation than they currently do.

School psychologists also reported in a survey that they perceived themselves as very confident in consulting (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, & Hall, 2002). Out of those surveyed, 68% were very confident in consulting with others and 76% were very confident in consulting about behavior problems. Even with this confidence school psychologists express an interest in additional training and experience for pursuing more consultation (Dillon, 1989; Larson, & Choi, 2010). With confidence and training consultation appears to be a role preferred to be integrated more into their daily routine.

Research on consultation has described a correlation between time spent in consultation and job satisfaction. Huebner (1993) surveyed school psychologists in

various school settings about their time spent in consultation and their job satisfaction. It was found that job satisfaction increased as time spent in consultation increased and time spent in assessment decreased. School psychologists who were serving as a consultant were happier with their job. Increasing the amount of time spent in consultation is a preferred activity.

Prevention and Other Roles

Besides increasing the amount of time spent on consultation, school psychologists have expressed a desire to increase the amount of time spent in other roles and areas including prevention, counseling, assessing motivation and self-regulation, and assessing internalizing disorders in the school.

First, an emphasis towards using preventative efforts in the school has been expressed (Stoiber & Vanderwood, 2008). School violence and bullying have received increased amounts of attention and schools have experienced increased pressure to prevent future incidents. School psychologists can have an important role in prevention. Increasing the amount of time and experience in prevention methods would benefit the school. Dean and Burns (2004) surveyed school psychologists' perceptions about their role in preventing school violence. They found that practitioners who completed fewer assessments were more likely to be asked for advice about developing programs for prevention of school violence like Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS). They also reported that they were underutilized in prevention efforts. A decrease in the amount of time spent in assessment would allow more time to be spent in prevention methods, a preferred role.

Prevention programs like PBIS have been developed to address behavioral issues in schools. Interventions aimed at reducing bullying have been shown to reduce behavioral issues like peer victimization (Elledge, Cavell, Ogle, & Newgent, 2010). Schools are expected to keep children safe during the school day and school psychologists can play a role in developing prevention programs to benefit students.

Second, counseling is an area of interest for school psychologists. Agresta (2004), surveyed school psychologists, school social workers, and counselors about their roles and which ones they would like to expand or reduce. School psychologists reported spending their time in testing and consultation, but they indicated they would like to expand their time spent in individual counseling. These practitioners felt that counseling was appropriate for their profession and wished to increase their time spent in this activity. Psychologists have good reason to be interested in counseling students individually and in groups because receiving these services is correlated to academic achievement. Research has found that students who attended group counseling performed better on state academic tests (Bruce, Getch, & Ziomek-Daigle, 2009; Luck & Webb, 2009). School psychologists' interest in providing counseling is reasonable given their interest in children's academic performance.

Next, school psychologists express interest in using assessments for school-based motivation and self-regulation. Assessing motivation and self-regulation can be important because these domains are linked to academic and behavioral outcomes (Howe, Lange, Farran, & Boyles, 2003; McClelland, Cameron, McDonald Connor, Farris, Jewkes, & Morrison, 2007; Ning & Downing, 2010). Cleary (2009) surveyed practicing school psychologists to explore the need and extent to which assessments were being

conducted for self-regulation and motivation. The results indicated that middle & high school practitioners encountered more referrals for motivation and were interested in learning more about evaluations. The school psychologists surveyed expressed a lack of knowledge about these processes and inadequate training for using the assessments. Since they are related to academics and behavior it would be preferred by school psychologists to dedicate more of their time to that role.

Fourth, the use of school-based assessments for internalizing disorders (anxiety, depression, withdrawal, etc.) with children is an interest for school psychologists. Miller and Jome (2008) surveyed school psychologists to examine their perceived knowledge and role for using school-based assessments for internalizing disorders. The respondents rated the disorders at least somewhat to very important for school psychologists to be knowledgeable about. The majority indicated they needed additional training in assessment across the array of internalizing disorders. The respondents also indicated they had moderate exposure to the internalizing disorders, including children with Obsessive-Compulsive disorder, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, and self-mutilation present in their school. They indicated they had frequent exposure to students with Depression, Generalized Anxiety Disorder, and suicidal behavior. Internalizing disorders, such as anxiety, can be linked to impaired cognitive performance, poor academic outcomes, and reduced social adjustment (Wood, 2006). Assessing or screening for internalizing disorders can help determine appropriate intervention strategies for students who would benefit from them.

COMPARING ROLES ACROSS DIFFERENT SCHOOL LOCATIONS (RURAL, SUBURBAN, URBAN)

School psychologists work all over the country, in different settings, and with different populations. Comparing the reports of school psychologists in different locations can identify similarities or differences in the current roles and preferred roles shared by school psychologists in those different settings. Locations are not compared often in the research of school psychology. Reschly and Connolly (1990) sent out surveys to compare school psychologists working in rural, urban, and suburban school settings on key dimensions including experience, employment conditions, roles, and job satisfaction. They found that school psychologists engaged in similar roles regardless of their setting (rural, suburban, and urban). The proportion of time devoted to special education did not differ significantly and all groups reported spending about two-thirds of their time in evaluations, staffing, placements, and reevaluations.

A more recent survey compared school psychologists in different school settings and consultation. Curtis, Hunley, and Chesno (2002) found that rural school psychologists reported more special education reevaluations but fewer consultations than school psychologists working in urban and suburban schools. There were significantly more students served through consultation in urban and suburban settings.

Before consultation began being emphasized in the schools, school psychologists in various settings were practicing similar roles. As consultation becomes a more important and preferred role in the schools, slight differences are starting to emerge when comparing the school setting. School psychologists working in rural schools are reportedly using consultation less compared to urban and suburban areas. This may be due to lack of experience as reported in the research.

JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is the attitude individuals hold about their work and a way to describe their level of reinforcement in their work environment. School psychologists are relied upon daily for input and assistance in making decisions about students, families, and school systems. The job satisfaction of school psychologists has been a topic of popular discussion in the research field. The first published national survey of school psychologists' job satisfaction was in 1982. Anderson, Hohenshil, and Brown (1984) collected survey information from 391 National Association of School Psychology (NASP) members working in public schools. They found over 85% of their participants were either satisfied or very satisfied with their job. They also found the common sources for dissatisfaction were school system policies and practices, and opportunities for advancement. Also, it was determined that demographic variables such as respondent's age and ratio of students per school psychologists were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction.

The first meta-analysis of national school psychologists' job satisfaction emerged in 2006. VanVoorhis and Levinson examined data from school psychologists' job satisfaction studies conducted between 1982 and 1999. There were 8 studies examined and researchers found that 79.87% of participants expressed overall job satisfaction within the satisfied range, 4.25% within the very satisfied range, 15.36% within the dissatisfied range, and 0.52% within the very dissatisfied range. Again, school system policies and practices, and opportunities for advancement were identified as factors for dissatisfaction.

