DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 170 CG 017 442

AUTHOR Smith, Douglas K.
TITLE Doctoral and Nondoctoral School Psychologists: Differences and Similarities.
SPONS AGENCY Wisconsin Univ., River Falls.
PUB DATE Aug 83
GRANT 9-1035-81
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Competence; *Doctoral Degrees; Educational Experience; Job Performance; *Job Skills; *Masters Degrees; Professional Services; *School Psychologists; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

In order to compare the practice of school psychology by doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners, the National School Psychology Questionnaire was sent to a nationwide, random sample of practicing school psychologists employed in public school settings. Responses from 869 school psychologists (142 doctoral practitioners and 727 nondoctoral practitioners) were analyzed. Minimal gender differences were noted. Doctoral school psychologists tended to spend more time with junior and senior high school students and students with behavioral problems and less time with mentally retarded students. Doctoral level practitioners, compared to nondoctoral level practitioners, indicated less time in intellectual assessment and more time in personality assessment, parent counseling, and research. Both groups wanted to reduce the amount of time spent in assessment, report writing, and attending child study meetings and to increase the amount of time spent in student observation, counseling activities, program development, inservice activities, and research and consultation. Doctoral school psychologists rated their competencies in each professional activity at a higher level than nondoctoral school psychologists. Overall the results indicated more similarities than differences in functioning between the two groups. (Author/BL)

Doctoral and Nondoctoral School Psychologists: Differences and Similarities

Douglas K. Smith

University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Running head: DOCTORAL AND NONDOCTORAL SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

Paper presented at 91st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at Anaheim, CA, August 1983.

This research was supported by Research Grant 9-1035-81 from the Institutional Research Committee of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

The author would like to thank Sandra Cochran, Robert de Gregory, Patricia Klass, Patrick Kleiner, Connie Schollmeier and Julie Smith for their assistance in this research.

Abstract

In order to compare the practice of school psychology by doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners, the National School Psychology Questionnaire was sent to a nationwide, random sample of practicing school psychologists employed in public school settings. Responses from 869 school psychologists (142 doctoral practitioners and 727 nondoctoral practitioners) were analyzed. Minimal gender differences were noted in the practice of school psychology. Doctoral school psychologists, as compared to nondoctoral school psychologists tended to spend more time with junior and senior high school students and students with behavioral problems and less time with mentally retarded students. With regard to professional activities, doctoral level practitioners indicated less time in intellectual assessment and more time in personality assessment, parent counseling and research, as compared to nondoctoral level practitioners. Both groups wanted to reduce the amount of time spent in assessment, report writing and attending child study meetings and to increase the amount of time spent in student observation, counseling activities, program development, inservice activities, research and consultation. Doctoral school psychologists rated their competencies in each professional activity at a higher level than nondoctoral school psychologists. Overall the results indicate more similarities than differences in functioning between the two groups. The implications of these results for the future practice of school psychology are discussed.

Doctoral and Nondoctoral School Psychologists: Differences and Similarities

The present status and future of school psychology have been discussed extensively at the Spring Hill Symposium, the Olympia Conference and elsewhere (e.g. Bardon, 1982; Kratochwill, 1982; Phillips, 1981). Among the issues raised has been the entry level for the practice of school psychology. This issue received renewed attention recently as Bardon (1983) supported a nondoctoral entry level for the practice of school psychology and a new definition and name for the current doctoral specialty. Central to this debate is whether doctoral and nondoctoral school psychologists practice in a different manner.

Although many studies of school psychologists have been completed (e.g. Fairchild, 1974; Goh, Teslow & Fuller, 1981; Lacayo, Sherwood & Morris, 1981; Meacham & Peckham, 1978), none has focused on this issue in a comprehensive manner. Subjects for these studies usually have been selected on the basis of professional memberships and sample sizes have been small or regional in nature.

Therefore, the present study was designed to examine the differences between doctoral and nondoctoral school psychologists in types of children served (actual and desired time spent with each exceptionality), ages of children served, professional activities (actual and desired times in each) and perceived

competencies in the professional activities.

Method

Subjects for the present study consisted of practicing school psychologists who had previously completed the National School Psychology Questionnaire (NSPQ). Consequently, sampling procedures are briefly described here and are presented in greater detail elsewhere (Smith, 1983).

