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ABSTRACT

There is a growing need for school psychologists to reform and restructure their roles in order to meet the mental health needs of student populations (Adelman & Taylor, 2003). Many school psychologists, district (school psychologists serving multiple schools) and building (school psychologists serving one school) are in favor of changing roles and responsibilities, but are faced with resistance from administrators when advocating for change (Adelman & Taylor, 2003). The purpose of this research study was to investigate elementary principals’ perceptions about school psychological services. Survey research was utilized to measure elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services provided by district (school psychologists serving multiple schools) and building (school psychologists serving one school) staff and general perceptions of school mental health providers. Of the 1683 voluntary participants e-mailed, a total of 194 participants participated in the survey research, for a total response rate of greater than 10%. Of the 194 participants that agreed to participate in research, 167 completed the survey in its entirety, which leads to a response rate of 86% for each question asked. Per research findings, the majority of elementary principal participants indicated that school psychological services are provided by district school psychologists. Additionally, less than 10% of participants indicated that current mental services are highly effective, and less than 10% of participants indicated that current social-emotional programming is highly effective. Participants further indicated that school social workers
are the predominate mental health provider in their elementary schools. Research findings further indicated that elementary principals with district school psychologists regard and utilize their school psychologists more as mental health providers than elementary principals with building school psychologists.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

Studies continue to highlight the need for early intervention and increased mental health support within schools. Per National Center for Children in Poverty and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013; Masi & Cooper, 2006) “one in ten youth have severe mental health issues that impact their functioning at school and/or home” (p. 1). Furthermore, 75% to 80% of students in need of mental health services do not receive services (Masi & Cooper, 2006). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013), further estimates that 13% to 20% of children in America meet criteria for a mental health disorder each year. Schools are often the only provider for mental health services for these children; however, there are limited school mental health services and providers (school psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors) who are readily available to all students who need them (Masi & Cooper, 2006).

School psychologists’, school social workers’, and school counselors’ graduate training programs encompass: individual counseling techniques, group counseling techniques, crisis intervention, and mental health programming. Furthermore, mental health content standards are assessed on all licensure exams, and are included in national organizations’ (i.e., National Association of School Psychologists, School Social Work
Association of America, and American School Counselor Association) professional competencies (American School Counselor Association, 2012; Frey, Alvarez, Dupper, Sabatino, Lindsey, Raines, Streeck, McInerney, & Norris, 2013; Skalski, Minke, Rossen, Cowan, Kelly, Armistead, & Smith, 2015). Despite comparable, comprehensive training and professional competencies, school psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors’ roles with school mental health vary significantly among positions, specifically for school psychologists’ positions.

Due to schedules and designated roles and responsibilities, school psychologists often have been limited in providing mental health services in schools across America (Eagle, Dowd-Eagle, Synder, & Holtzman, 2013; Gilman & Gabriel, 2003; Gilman & Medaway, 2007; Watkins, Crosby, & Pearson, 2001). School psychologists may be employed as district school psychologists, servicing multiple schools, or as building school psychologists, servicing one school (Greene, 2010). Due to their limited time and availability at each building, district school psychologists split amongst buildings often have to prioritize assessment (i.e., case study evaluation to determine initial and re-eligibility for special education and related services) to comply with federal and state requirements embedded in disability law. Furthermore, job descriptions for school psychologists may not include direct service mental health support due to the prevalence of disabling conditions present within the school district. Consequently, school psychologists may not have opportunities to be seen as school mental health professionals within their schools (Adelman & Taylor, 2003).
**Statement of Problem**

There is a growing need for school psychologists to reform and restructure their roles in order to meet the mental health needs of student populations (Adelman & Taylor, 2003). Many school psychologists, district and building, are in favor of changing roles and responsibilities, but are faced with resistance from administrators when advocating for change (Adelman & Taylor, 2003). The biggest hurdle in having school psychologists provide mental health services is lack of support from administrators (Suldo, Friedrich, & Michalowski, 2009). Administrators do not always see school psychologists as supporting the social-emotional learning of students, and focus school psychologists job descriptions heavily on psychoeducational evaluations in order to adhere to legal mandates (Suldo et al., 2009; Worrell, Skaggs, and Brown, 2006). To significantly change the role of school psychologists administrative support has to be established, and the requirements set out in the law that bind all school districts need to be appropriately considered.

**Purpose of Study**

Studies have measured principals’ attitudes about school psychological services; however, they have failed to measure elementary principals’ attitudes regarding school psychological services provided by staff servicing one elementary versus multiple elementary schools in various geographic regions (Greene, 2000). In a study conducted in 2003, principals had more knowledge of school psychologists’ abilities when school psychologists were housed in one school (Proctor & Steadman, 2003). School psychologists were also more integrated into schools when assigned solely to one school.
The purpose of this research study was to investigate elementary principals’ perceptions about school psychological services, specifically related to school psychologists’ roles within school mental health, and elementary principals’ perceptions about school mental health providers. Elementary principals were predominately selected, in order to focus on early intervention. Research implications of this study will help school psychologists identify barriers that exclude mental health support from their professional domains, and begin to implement plans to address barriers. Survey research was utilized to measure elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services provided by district (school psychologists serving multiple schools) and building (school psychologists serving one school) staff and general perceptions of school mental health providers.

**Research Questions**

Specifically, research addressed the following questions:

1. Who predominately assumes the role as mental health provider within elementary schools per elementary school principals?
2. To what extent, if any does an elementary school principal regard and utilize their building school psychologist as a mental health provider?
3. To what extent, if any, does an elementary school principal regard and utilize their district psychologist as a mental health provider?
4. Does the regard and utilization of school psychologists’ role as mental health providers differ depending upon whether the school psychologist is a building or district psychologist?
Conceptual Framework

In this current study, the following theoretical paradigm helped shape the research design: symbolic interactionism (Babbie, 2010). Symbolic interactionism refers to social behavior, and how social interactions shape perspectives (Babbie, 2010). Elementary principals’ interactions with school psychologists throughout their careers have shaped elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services. This research study aimed at understanding how elementary principals’ attitudes differ, if any, between school psychologists who service one elementary school verses school psychologists who service multiple elementary schools.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Purpose of Literature Review

The purposes of this literature review were as follows: (a) summarize historical perceptions of school psychological services and systems change from the 1970s to present day, (b) review school psychologists’ role as mental health providers, (c) summarize school psychologists’ job satisfaction and barriers, and (d) review administrators’ perceptions of psychologists per building placement. The intent of this literature review is to inform educational leaders and educators about school psychological services.

Historical Perceptions of School Psychological Services and Systems Change

School psychology has existed as a field for over 100 years; however, the modern school psychology era began in the 1970s as a result of the passage of Public Law (PL) 94-142, which is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) (Fagan, 1990). The purpose of PL 94-142 was to guarantee special education services to any child in need of them, and to ensure that the evaluation process and provision of special education services was fair and appropriate (Fagan, 1990). The passing of PL 94-142 lead to a significant increase of school psychology practitioners, due to legal mandates for evaluations for special education eligibility (Fagan, 1990). The
following historical review summarizes administrators and educators’ perceptions and systems change of school psychological practice since the passing of PL 94-142:

**1970s**

Assessment was the most common role of school psychologists during the 1970s. In nationally representative samples of administrators, Hughes (1979) and Landau and Gerken (1979) found that administrators and psychologists’ desire school psychologists’ roles to be expanded beyond assessment and to include mental health support. However, school psychologists’ primary roles consistently focused upon assessing students’ eligibility for special education and related services despite expressed interest in expanding school psychologists’ roles (Hughes, 1979; Landau & Gerken, 1979).