There have been several studies published that examined the job satisfaction of school psychologists at the state level. Sixty Nebraska school psychologists were

surveyed and it was found that they generally expressed moderate levels of job satisfaction. They reported dissatisfaction with workload and their ability to effect change or results (Wright & Gutkin, 1981). Levinson, Fetchkan, and Hohenshil (1988) found that over 84% of school psychologists practicing in public schools in Virginia were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs. Similar to national studies, these researchers found that factors for dissatisfaction included school system policies and practices, and opportunities for advancement. In West Virginia, over 64% of school psychologists reported being satisfied or very satisfied (Solly & Hohenshil, 1986). Again, the researchers found that factors for dissatisfaction included practices, advancement, compensation, working conditions, and supervision. The most recent single state study was published in 2003 and found that school psychologists from Florida that were serving a single school were more satisfied than those serving several schools in Florida (Proctor & Steadman, 2003).

Through national samples and within-state studies, most school psychologists across the country report being satisfied with their job. There were no studies found that examined school psychologists specifically in Wisconsin.

SUMMARY

Examining the role of the school psychologist is an ongoing task because the field is changing and shifting. Numerous researchers are surveying and analyzing reports to determine where the profession is currently and possibly where it is going next. Research has reported that assessments and special education-related activities still dominate the field today (Agresta, 2004; Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, Wallingsford, & Hall, 2002; Curtis, Hunley, Walker, & Baker, 1999; Hosp & Reschly, 2002; Huebner, 1993; Lewis,

Truscott, & Volker, 2008; Reschly & Wilson1995). School psychologists also report understanding the importance of conducting assessments, but they would like to spend less of their time fulfilling these activities (Brown, Holcombe, Bolen, & Thompson, 2006; Dillon, 1989; Reschly & Wilson, 1995).

Consultation in the school is increasing and school psychologists are spending more time now than they ever did in this role. Although the increases are small, they are still noticeable. School psychologists wish to expand their role as a consultant with teachers, parents, and administrators, and would prefer to dedicate more of their day to these activities (Argesta, 2004; Dillon, 1989; Stoiber & Vanderwood, 2008).

Also, school psychologists would prefer to expand and dedicate more time to other areas including prevention, counseling, and administering assessments for motivation, self-regulation, and internalizing disorders. School psychologists wish to increase prevention efforts for academic and behavioral problems, bullying, and school violence (Stoiber & Vanderwood, 2008). They would also like to take on more cases for group and individual counseling (Agresta, 2004). Assessing motivation, self-regulation, and internalizing disorders is relevant to the profession and school psychologists would like to learn more about being competent and knowledgeable in these assessments (Miller & Jome, 2008).

The role of the school psychologist continues to evolve as a result of response-to-intervention models and graduate programs adhering to *Blueprint III*. Recent policies are also shaping the roles and activities that school psychologists are expected to engage in. Legal requirements and funding, as well as the ratio of students to psychologist, degree level, and attitudes and beliefs exert influences on school psychologists (Reschly,

2000). School psychologists continue to report being satisfied with their job. There are multiple variables identified that may be impacting the beliefs of the school psychologist and their role preferences. With all the possibilities that have been identified, it is difficult to identify why school psychologists want to change their roles.

PRESENT STUDY

The present study looks at the actual roles and the preferred roles of school psychologists and compares professionals in the rural, urban, and suburban school settings. The first purpose of the study is to examine the amount of time spent in various roles associated with school psychology and the amount of time the professionals believe they should spend in these roles. No studies were found that addressed preferred roles by asking school psychologists how much time they should be spending in their roles. This phrasing (how much time they should be spending in their roles) will be used with the intention of obtaining information about what school psychologists would find efficient instead of asking about their personal preferences.

The average amount of hours per week spent in actual roles will be compared to the average amount of preferred hours per week reported by school psychologists. Similar to previous findings, it is hypothesized that the average amount of time actually spent in the psychoeducational assessment role (administering and scoring assessments, report writing, eligibility or placement conferences) will be a larger than the average amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. A second hypothesis of the study is that, on average, school psychologists spend the most amount of time per week engaged in psychoeducational assessment roles compared to other relevant roles.

Next, comparisons between the school settings (rural, urban, and suburban) will be made. Those practicing in urban settings are considered to have a larger case load. It is hypothesized that school psychologists identified as practicing in urban settings will spend more time per week engaged in psychoeducational assessment roles compared to those practicing in rural or suburban settings.

Another purpose of the study is to identify reasons for the belief that school psychologists should increase or decrease the amount of time spent in roles. There were no studies found that explicitly surveyed school psychologists about why school psychologists want to change the number of hours spent in each role. There are possible variables that influence the profession and school psychologists' roles, but they can only be speculated to cause the interest in change. It is hypothesized that specific options/factors related to everyday practice (case load and number of referrals) would be rated with higher importance compared to other options/factors (graduate training, professional affiliation, evidence-based practice, school district policy, federal policy, or personal interest).

Finally, the study will examine overall job satisfaction with the school psychologist career field. Previous research has found that school psychologists practicing in different school settings may experience different levels of job satisfaction (Huebner, 1993; Proctor & Steadman, 2003; Thielking, Moore, & Jimerson, 2006). It is hypothesized in this study that school psychologists practicing in rural school settings will have a higher average rating of job satisfaction compared to school psychologists practicing in urban or suburban school settings.

METHOD

Participants

There were 1,552 Wisconsin school psychologists selected from the 2011-2012 directory publicly provided by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction website. Wisconsin school psychologists who indicated they were not practicing in the schools were not included as participants for the study.

Survey

The electronic survey for this study is a modified version of the NASP-funded national survey of school psychologists (Reschly, Grenshaft, & Binder, 1987). Permission for modification was given by the lead researcher. The survey was created electronically through Qualtrics, an electronic survey tool available to faculty and students at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. Items regarding demographics and definitions of roles were used from the NASP survey. Items designed to collect demographic information included age, gender, ethnicity, if they were currently practicing in school setting, current level of degree, if they were state licensed, if they were nationally certified, ratio of students to school psychologists in their district, school setting (rural, urban, or suburban), educational level (early childhood, elementary, middle, or high school), any specialized roles, and intent to remain in the profession. The current survey included question designed to probe potential reasons for changing the amount of time in 7 roles and job satisfaction. These questions were independently developed. (See Appendix A for Survey Questions).

Roles examined included psychoeducational assessment, direct intervention, consultation, counseling, systems/organizational consultation, prevention services, and research/evaluation. These 7 roles were defined for the participant to avoid

misunderstandings or misperceptions. Respondents were asked to estimate the number of hours per typical week they actually spent in each of the 7 roles. Respondents indicated if the identified number of hours was considered necessary to perform the tasks associated with each role. Respondents were also asked to indicate the number of hours per typical week they believe they should spend in each role. Participants were asked to indicate how important 9 factors were in their decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spend in each role.

Finally, job satisfaction questions were based on the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The MSQ short form contains 20 items ($\alpha = .90$) in which respondents indicate their level of satisfaction with a variety of job-related activities. The MSQ short form has three scales (Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and General Satisfaction) and a strong reliability (Hoyt reliability coefficient for three scales ranging from .77 to .92). Revisions were made to the wording on some questions to increase relevance to the school psychology profession (i.e. "The way company policies are put into practice" changed to "The way school system policies are put into practice"). The neutral response options were removed so that participants were forced to choose more satisfied or dissatisfied. Participants rated their satisfaction on a 4-point scale (very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, very satisfied). A mean job satisfaction rating was calculated from the 20 items for each participant and determined their overall satisfaction level (very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied).