Subjects were selected randomly from the 1981-82 state department of education or local school district listings of currently employed school psychologists. For those states lacking such lists, membership lists of state school psychology organizations were used. If these were not available, the membership list of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) was used. Membership lists accounted for less than 25% of the sample.

The National School Psychology Questionnaire (NSPQ) was sent to 1,982 school psychologists representing a random sample of 15% of school psychologists identified as previously described. Responses were received from 962 individuals for a return rate of 49%. Only questionnaires from currently practicing school psychologists were used in data analysis (N = 869).

Respondents to the NSPQ had 8.14 years of school psychology experience and 2.81 years of teaching experience. Mean age was 38.7 for the sample. Characteristics of the subjects by level of training and gender are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Results and Discussion

Results of the NSPQ were analyzed using a series of 2 x 2 analyses of variance for unbalanced designs with level of training (doctoral, nondoctoral) and gender (male, female) as independent variables and questionnaire items as dependent variables. Post hoc comparisons utilized the protected t-test procedure (Couch, 1982).

No significant differences were indicated in the number of students served per year (mean of 167) or in the school psychologist to student ratio (mean of 1:2305).

Student exceptionalities (actual)

Doctoral as compared to nondoctoral school psychologists indicated significantly more time serving students with behavioral disorders with $F(1, 817) = 21.49$, $p < .001$ and significantly less time serving mentally retarded students with $F(1, 816) = 6.09$, $p < .001$. Main effects based on gender and interaction effects were not significant. In addition, there were no significant differences in time spent with the other seven categories of students. Results by level of training and gender are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

It should be noted that equivalent times are spent with the general school population, the learning disabled, the gifted and talented, students with sensory disorders, the physically handicapped and students with speech disorders. Thus, the two groups of practitioners (doctoral and nondoctoral) are quite similar in the amounts of time devoted to various student exceptionalities. The differences in actual time spent with various types of students are relatively small and are restricted to only two categories of students: the mentally retarded and those with behavioral disorders.

Student exceptionalities (desired)

Several significant differences were indicated in the percentage of time the practitioners would like to spend with students. Doctoral as compared to nondoctoral and female as compared to male school psychologists indicated significantly more time desired in serving students with behavioral disorders with $F(1, 753) = 25.79$, $p < .001$ and $F(1, 753) = 2.02$, $p < .04$ respectively and significantly less time with the general school population with $F(1, 757) = 3.65$, $p < .001$ and $F(1, 757) = 5.53$, $p < .001$ respectively. Interaction effects were not significant. In addition, doctoral as compared to nondoctoral practitioners indicated less time desired with mentally retarded students with $F(1, 758) = 6.89$, $p < .001$. Male as compared to female school psychologists indicated less time desired with students with

speech disorders with $F(1, 758) = 3.50$, $p < .001$. No significant differences by level of training or gender with the other categories of students and no significant interaction effects were present. Results by level of training and gender are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

With the exception of the gender differences, this pattern of results is similar to the pattern for actual times and suggests much similarity between doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners. Again the major differences are confined to the behavioral disorders and mental retardation categories, with the differences in the range of 4% to 10%. Although gender and level of training differences were present for the general school population, an examination of Table 3 indicates this was primarily the result of female, doctoral level school psychologists desiring to spend 16% of their time with this group as compared to approximately 22% for the other groups. It appears that female, doctoral practitioners would balance this by spending more time with behavioral problem children. The reason for this difference is not clear. Time with other categories among the four groups is quite consistent.

A comparison of actual and desired times spent with exceptional students reveals identical patterns for the school psychologists. Regardless of level of training or gender there is a desire to increase involvement with the regular school

population, students with behavioral problems, gifted and talented students, the physically handicapped, students with sensory disorders and students with speech disorders. Involvement with the latter four groups would still comprise less than 15% of the school psychologist's time. Although reductions are indicated in time spent with learning disabled and mentally retarded students (regardless of gender and level of training), the majority of time both presently and desired is devoted to the general school population, students with behavioral problems and the learning disabled with the greatest desired increase concentrated in service to the general school population (with the exception of female, doctoral school psychologists).

