

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

8100416

BOSSARD, MICHAEL DAVID

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL OPENNESS, PRINCIPAL
LEADER BEHAVIOR, AND CONSULTANT SKILL TO PREFERENCE FOR
AND USE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSULTATION SERVICES

The University of Nebraska - Lincoln

PH.D.

1980

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL OPENNESS,
PRINCIPAL LEADER BEHAVIOR, AND CONSULTANT
SKILL TO PREFERENCE FOR AND USE OF SCHOOL
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSULTATION SERVICES

by

Michael D. Bossard

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Interdepartmental Area of Psychological
and Cultural Studies

Under the Supervision of Associate Professor
Terry B. Gutkin

Lincoln, Nebraska

July, 1980

TITLE

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL OPENNESS, PRINCIPAL LEADER BEHAVIOR,
AND CONSULTANT SKILL TO PREFERENCE FOR AND USE OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONSULTATION SERVICES

BY

Michael D. Bossard

APPROVED	DATE
<u>Terry Gutkin</u>	<u>June 24, 1980</u>
<u>Lee A. Witters</u>	<u>June 24, 1980</u>
<u>Robert D. Brown</u>	<u>June 24, 1980</u>
<u>Barbara S. Plake</u>	<u>June 24, 1980</u>
<u>Sing nan Fen</u>	<u>June 24, 1980</u>
<u>Frederick C. Wendel</u>	<u>June 24, 1980</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

GRADUATE COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The challenge of doctoral studies has been made easier for me by a number of individuals. I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to each and every one of them.

To my dear wife Sherri, thank you for your steadfast patience, loving encouragement, and for being the Saint that you are.

Thank you to my boys, Ben and Luke, whose beautiful smiles have never failed to rejuvenate their daddy when he needed it most.

To my parents, Art and Ruth, thank you for your gracious support throughout the years and for the vision you've always had for me.

I am especially indebted to my advisor, Dr. Terry Gutkin, for the positive influence he has been, not only in the formulation of this dissertation, but throughout my graduate training as well. It has been my good fortune to have had the opportunity to learn from, be advised by, and work with a man of Terry's integrity and academic stature. Hopefully, a little of it will rub off on me.

I would also like to thank my other committee members, Dr. Robert Brown, Dr. Sing-Nan Fen, Dr. Barbara Flake,

Dr. Fred Wendel, and Dr. Lee Witters for their assistance in the preparation of this thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Wayne Piersel, Dr. Fred Grossman, Dr. Glenn Thiel, Oi Revels, Ranae Murphy, Rich Muff, Paul Nelson, Art Bossard, Ruth Bossard, and my mother-in-law, Bobbye Jean Owen, all of whom provided invaluable assistance without which this study could not have been completed.

I am also indebted to the school staffs who kindly agreed to participate in this study as well as the graduate student consultants who willingly served as subjects. Thank you all for helping to make this research possible.

Finally, special thanks to my colleague and friend, Marley Watkins, for his timely exhortations to finish this dissertation; to my brother, Brian, for his "courier" services; and to my mother for so ably and willingly serving as typist of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
	Problem Characteristics and Use of Consultation.....	8
	Consultee Characteristics and Use of Consultation.....	9
	Consultant Characteristics and Use of Consultation.....	11
	Organizational Characteristics and Use of Consultation.....	13
	Principal Behavior and Use of Consultation.....	17
	Current Study.....	19
III.	METHODS.....	21
	Subjects.....	21
	Procedures.....	22
	Instruments.....	26
	Independent Variables.....	32
	Dependent Variables.....	34
	Collection of Anecdotal Data.....	34
	Hypotheses.....	35
IV.	RESULTS.....	38
	Descriptive Statistics.....	38
	Correlational Analyses.....	38
	Regression Analyses.....	42

Table of Contents (Continued)

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
V.	DISCUSSION.....	53
	Prediction of Preference for Consultation.....	54
	Prediction of Use of Consultation.....	56
	Comparative Validity of Teachers' and Consultants' Ratings.....	58
	Secondary Findings.....	60
	Limitations.....	63
	Suggestions for Further Research...	66
	Summary.....	68
	Footnote.....	71
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	72
	APPENDICES.....	81

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Means and Standard Deviations for Independent and Dependent Variables.....	39
2. Correlation Matrix for Dependent and Independent Variables Including Consultant and Teacher Ratings of Organizational Variables.....	40
3. Stepwise Multiple Regression with Consultants' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Use of Consultation as Dependent Variable.....	45
4. Stepwise Multiple Regression with Teachers' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Use of Consultation as Dependent Variable.....	46
5. Stepwise Multiple Regression Including Both Consultants' and Teachers' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Use of Consultation as Dependent Variable.....	48
6. Stepwise Multiple Regression with Consultants' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Preference for Consultation as Dependent Variable.....	49
7. Stepwise Multiple Regression with Teachers' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Preference for Consultation as Dependent Variable.....	50
8. Stepwise Multiple Regression Including Both Consultants' and Teachers' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Preference for Consultation as Dependent Variable.....	52

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing concern among educators that the traditional methods for providing psychological services in the schools are not adequately meeting the mental health needs of students. Current emphases on testing and diagnosis have been criticized as yielding irrelevant information to teachers and negligible change in student behavior (Bersoff, 1971; Singer, Whiton, & Fried, 1970; Wolfensberger, 1965). In addition, the emphasis on individual diagnosis and treatment has resulted in huge backlogs of case referrals since there are not enough mental health professionals to meet the demand (Albee, 1959; Alpert, 1976; Bardon & Bennett, 1967; and Kennedy, 1971).

A wide variety of consultation techniques (Bergan, 1977; Caplan, 1970; Gallesich, 1974; Meyers, Parsons, & Martin, 1979; Schein, 1968) have been proposed as alternative models of service delivery to better meet the mental health needs of children. These preventative approaches have in common the goal of reducing the potential number of future problems by developing ongoing problem-solving relationships with teachers, administrators, and other

professional educational personnel. The school psychologist's effects are magnified by providing indirect services through these other agents who have long term relationships with large numbers of children.

There is already substantial evidence that both school psychologists (Barbanel & Hoffenburg-Rutman, 1974; Cook & Patterson, 1977; Giebink & Ringness, 1970; Meacham & Peckham, 1978) and other school personnel (Fairchild, 1976; Kirchner, 1971; Lambert, