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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to ascertain (1) the functions related to reading improvement now performed by a nation-wide sample of school psychologists, (2) their attitudes toward the performance of these functions, and (3) the school psychologists' conceptions of their relationships with reading teachers and specialists with respect to the improvement of reading.

Sources of Data

A questionnaire for school psychologists was designed (1) to identify their present functions related to reading improvement, (2) to indicate functions they think they should perform in order to deal adequately with reading problems, and (3) to obtain comments on the relationship between the school psychologist and the reading teacher or reading consultant. This questionnaire was sent to the membership of Division 16, the Division of School Psychologists, of the American Psychological Association (1,250 members).

Interviews were also conducted with a small sample of teachers of reading to ascertain the functions they expected the school psychologist to perform.
Major Findings

The questionnaire listed 24 functions which the investigator had judged to be related to reading improvement. Of these functions, the top three which the school psychologists said they performed are listed below, together with the frequency with which each of them was performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Performers (N=308)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Diagnose the causes of reading problems: Perceptual, psychogenic,</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental, faulty education, and others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administer individual intelligence tests upon request.</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assist in decisions about promotion and retention of students who</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have reading problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a substantial discrepancy between what school psychologists are doing in connection with reading and what they think they should be doing. Collectively, they see themselves kept short of the involvement they would prefer by such restrictions as time available to them, school and other policies on assignment of responsibilities, and limitations of other school personnel in profiting from and contributing to team efforts.

Insofar as the data were applicable to the question of whether or not clinically oriented school psychologists tend to neglect the psychoeducational or cognitive factors
in learning disorders, the data did not support the position that they are typically neglectful in this way.

The data revealed great diversity in the patterns of participation by individual school psychologists in particular functions, reflecting the variability of the personnel resources with which schools seek to meet reading program problems and challenges. This study supplies evidence which is helpful in understanding the difficulty experienced by Division 16 of the American Psychological Association in attempting to arrive at a consensus on the proper functions of the school psychologist.

Application

This study has called attention to a previously unexplored area: the contribution made by the school psychologist to the improvement of reading and the relationship between the school psychologist and the reading consultant. The findings suggest that some appraisal and other types of studies should be considered for the purpose of developing more definitive data in certain areas and identifying factors important in realizing the potentials of school psychologists in contributing toward the improvement of reading programs.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Although there is no dearth of advice about the proper role and function of school psychologists in connection with the improvement of students' reading, there is very little information on their actual contribution to it or on their attitudes toward what they are doing or might be doing. This lack of information is felt even among psychologists themselves.

Underlying many school learning and behavior problems are reading disabilities which may be prevented or corrected by skillful classroom instruction. Most classroom teachers are well aware of how the child behaves in a classroom setting and have some ideas as to why he behaves the way he does. Frequently, however, they need additional help in determining the causes of the difficulty and in instituting programs of corrective instruction. Reger (1965) stated that the primary function of the school psychologist is to help plan educational programs for children. "School psychologists," he said, "not only should be interested in preventing a reading problem from developing in a certain child, but in seeking ways of
making the reading experience a positive one for that child and for all children" (p. 18).

Typical of a more moderate and more widely accepted view is Strang's (1967) statement that the school psychologist works as a member of a team with the reading specialist, social worker, clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, and other professional persons available, in support of the teacher.

Whether a corps of workers functions as a team of equal staff members or in a hierarchy of supervision, the qualifications of each should complement those of the others. Qualifications of teachers of reading, reading specialists and school psychologists are being clarified, but these changes are taking place largely as a result of attempts to upgrade the professional qualifications of individual groups. There is still a lack of coordination based upon a concept of an ideal, articulated reading team. Before such a concept can be developed, there is need for more information on the ways in which the school psychologist has gained acceptance as a contributor to reading programs. If school psychologists are, and will continue to be, important contributors to reading programs, the nature of optimum interaction among them and reading personnel should be considered in establishing professional qualifications that take into account an appropriate division of responsibility.
It has been claimed (Capobianco, 1967) that the teacher and various specialists within the school "... are pathetically uninformed with regard to the role and functions of the school psychologist" (p. 105). The resulting misperceptions interfere with achieving the full potential of interaction. The need for an accurate perception of all important contributors to the reading program should be recognized in the training of reading teachers and consultants.

Lack of factual data is reflected by those writing about school psychologists. For example, White and Harris (1961) were forced to write in terms of likelihood in the statement: "Clinically oriented school psychologists may make the mistake of focusing on the emotional bases of reading difficulty to the neglect of other factors" (p. 232). Only an appropriate study can determine whether they actually do.

The school psychologist himself is in need of a better basis for assessing the shift of emphasis in his collective role. Division 16 of the American Psychological Association issued a list, in 1958, of the functions of school psychologists, accompanied by the statement: "The committee has been literally astounded by the amount of agreement" (p. 2). Less than ten years later French (1967) remarked: "Division 16 does not feel that this publication is now an adequate statement of the duties and
responsibilities of school psychologists in our present situation." It would therefore seem that the situation has achieved a much greater degree of complexity in a relatively short period of time. Lacking the guidance of a consensus on what is proper, school psychologists should find it helpful to have some definitive data on what their counterparts in other school systems are actually doing in the reading area.

There are indications that the role of the school psychologist has been undergoing a shift of emphasis from his traditional concern with emotional disturbance and deviant social behavior to concern with learning problems amenable to remediation. One aspect of this shift is greater activity in in-service training of teachers, accompanied by less work with individual children and their parents. These indications, however, do not provide much basis for appraising the extent to which the shift has already taken place or the factors that may contribute to its continuation. Predictions of future trends in this area cannot be made merely by extrapolating trends manifested over past periods.

Thus, the main problem with which this survey seeks to deal is the need for a basic fund of information on the activities and intentions of school psychologists in connection with the improvement of reading.
Questions to be Investigated

The primary objective of this survey is to gather normative data for describing the present activities and inclinations of school psychologists involved in the reading area. It is expected that the data will confirm that the school situations of psychologists are extremely diverse, that variations in their professional qualifications are reflected in their particular activities, and that these variations, along with those of reading consultants, result in a diversity of views of psychologists on their interrelationships with reading consultants.

The study is designed to elicit information from respondents that will make possible an analysis of role satisfaction of school psychologists, for subsequent speculation concerning possible role change.

Further, the data are expected to yield statistical data useful in determining whether clinically oriented psychologists will be significantly less active than school-oriented psychologists in such areas as psycho-educational evaluation, research, curriculum development, and in-service education.

Assumptions Underlying the Problem

It is assumed that a respondent who is asked whether he does or does not perform certain clearly
specified functions will provide a reliable report of these functions.

The question of whether or not a respondent thinks he should perform each of the particular functions is not intended to produce data upon which to predict the extent to which any indicated shift of emphasis will be actualized. The purpose of this phase of the inquiry is to assess the discrepancies, if any, between what school psychologists are doing in connection with reading and what they think they should be doing. Since the inclinations of school psychologists comprise only one of a number of factors in determining their particular activities, their response on this score can at best be used only for predicting direction rather than extent of shift.

The questions in the questionnaire inviting the psychologist to summarize his contribution to reading and his conception of the relationship between him and the reading consultant are somewhat general in form, to facilitate a freer response in which prejudices, enthusiasms, and attitudes toward communication difficulties and jurisdictional problems may be represented. Results of other descriptive studies support the assumption that this is an effective condition for eliciting insights concerning interpersonal relations between members of a team.
Limitations of the Problem

The findings of this study will be limited by the following conditions:

1. The sample data will consist of responses from a percentage of returns from the target population. Any mailed questionnaire response is subject to bias resulting from such factors as interest or lack of interest that determine whether or not an individual responds.

2. Much of the data, being primarily qualitative in character, will not be suitable for quantitative assessment and will be analyzed mainly in accord with qualitative methods.

Definitions

A serious impediment to an orderly investigation of the collaborative relationship in which the school psychologist is involved with educational specialists in the reading area is the semantic confusion arising from lack of an accepted basic terminology defined with adequate precision. Definitions are continually being rewritten. As an example, Magary (1967) cited fifteen completions of the sentence starting, "The school psychologist is . . ." then added his own definition as the sixteenth (pp. 684-686).
The following definitions have been adapted by the investigator from various sources to serve the purposes of this study.

1. **School psychologist** is defined as a full-time employee of a school system, whose responsibility is to use his psychological training and experience in the furtherance of the educational program of the school and community.

2. **Reading teacher** (or teacher of reading) is a person actively engaged in the teaching of reading without regard to the qualifications he might have that would be required for a reading specialist or reading consultant. There is no standard categorization of educators who are active in the reading area; therefore, definitions must necessarily be arbitrary, and related to the context in which the terms are used.

3. **Reading consultant** is one who is trained to identify and diagnose reading problems and to direct remedial procedures; to plan and implement developmental reading programs; to guide and assist teachers in the classroom procedures most effective in the teaching of reading. The title of reading specialist is also fairly common in the literature. In this study, the reading specialist will be referred to as a reading consultant. The classroom
teacher who is responsible for implementing the reading program in his room will be referred to as the teacher of reading.

4. **Psychoeducational evaluation** is defined as the process of identifying children's educational assets and deficiencies for the purposes of formulating educational goals and providing the means for achieving them.

5. **Clinically oriented** denotes the psychologist concerned primarily with helping those who have behavior, attitudinal, or emotional disorders to find better adjustment and self-expression.

6. **Task analysis** is the determination of the particular components of the content of learning tasks in terms that can be correlated with much more circumscribed learning attainments than are denoted by school "subjects."

7. **Cognitive domain** is that aspect of the activity of the organism which is concerned with perceiving, recognizing, conceiving, judging, and reasoning.

8. **Affective domain** is that aspect of the activity of the organism which is concerned with feeling, emotion, mood, and temperament.
Summary

There are many aspects of the teaching of reading that baffle classroom teachers. Some of these aspects require psychological knowledge and research, which psychologists should be able to supply to teachers. They should be skillful in communicating this knowledge to teachers in such a way as to help them improve classroom practice. This survey seeks to determine to what extent school psychologists are active in acquiring and communicating knowledge that will be helpful to teachers in the improvement of reading; and to what extent they consider their activities to be adequate in this respect.
CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature will begin with a general consideration of patterns and functions of personnel in the field of reading. This topic in turn will be subdivided into four major areas: teachers' needs for help in the teaching of reading, the reading consultant as a source of help, the school psychologist as a source of help, and the school psychologist as a contributor to the reading program. The chapter will conclude with a short summary.

References in this chapter were chosen to provide a perspective on the general setting in which the school psychologist seeks to have an impact on the school reading program. This setting includes both the personnel context in which he serves and the general state of the knowledge upon which he must draw to implement his help. The basic call for his help arises from the needs of teachers. First in line in answering this call for help is the reading consultant, if there is one on the scene. Next is the school psychologist, to the extent of his own qualifications, and within the school policy governing performance of functions of other personnel. These three types of school personnel--
teacher, reading consultant, and psychologist—functioning in a collaborative relationship, are sometimes referred to as a reading team.

**Patterns of Personnel and Function in the Field of Reading**

Surveys have shown many patterns of personnel and function involved in the improvement of students' reading. Dever (1956) sent a questionnaire to the 2,961 members of the National Association for Remedial Teaching and the International Council for the Improvement of Reading Instruction, to explore the work being done by persons in various reading positions at different educational levels. The number of replies was 480. Of these, 272 persons were specialists in various types of reading positions, and 208 were in other positions involving some responsibility for reading. Eight of the specialists who responded were school psychologists.

The connection with reading reported by the eight psychologists ranged all the way from providing therapy to emotionally disturbed children who were also poor readers to that of two respondents spending full time in reading work. One response Dever characterized as giving a typical picture of psychological services in which reading played a prominent part: "My reading work is integrated with other functions—testing, maintaining relations with clinics,
referral of pupils, and conferences with staff members" (p. 127).

In connection with eleven functions relating to the elementary school reading program, Austin and Morrison (1963), in the Harvard report on reading, did not find the school psychologist named as a participant at all. However, the category "Other Personnel" was mentioned, with the following notation: "School librarians, when available, are valuable assets to any reading programs. So, too, are psychologists, guidance counselors, and research directors. Like members of the administrative staff, these specialists are overburdened with a multitude of responsibilities" (pp. 196-197). One reason for the merely incidental emergence of the school psychologist in this report was the emphasis of the study on developmental reading with little attention given to readiness and remedial programs.

The composition of the reading team is not a constant from one school or system to another. In fact, in many systems there cannot be said to be a reading team at all. Austin and Morrison (1963), in Table 12 of their study, cited a 1960 survey made by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which reported the percentages of school systems having special subject matter assistance. Table 12 is reproduced here:
Percentages of Small, Medium, and Large School Systems Providing Special Assistance in Selected Subject Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Small (88)</th>
<th>Medium (75)</th>
<th>Large (106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In commenting on the information in Table 12, Austin and Morrison (1963) said:

The rationale given for the preponderance of art, music, and physical education teachers over reading specialists is that classroom teachers need help in teaching the ancillary subjects but not necessarily in teaching reading. On the basis of observations in approximately two thousand classrooms, the staff rejects this line of reasoning (p. 184).

These authors reported that the position most frequently mentioned by all systems as carrying major responsibility for some aspects of the elementary school program was that of elementary supervisor. This person was named by more than half of all respondents as having some responsibility for the content and conduct of the reading program.
Under the title of Reading Consultant, Austin and Morrison (1963) subsumed Specialists, Directors, and Coordinators. They reported:

... superintendents expect the reading consultant to devote a considerable amount of time working with non-readers or underachieving readers. This practice is somewhat difficult to defend, especially since the school officials interviewed agreed almost unanimously that the preparation received by the prospective teacher in the area of reading instruction at the collegiate level was inadequate (pp. 183-184).

In this chapter, concern will be restricted to the teacher of reading and the reading consultant (as defined in Chapter 1) in addition to the school psychologist himself. This may seem arbitrary in view of the diversity of personnel revealed by the Austin and Morrison (1963) study as having responsibility for reading, but is not without justification. It is, after all, ultimately the classroom teacher who needs help. The logical intermediary between the classroom teacher and whatever the psychologist may have to contribute is the reading consultant. Although Austin and her associates found reading consultants in less than one-third of the systems they studied, it seems safe to assume that this type of specialist is employed in more schools than was the case in 1963, when the study was conducted. It is also assumed that this trend will continue.
Teachers' Needs for Help in the Teaching of Reading

Studies on this topic are extremely limited both in number and in scope. One complication of study in this area is that classroom teachers sometimes have a misperception of a reading consultant or a psychologist which may prevent their seeking help on a particular problem for which those people are a potential source of help.

Perceived Needs. Adams' (1964) study of teachers' instructional needs in teaching reading, based on a questionnaire sent to a sampling of teachers in Florida schools, supplied the nucleus around which effective inservice education could be provided. Teachers were asked to assess the degree of need they felt for learning more about twenty-one different aspects of the teaching of reading. At least 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that teachers felt great need or some need for learning about corrective and/or remedial reading, diagnosis of reading problems, treatment of reading problems, and ways to meet individual differences and needs in reading. Forty per cent indicated that they already had sufficient understanding about the library, purposes of grouping and ways of grouping for reading, ways to attack new words, and ways to secure new books. The implication here is that the psychologist could be useful in helping to determine individual differences.
The Thayer Conference Report, *School Psychologists at Mid-Century* (Cutts, 1955), included a short section entitled "What the Classroom Teacher Wants." It was devoted almost entirely to the following summary of the testimony of one classroom teacher:

What do I want of a school psychologist?

I want a person to help me in the classroom in problems where I'll need help.

I want one to help me with a solution to my problem rather than to give me a diagnosis of my problem.

I want one to help me solve my problems within my classroom setting (as much as possible) rather than to take my problems from my classroom.

I want one to give me advice on my relations with my fellow staff-members if I need it.

I want one who may give me ideas on new techniques of teaching, but not one who would do them for me.

I want one who would be a member of my staff, rather than an assistant in the administrative office.

I want one who would be a member of the team.

I want one whose personality traits would be outstanding.

In teaching, we start with the child—we get back to the child. We are all in this together (p. 71).

Austin (1958), in reviewing the literature relating to the role of the school psychologist at the elementary level, found that:

While the majority of those who have written about the school psychologist have gone on record
as believing that all teachers, principals, and children within the elementary schools should have access to psychological services, that they are important and necessary, a few were found who voice hostility, suspicion and distrust of a school psychologist.

Durrell argues that the use of good teaching techniques is the key to solving most children's problems. He tells of one school system which has largely eliminated reading failures by providing specific teaching in the perceptual backgrounds necessary for reading and allowing children with high learning rates to progress accordingly (pp. 11-12).

"Real" Needs. Capobianco (1967) saw as one "real" need of the classroom teacher that of correcting her misperception of the psychologist. To substantiate this he reported the results of a brief questionnaire given to students in one of his summer classes, composed of thirty-five teachers of regular classes, six special class teachers, three school administrators, two school psychologists or counselors, two college instructors, and one student who did not indicate his occupation. He asked particularly for information about frequency of consultation with the psychologist, the psychologist's function in relation to school personnel, and the desirable and undesirable aspects of interaction in working with a school psychologist concerning a child in a classroom. From responses to these and other questions he concluded that:

1. The true role of the school psychologist is vague in the minds of these respondents.
2. In spite of lack of initiative in enlisting the aid of specialists, the respondents conclude that school needs are not met.

3. Interpersonal contacts between school psychologist and the child (or teacher) were seen predominately as negative, e.g., the child will fear the setting, the teacher will be concerned with her personal problems (pp. 104-105).

Capobianco commented that "The school psychologist may be perceived as either help or threat by the teacher... perhaps the basic criticism of teachers toward psychologists is the teachers' feeling that the psychologist is 'talking down' to them" (pp. 106-107).

On this point, Cutts (1955) reported:

No criticism is more devastating than the one which says psychologists look down on teachers. Failure to recognize teachers' competencies in education and their primary responsibilities is partly the cause of this difficulty. The wise, experienced school psychologist—and there are many!—has quite a different attitude. He looks on the teacher as a professional colleague. He knows that the good teacher is a highly-trained specialist in education. He recognizes that the teacher is not only responsible for each child in the classroom but that only the teacher can give the child who is in difficulty the minute-by-minute and day-by-day help which re-education entails. The Conference recognized this in agreeing that the psychologist's position was "staff, not line," in other words that the psychologist is an advisor and not an executive (p. 71).

Meeting Teachers' Needs. Approaches to meeting teachers' needs seem to fall into two categories, which might be referred to as the realistic and the idealistic. Engelmann (1967), in working with teachers at the Institute
for Research on Exceptional Children, at the University of Illinois, concluded: "The only contributions that are of real value to the teacher are those that allow the teacher to proceed forward, to a less inclusive, more specific knowledge about educational deficits and methods for correcting those deficits—a knowledge of concepts and of techniques for demonstrating the structure and application of concepts" (p. 98). His rule of thumb, in evaluating the psychologist's contribution from the teacher's standpoint, was:

As a teacher, do I know more about precisely how to educate the child than I did before I received the explanation? . . . Has the explanation changed any of the primary educational problems facing the child? Would I, as a teacher, have reasonable grounds for altering a single technique? Does the explanation provide me with a specific selection criterion? (p. 98).

With Bereiter, Engelmann (1967) developed a set of guidelines for helping teachers by developing curricula, methods and diagnostic instruments consistent with the condition imposed by the teaching situation. Excerpts from the guidelines they developed and followed are:

1. Express deficiencies in such a way that they are within the domain of the teacher. . . .

2. Qualify the references to "norms" of behavior and specify the educational conditions associated with norms. . . .

3. Develop test instruments that imply specific directions for the teacher. . . .
4. Develop educational explanations that talk about concept variables, not developmental variables.

5. Promote teaching attitudes consistent with the teaching situation. Do not blame the child if he fails to learn; blame yourself, and change your approach.

6. Develop programs in which concepts are presented as concepts, as specific rules of behavior that can be taught in a clean manner.

(Reger, 1965) suggested that the school psychologist could help the teacher by crystallizing the planning for new techniques, thus converting teachers' interests into concrete projects.