Student ages

Some differences in age groupings of students are revealed. Significant main effects for gender with $F(1, 858) = 3.68$, $p < .003$ and significant interaction effects with $F(1, 858) = 8.24$, $p < .001$ were obtained for service to preschool students. Post hoc comparisons indicated that female, doctoral level school psychologists spent significantly more time with preschoolers than male, doctoral level and female, nondoctoral level school psychologists. At the elementary level significant main effects for level of training with $F(1, 853) = 6.48$, $p < .001$ and significant interaction effects with $F(1, 853) = 2.38$, $p < .02$ were noted. Post hoc comparisons indicated that female,

nondoctoral practitioners spent significantly more time with these students than male and female doctoral practitioners. At the junior high level significant main effects for level of training were noted with $F(1, 854) = 3.20$, $p < .002$ with doctoral practitioners devoting more time to this group. At the senior high level significant main effects for both level of training and gender were indicated with $F(1, 854) = 4.51$, $p < .001$ and $F(1, 854) = 2.13$, $p < .04$ respectively. Doctoral practitioners and male practitioners devoted more time to this group than did the nondoctoral and female groups. Results by level of training and gender are reported in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

All four groups devote the most time to the elementary age student, followed by the junior high population, the senior high population and the preschool population. This rank order of time spent with each group of students by level of training and gender compares favorably with a previous study (Goh, Teslow & Fuller, 1981) in which 88% of the school psychologists surveyed indicated they "always" or "often" worked with elementary students followed by junior high, senior high and preschool students.

An inspection of Table 4 indicates that doctoral level school psychologists devote 40% to 42% of their time to the combined junior/senior high population, whereas nondoctoral level school

psychologists devote 32% to 35% of their time to this grouping. Thus, doctoral practitioners may be responding to the increased emphasis being placed on the needs of adolescents. At the same time this result may relate to the doctoral level school psychologists' preferences for working with students with behavioral difficulties as this category of exceptionality has increased at the junior/senior high level with the implementation of P.L. 94-142.

Professional activities (actual)

An analysis of actual professional activities by general area (intervention, consultation, assessment, research) revealed little difference between doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners. Time devoted to intervention and consultation was similar (23% and 18% respectively). Assessment comprised the greatest amount of time (approximately 53%). Significant interaction effects with $F(1, 702) = 2.10$, $p < .04$ indicated that female, nondoctoral level school psychologists spent more time in assessment than male, nondoctoral level school psychologists. Although doctoral as compared to nondoctoral practitioners indicated more time in research with $F(1, 701) = 4.22$, $p < .001$, less than 3% of the time was devoted to this activity.

An analysis of the specific activities comprising assessment, intervention and consultation revealed additional differences. In the area of assessment, significant main effects for level of

training were indicated for intellectual assessment with $F(1, 618) = 4.93$, $p < .001$ and personality assessment with $F(1, 616) = 23.45$, $p < .001$. School psychologists with doctoral degrees indicated they performed significantly less intellectual assessment and significantly more personality assessment than their nondoctoral colleagues. In the intervention area, significant main effects for level of training with $F(1, 659) = 9.00$, $p < .001$ and significant interaction effects with $F(1, 659) = 2.92$, $p < .01$ were indicated for counseling parents. The post hoc comparisons indicated that female, doctoral level school psychologists did more parent counseling than female, nondoctoral practitioners. In the area of consultation, significant main effects were present for gender only on the administrative consultation and inservice presentation variables with $F(1, 619) = 3.29$, $p < .01$ and $F(1, 619) = 2.84$, $p < .01$ respectively. Male school psychologists performed more administrative consultation and female school psychologists devoted more time to inservice activities.

Results for professional activities by level of training and gender are presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

Once again there seem to be more similarities than differences in the allocation of time to various professional activities. The differences that do exist, however, are primarily based on level of

training rather than gender and suggest a more clinical practice of school psychology by doctoral practitioners. Less time is devoted to intellectual assessment (22% vs. 26%) and more time is devoted to personality assessment (13% vs. 8%) by the doctoral level school psychologists. This emphasis on personality assessment, as compared to nondoctoral practitioners, may be related to the preference of doctoral level school psychologists to spend more time with students with behavioral problems.