**1980s**

Similar to the 1970s, assessment was also the most common role of school psychologists in the 1980s (Abel & Burke, 1985; Benson & Hughes, 1985; Senft & Snider, 1980). Senft and Snider examined 400 elementary school administrators’ perceptions of school psychological services. Results indicated that elementary principals perceived school psychologists the most helpful when traditional roles (i.e., assessments) were provided by school psychologists; however, elementary principals also desire changes to school psychologists’ roles to include school mental health support (Senft & Snider, 1980).

During 1985, Benson and Hughes examined 165 school psychologists’, 92 superintendents’, and 43 state education department officials’ perceptions of school psychological roles. Results indicated that assessment continued to be the designated job
function taking the greatest amount of time (Benson & Hughes, 1985). Hartshorne and Johnson (1985) examined 361 secondary school administrators’ perceptions of school psychologists’ actual and ideal roles. Results indicated that school administrators desire school psychologists’ involvement to be more with counseling and less time in staffing meetings. Results further indicate little difference, other than school administrators’ wanting school psychologists to spend more time with counseling and less time with special education eligibility, in actual and ideal roles of school psychologists per school administrators’ perceptions (Hartshorne & Johnson, 1985). Abel and Burke (1985) examined an elementary district staffs’ perceptions of school psychological services. Results indicated that differences and similarities exist among staff groups about how school psychologists’ time should be allocated (Abel & Burke, 1985). Participants rated favorably the following activities: special education activities, interpersonal or school-climate activities, and administrative responsibilities. Participants indicated differences with time allocation for school psychologists (i.e., building or district assignments) and helpfulness of school psychologists (Abel & Burke, 1985).

1990s

Within the 1990s, the primary role of school psychologists continued to be seen as assessment, specifically for determining special education eligibility, despite teachers’ interest in expanding the roles of school psychologists (Beauchamp, 1994; Thomas, Levinson, Orf, & Pinciotti, 1992). In Thomas et al.’s national study, 512 school administrators, elementary and secondary, participated in a survey. Participants shared their perceptions about the amount of time school psychologists spend in designated
roles, and their satisfaction with school psychological services. School psychologists’ roles were operationally defined and 15 roles were included within the study. The main conclusion of the study indicated that majority of administrators (79%) were happy with school psychological services within their buildings. Thomas et al. (1992) found three main role-functions that contributed to administrators’ positive attitudes towards school psychological services: consultation, assessment, and administrative duties. Researchers also indicated that future research should focus on school psychologists’ roles with: assessment, consultation, and administrative tasks. In a state representative sample of 268 Illinois early childhood special educators, Beauchamp (1994) indicated that educators preferred school psychologists to provide mental health services. However, psychological assessment was the most common reason for early childhood special educators to consult with school psychologists.

2000s

Within the 2000s, perceptions of school psychological services focused more upon moving school psychologists’ roles beyond assessment and expanding school psychologists roles to include: professional development (parents and teachers), consultation, and systems change (Eagle et al., 2013; Gilman & Gabriel, 2003; Gilman & Medaway, 2007; Watkins et al., 2001). Watkins et al. investigated 522 teachers’, support staff members’, and administrators’ perceptions of school psychologists’ roles in a school district in a southwest state in the United States of America. Survey results indicated that teachers, support staff, and administrators, would like school psychologists’ roles to still include assessment, but they would also like school psychologists’ roles to expand
Participants were asked to assess the importance of nine services provided by school psychologists. Of the nine services, participants rated six of the nine services as very important: assessment, special education input, consultation, counseling, crisis intervention, and behavior management (Watkins et al., 2001). School staff further indicated that they wanted their school psychologist to be available daily at their schools. Educators saw value in expanding school psychologists’ roles; however, they did not want to change school psychologists’ involvement with assessment. Educators also saw the benefit of having school psychologists in their building on a daily basis (Watkins et al., 2001).

Gilman and Gabriel (2004) examined 1,600 teachers’ and administrators’ perceptions of school psychological services in four states. Results indicated significant differences with regards to: school psychologists’ knowledge, satisfaction with school psychological services, perceived helpfulness of school psychological services, school psychologists’ methods for problem solving referrals, and roles of school psychologists. In a follow up study, Gilman and Medaway (2007) examined 1,533 general education teachers’ and special education teachers’ perceptions of school psychological services in eight school districts within four states. Results indicated that general education teachers were less knowledgeable about school psychological services, and reported lower satisfaction with school psychological services. Special education teachers were more knowledgeable of school psychological services than general education teachers, as school psychologists work more closely with special education teachers when adhering to traditional roles (Gilman & Medaway, 2007).
Eagle et al. (2015) stressed the importance of collaboration between school psychologists and administrators for implementing systems-level change when implementing multi-tiered systems of support within schools. Eagle et al. further indicated the important roles that school psychologists and school principals uphold within problem-solving practices. Furthermore, implications for future research discussed were related to school psychologists’ and administrators’ training, and specifically discussed school psychologists and school principals participating in training that focused upon: areas of expertise and professional roles for each position.

**School Psychologists’ Roles as Mental Health Providers**

Similar to other school mental health specialists (school social workers and school counselors), school psychologists can hold important roles with school mental health programming (Splett, 2013; Suldo et al., 2009; Vaillancourt-Strobach, 2015). School psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors, are trained to provide the following services: individual counseling, group counseling, and crisis intervention to a growing number of students in need (Hass, 2013; Perfect & Morris, 2011). Per the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), published December, 2015 and summarized by Vaillancourt-Strobach, “specialized instructional support personnel includes: school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and other qualified personnel (school nurses, speech-language pathologists, etc.) and personnel is responsible for providing assessment, diagnosis, counseling, educational, therapeutic, and any other necessary services as part of a comprehensive program to meet students’ needs.” ESSA further defines and Vaillancourt-Strobach summarizes school-based mental health
services provider as: “State-licensed/certified school counselor, school psychologist, school social worker, or other State licensed/certified mental health professional qualified under State law to provide mental health services to children and adolescents.”

**School Psychologists’ Job Satisfaction and Barriers**

In general, school psychologists desire to perform fewer assessments, and focus more time on direct intervention, problem-solving consultation, organizational consultation and applied research (Reschly, 2000). Worrell, Skaggs, and Brown (2006), examined job satisfaction of school psychologists throughout a twenty year period, and found that school psychologists generally have high job satisfaction. Per Worrell, Skaggs, and Brown, school psychologists indicated that they are the most satisfied with social service, independence, co-workers, and job activities. Worrell et al.’s study further indicated that school psychologists’ sources for job dissatisfaction are: school system policies and opportunities for advancement. School psychologists often want to provide more direct services to students; however they are often faced with barriers. Per Worrell et al., special education legal mandates, inadequate school district budgets, and poor communication often seem to dictate the roles of school psychologists in ways that highlight the discrepancy between what school psychologists are trained to do and what the school system requires of them.

Suldo et al. (2009) further examined why school psychologists are not providing mental health services within schools. School psychologists (39 in total) participated in eleven focus groups. Within focus groups, school psychologists responded to structured questions that explored the range of mental health services that school psychologists
provide within their schools and the limitations for providing mental health services. School psychologists indicated that they mostly provide group and individual counseling and crisis intervention. One of the biggest barriers in having school psychologists provide mental health support is lack of support from administrators. Administrators do not always see school psychologists as supporting the social-emotional learning of students; therefore, professional roles do not always include mental health services for school psychologists. Insufficient training is often provided to administrators about school psychologists’ professional roles. School psychologists may also have received insufficient training in mental health areas due to limited experience with providing mental health services in schools (Suldo et al., 2009).