In such "realistic" approaches, help is accommodated basically to perceived needs. There is often, however, a sought by-product in the area of "real" need in the form of more accurate perception of the psychologist. In connection with the impression of being "talked down to," Capobianco (1967) observed that the most effective way to dispel this kind of negation is for the psychologist to make practical recommendations, which will tend to reduce tensions of the teacher and promote greater cooperation and positive action. Teachers, in his opinion, vary in their needs. "Teacher A," he commented, "may need and demand fully prepared outlines or cookbooks describing specific behaviors for unique classroom situations, B may not" (p. 108).
Trione (1967) found that the solution of classroom problems was a mutual responsibility of the psychologist and the classroom teacher and that as the teacher learned to use the psychologist's training and skills he developed insight and implemented his own efforts with his class. The result was a gain in achievement by children of an experimental group of teachers, plus a significant change in teacher attitude related to guidance and reading principles.

In what has been referred to as "realistic" approaches, there is little direct effort to extend the competencies of the teacher. In "idealistic" approaches, on the other hand, the psychologist accepts a call for, as Eiserer (1963) put it, "... providing more formal opportunities for the teacher to improve her knowledge of the theories and practices of psychology which will enable her better to discharge her functions as a teacher" (p. 82). This is in accord with a projection of Magary's (1967) for the future:

Teachers will be more carefully trained and will be more sophisticated regarding psychological and sociological concepts. Teachers will be more knowledgeable regarding evaluation of educational competence and the promotion of mental health than were our school psychologists of the 30's--and 40's.

New concepts in learning will continue to influence educational and psychological thinking. The teacher and school psychological services worker will more carefully think through required behavior changes in children and as to whether suitable reinforcement is provided (pp. 674-675).
Trachtman (1961) also foresaw a close involvement of teacher and psychologist. He predicted that the schools of the 70's would not be able to provide the academic, clinical, and social services necessary for the children. As a result, he said, the limited non-instructional services possible for the schools to provide will, or should, focus primarily on education. This orientation would mean that the school psychologist would work closely with teachers in securing the intellectual development of the child, leaving adaptive and mental health problems largely to other agencies.

In order to further the intellectual development of the child, the teacher ideally needs to understand much more about the reading process. The recent increase in numbers of psychologists in the schools adds to the impact of psychological thinking about the causes of reading difficulty. Chall (1963) found that teachers had begun to question their role, wondering whether they should teach the child to read or try to get at the basic cause of his reading difficulty. She concluded: "With the recent emphasis on psychological factors in learning . . . many teachers have underestimated their role as teachers, and have, in fact, been almost afraid to teach. Yet they can contribute most, not by delving into the child's deeper problems, but by teaching him to read" (p. 442).
Dochant (1964) warned that since the teacher cannot understand fully how the pupil learns to read, he must constantly check teaching practices against theory and experimentation. He said:

The teacher cannot impulsively apply a "cookbook" recipe to learning problems. He may be content to give first place to the art of effective teaching, but for the highest excellence he generally must know also its scientific basis. He must know the why in order to perform the how. He must understand the learner as well as or better than what is learned (p. 479).

Since 1960 there has been an increase in the attention to the perceptual skills required for reading and to investigation of their amenability to training. A persistent confusor of "b" and "d" can convince a teacher that a better insight into the disability could be helpful. Increased attention to the psychological aspects of reading, to reading programs, and to an insistence that Johnny learn to read well can make the classroom teacher feel inadequate to handle the job alone.

In summary, it appears that the most urgent need is created by the disabled reader. There is divergence of opinion on ways of arriving at a prescription for relief of this need. To remediate the deficiency of such a pupil in accord with a rational plan, a teacher may see as his need a diagnosis of the subject's learning deficits and of his capacity for improvement, this diagnosis to be supplied by the reading specialist or psychologist. He would see
his need as one of enlightenment about the particular child that can be translated into practical training procedures. The conditions under which such help is provided are important. The teacher favors as a provider of such help a co-worker who does not jeopardize his classroom autonomy and his teacher-pupil relation.

Some authorities see a need for an upgrading of teachers that would reduce their dependence upon others for help. The teacher may see part of the solution in in-service training which would develop in him the capacity for more subtle psychological insights. Others see the same end achieved through more rigorous programs in training institutions. Still others would seem to accept the teachers' dependence upon help and would call for greater competence on the part of helping personnel in prescribing pupil-specific remediation.

In the current ferment of curriculum change and experimentation with its emphasis on psychological factors, the teacher needs assurance that what he is doing is not discordant with any established psychological principles. Such assurance can arise only from his own sophistication or from the advice of others in whom he has confidence. One of the latter is the reading consultant.
The Reading Consultant as a Source of Help

With the approval of the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association, a work conference met in November, 1966, to define the various categories of reading specialists. Dieterich (1967) reported on the five categories decided upon by the Conference: Reading Teacher, Reading Consultant, Reading Coordinator, Reading Clinician, and College Instructor. The role of each was defined and each was considered to be a "specialist."

Under the heading, "The Reading Consultant of the Present," Robinson (1967) wrote: "Although the duties of today's reading consultant vary from situation to situation, they appear to encompass the following areas (stated in no established order of priority or significance)" (p. 477). He then elaborated on the following areas: (1) in-service education of a teacher or of groups of teachers; (2) evaluation of tests and testing and of ways of diagnosing student strengths and weaknesses in reading; (3) development and implementation of methods and materials; (4) interpretation of research reports and direction of research studies; (5) explanation of the reading program to the public and to the Board of Education; (6) participation in curriculum development; (7) administration of reading programs and projects; and (8) preparation of reports.

Although there is no explicit mention of the school psychologist in the foregoing, there is room for his
involvement in some of those areas in which the reading consultant's role is designated as that of helper or conferee. Such accounts depict the school psychologist and the reading consultant as collaborators.

Both the school psychologist and the reading consultant are relatively late arrivals on the education scene, but the psychologist has some "seniority." Robinson (1967) reported:

It was not until 1930 that a reading specialist responsible for improving the teaching of reading emerged and then only in a few large cities. Twenty years later special supervisors of reading were visible at state, county, district, and city levels, but in very small numbers. During the early 1950's many more people were hired as reading consultants, but in the main they did not have specialized training in reading and were primarily used as remedial reading teachers (p. 175).

Austin and Morrison (1963) found it difficult to understand why reading consultants had so little responsibility for the overall reading programs of their schools. They reported:

The reading consultant was not ranked first in any of the functions by the chief respondent. The one in which he comes closest to assuming major responsibility is that which provides for diagnostic testing in reading, a function closely related to the corrective reading program. . . . On the other hand, only one-fourth or less of the systems assign to the reading consultant the responsibility for evaluating the reading program, for selecting reading materials, or for interpreting the reading program to parents and interested persons. It would appear, therefore, that in many school systems where reading consultants are employed they must assume more responsibility for the success of retarded readers than for teachers (pp. 187-188).
It would seem that the reading consultant of the stature that Robinson (1967) envisaged has yet to emerge in adequate numbers to establish prestige for the title. There has been only a relatively short time for the emergence, and there is a long way to go.

The future work of the reading consultant may be influenced by the adequacy of teacher education, especially the training of pre-service teachers. In her review of the 1950-1960 decade, Smith (1963) included as one feature "... a spurt of activity in the re-instatement and increase in reading courses in the curriculum of teacher-training institutions" (p. 13).

At the end of the 1950-1960 decade the authors of The Torch Lighters (Austin and Morrison, 1961) reported on academic training of pre-service teachers in the reading area:

A course in basic reading instruction is required in 90 per cent of the colleges sampled; in the remaining 7 per cent an elective course in reading is available to undergraduates. . . .

The requirement for the teaching of reading in the elementary school is satisfied in half of the colleges by student participation in a more general course such as "Teaching the Language Arts" . . . respondents were asked to estimate the instruction time given to reading per se. One hundred thirty-nine colleges offering reading in an integrated course replied to this question. Of these, forty-four indicated less than 10 per cent of instruction time was devoted to reading, eighty-three from 10 to 25 per cent, and the remaining twelve from 25 to 30 per cent (pp. 107-108).
Because of inadequate pre-service education of teachers the need for the reading consultant arose.

To summarize, Robinson (1967) listed duties which he considered within the range appropriate to a reading consultant, including several examples of patterns of functioning performed by particular consultants. His list does not necessarily prescribe the competence of even the ideal reading consultant. The role of the reading consultant as a co-worker with the psychologist is generally recognized in the literature. Affecting this relation as actualized would be the apparent trend toward an increase in the number of highly qualified reading consultants.

The School Psychologist as a Source of Help

Although the school psychologist is not so recent a newcomer to the schools as the reading consultant, he is considered last in this chapter. There is logic in this order in that the reading consultant is an intermediary between the classroom teacher and the psychologist. A discussion of the functions of the school psychologist in the reading area must be conducted largely in terms of relations to these two types of personnel.

Growth of School Psychology. Lighthall (1963) referred to the school psychologist as an "historical accident" (p. 374). However, despite anything questionable about the psychologist's original appearance in the
schools, he is considered by most observers to have a future there. Magary (1967) wrote:

The psychological services specialist in the late 1960's . . . will have many more fellow workers, as the number of individuals employed in this specialized area of educational and psychological employment has expanded six or sevenfold in the last fifteen years and the number will continue to grow . . . as the national school enrollment soars past the fifty million mark in the next decade. . . . Presently approximately eight percent of the national school budget is allocated for pupil personnel services of which school psychology is an important part (pp. 671-672).

To a very large extent, federal money makes up that eight per cent. Again quoting Magary:

These Federal laws offering large scale financial aid will greatly enhance all types of programs for handicapped and deprived children and youth as well as bolster research in the schools. School psychological workers will be called upon to play various roles in diagnosis, remediation, and research to evaluate these various federally initiated projects, and to help to select participants from local school districts (p. 682).

This outpouring of federal money has created a "sellers' market" among those offering psychological and allied services. It is obvious that this situation creates a difficulty for the administrator seeking to put together a staff in which the qualifications of the members nicely complement one another in such an area as reading.

Meacham and Trione (1967) reported a new source of "consumer" demand: "Community and rural school districts that have combined to form more efficient units are entering a phase where they are able to offer special
educational opportunities for many types of handicapped children who previously were not served in the schools" (p. 69).

During the decade of the sixties there has been increasing interest in the role of the psychologist in the school, including his involvement in reading programs. All but one of the dozen or so books published on this subject have appeared since 1960. Two new journals devoted to school psychology began publication in 1963 and 1964. Twice as many textbooks in the field have been published since 1960 as appeared prior to that date.

The bibliography of the Thayer Conference Report (Cutts, 1955) contained 188 references, but in only 29 titles was the term "school psychologist" (pp. 213-223) included. Reger (1965) also listed 188 references, but 166 of these included "school psychologist" (pp. 201-208) in the title.

Functions of the School Psychologist. Helping in the reading area is only one of the responsibilities of a school psychologist. Any realistic concept of the school psychologist as a member of the team of helpers in reading must take into account his diversified role. Even when he has a competence pertinent to reading or could readily acquire it, there is always the question of time available to him. More important, his concept of his basic roles
can be expected to delimit his involvement in such an area as reading.

As early as 1942 The Journal of Consulting Psychology devoted an issue to the functions of the school psychologist. It included an article by Gertrude Hildreth on the school psychologist's concern with reading. It was not until a dozen years later, however, that the Division of School Psychologists, of the American Psychological Association, sponsored a ten-day conference in New York to determine criteria for the functions, qualifications, and training of school psychologists. The report of the conference, popularly known as the Thayer Conference Report, was published in 1955 under the title, School Psychologists at Mid-Century. Cutts (1955), editor of the report, outlined the functions of the school psychologist in five broad categories:

1. Measuring and interpreting the intellectual, social and emotional development of children

2. Identifying exceptional children and collaborating in the planning of appropriate educational and social placements and programs

3. Developing ways to facilitate the learning and adjustment of children

4. Encouraging and initiating research, and helping to utilize research findings for the solution of school problems

5. Diagnosing educational and personal disabilities, and collaborating in the planning of re-educational programs (p. 30).
In 1958 the American Psychological Association published another report, *The Psychologist on the School Staff*, a reconsideration of the functions of the school psychologist. This report put more emphasis on service to the school in matters of administration, policy, and curriculum. It was a step in the progression of the school psychologist from clinician to a worker with broader functions in the school.

Since this report was concerned with the school-wide functions of the psychologist, mention was not made of particular areas such as reading, but the applicability of this kind of training program is readily apparent. Functions emphasized were: (1) service to the individual child, (2) service to the school as a whole, (3) service to the community, (4) research, and (5) organization of psychological services. In the body of the report there were recommendations that the school psychologist advise and collaborate with those offering remedial instruction and consult with staff on educational objectives and programs for pupils with special needs.

The letter of transmittal for this report started with:

Your committee on Reconsiderations of the Functions of the School Psychologist defined its assignment in two parts: (1) to determine whether a reasonable consensus as to the functions of school psychologists existed, and (2) if so, to prepare a clear factual statement in the language of the school administrator, a statement that
would be useful to the staff of a school system in planning new psychological services and in evaluating existing programs. The answer to the first assignment appears definitely positive. The committee has been literally astounded by the amount of agreement . . . . (p. 2).

As reported in Chapter 1, however, this statement is now regarded by Division 16 as inadequate.

Another national conference, "New Directions in School Psychology," the first since the Thayer Conference, was held in June of 1964 under the joint sponsorship of The American Psychological Association and The National Institute of Mental Health. Magary (1967) summed up this important conference with:

Some of the conclusions and recommendations of the conference were as follows: (1) school psychology is not clearly defined at this time; (2) the role of the school psychologist will continue to broaden with emphasis on primary prevention of emotional and learning difficulties through demonstration, consultation, research, and administration of the services of other specialists; (3) it is reasonable to assume that psychologists of different orientations and backgrounds will play an increasingly important part in public education; (4) the unsolved issues of manpower shortage, the desirable level of training of school psychologists remain important; (5) diverse opinions about role, trends, and training need buttressing with intensive self study of training programs; (6) if school psychology is to remain useful to a changing school structure, it must become more concerned with both the broad and local issues affecting its existence; (7) publication of research on self study and professional problems in school psychology, symposia, consensus and minority reports of local and state groups is vital to the development of the field (pp. 721-722).

Research into the functions of the school psychologist. Although limited, there has been some research in
this area. Members of the conference mentioned in the preceding section recommended self study and research on professional problems.

Austin (1958) commented on the confusion existing at that time as to the role of the school psychologist.

Styles (1965) found that teachers considered the school psychologist's most important function to be one of consultant in individual conferences about students.

Keenan (1964) analyzed the work of school psychologists in Massachusetts and found that their most frequently performed duty was consulting with teachers. Their concentration was in the elementary school, then in descending order in special education, and in junior and senior high school.

Scholten (1965) compared the attitudes of school psychologists and kindergarten teachers toward school readiness and found considerable disagreement.

Chickering (1965) described the evaluation of psychological services in a school system in a New York City suburb, serving 4,400 pupils. It was found that the responsibility of the school psychologist fell into two broad areas: service to the individual student and service to the school—including special education, evaluation, research, and contribution to professional literature.

Another action research project was Perkins' (1963-64) in which he sought an evaluation of school
psychological services from 110 administrators, 300 teachers, and 50 school nurses in Phoenix, Arizona. He found that school personnel and psychologists on the staff considered child study the most important function of the psychologist. Administrators considered in-service training the second most important function; teachers and nurses said community service was second, while psychologists thought consultation on curriculum and modification of instructional methods should come second. This kind of consultative service was rated fourth and fifth by teachers and administrators. Psychologists and teachers both gave third place to in-service training; administrators, to community service. Research fell to fourth place in psychologists' rating; to fifth by administrators.

Summaries of opinions concerning functions of school psychologists. Many have voiced opinions concerning the proper functions of the school psychologist. A few are highlighted here.

Gottsegen (1960) summarized them in four broad categories: giving aid to the individual child and his teacher, helping parents, acting as liaison with the community, and conducting research (p. 16).

Trachtman (1961) said: "The responsibility of the school psychologist is to help teachers educate children--nothing more or less than that" (p. 161). In his
summarizing statement he said: "The most effective use of the limited number of psychologists available to the schools is seen to lie in the deemphasis of the clinical approach and in the greater specialization of training and assignment for school psychologists . . . The clinical psychologist, working in the clinic or the school, serves the individual. The newly emerging school psychologist will serve the school" (p. 163).

White and Harris (1961) pointed out that the functions of the school psychologist vary with the type of school program but could be classified in four groupings: educational diagnosis, educational remediation, personality diagnosis, and personality remediation (p. 13).

Gray (1963, pp. 11-12), writing in terms of future needs, saw the emerging school psychologist as a data-oriented problem-solver and a transmitter of psychological skill and knowledge. Problems would be mainly in the areas of school learning and mental health.

Valett (1963, p. 22) pointed out that the development of the profession of school psychology will depend on personal commitment to research within the school.

Bindman (1964) saw the school psychologist as a scientific practitioner providing diverse services, but principally as "a diagnostician, remediator, consultant, and researcher" (p. 9).
Bardon (1964-65), in discussing the proceedings of the Conference on New Directions in School Psychology, said:

... respondents present a rather cohesive picture of the future. There is consensus that research activity in some form will play a larger part. ... Psychometrics is relegated to a lesser position than is true at present. Consultation, education of others, services to other specialists, in-service training, program planning are all part of the immediate future as seen by the conferees. The movement of the specialty is from the psychiatric to the educational; from technical level to professional level; from narrow specialization of function to broader concerns with the entire school system (p. 13).

Salten (1964-65), one of the educators, or "consumers," at the above-mentioned conference, listed thirteen needed services in addition to those already provided by school psychologists. One of them was concerned with knowledge of the teaching of reading:

2. School psychologists need to know more about teaching. The best way for them to find out what teaching is about is for them to know something about the teaching of reading, because reading is the fundamental educational skill. A study of teaching qua teaching which does not deal specifically with some substantive area will not be as helpful (p. 31).

Reger (1965) projected the role of the school psychologist, seeing him evolving from his present role of clinician to that of an "educational engineer," who will help to provide the conditions for professional growth on the part of other educational personnel within the school system.
Bardon (1968) made a projection, also. His projection was of two models of psychological services, one of which would probably be predictive of model direction within ten years. In one model the school psychologist would be understood to be a school technician and not a "psychologist" any more than guidance counselors are counseling psychologists. In the second model, the school psychologist would be a high-level specialist in the psychology of the child as he interacts with the school.

It is evident that the school psychologist has been seen by most of those writing about him as a member of the educational team, in the future if not now. His role of clinician is not to be diminished, but he is moving into the classroom to give direct aid to the teacher. Prescriptions of what school psychologists should do come principally from their trainers and from their "consumers," the school administrators. Expectations of many of these prescribers are so high as to raise questions about how realistic they are in relation to the services of any single psychologist.

Roles of the School Psychologist as a Contributor to the Reading Program

Berkowitz (1966) saw a shift in emphasis of the concern of the school psychologist toward the cognitive domain and away from excessive clinical concern with inadequate and inappropriate behavior in children. He commented:
Bower maintains that the educator's stance is task oriented, emphasizing cognitions and discipline above affects and affective expression. . . . The recent increase in emphasis upon ego-functions in psychoanalytic theory has resulted in increased emphasis upon the cognitive and structural aspects of functioning in clinical psychology. Such a shift in emphasis may well serve to lessen the distance between the positions of clinicians and educators and tend to increase the ease of communication between the two professions. On the other hand, educators are becoming increasingly concerned with the need for more emphasis upon the individual child in teacher training. It is in this area that the clinician brings to the classroom an emphasis and skill which the educator lacks (p. 225).

Among the first to consider the contribution of the psychologist to the teaching of reading was Hildreth (1942). "Problems in learning to read and applying reading skill are largely psychological," she said (p. 212). Her comprehensive summary of the qualifications needed for a school psychologist to be most helpful in the reading area is as follows:

. . . the psychologist who seeks to understand reading cases and to interpret them to teachers and parents requires an understanding of mental development processes in childhood, the nature of individual differences in the capacities and traits of school pupils, the psychology of learning a skill as it applies to elementary school work, the psychology of personality, temperament and emotion in childhood, the nature of the reading process, traditional and modern school room practices and adjustments, interrelations of language and reading, diagnostic and analytic methods with particular reference to reading, causal factors in reading disability, the physiological and psychomotor aspects of the reading process, methods of teaching reading to normal children, the use and place of drill, therapeutic methods in reading instruction, principles of mental hygiene. The well-prepared psychologist, in addition to all
Hildreth (1942) granted that this seemed a large order but said anything less would result in a one-sided approach to reading problems or superficial treatment.

In the Thayer conference Report (Cutts, 1955; pp. 40, 56, 58) there were listed four ways in which the school psychologist could give specific help in the improvement of reading: (1) solving children's problems of learning which are related to perception; (2) adapting the curriculum to children with sensory, neural and motor anomalies; (3) determining whether reading problems are due to basic retardation and faulty placement in school or to psychogenic determinants; and (4) determining whether the basic difficulty is in the home environment and instigating a program of investigation and remediation.

As a Member of the Reading Team. This function was given implicit endorsement by Eiserer (1963), who insisted that skills for working in an interdisciplinary team are cardinal requirements for the school psychologist. He said, "... in all his activities he works cooperatively with other educational personnel ... frequently he also works cooperatively with other specialists in assisting teachers and administrators to fulfill their objectives. Reading and speech specialists ... and others participate
with psychologists to constitute resources for special help when needed" (p. 105).

At Rutgers University, according to Bardon (1967), the training program for school psychologists "... places great emphasis on the school psychologist's part in the improvement of reading. Our philosophy is that enabling children to master educational skills is an excellent way to prepare to cope with life's problems, and helping people to cope with life's problems is the focus of any psychologist's role and function."

As an Evaluator of Non-Cognitive States. The school psychologist, in this function, is concerned with the psychodynamic processes of the individual. One variable under investigation in the present study is the extent to which the school psychologist has turned to the cognitive domain for some of his explanation of the disabled and underachieving reader. Since it is generally accepted that emotional disturbance can impede reading achievement, a school psychologist is expected to have a competence in the area of psychodynamics. A detailed consideration of his functions in this area and in the areas of neurological impairment and disorders of metabolism is beyond the scope of this study.

Dreikurs (1957) insisted that a psychodynamic approach to a child's reading problems is not only
necessary, but usually sufficient. He contended that most remedial reading programs do not take into account the emotional predispositions of reading difficulties. A child who feels that he does not "belong," he explained, will compensate by failing to read because he wants to attract attention, demonstrate his power, get even for all the hurts he has suffered, or display real or assumed deficiencies in order to be left alone. According to Dreikurs, the last-named is the most common among normal children because the child "... is sincerely convinced of his utter inability ever to learn to read or write ... so he avoids the effort altogether" (p. 65).

Jarvis (1958) expressed the psychoanalytic view of reading disability, suggesting that the psychologist focus attention on the visual problem as a "looking" rather than a vision problem. "It would be important," she said, "to screen carefully the student with a reading inhibition based on neurotic mechanism from one who has reading difficulty due to such causes as absence through illness and change of school" (p. 469).

Newton (1960) saw the school psychologist as an evaluator of the maladjusted or emotionally upset child whose reading is impaired for that reason.

Robinson and Rauch (1965) included in their summary of the relationships of the school psychologist with the reading consultant the following services: "(1) The
psychologist may test students to determine . . . any emotional disability hampering their progress; (2) He may counsel those students who require this type of guidance; (3) He may refer to the proper persons those students who need extensive professional help; (4) He may confer with the consultant to determine the best method of working with a child having emotional problems" (p. 42).

Smith and Carrigan (1959) would involve the school psychologist in being alert to the possibility of an imbalance of neural transmission--a chemical theory of learning with implications for acquisition of reading skills.

Penn (1966) stressed the neurological approach and cited references in the literature to substantiate a claim that 75 per cent of reading disability cases are caused by neurological impairment or neurological maturational delay.

As a Disseminator of Psychological Knowledge. Gray (1963) saw the school psychologist in a potentially important role. She wrote: "Of writing books there is no end. Yet when it comes to interpreting psychological material to other disciplines and to the lay public, psychologists are laggard indeed. And perhaps this is one area in which the school psychologist might serve with particular effectiveness" (p. 360).
In order to communicate one must have something to say, preferably of interest to the one being informed. What needs to be said about reading Douglass (1963) stated indirectly in the following:

Instead of manipulating the material and the method, we would gain more if we were to look more deeply, and respectfully, into the basic factors which affect human behavior. We would worry more about motivation and what kinds of circumstances promote a will or desire to learn. We would want to know more about how concepts are learned; how memory works; how speech, hearing, vision and the other language abilities (including all aspects of non-verbal communication) are interrelated; how the sensory receptors are utilized in the processes of thinking; how interests are formed and changed; how mental sets, attitudes and the like are developed; how the brain functions in spatial discrimination; how physiological and psychological disturbances affect cortical functioning, and so on. . . . Our major problem, as I see it, therefore, is to build a better balanced conception of the nature of the reading process—a better theoretical frame of reference which takes into account, and helps us to explain, the many interconnections which must be made within the human organism if reading is to take place (p. 7).

Gibson (1965) has charged teachers with being ignorant of the progress made in experimental laboratories. Dissemination is the cure for that situation, but the progress to date cannot support the kind of conception Douglass outlined. Further research is needed.

As a Researcher, Gray (1963) saw research as a potential way for the school psychologist to achieve both community and professional status. She did not see it, however, as any royal road. She wrote:
A research role for the psychologist is not an easy one. . . . A number of people, both lay and professional, raise questions about the school psychologist's role in research. Those who train psychologists are probably least ambivalent on this issue. Ability to do research on problems of human behavior seems to be the *sine qua non* of the psychologist's role as impressed upon the psychologist-to-be in graduate school . . . he is dismayed to see that the public, including the parents and teachers in the schools where he works, fail to share his reverence (p. 56).

Austin and Morrison (1963) made forty-five recommendations for the improvement of reading programs. Among these were projects to "... re-evaluate the content of existing pre-reading activities in an effort to determine the relation of these activities to future reading success" (p. 220) and "... determine the inter-relationships of personality, socio-economic backgrounds, ability, and the various approaches to teaching reading, particularly at the initial stages of reading instruction" (p. 221).

Money (1962) advocated that visible and audile types be identified, saying, "There is far too little known of imagistic and cognitional types in psychology, and pitifully little attention given to the problem" (p. 27). Insofar as present psychological knowledge is lacking for such preparation, the obvious call is for research by the psychologist to develop such knowledge.

The area of cognitive development is attracting the sort of attention that could culminate in a focus of educational research. Robinson (1967) wrote: "... there
is much we do not know, particularly in the teaching of higher level comprehension skills and in the area of differentiating instruction for individual needs" (p. 481).

Also, quoting Robinson (1968): "Many scholars with other types of orientation are using reading as an area of application for their studies of learning" (p. 420).

McCullough (1968) pointed out that: "Psychologists have made reading specialists aware of the gamut of cognitive processes of which a human being is capable. Consciously or unconsciously, the reader leans upon his knowledge of these processes" (pp. 332-333).

The school psychologist is already involved in various aspects of discrimination learning pertinent to readiness and beginning reading. Involvement in the associative learning of correlating words and concepts and in the role of such learning in the right processes could lead to a greater contribution by him to the area of developmental reading.

With regard to the relation of conceptual development to reading, Strang (1965) observed: "Several new tests may prove to be valuable supplements to tests of intelligence. In grades three, five, and seven, Braun found a test of concept formation to be more closely related to reading achievement than tests of mental maturity" (p. 51).
Mussen (1965) urged that psychologists pay attention to the cognitive style of children and determine whether different teaching techniques would be more effective with children with different cognitive styles.

In psychoeducational assessment of a disabled reader the psychologist may be confronted by a problem of determining whether the underlying cause is a deficit in perceptual learning or in the meaning for which the child is expected to read. Pitman (1963) saw the Initial Teaching Alphabet as a screening device for separating retarded readers who fail simply because of the "mechanical" difficulties of traditional orthography from those who fail because they are not adequately linguistic. The latter are those, according to Pitman, who fail with the Initial Teaching Alphabet encodement. This dichotomy of cognitively disabled readers is a challenge to the school psychologist as a researcher in testing its validity and in developing alternative screening devices.

As an Innovator. In this function the school psychologist might be expected to concern himself with changes in the educational procedures or with evaluation techniques. The conclusions of the 1964 conference, New Directions in School Psychology, indicated that whether or not the school psychologist should innovate is an unresolved issue. Reger (1965), however, saw the school
psychologist of the future functioning in ways that would make him primarily an innovator: "The school psychologist of tomorrow is likely to closely resemble a 'practicing academician' in his self-image and his actions. He is likely to be research oriented, helping the education system develop, understand, and integrate new ideas in educational philosophy and technology" (p. 10).

Ready or not, the school psychologist has been called upon to innovate in the reading area to take advantage of the flow of federal money. Federal-funding of projects carries with it requirements for the school psychologist with an innovative spirit.

Added to the pressure from many school administrators, learning theorists, teacher trainers, and federal programs for innovation is pressure in the form of discontent of many school psychologists with what they are doing. Farling (1967-68) stated:

Many persons in school psychology in Ohio are thinking that the profession is faced with a dire future if its members continue to emphasize the clinical model of individual diagnosis, continue to depend on resources outside of the school to produce changes in the school, continue to make recommendations to the teacher based on minimum involvement with her and her classroom, and continue to view the child per se as the client (p. 36).

In brief, the psychologist's contribution to the improvement of reading and to the prevention of reading problems involves passing along knowledge that others have developed, innovating promising techniques, and engaging in
research to discover and evaluate instructional procedures useful in developing reading competencies and helping to avoid and correct reading deficiencies.

Clearly, the social psychologist cannot stand apart from the mainstream of educational activity. Clinical assessment is no longer his primary function. Skills for working in an interdisciplinary team are cardinal requirements for the social psychologist of today. As Eiserer (1963) pointed out, "Roles must be delineated, relationships worked out, and systems of communication established if effective team cooperation is to be expected" (p. 106).

Summary

The purpose of Chapter 2 was to review the literature relevant to the functions and relationships of the teacher of reading, the reading consultant, and the school psychologist. After a general consideration of patterns and functions of these personnel in the field of reading, the following subdivisions were reviewed: teachers' needs for help in the teaching of reading, the reading consultant as a source of help, the school psychologist as a source of help, and roles of the school psychologist as a contributor to the reading program.

In a situation such as that in Ohio where the State Department of Education mandates that a minimum of 70 percent of the psychologist's time be used for individual
child study, actual efforts at innovation are severely restricted. Aside from formal restrictions is the factor of local receptivity of experimentation. Chall (1967) reported the West innovating more than the East, with California in a feverish state of experimentation.

White and Harris (1961) stated that the area of subject disabilities should be familiar to the school psychologist. They recommended, too, that the school psychologist continuously evaluate such innovations as the use of teaching machines and other devices. They suggested that he should be conversant with major findings in reading research and be prepared to provide for remedial services to the classroom.

Much of the material in the preceding section on research has implications for innovation. But innovation frequently becomes a matter of team effort in which the contribution of the psychologist is merged in a greater whole.

In brief, the psychologist's contribution to the improvement of reading and to the prevention of reading problems involves passing along knowledge that others have developed, innovating promising techniques, and engaging in research to discover and evaluate instructional procedures useful in developing reading competencies and helping to avoid and correct reading deficiencies.
Possible selections of literature were largely restricted to prescriptions of roles rather than descriptions of roles fulfilled. Prescriptions are relevant, however, to the objectives of this study, which include investigations of future trends. Any thoughtful prescription reflects an appraisal of needs and potentials for meeting those needs.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD OF STUDY

The problem to which this study is addressed was stated in Chapter 1 as the need for a basic fund of information on the activities and attitudes of school psychologists relevant to school reading programs. This information should be in a form suitable for portraying the nature of the present impact of school psychologists on reading programs and for directing attention to the factors pertinent to their future involvement. Further, the information should be such that it would be useful in providing suggestions and guideposts for appraisal and other types of studies for which this study might be a forerunner.

A set of generic roles was adopted in order to bring together a number of recommendations for what school psychologists should be doing; literature pertinent to the opportunities and obstacles in carrying out such recommendations was reviewed. For the purpose of this study a generic role is characterized by the general area of behavior rather than by particular content. These generic roles also make it possible to categorize many of the comments made by the respondents. This facilitates
bringing the response data into meaningful interaction with the literature.

**Analysis of Questions**

The first question to be considered relates to discrepancies between the psychologist's concept of his role and his practice: "Will there be a substantial difference between the school psychologist's concept of what his collective role in the improvement of reading should be and the functions he actually performs at present, and will such a discrepancy indicate a possible shift in role?"

The second question was prompted by the statement by White and Harris (1961) quoted in Chapter 1: "Clinically oriented school psychologists may make the mistake of focusing on the emotional bases of reading difficulty to the neglect of other factors" (p. 232). The question to be investigated here is: "Will clinically oriented psychologists be significantly less active than school-oriented psychologists in such areas as psychoeducational evaluation, research, curriculum development, and in-service education?"

**Subjects**

The primary requirement for the data sought was that they be representative in terms of particular functions of the kind of impact school psychologists are making on reading programs. It was decided that an
established list of school psychologists would provide an adequate source for such data.

Wallin and Ferguson (1967) described three professional associations related to school psychologists. The National Education Association was ruled out because its tie with school psychology is through the Council for Exceptional Children, thus representing a concern too restricted for the purpose of this study. The American Personnel and Guidance Association is a composite of industry, military, and school personnel workers, and does not maintain the identity of the school psychologist as the American Psychological Association does through its Division 16. Pertinent to the concerns of this study is Wallin and Ferguson's observation that the American Psychological Association "... provides a voice for the school psychologists" (p. 28).

It was decided, therefore, to use the Division 16 membership of 1,250 as the population segment from which to draw the sample.

The Questionnaire

A questionnaire to be mailed to the entire membership was selected as the only feasible instrument for gathering data from a wide geographical area. To simplify the task of response, the main part of the questionnaire was conceived as a listing of specific functions with
provision for the respondent merely to check whether or not he performed each of the functions and whether or not he thought he should.

Copies of the original version of the questionnaire were distributed to Dr. Ruth Strang, director of the initial stages of this study, to participants in the conference of school psychologists held in Atlanta, Georgia, in April of 1967. Sixteen of the participants in the workshop were school psychologists. Their responses were analyzed, and a study was made of the inadequacies of that version of the questionnaire, obtaining the respondents' facts and opinions.

The revised form was used by this investigator in a number of personal interviews in the Tucson area, and further changes were made, based on this experience.

The final form consisted of questions designed primarily to gather data from each respondent on whether or not he was active in each of twenty-four functions and on whether or not he thought he should be active in each. In addition, he was asked to specify his personnel context, to generalize about his contribution to the reading program, and to comment about the division of functions between him and the reading consultant.

The questionnaire and the covering letter are reproduced in Appendices A and B.
Respondents were not asked to specify their professional qualifications because it was decided that this would add unduly to the completion task and interfere with the responses sought. The interrelationship of professional qualifications and actual performance of functions relevant to reading, worthy of study though it may be, was decided to be beyond the scope of this study.

**Interviews**

It was decided to conduct a number of interviews with teachers of reading and reading consultants. One purpose of these was to test out the questionnaire to discover ways of improving it. Another purpose was to "sensitize" the investigator so that she might be better qualified for drawing implications from the responses to the mailed questionnaire. It was not contemplated that these interviews would be incorporated in the basic data for this study. However, since they provide comprehensive viewpoints and the "feel" of actual situations, transcriptions of parts of several interviews are included as Appendices C and D.

**Analysis of Data**

Although basically descriptive of a current state of affairs, this study is also relevant to future conditions in that it includes data on intentions of school psychologists regarding reading programs.
Treatment of the data required both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Quantitative analysis was limited for the most part to frequency distributions, rank orders, a graph, and the like. Statistical inference was used only in determining whether or not the data tended to support the speculation that clinically oriented school psychologists might tend to concentrate on emotional factors to the neglect of others. Qualitative analysis was applied primarily to the free responses of Parts I and III of the questionnaire. Kinds of emphasis in involvement, fulfilling of generic roles, variations in interpersonal relations, and sources of difficulty in function participation were the kinds of concern in this type of analysis.

In order to relate the data to the question of the effect of clinical orientation, an operational definition of the imprecise term "clinically oriented" was needed. Basis for a clear-cut dichotomy of school psychologists into those who are clinically oriented and those who are not is not available in readily obtained data. For the purpose of this study, therefore, engaging in individual and/or group psychotherapy was adopted as the observable criterion of clinical orientation. This no doubt left some clinically oriented in the "non-therapy" group because it is possible to be so oriented in the school setting and not actually to conduct therapy. This, however, would
affect the degree of difference between the two groups, not the kind.

To determine whether or not, even in the dichotomy, a significant difference obtained, a chi square test was decided upon as appropriate.

Some quantitative data were derived from the responses to Parts I and III of the questionnaire in the form of generalizations about a respondent's major contribution to reading and the division of responsibilities between him and the reading consultant.

The primary objective adopted for analysis of the qualitative data was a record to be useful in planning appraisal and other types of studies seeking a more definitive determination of the effectiveness of the school psychologist on the reading team.

No analysis of the interviews with reading consultants and teachers of reading was attempted. In general, these interviews confirmed conditions otherwise amply represented in the literature and in response to the questionnaire.

Summary

This chapter presents the methods and procedures followed in this study. The basic objectives of the study and the questions to which relevance in the data was to be sought were restated. An operational definition of the
term "clinically oriented" was provided, and the rationale of the choice of the membership of Division 16 of the American Psychological Association as the target population was presented.

An account was given of the development of the questionnaire, which was designed to gather data from each respondent on whether or not he was active in each of 24 functions and whether or not he thought he should be active in each. This questionnaire also invited generalization about his major contribution to the reading program and the kind of relation with the reading consultant that he preferred.

A plan of analysis appropriate to the qualitative and quantitative data obtained was adopted. To facilitate interaction between the response data and literature a set of generic roles was adopted to categorize some of the literature and some of the comments in the response.
This chapter presents the results of analysis of the data obtained from a questionnaire sent to the 1,250 members of Division 16, the Division of School Psychologists, of the American Psychological Association. First, general comments about the questionnaire returns will be made. Then tables derived from the data of Part II of the questionnaire will be presented and explained. Part II of the questionnaire deals with the responses and attitudes of school psychologists to 24 functions associated with the area of reading. Next the data presented in the tables will be analyzed to determine role satisfaction of the respondents, for subsequent speculation concerning possible role change. Further analysis of the data in the tables will be made to investigate the reading functions of clinically oriented school psychologists versus reading functions of non-clinically oriented school psychologists. Finally, data dealing specifically with the relationship of school psychologists to other disciplines related to reading will be presented and discussed.
General Comments About Questionnaire Returns

Of the 1,250 questionnaires mailed, 660 were returned, or slightly less than 53 per cent.

Included in the 660 were 106 that were only partially filled out because the respondents judged themselves to be ineligible to complete the questionnaire. Reasons given for considering themselves ineligible included: 23 per cent of the 106 no longer associated with school psychology; 14 per cent retired; 14 per cent connected with universities as professors or heads of departments; 11 per cent in administrative capacity in school systems, state departments of education, or other departments, special education, and pupil personnel services; almost 10 per cent engaged in the training of school psychologists, with no indication of type of training institution; about 5 per cent in research, consultation for schools and management, and private practice; the remaining 23 per cent in mental health work at county and state levels, in pediatric clinics, training teachers of the handicapped and mentally retarded, deceased, on maternity leave, or just starting work as school psychologists.

When these 106 replies were deleted, there remained 554 which were potentially usable. Of this number, however, there were 246 which were insufficiently filled out for tabulation of the 24 responses called for in Part II.
They did, nevertheless, contribute considerable information through responses to questions in Parts I and III of the questionnaire, and this information is included in the analysis of the responses to these parts.

The remaining 308 responses, about 25 per cent of the 1,250 questionnaires mailed, were used as the source of data for tabulation of answers to Part II of the questionnaire. It was recognized that the 554 who did answer may have differed in some way from those who did not respond. Furthermore, 246 of these responses were incomplete, and there was no way of knowing how these respondents differed from those who answered completely and how representative they were of the whole population. The resulting bias requires that reservations be held in projecting the findings to the target population and to school psychologists in general.

The 53 per cent return in this study (660 of the 1,250 questionnaires mailed) compares with a return of 16 per cent reported by Dever (1956) of her questionnaire sent to persons working in the field of reading. Her questionnaire was a job description form to be filled out by members of the National Association for Remedial Teaching and the International Council for the Improvement of Reading Instruction. The number of questionnaires mailed was 2,961; the number returned was 480. With some allowance
for the higher rate of return in the present study, her comment applies in general to this study:

This percentage of returns is small when considered for general survey purposes. However, the number of descriptions received and the wealth of information obtained on each type of position forms a basic fund of the kind of information sought in this study--namely, job descriptions of a large number of different kinds of reading positions (p. 4).

On the adequacy of the responses to her questionnaire, Dever commented: "More information might have been obtained concerning reading work performed by the reading counselors, therapists and psychologists" (p. 5). The response to the questionnaire for the present study provides some of the information lacking in the Dever study, with regard to work performed by school psychologists in the improvement of reading.

Reporting on data for the year 1960, Magary (1967) showed that of 2,836 school psychologists with that title, 2,081 of them (or 73 per cent) were concentrated in the seven states of California, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Figures in Table 1 for these states show a total of 187, or 61 per cent of the 308. It is generally accepted that since 1960, in addition to an increase in the numbers of school psychologists, there has been a considerable redistribution made possible by school consolidations and by formation of consortia and other cooperative arrangements. Thus the
Table 1. Distribution by States of the Basic 308 Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1960 data cannot be taken as a reliable index of the present distribution pattern.

There is no reliable, up-to-date information available on the geographical distribution of school psychologists and on the school situations in which they work. Thus there is no adequate basis for determining just how representative of these two factors the response in the present study is.

A breakdown by states, however, is given for the basic 308 responses in Table 1. Inspection of the breakdown suggests that returns are generally proportionate to
the population of the state, thereby supplying indirect
evidence of the representativeness of current returns.

In Part I the respondents were asked to specify
the school situations in which they worked. The particular
situations of the respondents varied widely, ranging from
psychologist for a small private school for girls to
director of psychological services for all the schools in
a large city. Table 2 gives a breakdown of the grade
ranges served by the respondents and the types of popula-
tion areas represented.

Table 2. Types of School Situations of the Basic 308
Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades Served</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Jr. High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12^b</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aIncludes county or unified school district.

^bIncludes a few who specified 1-12.
Analysis of Responses to Part II of Questionnaire

Tabulations of the responses to Part II of the questionnaire will be presented and explained in the following pages. Then an analysis of the data in the tables will be used as a basis for investigation of two aspects of the functioning of school psychologists: (1) role satisfaction and (2) reading functions of clinically oriented school psychologists versus reading functions of non-clinically oriented school psychologists. The determination of role satisfaction of the school psychologist will be used for speculation concerning possible changing roles.

For convenience in referring to the particular nature of the 24 functions, they are re-stated here in the form in which they appeared in the questionnaire, as follows:

1. Participate in group achievement testing in reading.
2. Analyze and interpret the data from such tests.
3. Diagnose the causes of reading problems: perceptual, psychogenic, environmental, faulty education, and others.
5. Make case studies of reading problems: diagnosis and suggested remedial work.
6. Confer with parents of child having reading difficulty.

7. Give remedial instruction in reading.

8. Provide psychotherapy for children with severe reading problems.


10. Refer reading cases to outside clinics.

11. Administer individual intelligence tests upon request.

12. Use tests as a basis for grouping: according to reading ability and potential.

13. Suggest to administrator curriculum changes, need for special reading classes and staff, etc.

14. Assist in decisions about promotion and retention of students who have reading problems.

15. Evaluate new techniques and devices for teaching reading, such as various machines, programmed learning, etc.

16. Participate in reading conferences and conferences related to reading.

17. Initiate and/or conduct research on learning problems related to reading: list on back of sheet researches completed or in progress.

18. Talk with teachers, at their request, about personal and interpersonal problems.
19. Conduct or participate in in-service training programs.


22. Give to teachers descriptions of teaching procedures and instructional materials that would help them to give more effective reading instruction and prevent and remedy reading difficulties in their classes.


24. Hold group discussions for parents of children with severe reading problems.

Presentation and Explanations of Tables

Table 3 presents a summary of certain responses to the 24 questions in Part II. This table shows the number of psychologists who performed each function, the number who reported they did not perform, and the number for each function who gave no response.

In Table 3, fifteen of the 24 functions were reported as performed by more than 50 per cent of the respondents, and only four of the remainder had 100 or fewer active performers out of the 308. As one might expect, the functions with the greatest numbers of
Table 3. Summary of Responses to the Questionnaire of Performers and Non-Performers of Functions Related to Reading (N-308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>Performers</th>
<th>Non-Performers</th>
<th>No. Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4390</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
performers were: diagnosis of causes of individual reading problems, administering intelligence tests, conferring with teachers and parents about the reading problems of individual children, helping to evaluate readiness for reading and first grade, and interpreting the psychological aspects of children's reading development to school personnel and others (Functions 3, 11, 4, 6, 20, 21, and 23).

Only two of the top 15 functions in the order of numbers performing were in the area of curriculum, and these two were limited to concern with the training of children with reading problems (Functions 5 and 13).

The remaining six of these 15 functions were: interpreting data from group achievement tests in reading, referring reading cases to outside clinics, participating in decisions on promotions of children with reading problems, taking part in conferences with a relevance to reading, talking with teachers about personal and interpersonal problems, and providing in-service training programs (Functions 2, 10, 14, 16, 18, and 19).

Table 4 adds to Table 3 to show the number of psychologists who performed and thought they should perform each of the functions, the number who thought they should not perform them, the number who questioned the suitability of their performance or were undecided about their performance, and those who gave no response to these choices.
Table 4. Responses of Performers of Functions Listed in the Questionnairea (N=308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Do and Should</th>
<th>Do but Should Not</th>
<th>Do but Question or Undecided</th>
<th>No Opinion Expressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4390</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe table reads as follows: 82 of the respondents reported that they perform Function 1; 60 perform this function and also stated that they thought they should; 15 perform this function but think that it should not be their responsibility; 7 perform this function but are undecided as to whether or not they should perform it; there were none who did not express an opinion about it.
Table 5 is a presentation of the data of Table 4 in percentage form.

Table 5. Data in Table 4 Converted to Percentages of Performers and of Their Attitudes Toward Functions Performed (N-308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>Do and Should</th>
<th>Do but Should Not</th>
<th>Do but Question or Undecided</th>
<th>No Opinion Expressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 is a presentation of the data showing the number of psychologists who did not perform each of the 24 functions and thought they should not, the number who thought they should perform functions which they did not, the number who questioned or were undecided about their non-performance, and those who gave no response to the choices.

Table 7 is a conversion of the data of Table 6 into percentage form.

Before analyzing the data presented in these tables, a deficiency in the data warrants some attention. Some respondents failed to indicate that they either performed or did not perform one or more of the 24 functions. The figures are listed in Table 3. Tables 4 and 5 show that some of the respondents indicated that they performed particular functions but did not express an attitude as to whether this performance was deemed appropriate. Tables 6 and 7 show the numbers of non-performers who failed to express such attitudes.

A brief analysis of these kinds of incompletions is given in this section. The range of "No Response" returns in Table 3 for the individual functions was from just less than one per cent to slightly more than six per cent, with a median of about four per cent. The range for "No Opinion Expressed" in Table 5 (the performers) was from 0 per cent to 24 per cent, with a median of about two per
Table 6. Responses of Non-Performers of Functions Listed in the Questionnaire\(^a\) (N-308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>Do Not</th>
<th>Do Not and Should Not</th>
<th>Do Not but Should</th>
<th>Do Not and Question or Undecided</th>
<th>No Opinion Expressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The table reads as follows: 221 of the respondents reported that they do not perform Function 1; 184 do not perform this function and think they should not; 13 do not perform this function but think they should; 6 do not perform this function and question or are undecided as to whether they should; 18 did not express an opinion about it.
Table 7. Data in Table 6 Converted to Percentages of Non-Performers and of Their Attitudes Toward Performance of Functions (N-308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>Do Not and Should Not</th>
<th>Do Not but Should</th>
<th>Question or Undecided</th>
<th>No Opinion Expressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The range of "No Opinion Expressed" of non-performers (Table 7) was also from 0 to 24 per cent, but with a median of about five per cent.

Respondents gave no reasons for failing to express opinions in terms of appropriateness of performance or non-performance of particular functions. It can only be speculated that performance of a function may have been somewhat more conducive to expression of the kind of opinion called for than was non-performance, resulting in a higher percentage of expression of opinions among the performers.

The largest percentage of those performing functions without indicating their attitude was for Function 8--providing psychotherapy for children with severe reading problems. The next highest percentage was for Function 9--providing group therapy for children with severe reading problems. School psychologists have never achieved consensus on the conduct of therapy in the school as a proper function for them, so avoidance of a controversial issue may have been a factor in the withholding of opinion on these two functions.

Among those who did not perform particular functions, 24 per cent failed to express an opinion on Function 11--administering individual intelligence tests upon request. This could well be an unresolved issue, with many psychologists resenting being called upon to function
simply as psychometrists and yet being the only ones in their situations qualified to do so. The next highest percentage was on Function 8, and the same explanation as offered in the preceding paragraph would seem to be in order.

Data of Tables Related to Speculation Concerning Possible Changing Role of School Psychologists

In this section the data will be analyzed to determine the role satisfaction of the respondents. This investigation, in turn, will be used as the basis for speculating about a possible tendency toward role change of school psychologists. A second investigation based on analysis of the data will be concerned with reading functions of clinically oriented school psychologists versus reading functions of non-clinically oriented school psychologists.

Role Satisfaction. There is speculation in the literature that the role of school psychologists is undergoing change and that the psychologists themselves are initiating much of this change. In designing the questionnaire, the investigator assumed that an on-going change of this kind would be accompanied by some appreciable degree of discontent with present status. The respondents were therefore asked to state whether or not they approved their relation of performer or non-performer of each function.
Analysis of responses of performers and non-performers, for the purpose of determining their role satisfaction, will be concerned with: (1) the difference between what school psychologists actually do (Performance) and what they do with the conviction that they should be doing so, and (2) the difference between what school psychologists are not doing (Non-Performance) and the belief that performance would be appropriate for them. Approval of performance by both present performers and non-performers is to be treated as a measure of role conception on the part of the respondents. A discrepancy between role conception and present practice would be interpreted as an indication of discontent.

Performers of Functions. Tables 4 and 5 present data relevant to the difference between what school psychologists actually do and their conviction that their performance is appropriate for them. In Table 4 are listed the numbers of performers of the individual functions and the numbers in four different categories of attitudes toward such performance. Under "Do and Should" are listed the numbers who reported performance appropriate for them. The difference between the numbers in this column and those of actual performers is accounted for by the remaining three columns listing the numbers of those who thought it inappropriate to be performing the functions, the numbers
who questioned the appropriateness, and the numbers expressing no opinion concerning its appropriateness. Table 5 presents these figures in percentage form.

Inspection of the data presented in Table 5 reveals that approximately 91 per cent of school psychologists reported that they thought the functions they were actually performing were appropriate. Approximately two per cent thought that the functions they were performing were inappropriate. The remaining seven per cent either expressed no opinion or reported that they questioned or were undecided about the appropriateness. In general, therefore, it would appear that school psychologists consider the functions they are actually performing to be appropriate.

Table 5 reveals that approval by school psychologists of their present performance of each of the 24 functions ranges between 66 and 97 per cent. For 18 of the functions this percentage was 90 or more. The lowest percentage (66 per cent), occurred on Function 7 (Give remedial instruction in reading), with the next lowest (73 per cent) awarded to Function 1 (Participate in group achievement testing in reading). Percentages of psychologists performing particular functions but feeling that they should not do so range between 0 and 18. With the exception of three functions, all of these are below five per cent. The three functions with their percentages are:
Function 1 (Participate in group achievement testing in reading) with 18 per cent; Function 7 (Give remedial instruction in reading) with 17 per cent; and Function 12 (Use tests as a basis for grouping according to reading ability) with eight per cent. It is perhaps significant to note that the six functions least approved by present performers contribute only 14 per cent (somewhat less than the expected 25 per cent) of the total of 4,390 participations in function performance.

No call was made in the questionnaire for grounds for the opinion of performers of particular functions that these activities were inappropriate for them. But plausible explanations for those in the higher frequencies readily come to mind. The greatest number of disapprovals was in response to the question on participation in group achievement testing in reading (Function 1). Of the 82 performers of this function, 15 of them, or somewhat more than 18 per cent, as shown in Table 5, disapproved this activity on their part. This function is within the nominal competence of the reading specialist and makes little call upon the special qualifications of the psychologist.

The next greatest number was produced by the question on administration of individual intelligence tests upon request (Function 11). The comment of one respondent is suggestive of the basis. He offered, "Not to
determine capacity." He likely had in mind the use of an IQ in estimating reading potential of suspected under-achievers. This could also have been a factor in the nine disapprovals of Function 12. In simply determining an IQ the psychologist is functioning only at the level of a psychometrist. More seriously, appreciation of the potential work load in offering such a service could well be enough to lead to its disapproval.

The single function that escaped disapproval was provision of group therapy for children with severe reading problems. One might be tempted to conclude that whether or not therapy is administered is primarily up to the psychologist. Oddly enough, however, Function 8 (Provision of psychotherapy for individual children with severe reading problems), had four disapprovals from present performers. There were five functions that received only one disapproval each: Functions 3, 5, 17, 23, and 24.

Although there is a factor of disaffection among present performers of the various functions, it is relatively minor and can be somewhat localized. On the whole, it would appear that school psychologists consider the functions in which they are currently engaged to be appropriate. If an important difference between present practice and role conception exists, the major basis for it must be sought in the attitudes of present non-performers of the 24 functions toward performance of them.
Non-performers of functions: Tables 6 and 7 present data relevant to the difference between what school psychologists are not doing (Non-Performance) and the belief that performance would be appropriate for them. In Table 6 are listed the numbers of non-performers in four different categories of attitudes toward hypothetical performance. Under "Do Not and Should Not" are listed the numbers who considered performance would not be appropriate for them. Under "Do Not but Should" are listed the numbers of those who thought performance would be appropriate for them. The numbers of those who expressed no opinion or who questioned or were undecided about the appropriateness of participation are listed in the last two columns. Table 7 presents these figures in percentage form.

Inspection of the data presented in Table 7 reveals that of the 2,761 cases of non-performance of particular functions more than 53 per cent fall under the category "Do Not and Should Not" compared with about 34 per cent in the "Do Not but Should" category. The remaining 13 per cent either expressed no opinion or reported they questioned or were undecided about the appropriateness. In general, therefore, it would appear that nearly one-half of non-performances of particular functions are either explicitly disapproved by their potential performers or lack explicit approval.
Table 7 reveals that approval of performance by present non-performers of each of the 24 functions ranges between two and 84 per cent, with a median percentage of 31.

In Table 8 are listed the 14 functions most frequently approved by present non-performers. The numbers of approvals are given along with the percentages of these numbers of the total non-performers of each of the functions.

Table 8. Fourteen Functions Most Frequently Approved by Present Non-Performers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>Number of Non-Performers Who Think They Should</th>
<th>Percentages of Non-Performers Who Think They Should</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those 14 functions most frequently approved by non-performers, Function 24 (Hold group discussions for parents of children with severe reading problems) showed the most pronounced discrepancy between present performances and approval. Although the percentages of those non-performers who thought they should perform was only moderately high (59 per cent), the relatively low number of present performers (80) made this discrepancy possible.

The second-highest number of non-performers who thought they should was on Function 17 (Initiate and/or conduct research on learning problems related to reading). The percentage who thought they should be performing was higher than that on Function 24 (67 per cent), although a relatively higher number are already performing this function.

The third-highest number of non-performers who thought they should was on Function 9 (Provide group therapy for children with severe reading problems). Here also there was a small number of performers (62), with a relatively large number who thought they should.

There was a higher percentage (84 per cent) of non-performers who thought they should be performing Function 23 (Interpret psychological aspects of children's reading development to administrators, teachers, parents, and the public), but this percentage was based on a very small number of non-performers. The performers (259) and
those who approved their performance (248) showed that psychologists were already heavily oriented toward this function.

The 78 per cent of non-performers of Function 19 who thought they should was also based on a very small number of non-performers (72), while those performing the function (Conduct or participate in in-service training programs) were also heavily involved in performance (231 performing and 215 approving).

Thus it appears that psychologists would like to be doing more work with groups of parents and groups of children and that they feel the need to be more heavily involved in research related to reading. They also approve of what they are doing in interpreting psychological aspects of children's reading development and in participating in in-service training.

When percentages of approvals by present performers are compared with percentages for non-performers who thought particular functions appropriate for them, a high degree of correspondence is revealed. Of the 18 functions approved by 90 per cent or more of their present performers, 16 are included in the 18 highest ranked on the basis of percentages by present non-performers as functions that they should perform. Both groups gave least approval to Function 1 (Participate in group achievement testing in reading) and Function 7 (Give remedial instruction in
reading). It seems probable that those two functions are judged to be appropriate to personnel directly responsible for instruction of students.

In general, there is a substantial disapproval by non-performers of their inactive roles. Many school psychologists apparently envision or desire their role to be significantly broader or more comprehensive than the role which they currently perform. It is not, however, simply a matter of being active in performing those functions in which they are now inactive.

The graph on page 88 indicates approval of function performance (with functions arranged in order of approval by present performers). Thus Function 3 with 271 approving performers is on the extreme left, and Function 7 with 15 approving performers is on the extreme right. The solid line represents present performers who approve their participation in each of the 24 functions. The broken line represents the addition of present non-performers who think they should be active to the number of approving performers, thus depicting totals of approvals from respondents regardless of whether or not they currently perform each of the functions. The irregular pattern of the broken line indicates that non-performers are selective in the functions that they approve for performance. The major source of dissatisfaction of school psychologists with their present contribution to the field of reading,
Present performers who approve of each of 24 functions

Approving present performers plus non-performers who think they should be active

Figure 1. Approval of Function Performance
therefore, lies in their substantial selective disapproval of certain inactive roles. Such dissatisfaction would be expected in the case of a school psychologist's role currently undergoing change.

Speculation as to Changing Role. Substantial dissatisfaction with present role would be a normal expectation for any professional role undergoing significant change. The data reveal dissatisfaction of this order. In Table 8 were listed the fourteen functions most frequently approved by present non-performers. Another possible source of light to be thrown by the data on the issue of a changing role for school psychologists lies in the remaining ten functions least approved.

No function failed to get approval from some present non-performers. But in the case of three functions --No. 1, No. 7, and No. 8--the net effect of the attitudes of all respondents was one of disapproval. One of these functions was the provision of psychotherapy for children with severe reading problems. Opinion on the relevance of such psychotherapy is obscured by the question of whether or not a public school is a proper setting for providing it. The other two functions with such net disapproval were participating in group achievement testing in reading (No. 1), and giving remedial instruction in reading (No. 7). The latter is clearly instructional and most would
agree that the former should be within the competence of reading personnel. These two were in the ten least approved by present non-performers.

The remaining eight were Functions 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, and 18. The last one—talking with teachers, at their request, about personal and interpersonal problems—has only an indirect relation to reading and can be ignored in connection with the present issue. No. 3 concerns the diagnosis of individual reading problems. No. 4 covers conferences with teachers concerning specific reading problems, and No. 5 is concerned with case studies of such problems and the prescription of remedial work. No. 6 deals with conferences with the parents of a child with reading difficulty. No. 10 is the referral of reading cases to outside clinics. No. 11 is the administering of individual intelligence tests upon request. No. 14 is assisting in decisions about the promotion of reading problem children.

The low levels at which respondents found these functions appropriate for them provide some basis for certain inferences. School psychologists would seem to be reluctant to become involved as reading instructors and prescribers of training on an individual basis. There would seem to be a strong desire to avoid the routine function, such as group achievement testing in reading, and the time-consuming tasks of conferring with the parents
of a child with a reading problem or with the teacher of
such a child and administering intelligence tests simply
to provide an IQ.

In order for a role such as that of school psychol-
ogist to change there must be some relief from present
activities. Prominent in the functions most highly
approved by the respondents are those that would make
teachers more independent in diagnosing and evaluating
children as readers, prescribing training for them and in
discussing individual cases with parents. This would be
accomplished by in-service training in which results of
research conducted by respondents could be included and by
talks to groups of parents to prepare them for explanations
of the difficulties of individual children.

One respondent expressed his general view of the
situation with: "The psychologists tend to be more the
theorists and evaluators. The reading people are the
actual experts, the detail people, the masters of the
specifics, the more skilled directors and suggestors to
the teachers."

This was written in the context of a situation
described with: "Our reading teachers are really top notch
and all of consultant quality and we have 5 in a district
of 2500 children--also 3 psychologists and 2 social
workers." The data indicate that this view is held by
many psychologists. As such, it is an important factor in
influencing any change that may occur in the role of the school psychologist.

Investigation of Reading Functions of School Psychologists—Clinically Oriented Versus Non-Clinically Oriented

This section will be concerned with the relevance of speculation in the literature that clinically oriented school psychologists tend to neglect psychoeducational aspects of learning problems more than do school-oriented psychologists. The responses to Part II of the questionnaire were analyzed for any light they might throw on this issue.

In the context of this study, the criterion for clinically oriented is the administering of individual and/or group psychotherapy. Those meeting this criterion are hereafter referred to as "Therapists," with the others referred to as "Non-Therapists." The latter correspond to the school-oriented of the speculation in the literature.

It was appreciated that the group of "Non-Therapists" would be contaminated by some clinically oriented who had outside clinics to which to refer children and thus did not themselves act as therapists. This heterogeneity would result in a narrower difference than would be expected for two "pure" populations.

In the investigation of this question there are three logical possibilities: (1) no significant difference,
(2) a difference with a direction indicating that clinically oriented school psychologists tend to neglect psychoeducational aspects of learning problems, and (3) a difference in the opposite direction, with "Therapists" significantly more active in the critical areas. Thus the problem may be two-fold: determining whether or not a significant difference obtains, and the direction of a significant difference, if one is found.

To determine whether or not there were significant differences, a tabulation was made of the frequency of performance of each of the functions by each of these two groups, and chi squares were then calculated, using a 2 x 2 contingency table. The results are given in Table 9.

Functions 8 and 9 were not included in the chi square tests because performance of them was the basis for the dichotomy of "Therapists" and "Non-Therapists." Performance and non-performance of these functions are independent variables upon which the variables in question are assumed to be dependent. For the remaining 22 functions the chi square tests were significant at the .01 level for ten functions and at the .05 level for one other function.

**Direction of Difference.** The percentages of each group performing each of the functions were calculated. These are presented in Table 10.
Table 9. Results of Chi Square Test for Significant Differences of Relative Frequency of Performance of Individual Functions by "Therapists" and "Non-Therapists"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.95*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.06*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.08*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34.53*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.29*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.89*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level.

**Significant at the .05 level.

Examination of these data shows that the direction is not uniform for all functions. Although the "Therapists" have higher percentages of performers for 20 functions, the "Non-Therapists" have relatively more of their numbers active in Functions 10, 14, 20, and 21. Only in case of Function 14, however, did the chi square tests show a significant difference in level of performance for these four functions. Function 14 is stated: "Assist in decisions about promotion and retention of students who have reading problems." Since both psychodynamic and
Table 10. Comparison of Percentages of "Therapists" and "Non-Therapists" Performing Each of the Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>&quot;Therapists&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Non-Therapists&quot;</th>
<th>Function No.</th>
<th>&quot;Therapists&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Non-Therapists&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psychoeducational factors enter into such decisions, the finding does not contribute to clarifying the present issue. Perhaps some factor beyond nature of concern with the individual child contributes to the higher level of performance by "Non-Therapists." Performance of the function could raise jurisdictional questions, and possibly "Non-Therapists" are more aggressive in extending their authority.

"Therapists" were significantly more active in ten functions—nine of them at the .01 level and one at the .05 level. Of these ten functions, seven are directly involved in reading: group achievement testing in reading.
and evaluation of these tests, conferring with teachers concerning specific reading problems, giving remedial instruction in reading, using tests as a basis for grouping, evaluating new techniques and devices for teaching reading, and doing research connected with reading. Those less directly involved are: conferring with parents of children with reading problems, administering individual intelligence tests, and holding group discussions for parents of children with reading problems.

The foregoing at least raises serious doubts that "clinically oriented" school psychologists tend to neglect the psychoeducational aspects of reading difficulties.

Analysis of Part I of the Questionnaire—Regarding Respondents' Situations

The analysis of Part II was based on 308 completed responses from psychologists to the 24 questions asked in that section. In the following analyses, of Parts I and III, the number of respondents will be increased to 554, to include the 246 questionnaires that were incomplete in respect to Part II but that otherwise contained valuable information pertinent to this study.

The First Question of Part I

This question asked: "What is your situation? School(s) served, type of student, quality of teachers?"
The response in regard to the kinds of population areas served by the respondents' schools and the types of students (by grade level) was incorporated in the section, "The Overall Quality of the Response," appearing early in this chapter. The response to that part of the question referring to the quality of the teachers included too many quantitatively indeterminate answers, such as "Some excellent, some good, some fair and the rest poor," for any attempt to be made to summarize the response other than in terms of the range indicated in the quotation.

The personnel contexts of school psychologists are analyzed in the discussion below of the response to the second question of Part I. This analysis supplements the data on school psychologists' situations developed by the first question.

The Second Question of Part I

This question requested information concerning the professional personnel contexts of the respondents. They were asked to state whether there were certain other specialists employed in their schools.

Here again there was great variability, ranging from the situation without any other specialists to those with all three specified in the question, plus a number of "others." Following is a breakdown of the contexts reported by four or more respondents, covering 377 situations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher only</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading consultant only</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker only</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three of above: reading teacher, reading consultant, social worker</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher, reading consultant, social worker, and others</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher and reading consultant</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher and social worker</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading consultant and social worker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher, social worker, and &quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher, reading consultant, and &quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading consultant, social worker, and &quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading teacher and &quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker and &quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading consultant and &quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>377</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This summarizes those who only checked this item without specifying professional categories. Other respondents under "other" mentioned speech correctionists 37 times. Also mentioned were counseling teachers, counselors and guidance personnel, special education supervisors, curriculum specialists, visual-motor teachers, learning disability specialists, nurses, psychiatrists, neurologists, and psychoanalysts.
The Third Question of Part I

This question asked the respondents in what ways they made a contribution to the improvement of reading in their schools or districts. They were asked to write freely. In many cases the responses were complex, with parts having relevance to two or more of the concerns of the present study. When thus broken down they yielded 1,011 separate comments.

Many interpreted the task in keeping with the investigator's hope that they would provide a highlight summary of their relation to the reading program. The question was kept general and included the word "freely" to leave the way open for an expression of prejudice, grievances, and enthusiasms. Major categories of functions, in order of frequency of mention, were as follows:

Consultation with teachers and other staff 118
Diagnostic appraisal of learning disabilities 104
Complete evaluation studies 100
Research 78
Suggestion of special training methods 75
In-service education of teachers 45
Referrals of children to specific learning disability and remedial reading classes 42
Parent conferences 37
Referral to community resources 29
The greatest value of the response to this question seems to lie in the light it throws on the readiness of the school psychologist to contribute to the understanding of reading problems and on his attempt to express ideas capable of being translated into training activities.

The School Psychologist in Generic Roles

In the present unsettled state of allocation of responsibility for many of the school functions relevant to reading, the initiative of a particular professional type becomes a factor in predicting his future place. Although such prediction is beyond the scope of the present study, it may well be the concern of an investigator seeking to carry forward from this study. The four generic roles adopted for classifying some of the literature cited in Chapter 2 are dependent, in substantial part at least, upon initiative of the school psychologist. Even the respondent who reported "Job function or role includes promotion of educational innovations" was responsible for the decisions allowed for by "when deemed appropriate."

It was possible to categorize somewhat roughly 722 of the 1,011 comments. They were made in a free response to a general question and so did not always conform neatly
to the four categories considered here. About 300 of the comments, representing slightly more than 5½ per cent of the 554 respondents, were pertinent to participation as members of a reading team. About 180 comments, or slightly more than 31 per cent of the respondents included, reported activity in the area of dissemination of psychological knowledge. About 16¼, or some 30 per cent, commented about innovations for which they took at least some credit.

There were 78 reports of research activity, representing about 14 per cent of the respondents.

In the following presentation, comments of respondents are quoted in proportion to the breakdown in the preceding paragraph, except in the case of research. In Part II of the questionnaire, where the question of research was put explicitly, 131 respondents, or almost twice as many as commented under Part I, indicated performance of this function. Since specific functions were not mentioned in Part I, a plausible explanation of the discrepancy is that performance of a function not regularly recurring might not so readily have come to mind as one that did.

The School Psychologist as a Team Member

The role is that of a cooperator in a group in which the members interact constructively with one another. Prominent in the comments were references to limitations
upon involvement in such a team, ranging from self-imposed through system-imposed to informal limitations. The last includes limitations of time and of the human intellect on the part of the psychologist himself or of those he seeks to enlighten. By way of contrast, several comments reflecting freedom from restraints are included in those quoted in the following.

**Self Restraints.**

Many psychologists who advocate a change in role from the clinical attitude seem to me to derogate the contributions and qualifications of other professionals, including general curriculum consultants, reading consultants, administrators, and teachers.

Specifically I hope the school psychologist never becomes a specialist in any subject or skill area in curriculum. I feel very strongly that the school psychologist should always function as a psychologist in the school, never as a curriculum specialist in any particular academic area.

I like to think that the contribution is mainly one of providing the teacher or reading consultant with a psychological profile of the student such as to indicate possible psychological reasons for any reading problem (intellectual status, emotional condition, special clinical manifestations, and so forth) and give recommendations realistically based on the nature of the diagnostic features. In other words, I would hope to answer for the teacher such questions as: Is he ready to learn? What are his special learning difficulties?

I hate to see school psychologists become "reading experts"—as opposed to, say, "behavior experts."

There is an over-present demand for the psychologist to function more as a consultant in the fields of human behavior and learning, and this is where I feel they can make their greatest contribution to education.
As a psychologist I would not attempt to give advice in the area of reading or reading problems. But I, as a psychologist, when reading problems have emotional undertones, or fairly clearly defined adjustment or personality factors, then as a member of a team, I would perform the service as needed.

**System Restraints.**

Direct improvement of reading is hampered somewhat by the fact that this is the domain of "curriculum" and is taboo for psychologists. However, we do diagnose reading problems, certify for remedial reading and educationally handicapped classes and give direct consultation to those children in all areas of learning.

We have some freedom to work directly with children who have neurological handicaps or perceptual problems.

If I suspect a reading disability in a pupil I evaluate, I refer to the reading consultant. At times my evaluations overlap with hers, but I am not expected to offer suggestions for improving her program.

**Informal Restraints.**

Do I? is the question. My diagnostic skills and assessment far exceed the ability of teachers and reading consultants to program these findings into curriculum.

My case load is so heavy that getting involved in reading issues just wouldn't be viable. Also we have five very competent reading consultants who are also psychometrists in our 12 elementary schools.

Limitation of staff forces me to be so busy making psychological evaluations based upon individual psychological testing that I cannot give as much time to reading problems as I should like to give.

I would be most pleased to learn of methods, techniques, or other workable ways in which one can definitely and knowingly really help a "non-reader." I believe we get caught up with our own
illogic by asserting we really know the causes and cures of these problems.

Kids who do not read are referred as mentally retarded. The diagnosis usually turns up "organic" with perceptual problems. I don't really feel I am contributing too much in this area. I've tried to teach reading teachers but it's a lost cause.

I feel very inadequate in reading problems. My experiences with children who come to the clinic are that they are likely to have reading problems which resist the best available efforts toward improvement. I hope to make a stronger effort to understand these reading difficulties.

In many ways our curriculum is textbook centered rather than child centered. Occasionally I am asked to talk to reading consultants. When I go into the areas of growth and development and "the child" I find little response or understanding in these areas.

Freedom From Restraints.

I and my staff search out and evaluate both potential reading problems and deficient readers. We consult regularly both with teacher and reading specialist. In a small system such as ours (2400--three schools) it is not difficult for both psychologist and the reading specialists to retain their identity and their status. Without any inter-necine rivalry, the best is worked out for the child. In addition, the psychologists have a policy of "The Open Door." Kids with reading problems come in as readily as do those who are emotionally upset. The reading people encourage this also.

Our reading teachers are really top notch and all of consultant quality and we have 5 in a district of 2500 children--also 3 psychologists and 2 social workers. The psychologists tend to be more the theorists, evaluators, and also participants in most of the curriculum and developmental planning. The reading people are the actual experts, the detail people, the master of the specifics, the more skilled directors and suggestors to the teachers. They also participate in all curriculum planning and innovations.
By maintaining a cooperative working arrangement with the reading consultant whereby ideas can be freely exchanged without concern as to whether someone's toes have been stepped on.

By consultation with the language and speech departments and in setting up programs, by diagnosis, and by in-service training and discussion. This cooperative attitude has only started this year, and we have a long way to go, but I am encouraged with the increase in both reading teachers and consultants, as well as their desire to work across departmental lines. It has been a long time coming.

The School Psychologist as a Disseminator of Psychological Knowledge

In the midst of teaching that has been criticized as based upon maxims rather than on psychological theory the school psychologist, in accord with his training, is in a position to pass along psychological knowledge in explaining learning problems and in providing rationales for new training programs. Psychologists have been charged with being laggard in sharing their insights, but the dissemination activity reported in the comments is not in accord with this charge with respect to school psychologists. The following comments are grouped according to area of concern.

Child Development.

Helped organize and direct an in-service training program for the eleven reading specialists held every two weeks. Together we worked out an Informal Reading Inventory, held a workshop on Initial Teaching Alphabet, explored Frostig materials, looked into causes for reading difficulty, etc.
Also encouraging teachers to become familiar with literature concerning relationships between achievement and visual-motor-perceptual difficulties.

Mainly by contributing the methods I learned by working at the Marianne Frostig School. I had a workshop in the remedial methods we used at the School, including perceptual training as a method to correct reading disability.

In-service training for teachers in learning theory as it related to the learning of reading; also in-service training in teaching approaches and use of reading materials.

While I do not feel that I specifically work with reading per se, I do feel I contribute a great deal to teachers in understanding specific learning disabilities as they relate to success in reading. I am doing a great deal of "prescriptive" follow-up. This to me seems to be my greatest contribution (thanks to my educational background). More and more my earlier training to teach the deaf seems to be invaluable in helping with learning disabilities.

**Dynamic Factors.**

A major role (partly in-service I suppose) involves helping the school understand the role of personality variables, including motivation, in learning to read and in increasing that skill.

Attempt to develop appreciation of relationship between feelings and cognitive skills.

Consult with teachers about classroom, small group reading, and individual dynamics of students.

I do use remedial reading with psychotherapy cases, and find that many children gain much from the successes possible through individual instruction.

Contribution is more through adding understanding of a child and his emotions as they may influence reading ability.
The School Psychologist as an Innovator

As was brought out earlier, specification of functions of a school psychologist may explicitly assign responsibility for innovations. Such activities as dissemination of psychological knowledge and direction of research put a school psychologist in a favorable position to come by ideas for translation into innovations. The following comments report activities not only in areas primarily the concern of the psychologist—diagnosis and therapy—but also of concern in training.

Diagnostic Innovations.

During the next school year "learning development" classes for "learning disability" children who traditionally have been labeled "dyslexic," "emotional," "brain-injured," etc. These are children of average intelligence who are not progressing (often in reading) for a variety of reasons. The plan is to provide small class instruction with excellent teachers, which includes such activities as "template," "Frostig," and "moviegenics," etc., according to "prescription" from psychologist and other professional consultants. Note. Our district uses Initial Teaching Alphabet as basic reading instruction.

I, personally, have been greatly involved in setting up programs of "psychoeducational screening" at kindergarten and first grade levels in my schools. The test battery has changed from year to year as we have tried different things but it has consistently included the PPVT, the WISC Vocabulary, DAP, Wepman, and sometimes the IT-A verbal encoding subtest and the Porteus Mazes. When it has been indicated, a second step in the screening has been the Frostig Test of Visual Perception.
Conduct city-wide reading readiness tests at the end of K year, making interpretations and recommendations as to promotion to grade one in the case of every child.

Screening of all K registrants and kindergartners, with special emphasis on social adequacy, speech, auditory discrimination, and visual-motor coordination.

**Training Innovations.**

From a preventive viewpoint, where the larger hope lies, I have worked with the school team at the primary level on a Title I project, to help students progress and develop by dealing not only with beginning reading training but visual-motor training, clarifying left-right confusion, using methods like those of Kephart. We are setting up readiness classes between K and first grade for slow developers, and I work closely in setting up these classes, screening procedures, and learning appraisals.

I have recommended changes in reading remedial techniques and studied the results. In addition, I have recommended special programs in reading and changes in curriculum based on my own work and other studies.

In addition, we are now trying to "hold" students in a pre-primary situation until language and other readiness is developed for profitable instruction. Considerable time has been spent in developing a "language arts" program to overcome the rigidity of many teachers who claim to be "phonics" or "whole word" or some other type of teacher.

Individually designed reading programs for particular children using traditional methods as well as experimental approaches in Behavior Modification application to reading problems.

**Therapy Innovations.**

I find a very high percentage of middle-class reading problems to be psychogenic or from value-standard distortions. Consequently, the psychologist
is essential in working through such solutions, e.g., removing "blocks," anxieties, helping parents develop values for reading, etc.

There were very few mentions of innovations in therapy. This is somewhat surprising because of the interest of many psychologists in group therapy.

The School Psychologist as a Researcher

Because of the nature of his training, the school psychologist is frequently the best qualified in his personnel context to design and evaluate research. As in other roles, much of his activity is on the "fringes" of the reading program—-with the unready, the retarded, and occasionally with the gifted.

Readiness.

Applied research in educational practices with special emphasis on development of assessment methods and the process of language acquisition and skill development.

Research project concerned with early screening, identification, diagnosis and assessment by inter-disciplinary team as well as early intervention particularly in school but also in home.

Research in the relationship between perceptual-motor disabilities and reading deficit.

The Retarded.

Limited research conducted on the progress and evaluation of the special reading class.

Some research, e.g., am gathering data on girls who have reading problems.
I am presently engaged in a research project, "Programmed Reading for the Mentally Retarded." I am the author and I have four teachers aiding me in the research.

Are currently up to our ears in two research projects attempting to relate perceptual training to reading improvement.

The Gifted.

Research leading to a paper entitled "Increasing Reading Speed in Gifted Junior High Students."

Future of an Indigenous School Psychology

Response to the third question of Part I included comments with apparent or real relevance to the development of an indigenous school psychology. In such psychology the psychologist, as some put it, would be of rather than merely in the school. What is apparently intended is that the school psychologist would be integrated with the other school personnel rather than segregated as a member of an "alien guild." Such segregation is, of course, not geographical, but ideological. The ideological segregation of the school psychologist is recognized in the common claim that his reports are "jargon." Since technical and scientific terminologies are jargons, the real difficulty is not simply that the school psychologist uses jargon, but that teachers and other educators are not members of the language community privy to that jargon. What is needed is a common meeting ground of ideas and verbal
symbols for those ideas. Such a common ground lies in the sort of theory of instruction that Bruner (1967) and others insist education should be working toward to supplant the present body of maxims upon which pedagogy, they claim, is based.

A number of respondents reported that they had had extensive experience in the reading area before becoming school psychologists.

Consult with reading staff as a team on individual pupils and program or curriculum. My situation may be unusual because I worked at a Reading Clinic and may be more familiar with diagnostic problems and actual reading teaching (have also done).

I may be particularly active in the instructional areas because I worked as a curriculum consultant before going into psychology. I am credentialed as a Reading Specialist under the new California Reading Specialist Examination program.

I am alert to possible visual and perceptual difficulties. Help to diagnose such and instruct the teachers in the remediation needed. Since my training and experience was originally in the field of reading (school and clinical) my background is much greater in this area than most school psychologists.

In specific cases of reading disability or difficulty I make an evaluation and then recommend various steps to be taken by the regular remedial reading teacher. I have had special training in reading.

These people already speak the jargon of the reading area and seem to have gained ready acceptance of what they have to offer. But it is questionable to what extent, if
any, they are contributing to the development of an indigenous school psychology.

Some other respondents indicated a willingness to achieve a competence in the reading area through the usual methods of gaining such competence.

In specific cases of reading disability or difficulty I make an evaluation and then recommend various steps to be taken by the regular remedial reading teacher. I have had special training in reading.

Detect, through individual testing using such instruments as Binet, Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Bender Visual Motor Gestalt, Graham-Kendall, Frostig, Illinois Test of Psycho-linguistics, and informal motor-coordination measures, such deficiencies, problems in abstract thinking, inference, ability to generalize or discriminate in ideas presented. Attempt to discover whether understanding of material is present despite inability to verbalize such understanding . . . I am not yet experienced in the newest techniques for remediation, but I am studying them: such methods as those advocated by Kephart, Frostig, et al, in the field of learning difficulties.

The same doubts about this group are pertinent as for the first in regard to their potential in developing a theory of instruction. More promising as potential contributors to an indigenous school psychology, it appears to the investigator, are respondents who made the following type of comment.

However, I am now involved in studying learning disabilities--perceptual problems, their nature and causes, and hope to develop techniques for training which would prevent reading disabilities in later grades.
Although I do not feel adequate in dealing with reading problems, I hope to add to my competence by taking courses to help me understand the techniques of such people as Frostig, Delacato, Cruikshank, Engelmann, and others.

Relevant to the development of a theory of instruction are the skepticism and the insistence upon understanding, presumably in terms of psychological processes, in a number of the preceding comments.

Analysis of the Response to Part III of the Questionnaire

The Relationship of School Psychologist to Reading Consultant

The first question of Part III was: "If there is a reading consultant in your school(s), what should be your relationship to him?"

This question was answered by 361 of the respondents. Their responses were sorted by categories, and the breakdown is summarized in Table 11. Under "Collaborator" were included such responses as "team member" and "colleague." For some, this relation included participation in the prescription and revision of training. The other categories are self-explanatory.

All the respondents except 20 specified some kind of positive relation. From this 20 came such comments as: "If possible, none." "None really--sometimes some consultation." "Professional courtesy. Minimal contact."
Table 11. Types of Roles Preferred by School Psychologists in Their Relations with Reading Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborator</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource for evaluation of all reading-relevant psychological factors</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant and/or in-service trainer</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No special relational role</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource for evaluation of intellectual capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minimal positive relational role is that of the evaluator of intellectual capacity only, approved by just three of the respondents. Also uncommon is the school psychologist in the role of supervising the reading consultant. Those in this position reported no dissatisfaction with it. One such respondent stated: "I am his director and the relationship is as it should be."

Those specifying evaluation of all psychological factors relevant to reading had little additional comment to make. By limiting himself to psychodiagnosis the school psychologist avoids problems that arise for those seeking a
broader impact upon the schools. Two comments from this point of view were:

As co-workers concerned with two aspects of the problem, I attempt to determine the why, and the consultant the how.

His emphasis instruction; mine on individual problems.

Consultation is the first stage in reaching out beyond a function of psychodiagnosis, and in-service training is often in order in achieving a language community among those participating in the consultations. Comments on the consultant role included:

Consultant.

Helping determine and incorporate psychodynamics of reading difficulties in a therapeutic remedial situation. General aspects normal development of children as it fits into general reading program. Consultant in various theories (learning theory, etc.) which can be used to enhance reading.

Consultation around the psychological aspects of reading problems, interpretation of the needs of individual children and their emotional development as it relates to their reading difficulty.

The proper type of relation according to the greatest number of respondents--47 per cent of the 361--was one of team cooperation. Such expressions as "interaction" and "multi-disciplinary approach" were frequent in their comments, as represented in the following:
In our multi-disciplinary approach to reading difficulties, the reading consultant, as well as speech, physical education teachers, administrators, and other personnel (e.g. art teacher, nurse) work closely together.

As a colleague in analyzing results of reading achievement tests, planning programs and selecting pupils for remedial instruction, evaluation of such programs and in planning and conducting studies of acquisition of reading skills, etc.

The reading consultant should provide structure for the developmental and corrective reading programs and the psychologist should provide the program for children requiring remedial services. There should be an understanding on the part of each that cooperation is needed so that a problem doesn't arise similar to "church-state" arguments. Both should be involved in curriculum planning, reviewing group achievement and intelligence results, developing retention and promotion policies.

Consultant to him, sharing opinions and working together on the more difficult cases, and helping to plan the total program. Evaluate his program to determine whether it is psychologically sound. Available to work with some of the more difficult cases, or more unusual ones. This would depend largely upon the abilities of the reading consultant. The operation of the remedial program should be a joint responsibility.

Differentiation of Roles of Psychologist and Reading Consultant

In order to determine the extent to which school psychologists agree on the functions appropriate to their role in the reading area they were asked these two questions:

1. What functions would you perform that should not be the province of the reading consultant?
2. What functions would the reading consultant perform that should not be the province of the school psychologist?

Only psychologists were named by the respondents as qualified for the functions listed in Table 12.

In Table 13 are listed the functions which psychologists assigned to reading consultants.

Interaction of Responses to the Two Questions

To articulate more fully the situation represented by the two sets of data, they are considered in relation to each other in terms of the following general areas.

**Diagnosis.** The function which the greatest number of psychologists thought should be exclusive with reading consultants was: "Differential diagnosis of specific types of reading difficulty." But 44 respondents gave "Diagnosis of specific learning disabilities" as part of their exclusive role. Here we have a difficulty created by inadequate terminology. It is not clear whether this could be interpreted as a division of opinion among school psychologists or whether a differentiation of function was intended.

As one would expect, no psychologist conceded to the reading consultant the evaluation of emotional disturbance.
Table 12. Functions Named by Respondents as Exclusively the Responsibility of School Psychologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Number of Psychologists Specifying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychodiagnostic evaluation of individual children</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and interpretation of individual intelligence tests</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapy with individual children</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality evaluation through projective techniques</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis of specific learning disabilities</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of emotional disturbances in children</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group therapy with children</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel teachers on procedures, attitudes appropriate in classroom</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret psychological factors in reading difficulty of individual children</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct and analyze research on reading</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel with children and/or parents</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate social and familial problems</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend plans (sometimes methods) for remediation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer children to psychiatrists, neurologists, other medical people</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold parent group discussion sessions</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate children for possible organic and neurological dysfunction</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant or leader for in-service education of teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make case studies and reports</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service education specifically for classroom management of disturbed children</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with teachers about personal and interpersonal problems</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend special classes to administration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic remedial tutoring: psycho-dynamic factors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install broad-based mental health program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Functions Which Respondents Assigned to Reading Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Number of Psychologists Specifying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differential diagnosis of specific types of reading difficulty</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remedial instruction of children when indicated--individual or group</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection and placement in classroom of books and materials for reading--new, additional, original. Evaluation of materials</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training, advising, assisting teachers in teaching techniques</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommend programming and methods--remedial and developmental--evaluation and choice, implementation</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescribe and implement corrective programs for individuals</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervise (assess, advise, coordinate) regular reading program, in several schools or district-wide</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum development and evaluation, implementation and adjustment</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-service education in reading, teacher-consultation</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give and interpret reading achievement tests for use in screening and diagnosis</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General statement: concern with regular or remedial program</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In charge of a remedial reading program</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hold routine parent conferences</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13.--Continued

| Conduct reading therapy for children with reading problems | 8 |
| Collect data for research in reading                      | 5 |
Therapy. Although "Psychotherapy with individual children" and "Group therapy with children" were cited as proper functions only for psychologists, eight respondents thought the reading consultant alone should perform "Reading therapy for children with reading problems."

Therapy in a broad sense to include instructional remediation would not seem to be an important source of jurisdictional conflict. A distinction between instructional therapy and adjustive therapy in the areas of personality and emotional balance is readily made.

The school psychologist does not see himself as performing services for pupil personnel exclusively. Seven of them stated that they, rather than the reading consultant, should "Talk with teachers about personal and interpersonal problems." Thirty-three of them thought counseling teachers on "procedures, attitudes appropriate in the classroom" was a function first of all of the psychologist.

Training Teachers. The "Training, advising and assisting of teachers in teaching techniques" was cited by 79 psychologists as the proper function of reading consultants, but 11 saw serving as a "Consultant or leader in in-service education for teachers" as the proper duty of a school psychologist. Prominent in this area is the psychologist's conception of himself as a consultant; but
one can function as a consultant without pre-empting this whole function.

**Curriculum.** Curriculum development is the function most heavily conceded to the reading consultant, yet five psychologists saw recommending of special classes to the administration as exclusively within their province. Eighteen likewise saw as their function "Recommend plans (sometimes methods) for remediation." In this area, too, the psychologist is prominent as a consultant with advisory rather than administrative responsibility.

**Parent Relations.** Eight psychologists conceded to reading consultants the function "Hold routine parent conferences." On the other hand, 22 specified "Counsel with children and/or parents" as their function; 16, "Hold parent group discussion sessions."

**Research.** Five psychologists saw reading consultants as helpful in collecting data for research in reading, but 26 thought that a proper function of the psychologist was to "Conduct and analyze research on reading."

**Summary**

This chapter has presented the analysis of the data. The data were categorized, organized, tabulated,
and summarized, and then subjected to quantitative and qualitative analysis.

The general quality of the response was evaluated in regard to its representativeness of the possible school situations of psychologists, and thus of the range of functions relevant to reading programs in which they might become involved. No basis for suspecting the data of falling short of encompassing this range was disclosed.

Next, the data derived from the response to Part II of the questionnaire were examined for what light they might throw on the issues of (1) a possible "significant" difference in numbers between school psychologists performing particular functions and those who think they should participate, and (2) a possible difference in involvement between "clinically oriented" and "school-oriented" psychologists. The data were in accord with the position that there is an important difference between numbers of school psychologists participating and those who think they should, varying from function to function. No support, however, was found for a possible neglect of certain factors relevant to reading by the "clinically oriented." Although the data were very limited in providing a basis for any inference of a trend, they suggested the possibility of a mixture of trends in which personal motivation could be an important factor in addition to ideological commitment.
Data obtained in response to Parts I and III of the questionnaire were quantified wherever this treatment was indicated. Other treatment included categorization and selection of representative responses.

The reports of the respondents' conceptions of their contribution to reading were grouped in accord with the set of generic roles adopted for organization of references in the literature and for facilitating an interaction of literature with the data in arriving at the conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 5.

The data evoked by the questions in Part III of the questionnaire on the relationship of school psychologist and reading consultant revealed postures on the part of the psychologist ranging from non-participation through minimum diagnostic aid to consultation and a full collaborative relationship of peers, with the last constituting the mode of the response.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUDING STATEMENT

This chapter relates the findings, which are based on analysis of the data, to the speculation, anecdotal evidence, fragmentary research, and role prescriptions reported in the literature, and to developments relevant to reading that have occurred since this study was started. Three of these developments, to be discussed later in the chapter are: a nation-wide survey of school psychologists by the National Association of School Psychologists, a proposal by President Nixon for an Institute of Education, and the growing interest in "special learning disabilities." Interaction of the findings and of recent developments leads to consideration of possible new roles for the school psychologist in the reading area. In keeping with these possibilities, recommendations are made for additional research.

This study was the first known attempt to gather data representative of the ways in which school psychologists are contributing to the effectiveness and improvement of reading programs and of their attitudes toward such participation.
Although not directly in line with the 1964 call of the American Psychological Association upon its Division of School Psychologists (Division 16) to conduct self-study, the present study was undertaken to make up in part for their failure to conduct such an investigation.

Discussion of Implications of the Findings

When this study was undertaken, knowledge of the school psychologist's involvement with reading was so limited that nothing more definitive than an exploratory study was indicated. Basis was therefore sought for answering such questions as: In what particular ways and in what frequencies are school psychologists contributing to reading programs? Is their overall contribution of sufficient proportions to warrant closer scrutiny? What are their attitudes toward their status of involvement or non-involvement, as the case may be with regard to particular functions? How does what they reveal about their activities conform to generalizations about them in the literature? What indicators are there of the nature and degree of their future involvement with reading?

Nature of Present Involvement

The involvement of school psychologists with reading programs was considered from three points of view:
1. Participation in performance of each of the 24 functions listed in Part II of the questionnaire.

2. Fulfillment of the more general roles of collaborator, researcher, innovator, and disseminator of psychological knowledge as indicated by responses to Parts I and III of the questionnaire.

3. Correlation of involvement with "child-centered" and "school-centered" variables of orientation with regard to precedence of objectives.

The data indicated that school psychologists are making a contribution to reading programs of relatively greater importance than could be inferred from earlier studies such as the Dover (1956) report and the Harvard Report on Reading (Austin and Morrison, 1963). In terms of the 24 functions listed in Part II of the questionnaire of the present study, out of a mathematically possible total of 7,392 participations in the individual functions by the 308 respondents whose data were used in analyzing Part II, they reported 4,390 or not quite 60 per cent. The functions varied in numbers of participants, with 15 functions being performed by more than 50 per cent of the respondents.

Data on the relative amount of time spent by participants on particular functions were not sought for several reasons. A primary concern of this study was the
variability of kind of involvement rather than intensity in terms of time devoted. Further, it is not known that respondents are in a position to provide reliable information on the amount of time spent in accord with the breakdown provided by the 24 functions. However, the time spent on reading program services as a whole by respondents ranged from none at all to all of their working time. About three per cent of the respondents stated that they made no contribution to reading and were little involved with instructional personnel. Some others, notably those with training and experience in the reading area prior to becoming school psychologists, were devoting full time to reading programs. The remainder were spread out between these two extremes.

One source of this variability is the ad hoc basis of much assignment of psychologists' responsibilities rather than adherence to a theoretical model based upon functions that are primarily their domain. Although a small "hard core" resist deviation from a theoretical model, many would seem to be in agreement with the respondent who wrote:

In my opinion, the interaction of a team of educators, each with his particular area of specialty, (reading, psychology, social work, administration, guidance, etc.) or personal attributes can best provide meaningful service. There are no neat packages of what a given type of specialist should provide without considering what kind of supportive or parallel services are available in that particular system. In public
school work each working team must consider how to slice the pie of educational programs (instructional or non-instructional) in a way that will serve best at the time. In our district it would be foolish to expect the reading consultant to do psychological testing when he could be free to concentrate on providing remedial instruction, or being available to classroom teachers concerning materials and techniques, etc. If his staff were not available to evaluate reading referrals, I as a psychologist better bone up on diagnostic reading tests.

No attempt was made to correlate professional qualifications of respondents with their participation in particular functions. The National Survey of School Psychologists, to be discussed in the next section, seeks to gather data on such qualifications, but only in terms of degrees and the majors of education, psychology, and sociology. In many cases only knowledge of particular courses taken would permit a meaningful correlation. For example, one would want to know the extent to which school psychologists active in diagnosing and remediating "perceptual learning" disabilities have had advanced courses in the psychology of perception. An advanced degree in psychology or education encompasses a considerable variety of particular courses. Many school psychologists crossed discipline lines in advancing to their present positions. Some respondents identified themselves as former reading consultants, teachers of remedial reading, or curriculum consultants. The resulting variability of professional qualifications can be assumed to be a factor in the variable use schools make of school psychologists.
The occasion for the ad hoc assignment of school psychologists is provided, of course, by the variability of the personnel contexts in which they work. As a result, psychologists are found doing almost everything relevant to reading short of instructing regular reading classes. A few of them even conduct remedial reading instruction. Some generalization, however, can be made. Most effort reported was directed at screening those unready for beginning reading, seeking to remedy their "perceptual learning" disabilities through prescription of training, and diagnosing cognitive, behavioral, emotional, and motivational deficits of retarded readers. Little activity was reported in connection with developmental reading and reading in content areas.

Little basis for correlations between professional qualifications and activities impinging explicitly on particular school subjects will be provided by the National Survey of School Psychologists. The questionnaire has little reference to school subjects. It does inquire whether respondents have attended or conducted workshops on psycholinguistic assessment and the diagnosis of reading problems and whether they have worked in a reading clinic.

The involvement of the school psychologist with reading was examined in this study from the point of view of fulfillment of the roles of collaborator, researcher, innovator, and disseminator of psychological knowledge.
Eiserer (1963) insisted that a cardinal responsibility of the school psychologist is to function as a member of an interdisciplinary team. On such a team, a school psychologist, in addition to competence in evaluation of intellectual and affective status, can likely offer the best qualifications to provide explanations in terms of psychological processes and to design, conduct, and evaluate research. Those roles lead to those of collaborator and innovator under circumstances favorable to their assumptions.

Gray (1963) was quoted in Chapter 2 as seeing the dissemination of psychological insights as a logical and important function of the school psychologist. She also sees as a by-product of such activity an enhancement of his status, thus providing motivation for him to function in this way.

In the past, the school psychologist has often been deprecated as a communicator on the grounds of his use of jargon, resulting from talk in terms of frames of reference difficult for the teacher to relate to practice. Since all scientific language is jargon, one solution for the school psychologist is to help qualify as members of his language community those with whom he would communicate. Respondents reported considerable effort along this line in the form of in-service training, talks to groups
of educators and parents, and consultations with parents and teachers.

With regard to research, the respondents' main efforts were directed at the lower levels of learning, sometimes referred to as "perceptual learning." A number of them reported attempts to develop adequate screening tests for placement of children in readiness training classes and in first grade. Considerable experimentation, probably on the action research level, with visual-motor coordination training aimed at preparing the unready was also reported. In the concept-learning area there was only one mention, with a respondent reporting that he was trying to develop a technique for determining whether or not a child had formed a particular concept despite the fact that he had not associated any verbal label with it.

Of all respondents not currently doing research, 67 per cent thought that they should. This conviction on the part of the inactive and the level of the activity on the part of others are contrary to Gray's (1963) statement, "When school psychologists list functions for themselves, either actual ones or those they would like, research brings up the rear" (p. 57). Austin and Morrison (1963), cited in Chapter 2, accounted for this by the lack of supportive conditions. Gray was quoted in Chapter 2 as seeing the public school as a vast, potential learning
laboratory in which she is certain cognitive development could be studied.

The increased activity and interest in research indicated by the present study are no doubt due largely to improvement in supportive conditions. Federal grants and the requirements of federally funded projects for research and evaluation were often mentioned by respondents. How much was due to awakening of the respondents to the potential of the school as a learning laboratory is an imponderable.

As an innovator a school psychologist could well develop an ambivalence for the school as the vehicle for such service. On one hand, the schools have never been "riper" for innovation. The information explosion, the problem of preparing children for a culture expected to undergo change, the observations of classroom teachers, and the challenge of learning theorists to maxim-based pedagogy are among the factors that have made many schools receptive to the general idea of innovation. The literature and comments of respondents indicate that the role of innovator is part of the perception of school psychologists by school administrators. On the other hand, some respondents reported frustrations due to exclusion from the area of curriculum development and to the incompatibility of "lock-step" procedures with changes they proposed, due to the conflict of textbook-centered and child-centered orientations.
Although the respondents made many references to innovations, there was relatively little in the nature of the innovations to establish the school psychologist as a developer of new ideas. A number of respondents reported innovations which categorically would have been in the province of a reading consultant. The special learning disabilities approach permits some psychologists to innovate training even though curriculum planning is officially "off bounds" for them. ("Special learning disabilities" will be discussed in the next section.) But the training procedures, for the most part, were those of Frostig, Kephart, and a few others, in the areas of perceptual and visual-motor training. Although emotional and attitudinal factors are clearly in the province of the school psychologist, the respondents made only seven references to innovations aimed at such factors. The picture of the school psychologist as an innovator that the data support is more that of an advocate of the adoption of ideas originated by others than that of the developer of such ideas.

In the role of collaborator, respondents in substantial numbers reported themselves as active members of reading teams. Recognition of this role as one acceptable to the reading discipline is made in its literature, and respondents with little exception stated that they
were willingly serving in this way. Since 67 per cent of the respondents were in personnel contexts that at least include a reading consultant, the response represents a sample in which team cooperation is a major aspect of the contribution to reading.

Exclusion from such collaboration was reported as due to limitations, in addition to the universal one of time, categorized in Chapter 4 as (1) self-imposed on an ideological basis, or in recognition of the limitations of knowledge on the part of either the would-be informer or the objects of his communication, and (2) system-imposed through school policy specifying jurisdiction.

The problem of establishing proper interpersonal relations was given considerable prominence in respondents' comments. There were, however, reports of what the respondents considered the achievement of highly cooperative team functionings.

The roles of researcher, disseminator of psychological knowledge, and innovator are seen by some writers about school psychologists as their best ways to gain status in their profession and in their communities. Among the particular school subjects, reading programs provide the best opportunity for them to fill these roles and thus become a factor in their involvement.

One factor proposed in the literature as affecting the degree of involvement of a school psychologist is
clinical orientation. It is speculated that such an orientation on his part is accompanied by a neglect of children's psychoeducational, or cognitive, aspects. The data were analyzed for what light they might throw on this. Rather than being in accord with the assumed neglect, the data indicated the likelihood of the opposite—a more than average concern with such aspects.

There are some psychologists, of course, who hold to the clinical model. One of these wrote: "Many psychologists who advocate a change in role from the clinical attitude seem to me to derogate the contributions and qualifications of other professionals, including general curriculum consultants, reading consultants, administrators and teachers."

Psychologists' Views About Their Involvement or Lack of It

A common harbinger of change in human behavior is dissatisfaction. To gather data on this, the questionnaire called for respondents to indicate for each of the 24 functions whether or not they thought they should participate. Only about two per cent of the reports of actual function performance were accompanied by indications that the performers thought their participation inappropriate. On the whole, present performers were thus strongly in accord with their present involvement.
As part of an effort to avoid excessive length of
the questionnaire, the investigator did not ask performers
to specify the grounds for their disapproval of performance
of a function. It was found that the major source of dis­
satisfaction was in non-performance of functions--
psychologists who were not performing but thought they
should. Of those who were inactive in particular
functions, \( \frac{3}{4} \) per cent disapproved of their inactivity.
Dissatisfaction as a predictor of change thus obtains
primarily among present non-performers, but the specific
grounds for this dissatisfaction remain undetermined and
unassessed.

One factor brought to light by the present study
is the substantial interest on the part of the respondents
in providing group therapy. This is counter to a possible
shift toward greater concern with psychoeducational
aspects, and at least suggests the possibility of a mixture
of trends. This interest in group therapy probably
reflects to some extent the growth of "humanistic
psychology" during the past fifteen years. The Society
for Humanistic Psychology now has more than 1,500 members.
Procedures such as T-group therapy, sensitivity group
therapy, syntectics, and the like, have been developed.
The likelihood of conditions arising that would favor
conversion of the interest into practice is another im­
ponderable. But the interest in providing psychotherapy is
relevant to the question of how well the concern of the psychologist coincides with that of the educator with regard to the intellectual status of the child. Those who would have the school psychologist as "educational engineer" would have it coincide closely.

Implications of Findings Related to Current Developments Relevant to Reading

Three recent developments at the national level can have an impact on school psychology and on reading, separately and in relation to one another. One of these is the National Survey of School Psychologists, the second one is President Nixon's proposal for a National Institute of Education, and the third is the growing interest in "special learning disabilities."

During the writing of this chapter, in February of 1970, a questionnaire was received from the National Association of School Psychologists. This questionnaire is the data-gathering instrument for a survey financed jointly by the Association, the University of Akron, and the federal government. It has been mailed to nearly 9,000 providers of psychological services to school-age children.

The major part of the questionnaire is devoted to developing information on the training and experience qualifications of school psychologists, their plans for up-grading such qualifications, a breakdown of time devoted to elementary versus secondary school children, and
information on salary status and allied non-school-contract professional activities. There are some questions, however, more directly relevant to the present study. One is concerned with discrepancy between present activity and what the subjects consider ideal; the other involves a possible change of role, as seen by school psychologists.

The National Survey seeks to measure the discrepancy between what school psychologists are doing and what they consider to be an ideal program of activity. One shortcoming of both the present study and the National Survey is that no distinction is made between approval based on a theoretical model of the school psychologist and that based on an ad hoc solution of a local problem. The use of the word "ideal" in the National Survey may evoke relatively more expression of opinion based on a theoretical model than did the present study with its use of "should" and "should not." In spite of the fact that school psychologists have not been able to reach a consensus on a theoretical model for themselves, many of them have evolved their own, as some respondents indicated.

The National Survey also seeks data relevant to a possible change of role as foreseen by school psychologists. Those receiving the questionnaire are asked whether or not they see an emerging role and, if so, what the nature of the effected change would be. This change is in terms of role responsibility for fourteen activities,
with role responsibility broken down to: personal performance, consulting, coordinating-administrating, or no responsibility. The fourteen activities are:

1. Individual psychoeducational evaluations
2. Parent and teacher conferences
3. Plan educational programs based upon your individual evaluations
4. Prepare written reports based upon individual evaluations
5. Follow-up on students who have been referred and for whom recommendations have been made
6. Apply variations of behavioral management techniques
7. Group counseling
8. Standardized group testing
9. Individual counseling
10. Evaluate special school programs
11. Evaluate regular school programs
12. Research (experimental designs in schools)
13. Research (survey designs)
14. In-service training of teachers

It will be seen that no activity necessarily implies involvement with any particular school subject. Whether or not the National Survey will throw any light on the issue of psychodynamic versus psychoeducational concern of school psychologists is difficult to foretell.

Another, and pertinent, question in the National Survey requests respondents to designate the single title
which they would prefer to have. The response could add something to what is known about the self-images of school psychologists.

The second development, occurring February, 1970, with relevance to school psychology and reading, is the proposal by President Nixon of a National Institute of Education. This has particular implications for the school psychologist as a conductor of research in the reading area.

James E. Allen, Jr., U. S. Commissioner of Education (1970), has stated that the Institute would do research aimed at discovering more about learning in order to help local school systems "... reform their educational practices on the basis of the best research available." The obvious implication of this is that supporters of the Institute believe better results from research can be obtained by departing from the present methods of supporting it. If the Institute is approved by Congress, it will likely become the most relevant factor in the school psychologist's involvement in research. What this relevance might be, however, cannot be known until procedures for the Institute are formulated.

The third development is concerned with "special learning disabilities," a particular kind of learning disorder that has attracted much interest since the time the present study was undertaken. A definition for this category was included in a talk by Kirk (1968). He
excluded from the group with "special learning disabilities" those with "... visual, hearing or motor handicaps, mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or environmental disadvantage." He cited as encompassed by "special learning disabilities" the following conditions: "perceptual handicaps, brain injuries, minimum brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia."

Concern with these conditions is directed by manifestations of disorders in the understanding and expression of spoken or written language. Those investigating "special learning disabilities" seek to determine disorders of basic psychological processes rather than external contributing factors such as the causes of emotional disturbance that may underlie the language deficits.

The expression, "special learning disabilities," because of its relative recency, was not used in the questionnaire for the present study. In Function 3, however, perceptual cause was specified as one of those to be considered in the diagnosis of reading problems. Function 17 covered research on learning problems related to reading. There were many references in the responses to learning problems, perceptual abilities, training to overcome perceptual handicaps, brain damage, and learning disabilities specialists. It is questionable that the use of the expression "special learning disabilities" in the
questionnaire would have evoked more response in this area, particularly since the expression was not familiar at the time. Further reference to these disabilities is made under Recommendations for Further Research.

In summary, the National Survey will provide important information about the nature of the school psychologist's present involvement in school programs, about his views concerning that involvement, and about a possible change of role as foreseen by school psychologists.

The proposed Institute of Education could stimulate activity on the part of school psychologists in the area of research, particularly in reading, which is often considered to be the proverbial "squeaking wheel" in the educational process. It seems likely that an Institute of Education could help encourage supportive conditions that would make it possible for school psychologists to engage in research which respondents in the present study indicated they wished to do.

Continuing growth of interest in "special learning disabilities" will involve the school psychologist as he works with children and teachers in diagnostic and remedial procedures.

Recommendations for Further Research

A common type of recommendation for a follow-through for a study aimed primarily at delineating the
activities of a group is to propose appraisals of those activities. Such appraisals would seek to determine the importance of the services, how adequately and efficiently they are being provided, and how improvement could be made both in the benefits and in the rendering of the services.

In the situation surveyed in the present study, it might seem that the categorizing of functions as properly those of the psychologist or of the reading specialist should have priority over appraisals. Under present conditions of variability of responsibility from one school situation to another, such a theoretical model might be premature, causing more difficulty than good if widely publicized. The lack of response of school psychologists to appeals for self-study is likely due in large part to the lack of consensus on a theoretical model of themselves as a baseline in assessing their present patterns of activity. Moreover, the 24 functions used in this study do not all present the same problem in assignment of responsibility. Under any approach to ideal conditions there would be little question that some of the functions are clearly in the province of reading personnel, others in that of the psychologist.

It appears to the investigator that it is more appropriate now to undertake appraisals of function performance to determine the conditions under which the services are best rendered, treating the question of who
should provide them as of secondary concern. The under-
lying problems of function performance remain, regardless
of the performer. If a teacher is to be provided with an
explanation in terms of psychological processes, the
problem of communication is essentially the same for both
reading specialist and psychologist as communicants. Of
course the necessity of explaining may vary in accord with
the difference between the psychologist acting as a
consultant and the reading specialist as a supervisor
empowered to give directions.

An equal need for appraisal is not presented by
each of the 24 functions. Those more properly the function
of reading personnel—administering of group achievement
testing in reading and analyzing and interpreting the
resulting data; providing remedial instruction in reading;
and assisting in the decision on whether or not a child
with a reading problem is to be promoted—do not necessarily
involve any unique contribution on the part of the psychol-
ogist. Three functions could be set aside on the basis
that, although they can be relevant to reading, they are
not limited to that subject: providing individual psycho-
therapy and group therapy and talking to teachers about
their personal and interpersonal problems. No appraisal
is indicated for the administering of individual intel-
ligence tests upon request. As such, this activity does
not involve the reading program, and there is no question
of improving the product of the service or the way in which it is rendered. There is a question of whether the service should be offered at all, which is another matter.

Prior to the proposal of the National Institute, the investigator had planned to recommend in some detail in the area of research by the school psychologist. Announcement of the proposed Institute should imply that due weight was given to the research conducted by school psychologists and that the decision was reached that a better way of achieving the desired results was possible. If school psychologists do not agree with the changes the Institute will bring about, they could spell out and defend what they have been doing in research.

A word might be said, however, about an area of activity that is a prerequisite to research—the necessary preliminary thinking. Some of those who, like Gagné (1965), are aware of the gap between present learning theory and the complexity of classroom learning tasks, have proposed task analysis as one approach to closing the gap. Even when factorial analysis is the method of task analysis, this method cannot discover anything that is not set up for it as a possibility, through prior thinking. Questions must be generated which will lead either to simplification of theoretical explanations for a phenomenon or to the uncovering of new possibilities for experimental support.
Collectively, school psychologists form a considerable pool of brainpower, and they should be able to contribute to the thinking aspect of task analysis. They are in a setting where children are confronted with complex learning tasks, which may seem to be represented by learning theory but actually are not. In this setting long-term memory is the basic concern; in the laboratory, short-term memory is usually the basis for experimentation. Exploring the possibility of getting school psychologists to attempt to contribute to the thinking aspect of task analysis might well be worth considering.

Investigators of "special learning disabilities" state that they are concerned with the basic psychological processes. Such processes, of course, are not accessible to direct observation and must be inferred from psychological correlates. This procedure has many pitfalls. It was thought until fairly recently that reasoning was the most important process in arithmetic tasks, and then factor analysis disclosed memory to be contributing more. Task analysis, by disclosing the specific nature of learning tasks, holds the promise of contributing to a sounder basis for inferences about psychological processes.

A problem common to the appraisal of most of the other functions is communication, due largely to the jargon the school psychologist uses in writing reports, consulting, conferring with parents and teachers, providing
in-service training, and in trying to educate the public in general about psychological processes. Some respondents commented in a way that implied adoption of a fatalistic attitude toward this kind of endeavor. In contrast, Money (1966) saw the future reading teacher as being "... diagnostically precise in tailoring the method of teaching to an individual's special handicaps and abilities" (p. vi). Such a situation would surely be dependent upon effective communication between the teacher and whoever contributes to diagnosis of handicaps and abilities.

A number of questions suggest themselves when one considers a possible inquiry into the problem of jargon. What are the actual dimensions of this problem? What is the size of the vocabulary involved? What essentially new concepts and principles are entailed? What happens to the problem when a reading consultant intermediates between teacher and school psychologist? To what extent is the problem alleviated by in-service training? What has been done about the problem of jargon in those situations for which the achievement of highly cooperative teamwork has been reported? What do former reading specialists now functioning as school psychologists have to say about relating psychological explanations to reading problems?

If a study of the problem of jargon showed that it is feasible to reduce it substantially, such a study might be helpful in enlisting institutions that train teachers
and other allied personnel to make supportive efforts. Perhaps even the amount of jargon could be reduced. An enlightened body of teachers and reading specialists could be a healthy deterrent to a school psychologist otherwise tempted to cloak a vague and uncertain understanding in terminology that suggests just the opposite to the naive.

Situations in which optimum team cooperation was reported as achieved suggest a follow-up in the form of case studies. The objectives of such studies would be to identify the means by which obstacles to cooperative effort on reading problems were overcome. For example, as a member of what has inelegantly been referred to as "a mixed breed of cats," many a psychologist has had the problem of weaning other school personnel from thinking of him in terms of the stereotype of a clinician. What deliberate efforts to set forth the qualifications, theoretical postures, and the like have been helpful in avoiding misperceptions? On the preventive side, case studies in this area could be evaluated in terms of what universities could do in coordinating the training in the several disciplines to prepare the trainees for collaboration.

It would seem that those respondents who first attained a competence in the reading area might have a special body of insights to contribute on the relevance of school psychology to reading. No elaborate study would be
required to gather their opinions as to what their qualifications in psychology had added to their ability to understand and deal with reading problems.

The present study produced only sporadic indications of the conditions underlying the discrepancy between what school psychologists are doing in connection with reading and what they think they should be doing. Among the reasons cited for non-performance of this type were time limitations, jurisdictional bounds, shortcomings in ability to contribute due to present deficits in training, and inability on the part of would-be beneficiaries to profit from the services. Consideration should be given to the question of whether or not the seeking of more definitive information in this area would be worth while. Such information is pertinent to the question of the future involvement of the school psychologist with reading.

Any forecasting of future involvement has to take into account the prospects for other members of reading teams. Complications arise here because of the uncertainty of answers to such questions as: How common will reading specialists and consultants become, and what up-grading of their qualifications will occur? What is in prospect in adding elementary counselors to staffs and what will be their competencies? And what will come of efforts to develop learning disabilities specialists? Increases in the number of kindergartens and nursery schools and
grouping for readiness training at the first-grade level are taking place. These create added call for services, but just how the call will be answered is far from certain.

On the question of whether or not efforts of school psychologists are undergoing a shift of emphasis from the psychodynamic to the psychoeducational, or from the affective to the cognitive, the data of the present study threw some light but were found inadequate to resolve the question. Knowledge of whether or not such a shift is occurring and, if so, in what magnitude, would be valuable to training institutions, prospective school psychologists, those setting certification requirements for them, and educators in general. Planning a study to resolve the question presents difficulties. One problem lies in practical ways for the school psychologists, or other data gatherers, to categorize their efforts as psychodynamic or psychoeducational and to keep a record of the time devoted to each category. If this is feasible, then a longitudinal study could be made, comparing a present state of affairs with that at some future date.

Such a study would not disclose how much shift, if any, had already taken place at the time of establishing the baseline. The speculation in terms of the present progressive tense assumes that some shift has already occurred. Some light might be thrown on this by comparing a representative sample of school psychologists' current
written reports with those of, say, ten or twenty years ago. The collective opinion of school psychologists on this issue would also be pertinent.

**Concluding Statement**

School administrators are looking to various sources for aid in helping children to develop skills in reading that will enable them to meet the demands of today. School psychologists have become involved deeply enough to warrant closer scrutiny of their contribution to reading programs than it has been given in the past. The purpose of the present exploratory study has been to determine the nature of this involvement in terms of particular functions performed, the attitudes of school psychologists toward both their involvement and non-involvement in these functions as a factor in their future participation, and something of the problems in gaining acceptance for their services and in rendering them.

In this chapter the results of the research reported in this study were discussed in relation to the literature cited in Chapter 2 and to developments that have taken place since this study was undertaken. On the basis of this interaction, a number of recommendations were made to which the following questions were germane: How could services be made more beneficial and more efficient in their rendering? What are the possibilities for alleviating
the problem of jargon? What is the place of the school psychologist in research? Is the reading specialist turned school psychologist a special source of insights on the involvement of the latter in reading programs? Would case studies of situations for which achievement of optimum team cooperation has been reported provide guidance toward such a goal? How does training in particular areas such as the psychology of perception correlate with participation in activities to which it would be pertinent? Is a shift of emphasis from the psychodynamic to the psychoeducational taking place and, if so, how much has already occurred? What significance to the prospects for future involvement lies in the dissatisfaction of many school psychologists with their non-participation in certain functions?
Dear ____________________,

One consensus of the recent Atlanta conference of school psychologists was that their role is shifting in emphasis. Any substantial shift, of course, involves the other members of the team that cooperates to meet children's educational needs.

In team realignment the school psychologist will be a pivotal figure. To assess his conception of his role with special reference to the improvement of reading is part of a doctoral study I have undertaken under the supervision of Dr. Ruth Strang of the University of Arizona.

In addition to interviews with a number of school psychologists, teachers and reading consultants, to insure data that are representative, I am seeking your cooperation in completing the enclosed analysis of your contribution to reading improvement. All members of Division 16 of the American Psychological Association will receive one. Dr. Edward French, Secretary of Division 16, has approved the questionnaire, and his office has made available the mailing tapes.

You will note that the report has two parts. On the first page, Part I invites your free response to the question: "In what ways do you contribute to the improvement of reading in your school or district?" Please write this without reference to Part II.

Part II. This gives you the opportunity to check and comment on a number of specific functions related to reading (a) which you actually perform and (b) which you think a psychologist should perform in a situation such as yours.
If you will take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and add any comments you think might be helpful, I shall be most grateful. It is unfortunate that I could not get it to you earlier in the year, and I hope that it will not inconvenience you to return it to me before you leave on vacation.

Sincerely,

Carlene Sampson
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS

THE PSYCHOLOGIST'S CONTRIBUTION TO READING IMPROVEMENT

Before turning this page, please answer the questions on this page.

PART I. Please write freely below, in answer to this question: "In what ways do you contribute to the improvement of reading in your school or district?"

1. What is your situation? School(s) served, type of student, quality of teachers.

2. Other specialists employed in your school(s) (yes) (no)
   Reading teacher
   Reading consultant
   School social worker
   Other (if so, who?)
**PART II**

**THE PSYCHOLOGIST'S CONTRIBUTION TO READING IMPROVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions you perform</th>
<th>Functions you should perform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Participate in group achievement testing in reading.

2. Analyze and interpret the data from such tests.

3. Diagnose the causes of reading problems: Perceptual, psychogenic, environmental, faulty education, and others.


5. Make case studies of reading problems: diagnosis and suggested remedial work.

6. Confer with parents of child having reading difficulty.

7. Give remedial instruction in reading.

8. Provide psychotherapy for children with severe reading problems.


10. Refer reading cases to outside clinics.
11. Administer individual intelligence tests upon request.

12. Use tests as a basis for grouping: according to reading ability and potential.

13. Suggest to administrators curriculum changes, need for special reading classes and staff, etc.

14. Assist in decisions about promotion of students who have reading problems.

15. Evaluate new techniques and devices for teaching reading, such as various machines, programmed learning.

16. Participate in reading conferences and conferences related to reading.

17. Initiate and/or conduct research on learning problems related to reading: list on back of sheet researches completed or in progress.

18. Talk with teachers, at their request, about personal and interpersonal problems.

19. Conduct or participate in in-service training programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions you perform</th>
<th>Functions you think you should perform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A

B


22. Give to teachers descriptions of teaching procedures and instructional materials that would help them to give more effective reading instruction and prevent and remedy reading difficulties in their classes.


24. Hold group discussions for parents of children with severe reading problems.

Comments:
PART III

1. If there is a reading consultant in your school(s), what should be your relationship to him?

2. What functions would you perform that should not be the province of the reading consultant?

3. What functions would the reading consultant perform that should not be the province of the psychologist?
APPENDIX C

TEACHER INTERVIEWS WITH GROUP INTERACTION

The interviewer set up a tape recorder in the teachers' room in an elementary school. As teachers came and went during their planning periods, recess, and lunch hours each was asked to respond to the question: "How do you think the school psychologist can assist you in the improvement of reading in your room?" There was a full-time school psychologist in the district, but there was no reading consultant.

In the transcript which follows, the interviewer's questions are indicated with Q; teacher responses with T, plus a number in accord with his appearance in the room. A few teachers left, then returned to participate again.

Transcript

Q: How many children are enrolled in your room?
T-1: There are 26, from second and third grades, children the teachers decided would benefit from special help. Originally it was supposed to be a smaller class, in order to give them more individual attention, but because of over-population I now have 26, and it has cut down on my effectiveness. All these children
have reading deficiencies, and they were losing out in regular classrooms.

Q: What kinds of reading problems do you see as you work with these children?

T-1: Well, I think my biggest problem is determining what the problem is. Now I get the child and all I know is that he can't read, that he's reading below level. Some of their deficiencies are poor instruction, and they don't have the foundation. With some of them it is an emotional problem; some others may be lacking in particular reading skills. So my first task is to determine what the child's problem is, and it's often very difficult because one child may respond on reading skills, but another child you can touch on every area of reading and you won't get through to him.

I've had this class since early November (three months), and I still haven't isolated all the causes of the reading deficiencies of the various children. I use most often a trial and error method. You know, I might try certain word attack skills with this particular group. Some child might not catch on. Maybe he's just slow, period. Or maybe I'm not communicating with him. Or maybe there's some kind of block. So I have to try something else.
Q: What kinds of screening devices are used to select children for your room? Does the psychologist help with this?

T-1: No, these children were the slowest ones in the classes that they came from. The teacher decided which ones would function better in a smaller class.

Q: She based her decision on achievement tests and performance in the classroom?

T-1: Yes, because the teachers had had them for two months and they had time to determine that this child just wasn't working on grade level and needed special attention.

Q: Do you have any formal testing program for them after they come into your room?

T-1: No. They were given tests before based on the basal reader they were using, and I borrowed a copy so that I could use it for my own diagnostic purposes. I had them read orally, and I gave them tests that I composed to determine as much as possible.

Q: Have you had a college course in reading?

T-1: No, I haven't.

Q: Do you think it would be helpful?

T-1: I certainly do.

Q: Do you plan any more testing for the children?

T-1: There is only one child that I have recommended to the psychologist. I think she is going to do a case
study on him, or some special work, and this child it
seems to me might have an emotional problem; but
other than that I really don't see any of those
children as having an emotional problem, or anything
special.

Q: You think, then, that the ones you believe have
emotional problems are the ones you would want the
psychologist to work with?

T-1: That's right. Well, primarily because she's got her
hands full. If she could handle more I'm sure that's
not the only area in which she could be of help. I
chose an emotional problem because it seemed to me
that this would be the most important for her to try
to handle. I might be able to do something myself
for some of the others, you know.

Q: Let's assume for the moment that she might have more
time to give to your group. Can you think of any
other ways she might be helpful?

T-1: Well, uh, I should think ... if there were some sort
of testing device that would help isolate the causes
of reading problems. I think that a strictly
academic reading problem can be handled by the
teacher. I may have overlooked children who have
emotional problems, so she would interview many of
them to see what she thought about it. I suppose
a deficiency in the home that has caused a poor
attitude toward school ... would have to be emotional.

Q: Does your school nurse screen the children for vision, hearing and other things?

T-1: I'm not familiar with any formal screening program, if they have. There are children in my room with deficiencies along this line. I have one partially sighted child and another has partial hearing. There, too, I suppose the school psychologist could be beneficial, but I'm not sure. I guess you need special training to know what to do with these particular children.

A: You have an in-service program for teachers that the school psychologist conducts, I believe?

T-1: You must be referring to the program that started yesterday. We had a meeting on behavior problems.

Q: Do you have behavior problems in your room?

T-1: No, I have children that misbehave, but for the most part I find that much of this happens when I haven't properly organized things.

Q: How about a child who is hyperactive, or one who withdraws into himself, looks out the window a lot?

T-1: No, I wouldn't say I see any of those symptoms. Danny, the one I have recommended for study may be a little bit hyperactive, but he is just so far behind
that he's always lost, so he's looking for something else to do.

Q: Do you have any who just can't read at all?

T-1: Danny. He can read certain words, but he has progressed so very little. I did discover a couple of days ago that he can put sounds together. He doesn't know his alphabet. I think once he learns that, and with his ability to put sounds together he may be able to pick up a lot of lost time.

Q: Do you have special materials in your room that the children can use as they have need?

T-1: Well, I have the Phonovisual Chart and another word chart, and then in Special Education we can have pets —as a sort of motivation—but other than that I have no special reading, teaching games.

T-2: Too many kids and not enough time to get going is my biggest problem. My group was originally screened out by the psychologist, the emotionally disturbed children, but now we're so crowded they just put in all the slow ones. I've got them from all IQ's, 23 of them.

Q: How do you determine the IQ?

T-2: Well, I don't go much for IQ tests—you know, one IQ test won't give you an accurate picture of a child's
ability unless he is willing to perform. If he wants to learn he can; if he doesn't, he's not going to.

Q: What are some reasons he wouldn't want to learn?

T-2: Some of them are lazy. Some of them have other problems--highly nervous and can't concentrate long enough to get down to it . . . get bored easily or fidgety. It's like a hit and miss thing.

T-3: Sometimes a child is afraid he will make a mistake. See, I have children on the second-grade level--repeaters, underachievers, and the one thing they can't do is read. I find the child has been told repeatedly, whether through the teacher or the method of reading or some way, that he can't do it, and his incentive is gone. His enthusiasm. In second grade! I have children with IQ's of 119, 125, still in first grade books, and they feel they cannot do it. Their feeling of trying is gone. It's just now that some of them are sparking, but others, well . . .

Q: How do you help them toward this enthusiasm?

T-3: Well, the first part of this year I did a lot of language arts experience--oral dictation, writing our own books, and I brought the typewriter to school and the children dictated stories, did painting, working with words--happy sounds, sad sounds. They were surprised that they said this, and suddenly
realized that they could talk and that they could read. These were the ones with the specially high IQ's. They had just given up. But I still have my problems.

T-2: I like to work with a tape recorder, too.

T-3: Yes, so do we. And we make film strips.

T-2: They like to look at pictures. and if the book might be too hard for them to read they can make up some cute stories.

T-3: We made our whole complete library for the first half of the year. The children made their own books. Now it's three books a week per child--I don't correct anything. If it's wrong it's just wrong--strictly their own vocabulary.

Q: If the school psychologist had time, do you think she could help you with these children?

T-3: Yes, in methods.

Q: By methods, you mean . . .

T-3: It seems we're always told what's wrong with the child but never what to do with him. I'd like some methods of reaching these underachievers. I'm of the opinion there's too much emphasis on the slow learner. The underachievers with the intelligence are being missed. I really think we're missing the boat with Dick and Jane--historical background, science, space--would give the children information
as well as learning to read. I had one get up and
tell about the Appollo explosion, how far Ed White
had been out in space, how long he was out of the
capsule, and he was using words like capsule,
tolerance, astronaut, and he can't read "What, that,
and was." I think they're bored.

Q: By the way, do many of them reverse letters and
words?

T-3: Oh, yes, some can't write b and d, and 5's are still
backwards--9's for 7's, also "saw" for "was." I had
a child who's been speaking English for just a year,
and he still puts his verbs at the end of the
sentence--"I to school went."

Q: Do they have trouble telling left from right?

T-1: Oh, yes. Except in the room. Left is toward the door
and right is toward the chalkboard. But if you say,
suddenly, hold up your right hand, they can't do this.
At the beginning of every year we start out with
everybody holding up their right hand, putting their
names in a certain place on every paper, right-hand
corner. Now I don't have to do this, but I still
have children who have confusion.

T-4: One of my biggest problems is the child who can't
hear sounds, can read sight words well for a while,
but then gets lost. And if he doesn't know the
sounds, he can't read and transfer a sound to another word.

Q: Do you have more boys or girls in your room?

T-4: I have six girls and 23 boys, all slow-learning children.

T-5: I had the same thing last year, with only five girls, so I am convinced that sex has something to do with it.

Q: If you could call on the psychologist for help with some of the things you have mentioned, would you feel that you could get help?

T-3: Usually they're so busy. Yes, I would. If they could have a follow-up, in methods and how to handle these children. I had a schizophrenic child the first of the year, and I was about ready to quit. Everybody knew what she was but nobody knew what to do about it. (Laughter)

Q: You feel that just testing and evaluation don't help, that you must have feedback??

T-3: Exactly.

T-1: I came back in to tell you something I thought of, that lack of experience creates a problem. They can't relate to many of the things they read about. Maybe the psychologist could help here.
Q: How do you think she might be able to function here?

T-1: Perhaps through games or things you can bring into the classroom—films, trips—their verbal experiences are so important.

Q: If it were possible for the school psychologist to be well trained in reading, would this be desirable?

T-3: It would be wonderful, but she already has such a load.

T-6: I think a social worker is very important—works hand in hand with a psychologist—go into the homes, which teachers can't always.

T-3: Right!

Q: In the primary grades where do you find the greatest weakness in the children's work?

All: Reading!

T-7: Because if they can't read they can't do anything. I've had to translate the third-grade English book and other books into language which would be no higher than second-grade level.

T-8: I've always thought of the school psychologist as one who deals with the emotionally disturbed youngster who can't achieve anything because he's blocked. I've never thought of it in terms of reading and teaching.
T-7: Why is he blocked, though. Could it be because he isn't achieving?

T-8: It could be, but I would think not, mostly.

T-7: Oh, very often, I think. Oh, yes. A child that gets along well with children socially, that has a good home and yet, when he cannot accomplish in class he becomes flustered and in a way he develops a block.

T-3: Watch a child that's had a series of failures and then he has a few successes; it may not be a cure-all, but what happens!

T-8: I was thinking of a child that is deeply disturbed emotionally. Generally a school success doesn't affect his psyche.

T-7: No?

T-8: To a large extent, usually he is affected before he comes to school. I've always thought of a school psychologist as one who communicates with this type of youngster.

Q: Could the school psychologist help the classroom teacher learn some of the skills to communicate with these children?

All: Yes, the psychologist would teach the teacher very definitely in-service type of thing learn to recognize problems, on-coming symptoms and possibilities of cures not cure-alls, but something to work toward.
T-3: Practical ways of dealing with them.

T-7: Yes, that's right. I've had quite a lot of psychology, practically a minor, and I feel I could use a lot more—it's more important all the time. Children are under more tension and pressure.

T-6: We had a lot of success when the psychologist worked with the social worker—-one dealt with the child and the other with the parents.

T-7: You can pick up a psychology book and read a lot that would be helpful, but so often we don't have the time to do this research. In the classroom we have to make almost snap judgments as to why children act the way they do, and you don't have the time to search out the true reason. If we have a few more danger signals, know these sorts of things, or keep them more refreshed in our minds, it would help us often to curb things that we can see coming.

T-6: I think it's a hard problem in the American education system as we have it now, it's so geared to the class and not to the individual, geared to the mediocre...

T-8: Don't you think the trend is away from the class anymore, to the individual?

T-6: Not when I look at the size of the classes!

T-8: Of course, I've been indoctrinated in the inquiry-type of learning, and I'm very fascinated with
it—let the children come up with questions, so they learn what they need to learn without you standing up there reciting this is the page, this is what we're going to do. Children are used to watching TV, things exciting and happening, and a teacher in front of them in the classroom is a pretty dull sight these days. We just don't compete with Batman and Captain Nice.

T-7: Well, again it comes back to this business of reading. You cannot do too much of this kind of inquiry work if they can't read. Now they look inside the pages, they look, they love it, but they can't read. They just look at pictures.

T-8: I think if you can use this inquiry method effectively you can stimulate motivation, because if you can verbally use the inquiry method, they'll just have to do more on their own because they will want to. The children started using it last year, and then they made the horrible discovery that the places where they looked things up didn't agree—this one said this and that one said that. I said all right, these are people's ideas and some are more accepted than others, but it doesn't necessarily mean that one is wrong and one is right. You have to learn to decide which is more nearly correct. I think getting them to think is one of the things we
have to battle with, too. With TV everything is there, you see it—their creativeness is being snuffed out.
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS OF READING

This set of interviews was conducted on an individual basis with teachers of reading who had had varying amounts of specialized training in the teaching of reading. Some taught remedial reading and some were regular classroom teachers. They also were asked the question: "What help in your teaching of reading would you expect from a school psychologist?"

The following excerpts are unedited reproductions of parts of their responses chosen to make a composite of the expectations of this particular group. All worked in the same district but in different elementary and high schools.

Elementary School Teachers

Teacher I

I would see the psychologist as maybe the educator of the teacher and making teachers aware of frustrations that children face. Many times the teachers that are not well versed in the diagnosis of reading and reading problems will place a child in a very threatening situation, in material much too difficult for him, which is a
very negative thing. If the school psychologist could educate the teachers to be aware of the need for diagnosis and be aware of what frustration looks like, how to know when the child is in trouble—interpretation of actions and to be aware of behavior and what it means, probably focusing on developmental aspects. I see a sharing of responsibility here, with the psychologist as guide.

Teacher II

Well, I have one child, I'm not sure how he sees things, visually, and this is an area where a school psychologist probably could test. It's hard to find time to do this kind of testing—their perception, their ability to reason things out. Another is where the school psychologist can pinpoint their actual intelligence level. Sometimes there's quite a wide gap between what their supposed intelligence is and what their performance is, and we don't have the time to run them through as many tests as we should—yet they maybe don't function at such a low level that they need to have a reading consultant.

I think a school psychologist could help where there is an emotional problem we haven't been able to uncover. I have a child in my room I have referred, a repeater, and when we talked to the mother we found out much more about the home situation, the parents' background, and the causes for the child's being this way. We
had assumed that the child's intelligence was much lower than it really was, and we found he could perform satisfactorily if we didn't push him. The psychologist helped a lot. If he can run them through more tests than we have time for, we often gain more information this way. It really opened our eyes as far as this child was concerned.

**Question from interviewer:** Can you tell me more about the little boy you think may have visual problems?

Yes, he was tested and got glasses, and sometimes he wears them and sometimes he won't. He has an emotional problem, too. It's funny, he looks at his book like this, with his head turned almost at right angles, and he doesn't even spell his name properly at times, and he leaves off words. I write words and have him trace them and write them over, and the next day he does the same thing. Either it's a habit of not looking closely or else he's just not seeing those words as clearly as he should. He doesn't reverse, he usually leaves off letters on the end, or somewhere in the word he will leave letters out. He isn't consistent in his errors--one time he will spell a word one way and another time another way. He's left-handed, writes upside-down.

**Teacher III**

*The teacher is usually able to pick out the children that have emotional problems, but is not able to tell*
why they have them. We would like to have something in the field of direct guidance, maybe more or less through reward and punishment sort of thing, possibly. Of course maybe this is asking quite a lot of the school psychologist, but there are so many kids with emotional problems where they are just not ready to accept help from a teacher in the field of reading. If we could get over this block, to where they want to be helped we could do a great deal for them.

Teacher IV

Many of my children tighten up and worry when they read orally. When they read individually at their desks, silently, they are all right. Now some of these I can help, by being patient and enticing them gradually into reading orally, but it is valuable to me to know when a child is mentally able and underachieving. The school psychologist can sometimes find the problems that the teacher can't.

I would ask for help with a child like one I had who could call words beautifully, tremendous sight vocabulary, but her work sheets and comprehension questions she could not do. She just didn't know what she had read. She couldn't do spelling and arithmetic, either. Out of ten spelling words she could retain three or four, but a week later nothing was left.
Teacher V

Ideally I would want to talk with the psychologist about every child that I suspected had an emotional base to his problem. I would like to see every child who has trouble with reading to have an individual test. I would want a school psychologist who would commit himself about the problems of the children, in interpreting sub-test scores, for instance—who would work as a partner. One who would work with me as a partner in dealing with parents, too.

Teacher VI

If a child is having a problem in reading, there is likely to be a psychological reason. Sometimes I can guess, but I'm not quite sure, and I'd like to have a psychologist help determine what the problem is, and then go beyond that and help me find out what I can do to correct the condition or situation. For instance, if a child is withdrawn, what do I do to help bring this child out. A psychologist could understand the situations in the home better than I could and interpret what's going on and work with parents to help them to understand their children better.

I'd like to know how to handle aggressive behavior, too, when I know they are dodging situations, trying to escape from the learning situation. I can put the lid on
the aggressive one and try to channel him, without feeling I am doing so much damage, even though I wonder whether I'm doing any real good. However, I just don't know how to begin with the withdrawn child, and I am afraid of doing the wrong thing, of causing further damage.

Teacher VII

One thing we need to pay attention to is whether the reading is the cause of emotional instability or behavior problems or if it's a symptom of something that comes before. This is certainly where our psychologist can help that teacher who is not trained, to get a little judgment, whether it's a cause or a symptom. For instance, I had one little boy who had to go to the bathroom every day at a certain time, and if I didn't let him go he wet his pants. So I talked to the psychologist about him, and he suggested that I look at the program, and sure enough I found that he always had to go during reading. And so we shifted—he made the suggestion—and it was a great help. I could lead the child into reading at a different time. I told him he didn't need to read when the others did, he could do what he wanted to, or join a group, but I gave him five or ten minutes all to himself first thing every day. He had built up such problems, hated reading so much that he had to overcome this, and this stopped the going to the bathroom and the wetting.
Teacher VIII

The school psychologist could help you a lot when you get to the cases that the mother and father say that Johnny's perfectly all right and the teacher, or the teachers he had, weren't very good. If you have somebody with authority and knowledge—a professional person—then he could talk to the parents. That would be the main thing.

I would like someone right now to help me know how to place some children. All the tests I've given them, and other teachers—why, the poor little guys, some days they spurt forward and you think there's something there, and then they can't do anything. The psychologist can help in their emotional problems, their home problems, social and adjustment with other children, the teacher-relationship ... he can sort of collect up loose ends and help everyone. After you get it back to the parents and they see the problem, then it's half over—sometimes they know down deep there is a problem, but they can't quite bring it out, so a school psychologist helps there.

---

High School Teachers

Teacher I

For a student who has had nothing but group, standardized tests, which for the nonverbal student aren't very indicative of his ability, I would ask for an
individual test. Then there are times when we need to have additional assistance. For example, I have a student now who has a speech impediment, one I have never run across before. He makes strange sounds in his throat as he begins to talk, and he stammers as well. I referred him to the speech therapist, and her comment was that she didn't feel adequate to work with the boy because she felt that his problem was emotional, and that she wasn't qualified to deal with his problem. We need some psychological advice, to tell us whether or not this student has an emotional problem that is causing his speech difficulty, and also what can we do about it.

I have another student who tests slightly above average on an individual test of intelligence, but she cannot read very well. She doesn't listen, can't seem to pay attention. I would like to have a psychologist talk to this child and find out why she has a very short span of attention. I don't know how to approach it. The teacher can too often fall into the trap of making a snap diagnosis himself, which is inept. In fact, it would be very easy for me to say in this case that she's hyperactive, but this is meaningless, really. The teacher, by watching the student's actions, being observant, watching the way he moves and uses his eyes, and listens to his speech patterns, is in a very good position not to diagnose
a problem, but to determine that one exists and then refer to a psychologist.

Teacher II

Well, the teacher often doesn't know as much as he should about the interpretation of the way children act, what the danger signals are, how to know that the child is maybe reacting to wrong teaching or is displaying some problem that is eating on him. The school psychologist could, through talking to teachers, and in in-service meetings, discussions, alert teachers as to what to watch for and then how to remedy a situation. This could help prevent some of the problems we have, too.
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