The obtained differences in parent counseling, administrative consultation and inservice activities, although statistically significant, suggest no practical differences in functioning. The amount of time devoted to each activity by each group is less than 6%.

The rank order of activities from most time to least time is assessment, intervention, consultation and research. This ranking is the same regardless of level of training or gender. For all groups assessment comprises over 50% of the time and research consumes 2% or less of the practitioner's time. Numerous surveys of practitioners (e.g. Goldwasser, Meyers, Christenson and Graden, 1983; Hughes, 1979; Meacham & Peckham, 1978) have indicated that assessment is the activity receiving the greatest amount of time from school psychologists. The present study clearly indicates that level of training is not related to the overall time devoted to assessment and has only a minimal relationship to distribution

of time in other activities.

Professional activities (desired)

Similarities are again noted in the way doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners would like to spend their time. There were no significant main effects due to level of training or gender in intervention and consultation. Significant main effects for level of training and gender were indicated for assessment with $F(1, 666) = 2.26$, $p < .03$ and $F(1, 666) = 2.26$, $p < .03$ respectively. The doctoral and male groups indicated less time for assessment than did the nondoctoral and female groups respectively. Doctoral as compared to nondoctoral school psychologists indicated a preference for more involvement in research with $F(1, 667) = 6.23$, $p < .001$.

An analysis of the specific activities comprising assessment, intervention and consultation revealed several differences. In the area of assessment, significant main effects for level of training were indicated for intellectual assessment with $F(1, 573) = 2.39$, $p < .05$, for personality assessment with $F(1, 571) = 6.10$, $p < .001$, for student observation before testing with $F(1, 611) = 3.15$, $p < .01$ and for student observation after testing with $F(1, 614) = 2.97$, $p < .01$. Doctoral level school psychologists indicated a preference for less intellectual assessment, more personality assessment and less student observation as compared to nondoctoral level school psychologists. There were no significant

main effects for gender or significant interaction effects. In the intervention area, significant main effects for level of training were indicated in program development with $F(1, 582) = 2.09$, $p < .05$ and significant main effects for level of training and gender as well as interaction effects were indicated for parent counseling with $F(1, 618) = 3.94$, $p < .001$, $F(1, 618) = 3.94$, $p < .001$ and $F(1, 618) = 7.38$, $p < .001$ respectively. Doctoral level school psychologists indicated more time in program development and female, doctoral level school psychologists indicated they would like to devote more time to parent counseling than the other groups. In the area of consultation, significant main effects for level of training with $F(1, 615) = 5.61$, $p < .001$ and gender with $F(1, 615) = 3.01$, $p < .01$ were indicated for inservice activities. Doctoral level school psychologists and female school psychologists indicated a greater emphasis in this area as compared to the other groups.

Results for professional activities (desired) by level of training and gender are presented in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

These results clearly indicate differences in how the school psychologists would like to practice with doctoral practitioners differing from nondoctoral practitioners in about 50% of the specific activities comprising assessment, intervention and

consultation. Again the percentage differences are modest but the pattern of results suggests greater differences in functioning than previously noted. The pattern suggests a more clinical approach to school psychology by doctoral pracitioners as evidenced by less intellectual assessment, more personality assessment, less student observation, more parent counseling, more program development and more inservice activities as compared to nondoctoral practitioners.

The source for this difference may be the training of the school psychologists. Often doctoral training involves a greater emphasis on clinical skills and more practicum and internship experience in clinical settings. For example, doctoral programs often require a one year internship which is usually evenly divided between public schools and clinical settings, whereas practicum experiences are usually weighted toward more public school experience.

The gender differences which occurred are minimal and do not seem to reflect practical differences in functioning. In addition, they generally occurred in combination with stronger degree effects.