Administrators’ Perceptions of Psychologists per Placement:

One School verses Multiple Schools

School psychologists service individual buildings or multiple schools. Limited research was found on elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services provided by school psychologists servicing one school verses multiple schools. In a study conducted by Proctor and Steadman (2003), 63 school psychologists were surveyed with regards to job satisfaction. Results indicated that school psychologists had higher job satisfaction and were integrated more into schools when assigned solely to one school. Furthermore, results indicated that administrators had more knowledge about school psychological services when school psychologists served predominately one school (Proctor & Steadman, 2003).
In Greene’s unpublished dissertation in 2010, ten elementary principals from New Jersey were interviewed. Greene found that the number of days that the school psychologist spent at assigned school/s influenced principals’ understanding of school psychologists’ roles. Principals had more working knowledge of school psychologists’ roles when the school psychologist served one school verses multiple schools. Greene recommended that future studies further examine the structure of school psychologists’ positions, and the impact of building assignments on elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of Research Design

As described in Chapter I, the purpose of this research study was to further investigate elementary principals’ perceptions about school psychological services, specifically related to school psychologists’ roles with school mental health. Research implications of this study will help school psychologists identify barriers that exclude mental health support from their professional domains, and begin to implement plans to address barriers. Survey research was utilized to measure elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services provided by district (school psychologists serving multiple schools) and building (school psychologists serving one school) staff.

Participants

Elementary principals were asked to participate in on-line survey research and describe their perceptions of school psychological services and school mental health services. Nonprobability sampling was utilized, as elementary principal members of the Illinois Principal Association (IPA) were asked to volunteer as research participants in the study. The Illinois Principal Association encompasses elementary and secondary principals. Participants, IPA members, who work in elementary schools only, were asked to participate in the study. Due to the fact that this is a statewide survey, the goal for this
The study was to have 250 or more participants. The number of participants (250) represents approximately 20% of the elementary principal members.

**Procedures**

The executive director of IPA was asked to submit a letter of support for the study. After receiving approval from executive director and Loyola’s Institutional Review Board for the protection of human participants, the executive director was asked to share e-mail addresses of elementary members. A letter of consent and survey link was then e-mailed from the researcher (see Appendices A and B). All participants were informed that participation in the study is voluntary. Throughout the designated month of survey administration, a reminder e-mail was sent two weeks after the initial distribution and two days prior to the data collection window closing.

A survey protocol was followed to help ensure standardized administration for all participants. All perspective participants were e-mailed the same introduction, which reviews the purpose of the study (see Appendix A). Participants were then directed to an IRB, approved-language, informed consent page in Survey Monkey. If participants agreed to participate in the study, they indicated agreement by proceeding to the survey. If participants choose not to participate, they exited the survey. At the beginning of the survey, participants indicated if their current school psychological services are provided by a building school psychologist or a district school psychologist. Participants were then directed to the appropriate survey questions for building or district school psychologists. Standardized directions were also provided for each section of the survey. Demographic information, school and participant, was collected for all participants at the end of the
survey. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to provide their e-mail address if they are interested in reviewing the results of the study.

Participants were asked to volunteer for the study, and were told that they may withdraw from the study at any time. Participants could receive a copy of the study when complete by providing their e-mail addresses at the end of the survey. Participants were informed that e-mail addresses will remain anonymous when publishing the study, regardless of results being shared to participants’ e-mail addresses per their request. Survey questions reflected elementary principals’ views on school psychological services verses individual staff members. If participants felt uncomfortable answering any question, they could choose not to answer the select question/s. The study did not cause physical harm or risk to participants, and benefits of participating in the study were stated on the informed consent form.

**Measures**

Operationally defined terms for this study are as follows:

**Building School Psychologists:** school psychologists who hold proper endorsement within state of employment, employed full-time in one public, elementary school building five days a week, and work in an elementary school that services kindergarten up to eighth grade students.

**District School Psychologists:** school psychologists who hold proper endorsement within state of employment, employed five days a week at two or more public, elementary school buildings, and work in elementary schools that service kindergarten up to eighth grade students.
Elementary Principals: principals who hold the proper endorsement within state of employment, work in an public, elementary school that services kindergarten up to eighth grade students, and have district or building school psychological services present in he/she’s elementary school.

Direct Mental Health Services: for purposes of this study individual counseling, group counseling, co-teaching of social-emotional learning in classrooms, and/or crisis intervention.

Social-Emotional Learning: for purposes of this study social-emotional learning is defined as standards-based (Illinois Learning Standards for Social/Emotional Learning), core curriculum.

Mental Health Provider: for purposes of this study an individual that provides direct mental health services and supports social-emotional learning school-wide.

School Mental Health Services: for purposes of this study school mental health is defined as multi-tiered levels of support provided to all students, students participating in small group social-emotional interventions, and students participating in individual social-emotional interventions.

School Psychological Services: for purposes of this study school psychological services are defined as assessment, prevention, intervention, and systems consultation. Elementary Principals’ Perceptions of Building Based School Psychological Services: effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness of school psychological services being provided in the elementary school per elementary principal.
Elementary Principals’ Perceptions of District Based School Psychological Services: effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness of school psychological services being provided in the elementary school per elementary principal.

Elementary Principals’ Perceptions of Mental Health Services: effectiveness and/or ineffectiveness of school mental health services being provided in the elementary school per elementary principal.

**Survey**

A survey (see Appendix C) was utilized to measure elementary principals’ perspectives of mental health services and school psychological services provided by building or district school psychologists. Survey Monkey will be utilized as the survey delivery tool. Elementary school principals were asked closed-ended questions using matrices in order to obtain the most reliable data. Elementary principals were specifically asked to describe school psychologists’ roles as mental health providers in their assigned school/s. Elementary principals specifically discussed the school psychologists’ roles with direct mental health services and social-emotional learning, and knowledge of school mental health. Participants were asked to describe the effectiveness of school psychological services, such as highly effective, effective, slightly effective, slightly ineffective, ineffective, or not effective. Elementary principals were also asked to describe the effectiveness of school mental health services, such as highly effective, effective, slightly effective, slightly ineffective, ineffective, or not effective.

School demographic information included: IPA region location, total student enrollment, grade levels taught, percent of students receiving special education and
related services, percent of students receiving English learner support, and percent of students with low family incomes as measured per the school’s Illinois State Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year. Participant demographics included the following: years in current position, years in profession, identified race, and identified gender.

**Data Analysis**

After surveys were administered, Survey Monkey provided automatic data entry into IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22. Responses to survey questions were descriptively and graphically displayed. Measures of central tendency were utilized to see if data is normally distributed among variables, District School Psychologists and Building School Psychologists. Exploratory analysis based on demographic variables also occurred. In addition, measures of dispersion were collected to measure the standard deviation of each mean. By measuring the mean and standard deviation of each variable, the researcher was able to see if the data collected was normally distributed among all variables. Furthermore, inferential statistical testing was also completed following data collection. All data results were displayed visually within the report.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND REPRESENTATION OF DATA

Response Rate to Survey Research

Of the 1,683 voluntary participants e-mailed, a total of 194 participants participated in the survey research, for a total response rate of greater than 10%. Of the 194 participants that agreed to participate in research, 167 completed the survey in its entirety, which leads to a response rate of 86% for each question asked.

Data Analysis Procedures

The researcher utilized data collected from a survey that was conducted during four weeks. The survey (see Appendix C) measured elementary principals’ perspectives of mental health services and school psychological services provided by building or district school psychologists. Survey Monkey was utilized as the survey delivery tool. Elementary school principals were asked closed-ended questions using matrices in order to obtain the most reliable data. The survey consisted of eight questions regarding building and/or district school psychologists, and 10 questions pertaining to participants’ personal and professional demographics.

After surveys were administered, Survey Monkey provided for automatic data entry into IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22. Measures of central tendency were utilized to see if data is normally distributed among variables, District School Psychologists and Building School Psychologists. Exploratory analysis based on demographic variables also
occurred. In addition, measures of dispersion were collected to measure the standard deviation of each mean. By measuring the mean and standard deviation of each variable, the researcher was able to see if the data collected was normally distributed among all variables. Furthermore, inferential statistical testing was also completed following data collection. Data results are displayed visually later within Chapter IV of the report.