Procedure

Mailing information was obtained from the public directory found on the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) website and postcards were sent to

1,552 Wisconsin school psychologists. The postcards contained information about the study and provided a link to the electronic survey (see Appendix B). Reminder postcards (postcards containing the same information as initial postcards) were sent out two weeks after mailing initial postcards (see Appendix C). The survey link remained open for six weeks. Participants were asked to access the link and complete the survey. The survey was created through Qualtrics, a survey tool through the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, and contained a cover letter with a statement of consent (see Appendix D).

RESULTS

Participants (Demographics)

From the initial sample of 1,552 Wisconsin school psychologists contacted, 164 (10.57%) responded by accessing the website and link for the electronic survey. Of the 164 psychologists accessing the survey, 1 school psychologist (0.61%) did not agree to participate and 163 school psychologists (99.39%) agreed to participate in the survey. Of the 163 who participated in the survey, 98 participants (60.12%) provided responses to every survey item. There were 65 participants (39.88%) who did not provide a response to every survey item, but the responses they provided were used in analyzing the results.

Of the total participants responding to the questions for demographic information, 77.9% (n = 127) were female and 22.1% (n = 36) were male. The mean age of the participants was 38.13 (SD = 10.91) years and ranged from 23 to 68 years of age. The ethnic distribution was 95.1% (n = 155) Caucasian, 2.5% (n = 4) African American, 1.8% (n = 3) Other, and 0.6% (n = 1) Asian American. The 3 participants who indicated Other ethnicity did not provide additional information about their background. All of the 163 (100%) participants responded that they were practicing in the schools at that time.

The level of degree for the participants is presented in Table 1. Most participants held a Specialist level degree (60.9%; $n = 98$). There were 31.7% ($n = 51$) that held a Master's degree, 6.2% ($n = 10$) that held a Doctoral degree, 0.6% ($n = 1$) that held a Bachelor's degree, and 0.6% ($n = 1$) indicated they held a degree other than those listed. The participant who indicated having an Other degree did not provide additional information about the degree. The responses from the participants mostly support the published guidelines for practice and licensure from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The website and publications report that licensed school psychologists in Wisconsin must complete an approved program resulting in a doctor degree, education specialist degree, or the equivalent, including a master's degree (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2006).

Table 1. Participants' Current Level of Degree

School Psychologists' Current Level of Degree		
Degree	N	%
Bachelor's Degree	1	0.6
Master's Degree	51	31.7
Specialist Degree	98	60.9
Doctoral Degree	10	6.2
Other (Not Specified)	1	0.6

Most school psychologists participating in this study reported they were state licensed (98.8%; $n = 159$). In regards to national certification (Nationally Certified School Psychologist, NCSP), 32.3% ($n = 52$) were nationally certified and 67.7% ($n = 109$) were not. The majority of participants indicated that they intend to stay in the profession (95.0%; $n = 153$).

Participants also identified the ratio of students they work with. The mean ratio of students to 1 school psychologist was 920.60 students ($SD = 439.97$). The number of students to 1 school psychologist ranged from 57 students to 2,400 students.

Participants identified the type of school they worked in and those results are presented in Table 2. Most participants identified their school setting as rural (43.5%; *n* = 70), followed by suburban (31.1%; *n* = 50), and then urban (25.5%; *n* = 41). Participants were more likely to work within an elementary level building (61.5%, *n* = 99). Twenty and a half percent (n = 33) were in a high school level building, 16.1% (n = 26) were in a middle school level building, and 1.9% (*n* = 3) were in an Early Childhood setting.

Table 2. Participants' Current School Setting

School Psychologists' Current School Setting		
School Setting	N	%
Rural	70	43.5
Urban	41	25.5
Suburban	50	31.1
School Level		
Early Childhood	3	1.9
Elementary	99	61.5
Middle School	26	16.1
High School	33	20.5

There were school psychologists who reported that they engaged in specialized roles. Of the 158 participants who responded to the question, 41.1% (*n* = 65) indicated they had a specialized role. Text responses describing the specialized role were categorized by the researcher. The categories and frequencies of the specialized roles are presented in Table 3. The most often reported specialized role was for a special education director or coordinator (24%; *n* = 8).

Table 3. Specialized Roles.

School Psychologists' Specialized Roles		
	N	%
Special Education Director/Coordinator	8	24%
PBIS Coach/Facilitator	5	15%
RTI Coordinator/Coach	4	12%
Direct Assessment Coordinator	2	6%
504 Coordinator	2	6%
Guidance Counselor	2	6%
IEP Coordinator	2	6%
Problem Solving Team Coordinator	2	6%
Jack of all Trades	1	3%
Assessment	1	3%
Virtual School	1	3%
ADA Transition	1	3%
Principal	1	3%
Early Childhood Support	1	3%

Note. PBIS = Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports ADA = Americans with Disabilities Act

Actual and Preferred Roles

The first purpose of the study was to examine the average number of hours school psychologists actually spend in the 7 roles (psychoeducational assessment, direct intervention, consultation, counseling, systems/organizational consultation, prevention, research/evaluation) per week and to examine the average number of hours per week school psychologists prefer to spend in the 7 roles. A mean score and standard deviation for actual and preferred hours per week for each of the 7 roles were calculated, as well as the range of responses (See Table 4). A discrepancy was calculated between the actual and preferred hours per week for each participant. The mean and standard deviations for the discrepancy with each of the 7 roles are also reported in the table.

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to compare actual hours and preferred hours per week for each of the seven roles. The results from the paired-samples t-tests are also displayed in Table 4. There were significant differences found between actual and preferred hours per week for all seven roles. To correct for multiple comparisons, the *p* values were adjusted using Bonferroni adjustment for multiple comparison. Adjusted *p* values are presented in the table below.

Table 4. Actual Hours, Preferred Hours, Discrepancy, and Paired Samples T Test.

Role	Actual Hours		Preferred Hours		Discrepancy				
	Mean *(SD)*	Range	Mean *(SD)*	Range	Mean *(SD)*	n	t	df	Adjusted *p* value
Psychoeducational Assessment	14.75 *(9.33)*	1-45	12.51 *(7.57)*	1-30	2.29 *(6.01)*	125	4.257	124	< .001
Direct Intervention	6.35 *(4.50)*	0-20	11.54 *(5.58)*	0-30	-5.18 *(4.86)*	114	-11.363	113	< .001
Consultation	6.19 *(4.71)*	0-30	8.91 *(5.68)*	0-30	-2.63 *(4.75)*	101	-5.561	100	< .001
Counseling	3.96 *(4.38)*	0-24	6.57 *(5.33)*	0-24	-2.71 *(3.95)*	99	-6.815	98	< .001
Systems/ Organizational Consultation	3.14 *(2.88)*	0-15	4.89 *(3.95)*	0-20	-1.73 *(3.31)*	98	-5.174	97	< .001
Prevention	2.02 *(2.30)*	0-10	4.94 *(5.63)*	0-40	-2.84 *(5.37)*	98	-5.228	97	< .001
Research/Evaluation	1.03 *(1.43)*	0-5	2.84 *(2.54)*	0-10	-1.82 *(2.38)*	99	-7.636	98	< .001

Note. *p* values adjusted with Bonferroni Adjustment for Multiple Comparisons

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was completed to compare the amount of discrepancy between actual and preferred hours for each role for participants across the three school settings (urban, suburban, and rural). The only actual/preferred role discrepancy that produced a significant difference between school settings was systems/organizational consultation, $F(2, 95) = 3.143, p < 0.05$. A post hoc test with Bonferroni correction was completed and there was a significant difference between participants in rural and suburban school settings. School psychologists from suburban school settings reported a larger discrepancy for actual and preferred hours within the systems/organizational consultation role than school psychologists reporting from rural school settings. School psychologists from the three school settings reported similar discrepancies between actual hours and preferred hours for the other roles

(psychoeducational assessment, direct intervention, consultation, counseling, prevention, and research/evaluation).

A one-way repeated measures ANOVA was completed to determine if there was a significant difference in the number of actual hours participants spent in the 7 roles (psychoeducational assessment, direct intervention, consultation, counseling, systems/organizational consultation, prevention, and research/evaluation). The differences in mean actual hours across the 7 roles was statistically significant: $F(6, 576) = 85.874$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta_p^2 = .873$. Planned contrasts were obtained to compare the means of actual hours. Every comparison produced significant differences in the mean number of actual hours across the 7 roles except for 2 comparisons. The difference in mean number of actual hours between direct intervention and consultation was not statistically significant. The difference in mean number of actual hours between counseling and systems/organizational consultation was also not statistically significant. After spending the most amount of time in psychoeducational assessment roles, school psychologists reported spending similar amounts of time in direct intervention and consultation. They also reported spending similar amounts of time in counseling and system/organizational consultation.

The next purpose of the study was to examine the three school settings (rural, urban, & suburban) and the amount of time spent in the psychoeducational assessment role. The mean actual hours spent in psychoeducational assessment per week by school setting is displayed in Table 5. Participants working in a rural setting reported engaging in psychoeducational assessments more often with an average of 16.28 hours per week. Participants working in urban and suburban school settings reported engaging in

psychoeducational assessment with an average of over 13 hours per week. The range of mean number of actual hours for the three school settings was 13.45 to 16.28 hours per week.

Table 5. Actual Hours Spent in Psychoeducational Assessment by School Setting.

School Setting	N	Mean Actual Hours in Psychoeducational Assessment	SD
Urban	32	13.53	8.76
Suburban	39	13.45	9.51
Rural	59	16.28	9.42

A one-way between subjects ANOVA was completed to compare the mean number of actual hours spent in psychoeducational assessment for participants from the three school settings (urban, suburban, and rural) to determine if there was a significant difference. The results indicated that there was not a significant effect of school setting and the mean actual hours spent in psychoeducational assessment; $F(2, 127) = 1.457$, $p = 0.237$. Therefore, the amount of time spent in psychoeducational assessment is not impacted by the type of school setting (urban, suburban, and rural).

Reasons for Preference

It was hypothesized that specific options related to everyday practice (case load and number of referrals) would be rated with more importance than the other practice options (graduate training, professional affiliation, evidence-based practice, school district policy, federal policy, personal interest, and other). Table 6 displays the mean rating for everyday practice and the mean rating for other practice options for each of the 7 roles. Across the 7 roles, participants rated everyday practice options with greater importance than other practice options.

Paired samples t-tests were conducted to compare the mean ratings for everyday practice and mean ratings for other practice for each of the 7 roles. Results are displayed

in Table 6. There were significant results for each comparison. To correct for multiple comparisons, the *p* values were adjusted using a Bonferroni correction. Adjusted *p* values are presented in the table below.

Table 6. Mean Ratings and Paired Samples T Test for Everyday and Other Practice.

Role	Everyday Practice Rating Mean *(SD)*	Other Practice Rating Mean *(SD)*	n	t	df	Adjusted *p* value
Psychoeducational Assessment	3.17 *(0.62)*	2.08 *(0.46)*	130	16.61	129	< .001
Direct Intervention	3.00 *(0.77)*	2.22 *(0.50)*	115	10.10	114	< .001
Consultation	3.04 *(0.75)*	2.09 *(0.51)*	108	11.53	107	< .001
Counseling	3.07 *(0.80)*	1.96 *(0.49)*	107	13.51	106	< .001
Systems/ Organizational Consultation	2.55 *(0.95)*	2.21 *(0.52)*	106	3.27	105	< .001
Prevention	2.99 *(0.83)*	2.09 *(0.54)*	105	9.51	104	< .001
Research/Evaluation	2.81 *(1.01)*	2.02 *(0.53)*	105	7.93	104	< .001

Note. Everyday Practice = Case Load and Number of Referrals; Other Practice = Graduate Training, Professional Affiliation, Evidence-Based Practice, School District Policy, Federal Policy, Personal Interest, and Other; *p* values adjusted with Bonferroni Adjustment for Multiple Comparisons

Job Satisfaction

An overall job satisfaction rating was determined by calculating a mean score from the 20 items of the short form for the MSQ for each participant. Statistical analysis determined demographic results including age, gender, ethnicity, degree, licensure, certification, ratio, and school setting did not predict mean job satisfaction.

Overall job satisfaction ratings were analyzed by school setting. The mean rating of job satisfaction for each school setting is displayed in Table 7. The mean rating for rural and suburban school psychologists was within the satisfied range. School psychologists in urban settings reported a lower mean job satisfaction rating that was

within the dissatisfied range. But across the three school settings ratings were similar. A one-way ANOVA was calculated to determine if there was a significant difference between school settings and mean job satisfaction rating. The results indicated that there was not a significant difference between the type of school setting and mean job satisfaction rating, $F(2, 102) = 0.821, p = 0.443$. School psychologists generally reported similar job satisfaction regardless of where their school district was located (rural, urban, or suburban).

Table 7. Mean Job Satisfaction Rating by School Setting.

	Job Satisfaction Rating		
School Setting	N	Mean	SD
Rural	47	3.10	0.39
Urban	27	2.97	0.58
Suburban	31	3.08	0.30

Pearson correlation found two correlations between actual hours and mean job satisfaction were found to be significant. Actual hours spent in psychoeducational assessment were negatively correlated with mean job satisfaction rating, $r(103) = -.24, p < .05$. Actual hours spent in direct intervention were positively correlated with mean job satisfaction rating, $r(103) = .20, p < .05$.

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between actual hours and mean rating for job satisfaction. Results are presented in Table 8. The multiple regression model with all seven predictors (actual hours for each of the seven roles) produced $R^2 = 0.133$, $F(7, 89) = 1.946, p = 0.071$. There were no significant regression weights, indicating that the actual hours spent in the seven roles did not predict mean rating for job satisfaction. Thus, the time school psychologists reported spending in various roles did not predict their level of satisfaction.

Table 8. Multiple Regression Actual Hours and Mean Rating Job Satisfaction.