It should be noted that both doctoral and nondoctoral school psychologists are in agreement with the direction of change in the allocation of time to professional activities. Both groups desire reductions in assessment, report writing and time in child study meetings. At the same time they desire increases in student observation, counseling activities (students, parents, teachers),

program development inservice activities, research and consultation (teacher, parent, administrative). The percent of time the two groups would devote to these activities does vary to some extent and suggests a more clinical orientation to school psychology by the doctoral practitioners. The differences in percentage of time the practitioners would devote to these activities, although statistically significant, are rather small and range from 1% to 4%. The overall pattern of results, however, suggests less agreement between the two groups as compared to their actual professional activities. Thus, it appears that the two groups might practice school psychology differently if they were able to structure the role as they would like.

Perceived competencies in professional activities

Participants indicated their perceived competencies in the specific activities comprising assessment, intervention and consultation using a seven point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (low competency) to 7 (high competency).

Significant main effects for level of training were indicated by the analyses of variance on all the activities comprising assessment, intervention and consultation and significant main effects for gender were indicated on competencies in intellectual assessment, student observation before testing and in counseling students. There were no significant interaction effects. Doctoral level school psychologists perceived their competencies

in all areas at a higher level than nondoctoral level school psychologists. Male school psychologists perceived their competencies at a higher level than female school psychologists in personality assessment and student counseling whereas female school psychologists rated their competencies higher in student observation before testing. Results of the analyses of variance are presented in Table 7 and mean competency scores by level of training and gender are presented in Table 8.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 about here

The clear pattern that emerges from these results is that doctoral level school psychologists rate their competencies on a higher level than nondoctoral practitioners. Significant differences ($p < .001$) in competency rating by level of training are indicated on each professional activity, whereas such differences by gender were noted on only one activity, student observation before testing. There were no significant interaction effects.

Perceived competency and time spent in professional activities

Although perceived competency by an individual may or may not correspond to one's actual competency, it seems likely to be related to the frequency with which one engages in particular activities. The more competent an individual perceives his or her skills in a particular activity, the more likely the

individual would be to engage in those activities. At the same time continued use of skills in a particular activity may well lead to higher levels of perceived competency. Thus, perceived competency may be positively related to time devoted to specific professional activities. Therefore, Pearson product moment correlations were computed for competency ratings and time devoted to each professional activity. These results are presented in Table 9 by level of training and gender.

Insert Table 9 about here

Although a number of statistically significant correlations are reported in Table 9, many of them appear to have minimal practical significance. Therefore, only correlations greater than .20 are considered significant for the present study. With this criterion, 5 of the correlations for doctoral level practitioners and 15 of the correlations for nondoctoral level practitioners are significant and suggest definite but small relationships between competency ratings and percent of time devoted to an activity.

For the doctoral school psychologist, competency ratings are at a higher level than nondoctoral school psychologists. In addition, the relationship between perceived competency and percentage of time devoted to an activity is not as strong as with nondoctoral school psychologists.

For the nondoctoral group percent of time devoted to a number of professional activities is positively related to perceived competency. The more time devoted to an activity, the more competent they view themselves. Conversely, the less time devoted to an activity, the less competent they view themselves. Many of the significant correlations are in activities in which the practitioners spend little time (3% to 9%) at present but in which they want to expand the time commitment.

The desire of school psychologists to engage in more consultation and intervention activities and less assessment activities has been documented in the present study and others (e.g. Hughes, 1979; Meacham & Peckham, 1978). At the same time a comparison of the previous studies and the present one indicate that the percentage of time devoted to assessment, consultation and intervention has remained relatively stable. In other words there has been little, if any, expansion of time devoted to intervention and consultation.

The perceived competency of the nondoctoral school psychologist may be related to this failure to expand the time devoted to intervention and consultation. In the present study the nondoctoral school psychologists rated their competencies in activities such as counseling students, counseling teachers, program development and consultation at lower levels than their competencies in intellectual assessment and report writing. In

addition, the intervention and consultation activities each received less time from the practitioners (3% to 9%) while intellectual assessment and report writing together received 40% or more of their time. In order to expand school psychologists' activities in consultation and intervention, it would be necessary for school psychologists to limit the activities in which they feel the most competent and are the most experienced and to expand their involvement in activities in which they feel less competent and are less experienced. Although the mean competency ratings for all activities are average or above, there could be some reluctance to engage in activities in which they view themselves as less competent.

The failure to expand roles and functions of the school psychologist has been attributed previously to external causes such as litigation, legislation and the historical link with special education and its emphasis on assessment (Ysseldyke, 1978). The present study suggests that this may not be the case. Rather the typical, nondoctoral practitioner, who comprises the vast majority of practicing school psychologists, may want to do more consultation and intervention, and yet, be reluctant to expand these activities on the basis of perceived competency. In such a situation the practitioner could easily cite an external reason, such as demand for assessment services, for maintaining the status quo rather than one's perceived competency level and lack of

experience in the new area. This could certainly apply to practitioners who have been in the field for a number of years, since consultation training, for example, has not been emphasized in training programs until recently. Clearly the relationship between perceived competency and role expansion merits additional investigation.

Conclusions

The present study indicates minimal gender differences in the practice of school psychology and only moderate differences based on level of training. There are no significant differences in number of students served per year or school psychologist to student ratio between doctoral and nondoctoral school psychologists. Doctoral level practitioners exhibit a more clinical approach to school psychology. They devote less time to intellectual assessment and more time to personality assessment as compared to their doctoral colleagues. In addition, doctoral school psychologists both allocate and want to allocate less time to mentally retarded students and more time to students with behavioral problems.

Greater differences are noted in the ways in which doctoral school psychologists would like to divide their time within professional activities as compared to nondoctoral school psychologists. The former group would emphasize clinical activities such as personality assessment, parent counseling,

program development and research to a greater degree. The direction of change (increase or decrease in time allotted), however, is the same for both groups in each professional activity presented.

The most significant result from the present study is that doctoral level practitioners rate their competencies on a higher level than nondoctoral level practitioners. This result is present for every professional activity presented. In addition, perceived competency is more strongly related to percent of time devoted to professional activities for the nondoctoral school psychologists. This relationship may explain the failure of school psychologists to expand their activities in consultation and intervention, areas that receive less emphasis as compared to assessment and areas in which school psychologists indicate a desire to expand their involvement. Therefore, it is suggested that inservice programs for practicing school psychologists be developed to provide training and experience in these areas. Such training should focus on skill development, the practice of those skills in simulated settings and, most importantly, the use of those skills in real-life situations. This training should be an on-going process that provides the participants an opportunity to meet regularly to discuss specific cases and analyze successes and failures rather than a single session program. In addition, it might be helpful for groups of school psychologists to work

together in systematically expanding their involvement in specific activities. By working together, practitioners might be able to offer each other mutual support as they gain additional experience in the activity. This might also lead to higher levels of perceived competency.

Although some differences in the practice of school psychology by doctoral and nondoctoral level practitioners are indicated, the two groups do not seem to dramatically differ in their approach to the specialty. The data from this nationwide sample of practicing school psychologists suggest that the differences that do exist are differences of degree and not in basic orientation to the field. For example, both doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners would like to reduce the time they spend in intellectual assessment from 52% to 37% for doctoral group and from 55% to 40% for the nondoctoral group.

It should be noted that this sample was drawn from school psychologists practicing in public school settings. It is possible that differences do exist in the practice of school psychology between public school and nonpublic school settings and that a greater percentage of nonpublic school practitioners are trained at the doctoral level. However, the differences between doctoral and nondoctoral practitioners in the public schools are minimal.

The similarity of functioning between doctoral and nondoctoral

practitioners lends support to a nondoctoral entry level for school psychologists, as the data do not indicate that doctoral specialists practice school psychology in a significantly different manner from their nondoctoral colleagues. School psychology, as currently practiced by doctoral and nondoctoral specialists, is remarkably similar and encompasses a wide range of activities and functions. Finally, the results of the present study do not support the hypothesis that school psychologists with a doctoral degree represent a specialty that is different from that represented by nondoctoral school psychologists.

References

Bardon, J. (1982). School psychology's dilemma: A proposal for its resolution. Professional Psychology, 13 (6), 955-968.

Bardon, J. (1983). Psychology applied to education: A specialty in search of an identity. American Psychologist, 38 (2), 185-196.

Fairchild, T. (1974). An analysis of the services performed by a school psychologist in an urban area: Implications for training programs. Psychology in the Schools, 11, 275-281.

Goh, D., Teslow, C., & Fuller, G. (1981). The practice of psychological assessment among school psychologists. Professional Psychology, 12 (6), 356-362.

Goldwasser, E., Meyers, J., Christenson, S., & Graden, J. (1983). The impact of PL 94-142 on the practice of school psychology: A national survey. Psychology in the Schools, 20 (2), 153-165.

Hughes, J. (1979). Consistency of administrators' and psychologists' actual and ideal perceptions of school psychologists' activities. Psychology in the Schools, 16 (2), 234-239.

Kratochwill, T. (1982). School psychology: Dimensions of its dilemmas and future directions. Professional Psychology, 13 (6), 977-989.

Lacayo, N., Sherwood, G., & Morris, J. (1981). Daily activities of school psychologists: A national survey. Psychology in the Schools, 18, 184-190.

Meacham, M. & Parkham, P. (1978). School psychologists at three-quarters century: Congruence between training, practice, preferred role and competence. Journal of School Psychology, 16, 195-206.

Phillips, B. (1981). School psychology in the 1980's: Some critical issues related to practice. In T. Kratochwill (Ed.). Advances in school psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smith, D. (1983). Practicing school psychologists: Their characteristics, activities and populations served. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Ysseldyke, J. (1978). Who's calling the plays in school psychology? Psychology in the Schools, 15, 373-378.

Table 1

Characteristics of Participants

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male[a]	Female[b]	Male[c]	Female[d]
Age in years	42.50	39.44	37.43	39.02
Months employed per year	10.39	10.41	10.46	10.21
Years of teaching	4.25	3.51	2.41	2.81
Years as a school psychologist	10.85	7.18	8.50	7.18
Individual students served (1980-81)	165	156	158	179
School psychologist to student ratio (1981-82)	1:2231	1:2183	1:2303	1:2343

[a] n = 86 [b] n = 56 [c] n = 384 [d] n = 343

Table 2

Mean Percent of Time Spent with Students by Exceptionality

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
General school population	17.50	13.76	16.75	15.52
Behavioral problems	28.30	28.73	19.70	20.52
Learning disabled	30.08	29.67	33.06	31.57
Mentally retarded	9.81	12.41	14.72	14.30
Gifted/talented	3.44	3.08	3.04	4.66
Hearing/vision disorders	2.29	2.12	2.37	3.25
Physically handicapped	2.64	2.53	2.37	2.38
Speech disorders	1.89	2.86	2.65	2.78

Table 3

Mean Percent of Time Desired with Students by Exceptionality

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
General school population	22.45	15.80	23.78	21.62
Behavioral problems	28.69	32.84	21.19	22.13
Learning disabled	23.66	22.13	24.81	22.16
Mentally retarded	8.71	8.11	12.01	11.23
Gifted/talented	6.64	5.85	6.53	7.36
Hearing/vision disorders	2.72	2.67	2.64	3.53
Physically handicapped	2.30	2.64	2.54	2.56
Speech disorders	1.15	2.58	2.08	2.80

Table 4

Mean Percent of Time Spent with Students by Age

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Preschool	3.77	9.93	6.75	5.53
Elementary	49.92	47.93	52.67	59.14
Junior high	22.10	22.06	18.80	18.78
Senior high	20.02	17.87	16.53	12.78

Table 5

Mean Percent of Time Devoted to Professional Activities

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Assessment	53.59	51.17	52.74	56.15
Intellectual	22.82	21.96	24.99	28.24
Personality	12.89	14.18	8.21	8.73
Report writing	15.20	12.75	14.36	16.41
Student observation				
before testing	4.14	3.42	4.18	4.35
after testing	1.48	1.48	2.08	1.82
Intervention	22.84	24.93	23.88	21.20
Counseling students	8.51	7.32	8.10	6.20
Counseling parents	4.46	5.94	3.76	3.38
Counseling teachers	2.29	2.59	3.48	2.66
Child study meetings	6.27	7.50	7.50	8.03
Program development	1.91	2.28	2.35	2.42
Consultation	19.97	17.80	19.31	18.20
Teachers	7.34	8.35	8.44	7.50
Parents	5.56	4.97	5.61	5.54
Administrators	4.91	3.69	4.54	3.81
Inservice activities	1.42	2.50	1.75	1.88
Research	1.31	2.02	1.21	.54