Demographic Data

The survey instrument contained questions intended to produce specific demographic data, participant and school focused, about the elementary principals within each participating school. Participant demographic questions included the following topics: years in education as an elementary principal, years in current position, race, and gender. School demographic questions included the following topics: IPA region, student enrollment, grades taught, percentage of students participating in English Learner (EL services), percentage of students receiving special education and related services, and percentage of students from low income families.

Participant Demographic Questions and Results

Participant Demographic Question 1

The first participant demographic question asked participants: Please indicate in the textbox below how long you have been an elementary principal. A total of 181 participants responded to this question. Of the 181 participants, 1 participant indicated less than 1 year, 14 participants indicated 1 year, 18 participants indicated 2 years, 9 participants indicated 3 years, 18 participants indicated four years, 15 participants indicated 5 years, 10 participants indicated 6 years, 11 participants indicated 7 years, 4
participants indicated 8 years, 14 participants indicated 9 years, 14 participants indicated 10 years, 8 participants indicated 11 years, 7 participants indicated 12 years, 3 participants indicated 13 years, 9 participants indicated 14 years, 6 participants indicated 15 years, 4 participants indicated 16 years, 4 participants indicated 17 years, 4 participants indicated 18 years, 3 participants indicated 20 years, 1 participant indicated 19 years, 1 participant indicated 21 years, 1 participant indicated 22 years, 2 participants indicated 23 years, 1 participant indicated 27 years.

**Participant Demographic Question 2**

The second participant demographic question asked participants: Please indicate in the textbox below how long you have been in your current position. A total of 180 participants responded to this question. Of the 180 participants, 1 participant indicated less than 1 year, 30 participants indicated 1 year, 25 participants indicated 2 years, 12 participants indicated 3 years, 20 participants indicated 4 years, 15 participants indicated 5 years, 8 participants indicated 6 years, 11 participants indicated 7 years, 7 participants indicated 8 years, 9 participants indicated 9 years, 12 participants indicated 10 years, 5 participants indicated 11 years, 1 participant indicated 12 years, 5 participants indicated 13 years, 5 participants indicated 14 years, 2 participants indicated 15 years, 2 participants indicated 16 years, 2 participants indicated 17 years, 3 participants indicated 18 years, 1 participant indicated 19 years, 1 participant indicated 20 years, 1 participant indicated 22 years, and 2 participants indicated 23 years.
Participant Demographic Question 3

The third participant demographic question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: What race best describes you? (Please only choose one.) Choices were as follows: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Black or African American, Hispanic, White/Caucasian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Bi-Racial, or Prefer Not to Respond. A total of 180 participants responded to this question. Of the 180 participants, 1 participant (0.56%) indicated American Indian or Alaskan Native, 13 participants (7.22%) indicated Black or African American, 7 participants (3.89%) indicated Hispanic, 154 participants (85.56%) indicated White/Caucasian, 0 participants indicated Asian/Pacific Islander, 0 participants indicate Bi-Racial, and 5 participants (2.78%) indicated Prefer Not to Respond. Please refer to Table 1 for a visual representation of results.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Respond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Demographic Question 4

The fourth participant demographic question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: Please select your gender. Choices were as follows: Female, Male, or Prefer Not to Respond. A total of 179 participants answered this question. Of the 179 participants, 118 participants (65.92%) indicated Female, 59 participants (32.96%) indicated Male, and 2 participants (1.12%) indicated Prefer Not to Respond. Please refer to Table 2 for a visual representation of results.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Demographic Questions and Results

School Demographic Question 1

The first school demographic question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: Please indicate what region, as defined by the Illinois Principal Association, your elementary school is located in? Choices were as follows: Kishwaukee, Lake, North Cook, Dupage, West Cook, Three Rivers, Starved Rock, Northwest, Blackhawk, Western, Central Illinois Valley, Corn Belt, Two Rivers, Abe Lincoln, Illini, Wabash Valley, Kaskaskia, and Southwestern, Egyptian, Shawnee. A total of 163 participants
answered this question. Of the 163 participants, 18 participants (11.04%) indicated Kishwaukee, 9 participants (5.52%) indicated Lake, 7 participants (5.52%) indicated Lake, 7 participants (4.29%) indicated North Cook, 12 participants (7.36%) indicated Dupage, 11 participants (6.75%) indicated West Cook, 21 participants (12.88%) indicated Three Rivers, 3 participants (1.84%) indicated Starved Rock, 7 participants (4.29%) indicated Northwest, 7 participants (4.29%) indicated Blackhawk, 5 participants (3.07%) indicated Western, 10 participants (6.13%) indicated Central Illinois Valley, 8 participants (4.91%) indicated Corn Belt, 3 participants (1.84%) indicated Two Rivers, 6 participants (3.68%) indicated Abe Lincoln, 9 participants (5.52%) indicated Illini, 1 participant (0.61%) indicated Wabash Valley, 4 participants (2.45%) indicated Kaskaskia, 10 participants (6.13%) indicated Southwestern, 5 participants (3.07%) indicated Egyptian, and 7 participants (4.29%) indicated Shawnee. Please refer to Table 3 for a visual representation of results.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Principals Association Region</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishwaukee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Cook</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupage</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cook</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starved Rock</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackhawk</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois Valley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Belt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Rivers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe Lincoln</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illini</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaskaskia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the fact that the Three Rivers represented the largest respondents from an IPA region, additional information of the Three Rivers region was gathered. The Three Rivers region is comprised of the following counties: Grundy, Kankakee, Kendall, and Will. Grundy, Kankakee, Kendall, and Will counties all currently have special education cooperatives that provide school psychological services, and are named as follows:

- Grundy County Special Education Cooperative,
- Southern Will County Cooperative for Special Education,
- Kankakee Area Special Education Cooperative,
- Plano Area Special Education Cooperative (Grundy County Special Education Cooperative, 2017; Southern Will County Cooperative for Special Education, 2017; Kankakee Area Special Education Cooperative, 2017; Plano Area Special Education Cooperative, 2017).

Kendall County’s initial special education cooperative, Kendall County Special Education Cooperative, dissolved as of June 30, 2016 (Kendall County Special Education Cooperative, 2017). Kendall County is now serviced by individual school districts or Plano Area Special Education Cooperative (Kendall County Special Education Cooperative, 2017). Only Kankakee’s website provided detailed information about school psychology services. Per Kankakee’s website, elementary school psychology
services focus upon: assessment, problem solving, and special education eligibility (Kankakee Area Special Education Cooperative, 2017). There was no reference to mental health services with regards to elementary school psychology services. However, secondary school psychology services did emphasis mental health services (Kankakee Area Special Education Cooperative, 2017).

Per research findings, 13 of the 21 respondents from Three Rivers reported that current school psychological services are provided by district school psychologists, and 8 of the 21 respondents reported that school psychological services are provided by building school psychologists. Only 9.5% of building principals in the Three Rivers region very strongly agree that school psychologists are mental health specialists. Fourteen percent (14.3%) of respondents indicated that it is very likely for school psychologists to support social-emotional learning programming. Additionally, 4.8% percent of building principals indicated that it was very likely for school psychologists to provide direct mental health services. However, 14.3% of respondents indicated that effectiveness of direct mental health services provided by school psychologists is highly effective. It is important to note that 28.6% of respondents indicated not applicable for effectiveness of direct mental health services provided by school psychologists. 90.5% of respondents indicated that the predominate mental health provider as school social workers. Five percent (4.8%) of respondents indicated that current mental health services are highly effective. Lastly, 19% of school principals indicated that social-emotional programming is highly effective.
School Demographic Question 2

The second school demographic question asked participants: Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please enter the total student enrollment in the textbox below. A total of 166 participants provided a response to this question. Of the 166 participants, 2 participants indicated total student enrollment less than 100, 7 participants indicated total student enrollment between 100-199, 23 participants indicated total student enrollment between 200-299, 35 participants indicated total student enrollment between 300-399, 40 participants indicated total student enrollment between 400-499, 28 participants indicated total student enrollment between 500-599, 15 participants indicated total student enrollment between 500-599, 5 participants indicated total student enrollment between 600-699, 5 participants indicated total student enrollment between 600-699, 8 participants indicated total student enrollment between 700-799, 8 participants indicated total student enrollment between 800-899, and 3 participants indicated total student enrollment between 1500-1800.

School Demographic Question 3

The third school demographic question asked participants to provide the following in a multiple-choice format: Please indicate current grades taught at your elementary school. Choices were as follows: Kindergarten-Fifth Grade, Kindergarten-Sixth Grade, Kindergarten-Eighth Grade, or Other. A total of 170 participants answered this question. Of the 170 participants, 41 participants (24.12%) indicated Kindergarten-Fifth Grade, 13 participants (7.65%) indicated Kindergarten-Sixth Grade, 15 participants
(8.82%) indicated Kindergarten-Eighth, and 101 participants (59.41%) indicated Other.

Please refer to Table 4 for a visual representation.

Table 4

*Grades Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-Fifth Grade</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-Sixth Grade</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-Eighth Grade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing System | 24 | 12.4 |          |                   |
| Total          | 194| 100.0|          |                   |

**School Demographic Question 4**

The fourth school demographic question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please select the percentage of students that received special education services. Choices were as follows: Less than 5 percent, 6-10 percent, or more than 10 percent. A total of 167 participants answered this question. Of the 167 participants, 15 participants (8.98%) indicated Less than 5 percent, 59 participants (35.33%) indicated 6-10%, and 93 participants (55.69%) indicated More than 10 percent. Please refer to Table 5 for a visual representation of results.
Table 5

*Special Education Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Less than 5 percent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 percent</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 percent</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Demographic Question 5**

The fifth school demographic question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please select the percentage of students that received English learner services. Choices were as follows: Less than 10 percent, 11-25 percent, 26-50 percent, or More than 50 percent. A total of 169 participants answered this question. Of the 169 participants, 121 participants (71.60%) indicated Less than 10 percent, 26 participants (15.38%) indicated 11-25 percent, 12 participants (7.10%) indicated 25-50 percent, and 10 participants (5.92%) indicated More than 50 percent. Please refer to Table 6 for a visual representation of results.
Table 6

*English Learner Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 percent</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25 percent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50 percent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 percent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing System</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Demographic Question 6**

The sixth school demographic question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please select the percentage of students with low family incomes. Choices were as follows: Less than 10 percent, 11-25 percent, 26-50 percent, or More than 50 percent. A total of 170 participants answered this question. Of the 170 participants, 20 participants (11.76%) indicated Less than 10 percent, 34 participants (20.00%) indicated 11-25 percent, 44 participants (25.88%) indicated 26-50 percent, and 72 participants (42.35%) indicated More than 50 percent. Please refer to Table 7 for a visual representation of results.
Table 7

Low Income Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 10 percent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-25 percent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-50 percent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 50 percent</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Questions and Results

It is important to note that some participants responded to survey questions pertaining to buildings with building school psychological services and buildings with district school psychological services. In the data analysis section of Chapter IV, responses are merged into one variable per each question, and result responses are analyzed to ensure validity.

Survey Question 1

The first survey question asked participants, in a multiple-choice format, to indicate if school psychological services are currently being provided by a building school psychologist (servicing one school) or a district school psychologist (servicing two or more schools). Of the 194 respondents to this question, 52 (26.80%) reported that school psychological services are currently being provided by a building school psychologist within their elementary school, and 142 (73.20%) reported that school psychological services are currently being provided by a district school psychologist within their elementary school.
After responding to the first question, elementary principals were then directed to building school psychologist questions or district school psychologist questions. It is important to note that questions were worded the same, except for the reference to the school psychologist placement as a building or district school psychologist.

**Survey Question 2**

**Building school psychologists.** The second survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: To what extent, if any, do you agree with the statement, “Building school psychologists are specialists in school mental health?” The rating scale was as follows: Very Strongly Agree, Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Very Strongly Disagree. A total of 49 participants answered this item. Of the 49 participants that responded to this item, 10 participants (20.41%) indicated that they Very Strongly Agree, 15 participants (30.61%) indicated that they Strongly Agree, 15 participants (20.41%) indicated that they Agree, 8 participants (16.33%) indicated that they Disagree, and 1 participant (2.04%) indicated that they Very Strongly Disagree with the statement.

**District school psychologists.** The second survey question used a rating scale asked participants: To what extent, if any, do you agree with the statement, “District school psychologists are specialists in school mental health?” The rating scale was as follows: Very Strongly Agree, Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and Very Strongly Disagree. A total of 172 participants responded to this item. Of the 172 participants that responded to this item, 17 participants (9.88%) indicated Very Strongly Agree, 34 participants (19.77%) Strongly Agree, 77 participants (44.77%) Agree, 32
participants (18.60%) Disagree, 10 participants (5.81%) Strongly Disagree, and 2
participants (1.16%) Very Strongly Disagree.

**Survey Question 3**

**Building school psychologists.** The third survey question used a rating scale asked participants: How likely or unlikely is it for the building school psychologist to help implement social-emotional learning programs? The rating scale was as follows: Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, and Very Unlikely. A total of 49 participants answered this item. Of the 49 participants that answered this question, 15 participants (30.61%) indicated Very Likely, 11 participants (22.45%) indicated Likely, 10 participants (20.41%) indicated Slightly Likely, 6 participants (12.24%) indicated Slightly Unlikely, 5 participants (10.20%) indicated Unlikely, and 2 participants (4.09%) indicated Very Unlikely.

**District school psychologists.** The third survey question used a rating scale asked participants: How likely or unlikely is it for the district school psychologist to help implement social-emotional learning programs? The rating scale was as follows: Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, and Very Unlikely. A total of 171 participants responded to this question. Of the 171 participants, 17 participants (9.94%) indicated Very Likely, 47 participants (27.49%) indicated Likely, 40 participants (23.39%) indicated Slightly Likely, 16 participants (9.36%) indicated Slightly Unlikely, 31 participants (18.13%) indicated Unlikely, and 20 participants (11.70%) indicated Very Unlikely.
Survey Question 4

**Building school psychologists.** The fourth survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: How likely or unlikely is it for the building school psychologist to provide direct mental health supports to students? The rating scale was as follows: Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, and Very Unlikely. A total of 49 participants answered this item. Of the 49 participants that answered this question, 8 participants (16.33%) indicated Very Likely, 11 participants (22.45%) indicated Likely, 9 participants (18.37%) indicated Slightly Likely, 8 participants (16.33%) indicated Slightly Unlikely, and 5 participants (10.20%) indicated Very Unlikely.

**District school psychologists.** The fourth survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: How likely or unlikely is it for the district school psychologist to provide direct mental health supports to students? The rating scale was as follows: Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, and Very Unlikely. A total of 172 participants answered this question. Of the 172 participants that answered this question, 8 participants (4.65%) indicated Very Likely, 27 participants (15.70%) indicated Likely, 44 participants (25.58%) indicated Slightly Likely, 21 participants (12.21%) indicated Slightly Unlikely, 35 participants (20.35%) indicated Unlikely, and 37 participants (21.51%) indicated Very Unlikely.

Survey Question 5

**Building school psychologists.** The fifth survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: How effective or ineffective are the mental health services provided by the school psychologist in your elementary school? The rating scale was as follows:
Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective, and Not Applicable. A total of 48 participants answered this item. Of the 48 participants that answered this question, 4 participants (8.33%) indicated Highly Effective, 14 participants (29.71%) indicated Effective, 17 participants (35.42%) indicated Slightly Effective, 5 participants (10.42%) indicated Slightly Ineffective, 5 participants (10.42%) indicated Ineffective, and 3 participants (6.25%) indicated Highly Ineffective.

**District school psychologists.** The fifth survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: How effective or ineffective are the mental health services provided by the school psychologist in your elementary school? The rating scale was as follows: Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective, and Not Applicable. A total of 172 participants answered this question. Of the 172 participants, 8 participants (4.65%) indicated Highly Effective, 34 participants (19.77%) indicated Effective, 42 participants (24.42%) indicated Slightly Effective, 18 participants (10.47%) indicated Slightly Ineffective, 20 participants (11.63%) indicated Ineffective, 8 participants (4.65%) indicated Highly Ineffective, and 42 participants (24.42%) indicated Not Applicable.

**Survey Question 6**

**Building school psychologists.** The sixth survey question asked participants in multiple-choice format: Please indicate who predominately provides mental health services to students in your elementary school? Choices were as follows: School Social Worker, School Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, Teacher, or Other. A total of
49 participants answered this item. Of the 49 participants that answered this question, 40 participants (81.63%) indicated School Social Worker, 4 participants (8.16%) indicated School Guidance Counselor, 2 participants (4.08%) indicated School Psychologist, 1 participant (2.04%) indicated Teacher, and 2 participants (4.08%) indicated Other.

**District school psychologists.** The sixth survey question asked participants in a multiple-choice format: Please indicate who predominately provides mental health services to students in your elementary school? Choices were as follows: School Social Worker, School Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, Teacher, or Other. A total of 169 participants answered this question. Of the 169 participants, 129 participants (76.33%) indicated School Social Worker, 26 participants (15.38%) indicated School Guidance Counselor, 4 participants (2.37%) indicated School Psychologist, and 10 participants (5.92%) indicated Teacher.

**Survey Question 7**

**Building school psychologists.** The seventh survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: Regardless of who provides services, how effective or ineffective are school mental health services in your elementary school? The rating scale was as follows: Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, and Highly Ineffective. A total of 49 participants answered this item. Of the 49 participants that answered this question, 6 participants (12.24%) indicated Highly Effective, 25 participants (51.02%) indicated Effective, 13 participants (26.53%) indicated Slightly Effective, 1 participant (2.04%) indicated Slightly Ineffective, 3
participants (6.12%) indicated Ineffective, and 1 participant (2.04%) indicated Highly Ineffective.

**District school psychologists.** The seventh survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: Regardless of who provides services, how effective or ineffective are school mental health services in your elementary school? The rating scale was as follows: Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, and Highly Ineffective. A total of 173 participants answered this question. Of the 173 participants, 11 participants (6.36%) indicated Highly Effective, 67 participants (38.73%) indicated Effective, 71 participants (41.04%) indicated Slightly Effective, 11 participants (6.36%) indicated Slightly Ineffective, 10 participants (5.78%) indicated Ineffective, and 3 participants (1.73%) indicated Highly Ineffective.

**Survey Question 8**

**Building school psychologists.** The eighth survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: How effective or ineffective is social-emotional learning programming in your school? The rating scale was as follows: Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective, and Not Applicable. A total of 49 participants answered this item. Of the 49 participants that answered this question, 5 participants (10.20%) indicated Highly Effective, 24 participants (48.98%) indicated Effective, 14 participants (28.57%) indicated Effective, 4 participants (8.16%) indicated Slightly Ineffective, 1 participant (2.04%) indicated Ineffective, and 1 participant (2.04%) indicated Highly Ineffective.
**District school psychologists.** The eighth survey question used a rating scale and asked participants: How effective or ineffective is social-emotional learning programming in your school? The rating scale was as follows: Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective, and Not Applicable. A total of 173 participants answered this question. Of the 173 participants answered this question, 17 participants (9.83%) indicated Highly Effective, 64 participants (36.99%) indicated Effective, 69 participants (39.88%) indicated Slightly Effective, 15 participants (8.67%) indicated Slightly Ineffective, 5 participants (2.89%) indicated Ineffective, and 3 participants (1.73%) indicated Highly Ineffective.

**Data Analysis Results**

In order to allow for independent sample comparisons among survey questions and to ensure survey responses were reported accurately, building school psychological perceptions and district school psychological perceptions were merged into one variable for each survey question (see Tables 8 through 15).

**Table 8**

*Current Services: Building or District School Psychological Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Building School Psychologist</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District School Psychologist</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

*School Psychologists as Mental Health Specialists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Strongly Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Very Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Likelihood of School Psychologists Implementing Social Emotional Learning Programming*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Likely</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Likely</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Slightly Likely</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unlikely</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Very Unlikely</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Likelihood of School Psychologists Providing Direct Mental Health Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Likely</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Likely</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Slightly Likely</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unlikely</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Very Unlikely</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Effectiveness of School Psychologists’ Direct Mental Health Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Highly Effective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Effective</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Slightly Effective</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Slightly Ineffective</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ineffective</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Highly Ineffective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Not Applicable</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

*Predominate School Mental Health Specialists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Social Worker</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

*Effectiveness of School Mental Health Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Highly Effective</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Effective</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Slightly Effective</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Slightly Ineffective</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ineffective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Highly Ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15

**Effectiveness of Social Emotional Learning Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Highly Effective</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Effective</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Slightly Effective</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Slightly Ineffective</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ineffective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Highly Ineffective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further examine survey results and to increase the power of analysis, an index was created that combined participants’ responses to the six survey questions related to elementary principals’ perceptions about mental health services and school psychological services (Survey Questions: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, & 8). Prior to creating the combined index, a Cronbach analysis was completed. The results of the Cronbach analysis indicated that the reliability of the six item responses was high enough to create a combined index. A Univariate ANOVA was then completed to determine if there were statistical differences between elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services being provided by building school psychologists, and elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services being provided by district school psychologists. Within the study, building school psychologists had a mean of 2.53 with a standard deviation of .82002, and district school psychologists had a mean of 2.93 with a standard deviation of .78830. The ANOVA model for school psychologist (SchoolPsych) services, building or
district services, is significant at the .003 level with a F statistic of 9.252 and a df of 1.

The resulting analysis is presented in Tables 16 and 17.

Table 16

*Descriptive Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Psych services currently being provided by Building or District Psychologists</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building School Psychologist</td>
<td>2.5335</td>
<td>.82002</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District School Psychologist</td>
<td>2.9369</td>
<td>.78830</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.8306</td>
<td>.81427</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

*Analysis of Variance, Building and District School Psychologists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>5.873&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>9.252</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1080.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1080.061</td>
<td>1701.617</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SchoolPsych</td>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.873</td>
<td>9.252</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>116.790</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1612.997</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>122.662</td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> R Squared= .048 (Adjusted R Squared= .043)
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Purpose

As stated in Chapter I, there is a growing need for school psychologists to reform and restructure their roles in order to meet the mental health needs of student populations. Many school psychologists, district and building, are in favor of changing roles and responsibilities, but are faced with resistance from administrators when advocating for change (Adelman & Taylor, 2003). The biggest hurdle in having school psychologists provide mental health services is lack of support from administrators (Suldo et al., 2009). Administrators do not always see school psychologists as supporting the social-emotional learning of students, and focus school psychologists job descriptions heavily on psychoeducational evaluations in order to adhere to legal mandates (Suldo et al., 2009; Worrell et al., 2006). To significantly change the role of school psychologists administrative support has to be established, and the requirements set out in the law that bind all school districts need to be appropriately considered.

Studies have measured principals’ attitudes about school psychological services; however, they have failed to measure elementary principals’ attitudes regarding school psychological services provided by staff servicing one elementary versus multiple elementary schools in various geographic regions (Greene, 2010). The purpose of this research study was to investigate elementary principals’ perceptions about school
psychological services, specifically related to district (school psychologists servicing multiple schools) and building (school psychologists serving one school) school psychologists’ roles within school mental health, and elementary principals’ perceptions about school mental health providers. Elementary principals were predominately selected, in order to focus on early intervention.

**Research Questions**

As stated in Chapter I, research addressed the following questions:

1. Who predominately assumes the role as mental health provider within elementary schools per elementary school principals?
2. To what extent, if any does an elementary school principal regard and utilize their building school psychologist as a mental health provider?
3. To what extent, if any, does an elementary school principal regard and utilize their district psychologist as a mental health provider?
4. Does the regard and utilization of school psychologists’ role as mental health providers differ depending upon whether the school psychologist is a building or district psychologist?

**Summary of Procedures**

Per Chapter III, survey research was utilized to measure elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services provided by district (school psychologists serving multiple schools) and building (school psychologists serving one school) staff and general perceptions of school mental health providers. At the beginning of the survey, participants voluntarily indicated if their current school psychological services
are provided by a building school psychologist or a district school psychologist. Participants were then directed to the appropriate survey questions for building or district school psychologists. Standardized directions were provided for each section of the survey. Demographic information, school and participant, was collected for all participants at the end of the survey. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to provide their e-mail address if they are interested in reviewing the results of the study.

**Summary of Demographic Data and Patterns**

Per Chapter IV, the survey instrument contained questions intended to produce specific demographic data, participant and school focused, about the elementary principals within each participating school. Participant demographic questions included the following topics: years in education as an elementary principal, years in current position, race, and gender. School demographic questions included the following topics: IPA region, student enrollment, grades taught, percentage of students participating in English Learner (EL services), percentage of students receiving special education and related services, and percentage of students from low income families.

With regards to participant demographic data trends, most participants indicated that they have upheld a position as an elementary principal for two years, and have been in their current position for one year. The majority of participants identified their race as White/Caucasian, and their gender as female. Regarding school demographic data patterns, most participants indicated that their schools belonged to Three Rivers IPA region. The majority of participants indicated that their student population ranged from
300-399, and indicated that grades taught at their elementary school were different from
Kindergarten-5th grade, Kindergarten-6th grade, and Kindergarten-8th grade. Most
participants indicated that more than 10% of their student population received special
education services. The majority of participants indicated that less than 10% of their
student population received English Learner services. Lastly, more than 50% of
participants indicated that their students come from low income families.

As stated in Chapter IV, due to the fact that the Three Rivers region represented
the largest respondent sample, additional data analysis was gathered on respondents from
this region. Results indicated very low responses of highly effective school
psychological, school mental health services, and social-emotional programming per
elementary principals in the Three Rivers region. Most of the school psychological
services currently being provided in the Three Rivers region are by district school
psychologists, and the majority of the school psychologists are hired by special education
cooperatives not individual school districts. It is important to note the large response rate
from the Three Rivers region may have had some effect on the overall research findings
of this study.

Summary of Research Findings

Per research findings, the majority of elementary principal participants indicated
that school psychological services are provided by district school psychologists.
Additionally, less than 10% of participants indicated that current mental services are
highly effective, and less than 10% of participants indicated that current social-emotional
programming is highly effective. Participants further indicated that school social workers
are the predominate mental health provider in their elementary schools. In Chapter I, it was discussed that school social workers, school counselors, and school psychologists have similar training and professional competencies; however, mental health roles vary among positions, especially for school psychologists (American School Counselor Association, 2012; Frey et al., 2013; Skalski et al., 2013). Per the results of this study, school counselors and school psychologists are secondary and tertiary mental health providers, despite having similar professional skills as school social workers.

Research findings further indicated that elementary principals with district school psychologists regard and utilize their school psychologists more as mental health providers than elementary principals with building school psychologists. As stated in Chapter I, there are limited studies that measure elementary principals’ perceptions of school psychological services based upon job placement. Per Proctor and Steadman’s (2003) study, results indicated that administrators had more knowledge about school psychological services when school psychologists served predominately one school. Greene (2010) further indicated that the number of days that the school psychologist spent at assigned school/s influenced principals’ understanding of school psychologists’ roles. Principals had more working knowledge of school psychologists’ roles when the school psychologist served one school verses multiple schools (Greene, 2010). Current research findings indicated the opposite results, as elementary principals indicated more regard and utilization of district school psychologists as school mental health specialists. It is important to note that the sample size of participants with district school psychologists was larger than the sample size of participants with building school
psychologists. Furthermore, it also important to note that respondents were not equally distributed among Illinois Principals Association regions.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

With regards to recommendations for future research, it would be helpful to gather a more evenly distributed sample from the Illinois Principals Association, as the current results gathered were not evenly distributed among all Illinois Principal Association regions. Per research findings, 13% of respondents were from the Three Rivers region. Additionally, it would be helpful to compile a national survey with elementary principals’ perceptions across the country. Within this current study, only Illinois elementary principals, whom are active members of the Illinois Principals Association, were included. Of the 1,683 Illinois Principals Association asked to voluntarily participate, only 194 participated and 167 completed the survey in entirety. It would be helpful to gather a larger sample of administrators’ perceptions nationally to gain more perspectives on the topic. Furthermore, it would also be helpful to gather principals’ perceptions across all grade levels, such as: early childhood, elementary, middle, and secondary. This current student focused predominately on elementary principals’ perceptions in order to help address barriers for early intervention of services. However, mental health is an area of need across grade levels, and the severity and intensity of mental health conditions often increases with age (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013).

As stated in Chapter II, there are limited studies available on job placement of school psychologists and administrators’ perceptions of staff, school psychologists,
depending upon placement. This study helps to provide some research on administrators’ perceptions of building verses district school psychologists; however, it is recommended that additional research be completed. In this current study, the number of respondents with building school psychologists was smaller than the number of respondents with district school psychologists, and it is recommended that future samples be more evenly distributed. Additionally, although district school psychologists were higher regarded than building school psychologists, this has not been the trend in past research studies as outlined in Chapter II. It may be helpful for this study to be replicated, and focus solely on elementary principals with district school psychologists to gather more insight on current research findings. Future research studies may also benefit from including focus groups to gain even deeper perspectives from elementary principals on district school psychological services verses building school psychological services.

Implications for Practice

Research implications of this study, specifically survey research results, indicated that mental health services and social emotional programming are not highly effective in meeting the needs of students across the state of Illinois. Therefore, transformation of school mental health and social-emotional programming should occur. It is recommended that all school mental health specialists, school psychologists, school social workers, and/or school counselors, partner with administrators and fellow educators to help address systematic barriers within their district and respective schools. Additionally, school psychologists currently providing district level services, servicing more than one school, and building school psychologists should continue to identify barriers that
exclude mental health support from their professional domains. It is further recommended that school psychologists work collaboratively with administrators to implement plans to address barriers, so more students’ social and emotional well-being can be addressed in schools. Lastly, it recommended that school psychologists in the Three Rivers region and all IPA regions continue to advocate for their professional competencies with their administrators and school districts, and educate elementary principals about their roles. School psychologists are encouraged to seek out opportunities that promote and utilize their knowledge of school mental health and social-emotional programming.

Conclusions

As stated in Chapter I, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013), estimates that 13% to 20% of children in America meet criteria for a mental health disorder each year (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2013). Schools are often the only provider for mental health services for these children; however, there are limited school mental health services and providers (school psychologists, school social workers, and school counselors) who are readily available to all students who need them (Masi & Cooper, 2006). Due to schedules and designated roles and responsibilities, school psychologists often have been limited in providing mental health services in schools across America (Eagle et al., 2013; Gilman & Gabriel, 2003; Gilman & Medaway, 2007; Watkins et al., 2001). In order to significantly change the role of school psychologists, administrative support has to be established, and school psychologists need to continue to advocate for their professional competencies. Furthermore, in order to change school
mental health support, systematic barriers needed to be addressed, and school mental health specialists need to collaboratively action plan with school administrators.
APPENDIX A

DRAFT INTRODUCTION E-MAIL TO PARTICIPANTS
Dear Elementary Principal,

You are receiving this email because your name is listed as the elementary principal on the Illinois Principal Association listserv. If you are not this person, please forward this email to the correct person in your organization.

This unique study is designed to solely gather the perspectives of elementary principals’ on school psychological services, and extend knowledge of elementary school mental supports in Illinois schools.

As an elementary principal in Illinois your views are essential for this preliminary research to be conducted. The survey is relatively short and will take approximately 10-20 minutes to complete. Although your e-mail address was obtained from the Illinois Principal Association listserv, your responses will remain anonymous because the survey delivery software masks your IP address upon completion of the survey.

You will receive no compensation for participating in this survey; however, your responses will contribute to scholarly research. By sharing your perspectives as an elementary principal, you will provide knowledge to help improve school mental health support in Illinois schools.

This research has been approved by Loyola University Chicago’s Institute Review Board (IRB). There is an active link to the survey at the bottom of this e-mail. Please carefully read the consent form embedded within the survey link before deciding whether or not to participate in the study. Thank you in advance for the time you took to read this email. I hope you will complete the survey and share your perspectives.

Survey Monkey Link:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/elementaryprincipalsperspectives

Sincerely,

Tiffany Voight
Doctoral Student
Loyola University Chicago
School of Education
APPENDIX B

DRAFT CONSENT FORM (EMBEDDED IN SURVEY)
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Project Title: Elementary Principals’ Perceptions of School Psychological Services  
Researcher: Tiffany Voight, Ed.S.  
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Lynne Golomb

Introduction:  
You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Tiffany Voight, as part of a doctoral research project under the supervision of Dr. Golomb in the Department of Education at Loyola University of Chicago. You are being asked to participate in this study because of your membership with the Illinois Principals Association (IPA) and your roles as an elementary principal in the state of Illinois. Please read this information carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose:  
The purpose of this study is to better understand elementary principals’ perspectives of school psychological services and school mental services.

Procedures:  
If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:  
• Complete a survey that will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.  
• Answer a variety of questions about school psychological services, school mental health services, and participant and school demographics.  
• If you do not want to answer some questions, you may skip them.  
• If you want to stop the survey, you may exit at any time by clicking the “X” in the upper right-hand corner of each page.

Risks/Benefits:  
There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday use of the Internet. There are no direct benefits to you from participation, but the findings may result in scholarly publication.

Confidentiality:  
• Your confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by Survey Monkey and other technology used. You may maintain your anonymity if you wish because your IP address will be suppressed so that the computer you use to complete the survey will not be identifiable and the survey itself asks for no identifying information.  
• If you wish to add your email address at the end of the survey in order to receive a summary of the results of this study, a space will be provided for this information. If you do not choose to provide your email address, your survey will be entirely anonymous.
**Voluntary Participation:**
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Additionally, please note that your decision to participate or not participate will have no effect on your current relationship with the Illinois Principals Association.

**Questions/Contact:**
If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact Tiffany Voight, doctoral student, at tdirenz@luc.edu or Dr. Lynne Golomb, university supervisor, at lgolomb@luc.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Chicago Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

**Consent:**
By proceeding to the survey, this indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study.
APPENDIX C

DRAFT SURVEY QUESTIONS
Directions: The following set of questions addresses elementary principals’ perspectives of school psychological services. Please read each question and select the response that best describes your professional experiences and perspectives.

Please indicate, in the drop-down menu below, if school psychological services are currently being provided by a building (school psychologist servicing one school only) or a district (school psychologist servicing two or more schools) school psychologist.

Building School Psychologist
District School Psychologist

Skip logic will then be provided to following questions:

Questions for Elementary Principals with Building School Psychologist

1.) To what extent, if any, do you agree with the statement, “Building school psychologists are specialists in school mental health?”
Very Strong Degree, Strong Degree, Some Degree, Neutral, No Degree

2.) How likely or unlikely is it for the building school psychologist to help implement social-emotional learning programs?
Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, Very Unlikely

3.) How likely or unlikely is it for the building school psychologist to provide direct mental health supports to students?
Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, Very Unlikely

4.) How effective or ineffective are the mental health services provided by the school psychologist in your elementary school?
Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective, Not Applicable

5.) Please indicate who predominately provides mental health services to students in your elementary school?
School Social Worker
School Guidance Counselor
School Psychologist
Teachers
*Other (text box provided)

7.) Regardless of who provides services, how effective or ineffective are school mental health services in your elementary school?
Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective

8.) How effective or ineffective is social-emotional learning programming in your school?
Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective

Questions for Elementary Principals with District School Psychologists

1.) To what extent, if any, do you agree with the statement, “District school psychologists are specialists in school mental health?”
Very Strong Degree, Strong Degree, Some Degree, Neutral, No Degree
2.) How likely or unlikely is it for the district school psychologist to help implement social-emotional learning programs?
Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, Very Unlikely

3.) How likely or unlikely is it for the district school psychologist to provide direct mental health supports to students?
Very Likely, Likely, Slightly Likely, Slightly Unlikely, Unlikely, Very Unlikely

4.) How effective or ineffective are the mental health services provided by the school psychologist in your elementary school?
Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective, Not Applicable

5.) Please indicate who predominately provides mental health services to students in your elementary school?
School Social Worker
School Guidance Counselor
School Psychologist
Teachers
*Other (text box provided)

7.) Regardless of who provides services, how effective or ineffective are school mental health services in your elementary school?
Highly Effective, Effective, Slightly Effective, Slightly Ineffective, Ineffective, Highly Ineffective

8.) How effective or ineffective is social-emotional learning programming?
Participant Demographic Questions

Directions: Please read and answer each question that best describes your professional experiences and personal demographics.

Text Box Question:
1.) Please indicate in the text box below how long you have been an elementary principal.

Text Box Question:
2.) Please indicate in the text box below how long you have been in your current position.

Multiple Choice Question:
3.) What race best describes you? (Please only choose one.)

American Indian or Alaskan Native
Asian /Pacific Islander
Black or African American
Hispanic
White /Caucasian
Bi-Racial
Prefer Not to Respond

4.) Please select your gender.

Female
Male
Prefer Not to Respond
Elementary School Demographic Questions

Directions: Please read each question and answer each question per current school demographics.

Multiple-Choice Questions:

1.) Please indicate what region, as defined by the Illinois Principal Association, your elementary school is located in?

Kishwaukee
Lake
North Cook
Dupage
West Cook
Three Rivers
Starved Rock
Northwest
Blackhawk
Western
Central Illinois Valley
Corn Belt
Two Rivers
Abe Lincoln
Illini
Wabash Valley
Kaskaskia
Southwestern
Egyptian
Shawnee

Textbox Question

2.) Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please enter the total student enrollment in the textbox below.

Multiple Choice Questions:

3.) Please indicate current grades taught at your elementary school.

   Kindergarten-Fifth
   Kindergarten-Sixth
   Kindergarten-Eighth

   *Other (please specify)

4.) Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please select the percentage of students that received special education services.

   Less than 5 percent
   6-10 percent
   More than 10 percent

5.) Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please select the percentage of students that received English learner services.

   Less than 10 percent
   11-25 percent
26-50 percent
More than 50 percent
6.) Per your school’s Illinois Report Card for the 2014-2015 school year, please select the percentage of students with low family incomes.
Less than 10 percent
11-25 percent
26-50 percent
More than 50 percent

End of Survey

Text Box:
Thank you for your time and participation. If you wish to receive a summary of the results of this study, please enter your e-mail in the textbox below to be provided this information once the study is complete.
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