	Multiple Regression Weights	
Role for Actual Hours	b	β
Psychoeducational Assessment	-0.007	-0.145
Direct Intervention	0.018	0.188
Consultation	-0.011	-0.125
Counseling	0.010	0.105
Systems/Organizational Consultation	0.026	0.178
Prevention	-0.003	-0.014
Research/Evaluation	0.018	0.063

Pearson correlation found only two correlations between discrepancy of hours and mean rating for job satisfaction to be significant. The discrepancy between actual and preferred hours for direct intervention and prevention were positively correlated with mean job satisfaction rating (direct intervention, $r(102) = .28, p < .01$; prevention, $r(96) = .32, p < .01$).

Multiple regression analyses were also conducted to examine the relationship between discrepancy of hours and mean rating for job satisfaction. Results are presented in Table 9. The multiple regression model with all seven predictors (discrepancy between actual and preferred hours for each of the seven roles) produced $R^2 = 0.312$, $F(7, 79) = 5.116, p < 0.001$. There were three significant positive regression weights, indicating that discrepancies between school psychologists' actual hours and preferred hours spent in various roles predicted job satisfaction. The positive regression weights suggest that school psychologists reported an increase in preferred hours for these roles. Therefore, a preference for spending more time engaging in direct intervention, counseling, and prevention than they actually do is predictive of higher job satisfaction.

Table 9. Multiple Regression Discrepancies and Mean Rating Job Satisfaction.

Role for Discrepancy Between Actual and Preferred Hours	Multiple Regression Weights	
	b	β
Psychoeducational Assessment	0.001	0.008
Direct Intervention	0.028**	0.321
Consultation	-0.015	-0.160
Counseling	0.025*	0.236
Systems/Organizational Consultation	-0.006	-0.041
Prevention	0.035***	0.444
Research/Evaluation	-0.020	-0.111

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < 0.001$

DISCUSSION

Interpretations

Demographics reported for Wisconsin school psychologists in the current study were comparable to previous findings. The majority of participants for the current study were female, identified as Caucasian, and held a Specialist degree. Previous findings from national studies have reported similar results (Curtis, Castillo, & Galley, 2012; Reschly 2000). The field of school psychology is composed mostly of females who are identified as Caucasian and with a Specialist degree. School psychologists in Wisconsin are engaged in specialized roles similar to other school psychologists across the country. Specialized roles that have been reported by school psychologists in previous studies include special education administrator or coordinator, school principal or superintendent, and director of community- or hospital-based mental health services.

Other demographics reported for the current study were not similar to previous findings. Previous studies have reported a mean age of participants within the range of 40 to 50 years old (Curtis, Castillo, & Galley, 2012; Reschly, 2000). The current study reported a younger age mean of 38.13 years. Prior studies have found a mean ratio of students per school psychologist ranging from 1,300 to 1,900. The current

study reported a mean ratio of 920.6 students per school psychologist. This is more comparable to the NASP recommendation of 1,000 students per school psychologist. Wisconsin school psychologists identified themselves as working in more rural school districts compared to other school settings, whereas other studies have found a larger representation in suburban school settings.

The first hypothesis of this research was that the average amount of time (actual hours) spent in the psychoeducational assessment role (administering and scoring assessments, report writing, eligibility or placement conferences) per week would be larger than the average amount of time preferred (preferred hours) to be spent in that role. Results confirmed this hypothesis. School psychologists reported spending an average 14.75 hours per week and reported a preference of reducing to an average of 12.51 hours per week. There was a statistically significant difference between the actual and preferred hours for psychoeducational assessment. School psychologists reported wanting to spend less time per week within psychoeducational assessment activities. This finding was similar to previous results that school psychologists report wanting to spend less time in psychoeducational assessment activities (Agresta, 2004; Brown, Holcombe, Bolen, & Thompson, 2006; Reschly, 2000; Reschly & Wilson, 1995).

Upon further examination of the findings for time spent engaged in psychoeducational assessment, it is noteworthy to point out that the mean preferred hours for psychoeducational assessment was only 2.24 hours less than the mean actual hours for that role. Although the previous research and the current study reported that school psychologists would prefer to spend less time in psychoeducational assessment, the mean preferred hours for psychoeducational assessment is still larger than that of the other

roles. Even if school psychologists reduced the amount of time to the mean number of preferred hours per week, they would still be engaging in psychoeducational assessment tasks more frequently than the other roles.

The second hypothesis of the study was that, on average, school psychologists spend the most amount of time per week engaged in the psychoeducational assessment role and activities compared to the other 6 roles (direct intervention, consultation, counseling, systems/organizational consultation, prevention, and research). Results indicated that participating psychologists spent the most amount of time per week in psychoeducational assessment with a mean of 14.75 hours. Next was direct intervention with a mean of 6.35 hours per week followed by consultation (M = 6.19), counseling (M = 3.96), systems/organizational consultation (M =3.14), prevention (M = 2.02), and research (M =1.03). A one-way repeated measures ANOVA reported a significant difference between the mean hours per week for psychoeducational assessment and the other 6 roles.

Previous research has found similar results in which school psychologists report spending most of their time engaged in psychoeducational assessment activities (Bramlett, Murphy, Johnson, & Hall, 2002; Castillo, Curtis, & Gelley, 2012; Huebner, 1993; Larson & Choi, 2010; Reschly, 2000; Reschly & Wilson, 1995). This finding has been consistent over the last 20 years. School psychologists report that they are spending most of their time in psychoeducational assessment, but would like to spend more time in other roles.

There are a couple of hypotheses as to why school psychologists have experienced limited progress in spending less time in psychoeducational assessment and

more time in other roles. First, school psychologists report that they do not have enough training in other roles. Wnek, Klein, and Bracken (2008) surveyed practitioners and found that additional training related to day-to-day practice was needed. Other research has reported that professionals were looking for additional training in interventions and functional assessments (Rossen & Charvat, 2011; Stoiber & Vanderwood, 2008). Second, school psychologists may not be viewed as viable candidates to perform the tasks associated with other roles beyond psychoeducational assessment. Dean and Burns (2004) found Michigan school psychologists were identified as the third professional as most responsible for school violence prevention (after the administrator and teachers). Some school cultures do not identify school psychologists as serving multiple roles beyond psychoeducational assessment and special education. Watkins, Crosby, and Pearson (2001) reported that school psychologists may be unable to diversify their role without first modifying the attitudes and expectations of school staff.

In addition, school psychologists are the usually the only professional in the school setting that has training in conducting psychoeducational assessments. Therefore, it would seem reasonable that school psychologists would spend most of their time engaged in the tasks associated with that role. There may be no one else available to perform similar roles.

It was hypothesized that school psychologists who reported practicing in urban school settings would spend more time engaged in psychoeducational assessment roles and activities per week compared to those practicing in other school settings (rural and suburban). Results indicated that school psychologists who were practicing in rural districts reported the most amount of time spent in psychoeducational assessment with

16.28 mean hours. Those practicing in urban school setting reported 13.53 mean hours per week, and those practicing in suburban school settings reported 13.45 mean hours per week. Although school psychologists in rural school settings spent more hours per week on average in psychoeducational assessment, a one-way ANOVA reported there was no statistical significance between time spent in psychoeducational assessment role and the three school settings. Therefore, the amount of time spent in psychoeducational assessment did not appear to be impacted by the type of school setting (urban, suburban, or rural). These results are similar to findings from Reschly and Connolly (1990) when NASP members were surveyed and compared key dimensions of the school psychology profession between those practicing in in rural, urban, and suburban school settings. There was little or no significant difference between school settings. Results from the current study and previous studies describe school psychology and school psychologists as similar regardless of the community setting.

An additional finding for this study was the significant difference between suburban and rural school settings and the discrepancy between actual and preferred hours for systems/organizational consultation. Statistical analysis found that school psychologists working in suburban school settings reported a larger discrepancy for actual and preferred hours for systems/organizational consultation compared to those working in rural school settings. These findings suggest that school psychologists working in suburban school districts expressed a preference for engaging in this role and activities more often per week than school psychologists working in other school settings. With the increase in demands for school-wide initiatives (PBIS, RtI, etc.), school psychologists working in the suburban settings may perceive their role as being more

involved in system-wide initiatives compared to school psychologists in other settings. Although previous findings have supported the consistency between school psychologists in terms of what they already spend their time doing, there is little to no research specifically comparing school psychologists in different school settings and what they prefer to do.

The next hypothesis predicted specific options related to everyday practice (case load and number of referrals) would be endorsed with higher importance compared to the other options (graduate training, professional affiliation, evidence-based practice, school district policy, federal policy, or personal interest). Results confirmed the hypothesis and school psychologists reported higher average ratings for everyday practice compared to average ratings for other practice. This finding was consistent across all 7 roles and paired samples t-tests reported a statistical significance between every day and other practice for each role.

There were no prior studies that explicitly surveyed school psychologists about why they want to change the number of hours spent in each role. A study by Reschly (2000) examined trends in school psychology and concluded that determinants of school psychologists' roles are understood imperfectly. The combination of legal requirements, funding mechanisms, service delivery models, and attitudes and beliefs exert influence on school psychology employment, working conditions, and time spent in roles.

The final hypothesis predicted that school psychologists practicing in rural school settings would have a higher average rating of job satisfaction compared to school psychologists practicing in urban and suburban school settings. School psychologists

practicing in rural school settings reported the highest average rating of job satisfaction with 3.10, followed by suburban school psychologists with 3.08 and urban school psychologists with 2.97. School psychologists practicing in rural and suburban school settings were considered to be in the satisfied range, and school psychologists from urban school settings were considered to be in the dissatisfied range. Although school psychologists in rural school settings reported the highest average rating for job satisfaction, a one-way ANOVA did not result in statistically significant differences between school settings for job satisfaction.

Previous research has found that in general, school psychologists report being satisfied with their jobs (Proctor & Steadman, 2003; Reschly, 2000; Reschly & Wilson, 1995; VanVoorhis & Levinson, 2006; Worrell, Skaggs, & Brown, 2006). More specifically, a study examining school settings (urban, rural, and suburban) found differences in job satisfaction ratings. Huebner (1993) found urban school psychologists in secondary schools to be more satisfied than rural school psychologists in secondary schools.

In an attempt to examine predictors of job satisfaction, actual hours spent in each role and the discrepancy between actual and preferred hours in each role were analyzed with mean job satisfaction rating. Results indicated that although actual hours spent in psychoeducational assessment and direct intervention were significantly correlated with mean job satisfaction, actual hours for all seven roles did not impact mean rating for job satisfaction. Prior research had found that time spent in roles such as counseling and psychoeducational assessment correlated significantly with job

satisfaction. Huebener (1993) reported job satisfaction increased as time spent in individual and family counseling increased and time spent in assessment decreased.

Results from the present study indicated the discrepancy between actual and preferred hours for 3 roles did impact ratings of job satisfaction. Positive regression coefficients were found for direct intervention, counseling, and prevention, meaning that school psychologists' preference for increasing their time in these roles had an impact on job satisfaction. School psychologists reported that the idea of increasing their time in these 3 roles would impact job satisfaction. A study from Brown, Holcombe, Bolen, and Thompson (2006) found that school psychologists reported higher job satisfaction when there were small discrepancies between actual and preferred hours for non-traditional delivery models. Similar results were reported from that study such as decreasing the amount of time in assessments and increasing the amount of time in areas such as direct intervention.

Limitations

There were several limitations identified. First, the response rate from potential participants was lower than other similar research studies. The process for accessing the survey and study may have affected the response rate for this study, 10.57%. Participants were sent a postcard with a web address, and were asked to visit the website in order to access the electronic link to the survey. The response rate may have been improved if the researcher was allowed to email the electronic link for the survey instead. Unfortunately, the researcher was not provided with members' email addresses through the database of Wisconsin school psychologist information. The information

reported by the participants may not actually represent the majority of Wisconsin school psychologists.

A second limitation of this study was the small sample size as a result of a low response rate. A small sample size of 164 participants may limit the generalizability of the results found in this study. The results from this study may not be generalizable to the entire population of school psychologists in Wisconsin.

A third limitation of the present study was the method for obtaining job satisfaction ratings. Previous research has cited using the long form of the MSQ and includes 100 questions. For the present study, the short form was used and included 20 questions. Due to the length of the survey without the job satisfaction questions, it was decided that the short form would allow the researcher to obtain a valid estimate of job satisfaction without making the survey excessively long. Using the short form for the MSQ limits the ability to fully compare satisfaction ratings of this study to previous studies. Total scores cannot be compared, but mean ratings can be compared. Most research in job satisfaction and school psychology has used the MSQ long form and cut scores for satisfaction categories.

Future Directions

Future research could enhance the impact and generalizability of the present study. First, the study could be replicated with modifications in order to obtain a larger sample size from Wisconsin. Those results could be compared with the present study to determine current practices, preferred practices, and job satisfaction of school psychologists in Wisconsin. Another future direction could include administering the entire 100-item MSQ long form to Wisconsin school psychologists. These findings could

be analyzed and compared to national and state findings for job satisfaction among school psychologists. Finally, a future direction could include continuing to explore the barriers and challenges for school psychologists in obtaining a set of roles that balances their preferences and school districts' needs. As mentioned earlier, training and school district cultures may be interfering with practitioner's ability to obtain more time in preferred roles (non-traditional roles). Additional research is needed to identify the barriers, and how to combat those challenges to ensure that school psychologists can achieve a balance. School psychologists continue striving to obtain a balance between what their school district needs and what they would prefer to spend their time doing. The findings in this study help illustrate for Wisconsin the issue of continuously striving to find that balance between what school districts need and what school psychologists find important.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agresta, J. (2004). Professional role perceptions of school social workers, psychologists, and counselors. *Children & Schools*, 26(3), 151-163.

Anderson, W.T., Hohenshil, T.H., & Brown, D.T. (1984). Job satisfaction among practicing school psychologists: A national study. *School Psychology Review, 13(2),*225-230.

Bradley-Johnson, S. & Dean, V.J. (2000). Role change for school psychology: The challenge continues in the new millennium. *Psychology in the Schools, 37(1),* 1-5.