Table 6

Me[illegible] Percent of Time Desired in Professional Activities

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Assessment	35.97	38.38	38.37	41.08
Intellectual	14.94	14.23	15.82	17.62
Personality	11.75	9.88	8.18	8.38
Report writing	8.26	7.58	7.68	9.70
Student observation				
before testing	3.95	4.90	5.34	6.01
after testing	2.27	2.77	3.38	3.61
Intervention	30.14	29.68	31.22	29.63
Counseling students	11.15	10.12	12.04	10.86
Counseling parents	6.10	10.25	6.69	6.47
Counseling teachers	3.66	4.09	4.52	4.50
Child study meetings	4.92	5.91	5.95	6.95
Program development	4.10	5.56	3.78	3.94
Consultation	24.59	22.10	23.09	22.63
Teachers	9.40	10.19	9.79	8.95
Parents	7.86	6.53	7.16	7.12
Administrators	4.57	4.52	4.47	4.49
Inservice activities	3.97	5.31	3.06	3.62
Research	6.30	5.52	4.32	3.76

Table 7

Analysis of Variance Results for Perceived Competencies

	Value of F for Main Effects		df
	Degree	Gender	
Assessment			
Intellectual	4.85**	.00	(1, 788)
Personality	33.18**	3.08*	(1, 753)
Report writing	15.94**	.49	(1, 773)
Student observation			
before testing	14.93**	4.37**	(1, 738)
after testing	6.61**	.05	(1, 738)
Intervention			
Counseling students	22.16**	8.97**	(1, 778)
Counseling parents	28.78**	1.72	(1, 753)
Counseling teachers	25.70**	1.46	(1, 707)
Child study meetings	12.69**	.95	(1, 720)
Program development	27.86**	1.53	(1, 634)
Consultation			
Teachers	31.28**	1.51	(1, 795)
Parents	24.57**	.52	(1, 765)
Administrators	14.90**	.80	(1, 717)
Inservice activities	39.71**	.11	(1, 691)

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .001$

Table 8

Mean Competency Ratings in Professional Activities

	Doctoral Level		Nondoctoral Level	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Assessment				
Intellectual	6.65	6.65	6.50	6.51
Personality	6.19	5.94	5.44	5.25
Report writing	6.25	6.40	5.92	5.91
Student observation				
before testing	6.03	6.35	5.70	5.81
after testing	6.08	6.00	5.60	5.74
Intervention				
Counseling students	6.20	5.70	5.49	5.24
Counseling parents	6.31	6.08	5.59	5.50
Counseling teachers	6.17	6.00	5.50	5.35
Child study meetings	6.17	6.43	5.90	5.87
Program development	5.60	5.95	4.88	4.94
Consultation				
Teachers	6.32	6.24	5.83	5.67
Parents	6.39	6.34	5.91	5.82
Administrators	6.15	6.10	5.75	5.60
Inservice activities	5.84	6.05	5.11	5.00

Table 9

Correlation between Perceived Competency and Time Spent in Professional Activities

	Doctoral Level				Nondoctoral Level			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	n	r	n	r	n	r	n	r
Assessment								
Intellectual	55	.25*	27	-.10	282	-.03	244	-.02
Personality	53	.29*	27	.35*	272	.40**	222	.37**
Report writing	54	.05	26	.17	281	.00	239	.04
Student observation								
before testing	50	-.11	26	-.11	261	.21**	232	.15
after testing	37	.14	18	.15	216	.32**	193	.10
Intervention								
Counseling students	55	.19	31	.06	289	.29***	238	.18**
Counseling parents	53	.04	29	-.07	279	.32***	224	.22***
Counseling teachers	45	.38**	24	.04	266	.21***	212	.38***
Child study meetings	51	.05	27	-.20	263	.21***	218	.21***
Program development	39	.14	20	.25	228	.35***	193	.19**
Consultation								
Teachers	57	.08	33	.11	287	.15**	249	.22***
Parents	51	.03	27	.40*	281	.16**	241	.17**
Administrators	45	-.20	22	-.05	257	.18**	227	.25***
Inservice activities	50	.23	25	.09	239	.29***	219	.12*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$