Bramlett, R.K., Murphy, J.J., Johson, 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.

Brown, M.B., Holcombe, D.C., Bolen, L.M., & Thomson, W.S. (2006). Role function and job satisfaction of school psychologists practicing in an expanded role model. *Psychological Reports*, 98(2), 484-496.

Bruce, A.M., Getch, Y.Q., & Ziomek-Daigle, J. (2009). Closing the gap: A group counseling approach to improve test performance of African-American students. *Professional School Counseling, 12(6),* 450-457.

Castillo, J.M., Curtis, M.J., & Gelley, C. (2012). School psychology 2010 – Part 2: School psychologists' professional practices and implications for the field. *Communiqué, 40(8),* 4-6.

Cleary, T.J. (2009). School-based motivation and self-regulation assessments: an examination of school psychologists beliefs and practices. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 25, 71-94.

Conoley, C.W., Conoley, J.C., & Reese, R.J. (2009). Changing the field of change. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 19,* 236-247.

Curtis, M.J., Castillo, J.M., & Gelley, C. (2012). School psychology 2010: Demographics, employment, and the context for professional practices – Part 1. *Communiqué, 40(7),* 1 & 28-30.

Curtis, M.J., Hunley, S.A., & Chesno Grier, J.E. (2002). Relationships among the professional practices and demographic characteristics of school psychologists. *School Psychology Review, 31(1)*, 30-42.

Curtis, M.J., Hunley, S.A., Walker, K.J., & Baker, A.C. (1999). Demographic characteristics and professional practices in school psychology. *School Psychology Review, 28(1),* 104-116.

Dean, V. & Burns, M.K. (2004). Practicing school psychologists' perceived role in prevention of school violence. *Psychological Reports*, *94(1),* 243-250.

Dillon, P.J. (1989). A comparison between Arizona school psychologists' perceptions of actual and idealized evaluative and consultative roles. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University).

Elledge, L.C., Cavell, T.A., Ogle, N.T., & Newgent, R.A. (2010). School-based mentoring as selective prevention for bullied children: A preliminary test. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 31,* 171-187.

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

Howse, R.B., Lange, G., Farran, D.C., & Boyles, C.D. (2003). Motivation and self-regulation as predictors of achievement in economically disadvantaged young children. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 2(Winter)*, 151-174.

Huebner, E.S. (1993). Psychologists in secondary schools in the 1990s: Current functions, training, and job satisfaction. *School Psychology Quarterly, 8(1)*, 50-56.

Larson, J.P., & Choi, H. (2010). The effects of university training and educational legislation on the role and function of school psychologists. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 26, 97-114.

Levinson, E.M., Fetchkan, R., & Hohenshil, T.H. (1988). Job satisfaction among practicing school psychologists revisisted. *School Psychology Review, 17(1),* 101-112.

Lewis, M.F., Truscott, S.D., & Volker, M.A. (2008). Demographics and professional practices of school psychologists: A comparison of NASP members and non-NASP school psychologists by telephone survey. *Psychology in the Schools, 45(6),* 467-482.

Luck, L. & Webb, L. (2009). School counselor action research: A case example. *Professional School Counseling, 12(6),* 408-412.

Miller, D.M., & Jome, L.M. (2008). Psychologists and the assessment of childhood internalizing disorders: perceived knowledge, role preferences and training needs. *School Psychology International*, 29(4), 500-510.

McClelland, M. M., Cameron, C. E., McDonald Connor, C., Farris, C. L., Jewkes, A. M., Morrison, F. J. (2007). Links between behavioral regulation and preschoolers' literacy, vocabulary, and math skills. *Developmental Psychology, 43(4)*, 947-959.

Ning, H. K., & Downing, K. (2010) The reciprocal relationship between motivation and self-regulation: A longitudinal study on academic performance. *Learning and Individual Differences, 20,* 682-686.

Powers, K., Hagans, K., & Busse, R.T. (2008). School psychologists as instructional consultants in a response-to-intervention model. *The California School Psychologist,* 13, 41-53.

Proctor, B.E., & Steadman, T. (2003). Job satisfaction, burnout, and perceived effectiveness of 'in-house' versus traditional school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(2), 237-243.

Reschly, D.J. (2000). The present and future status of school psychology in the United States. *School Psychology Review, 29(4),* 507-522.

Reschly, D.J. & Connolly, L.M. (1990). Comparisons of school psychologists in the city and country: Is there a 'rural' school psychology? *School Psychology Review, 19(4)*, 534.

Reschly, D.J., Genshaft, J., & Binder, M.S. (1987). The 1986 NASP survey: Comparison of practitioner, NASP leadership, and university faculty on key issues. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 300 733).

Reschly, D.J. & Wilson, M.S. (1995). School psychology practitioners and faculty: 1986 to 1991-92 trends in demographics, roles, satisfaction, and system reform. *School Psychology Review, 24(1)*, 62.

Rossen, E. & Charvat, J. (2011). Preliminary results from the NASP self-assessment tool. *Communiqué, 40(4),* 4.

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.

Solly, D.C. & Hohenshil, T.H. (1986). Job satisfaction of school psychologists in a primarily rural state. *School Psychology Review, 15(1)*, 119-126.

Stoiber, K.C., & Vanderwood, M.L. (2008). Traditional assessment, consultation, and intervention practices: urban school psychologists' use, importance, and competence ratings. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 18, 164-292.

Thielking, M., Moore, S., & Jimerson, S.R. (2006). Supervision and satisfaction among school psychologists: An empirical study of professionals in Victoria, Australia. *School Psychology International, 27(4),* 405-414.

VanVoorhis, R.W. & Levinson, E.M. (2006). Job satisfaction among school psychologists: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly, 21(1)*, 77-90.

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.

Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967) *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* [Monograph]. Minnesota: Work Adjustment Project Industrial Relations Center University of Minnesota.

What is RtI? Retrieved March 10, 2011, from National Center on Response to Intervention website, http://www.rti4success.org.

Wnek, A.C., Klein, G., & Bracken, B.A. (2008). Professional development issues for school psychologists: What's hot, what's not in the United States. *School Psychology International*, 29(2), 145-160.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2006). *Wisconsin Content Guidelines for School Psychologist (62) Licensure Programs Pupil Services Category.* Retrieved from http://tepdl.dpi.wi.gov/epp/licensure-program-guidelines.

Wood, J. (2006). Effect of anxiety reduction on children's school performance and social adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 42(2),* 345-349.

Worrell, T.G., Skaggs, G.E., & Brown, M.B. (2006). School psychologists' job satisfaction: A 22-year perspective in the USA. *School Psychology International, 27(2),* 131-145.

Wright, D. & Gutkin, T.B. (1981). School psychologists' job satisfaction and discrepancies between actual and desired work functions. *Psychological Review, 49,* 735-738.

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Electronic Survey

Demographics:

1. Age:_____

2. Gender: ___Male ___Female

3. Ethnicity: ___African American ___Hispanic/Latino ___Asian American
___Native American ___Caucasian ___Other

4. Are you currently practicing as a school psychologist in a school setting?

___Yes ___No

5. Current level of degree? ____Bachelors Degree ____Masters Degree

____Specialist Degree ____Doctoral Degree _____Other

6. State Licensed? ____Yes ____No

7. National Certification? ____Yes ____No

8. Ratio of students to school psychologists in your school setting?_____

9. Is the school setting considered: ___Rural ___Urban ___Suburban

10. School setting you spend the majority of your time

_____ Early Childhood ____Elementary School _____Middle School

_____High School

11. Do you have a specialized role in your school setting? ___Yes ____No

If yes, Please explain:

_____

12. Do you intend to remain in the profession? ____Yes ___No

Actual and Preferred Role:

Psychoeducational Assessment Role: evaluations for disability conditions, testing, scoring and interpretation of psychoeducational tests, report writing, eligibility, or placement conferences with teachers and parents, re-evaluations.

13. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Psychoeducational Assessment role. _____Hours

14. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Psychoeducational Assessment role? _____Yes ____No

15. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Psychoeducational Assessment role? _____Hours

16. Please evaluate the Psychoeducational Assessment role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Direct Interventions Role: Working with teachers, students, and parents to develop intervention goals, specific intervention plans, and evaluate success of intervention through progress monitoring.

17. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Direct Interventions role. _____Hours

18. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Direct Intervention role? ____Yes _____No

19. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Direct Intervention role? _____Hours

20. Please evaluate the Direct Intervention role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Consultation Role: Problem-solving consultation with teachers or parents with students as clients in the interest of changing the behavior of the client, problem identification, problem analysis, treatment design and implementation, and treatment evaluations.

21. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Consultation role.
_____Hours

22. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Consultation role?

___Yes ___No

23. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Consultation role? _____Hours

24. Please evaluate the Consultation role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Counseling Role: Individual counseling, group sessions, social skills groups, or crisis intervention.

25. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Counseling role.
_____Hours

26. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Counseling role?

____Yes ____No

27. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Counseling role? _____Hours

28. Please evaluate the Consultation role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Systems/Organizational Consultation Role: working toward system level changes, improved organizational functioning, school policy, general curriculum issues.

29. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Systems/Organizational Consultation role. _____Hours

30. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Systems/Organizational Consultation role? ____Yes ____No

31. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Systems/Organizational Consultation role? _____Hours

32. Please evaluate the Systems/Organizational Consultation role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Prevention Services Role: Conducting at-risk screening with students and developing school wide or classroom-based programs to promote prosocial behavior.

33. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Prevention Services role. _____Hours

34. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Prevention Services role?

____Yes ___No

35. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Prevention Services role? _____Hours

36. Please evaluate the Prevention Services role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Research/Evaluation Role: Program evaluation, conducting research, grant writing, needs assessment, determining correlates of performance, and evaluating effects of programs

37. Estimate the number of hours in a typical week spent in the Research/Evaluation role. _____Hours

38. Is this amount of time necessary to perform tasks in the Research/Evaluation role?

____Yes ____No

39. What is the number of hours in a typical week you *should* spend performing tasks in the Research/Evaluation role? _____Hours

40. Please evaluate the Research/Evaluation role and indicate how important these factors are in your decision to increase or decrease the amount of time preferred to be spent in that role. Slide the bar for each option.

	Not at all important	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
Case Load				
Graduate Training				
Professional Affiliation				
Evidence-Based Practice				
Number of Referrals				
School District Policy				
Federal Policies				
Personal Interest				
Other				

Job Satisfaction:

On my present job, this is how I feel about…

41. Being able to keep busy all the time

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

42. The chance to work along on the job

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

43. The chance to do different things from time to time

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

44. The chance to be "somebody" in the community

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

45. The way my boss handles his/her workers

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

46. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

47. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

48. The way my job provides for steady employment

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

49. The chance to tell people what to do

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

50. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

51. The way school policies are put into practice

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

52. My pay and the amount of work I do

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

53. The chances for advancement on this job

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

54. The freedom to use my own judgment

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

55. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

56. The working conditions

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

57. The way my co-workers get along with each other

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

58. The praise I get for doing a good job

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

59. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job

Very Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

Appendix B: Postcard

Dear Participant:

Krystle Kaifesh, in the Department of School Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire is conducting a study comparing rural, urban, and suburban school psychologists' actual and preferred roles. The role of the school psychologists has been changing and we are interested in its current state. You are invited to participate in this study. There are no direct benefits to you from your participation; however, the data will be useful to the school psychology profession and be presented at national and state conferences. A link for the survey is provided at the bottom of the postcard. Your potential participation is entirely voluntary. You may discontinue your participation in the study at any time if you so choose without prejudice. Your identity will be kept confidential.

I hope that you will choose to participate in this study. A high return rate is needed to assure that our data are representative. If you have any questions about this project or the results please contact Krystle Kaifesh (414)416-3654 or Dr. Jeffrey Goodman (715) 836-2215, at the Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, 54702.

LINK FOR SURVEY WILL APPEAR HERE

Appendix C: Reminder Postcard

Dear Participant,

You have previously been sent an invitation to participate in a study being conducted by Krystle Kaifesh in the Department of School Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. The study aims to compare rural, urban, and suburban school psychologists' actual and preferred roles. The role of the school psychologists has been changing and we are interested in its current state. You are invited to participate in this study. There are no direct benefits to you from your participation; however, the data will be useful to the school psychology profession and be presented at national and state conferences. A link for the survey is provided at the bottom of the postcard. Your potential participation is entirely voluntary. You may discontinue your participation in the study at any time if you so choose without prejudice. Your identity will be kept confidential.

In case you have already participated in the online survey, thank you. If you have not had the opportunity to participate yet, I hope that you will choose to participate in this study. A high return rate is needed to assure that our data are representative. If you have any questions about this project or the results please contact Krystle Kaifesh (414)416-3654 or Dr. Jeffrey Goodman (715) 836-2215, at the Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, 54702.

LINK FOR SURVEY WILL APPEAR HERE

Appendix D: Cover Letter and Statement of Consent (Electronic Survey)

Welcome,

You have been invited to take part in a study comparing rural, urban, and suburban school psychologists' actual and preferred roles in Wisconsin. The role of the school psychologist has been changing and we are interested in it's current state. This survey is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Ed.S. degree in School Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire and has been approved by the University Institutional Review Board. Mailing information has been obtained by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction website. Your participation is completely voluntary.

If you have any questions or concerns about your treatment as a participant in this study, please contact Dr. Don Bredle, Chair, Institutional Review Board for Protection of Human Subjects, Schofield 17, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, WI, 54702-4004, (715) 836-2373. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

This survey will take approximately 30 minutes of your time. First, you will be asked 12 questions for the purposes of demographic information. Second, you will be asked 35 questions about each of the seven roles school psychologists typically engage in. Last, you will be asked 20 questions about job satisfaction in your career field. Your answers will be kept anonymous and secure to extent possible with the hardware and software security systems we have currently in use. I encourage your participation in this survey.

Please click "I agree to participate" to continue on to the survey. If you do not wish to continue, click "I do not agree to participate."

Thank you,

Krystle Kaifesh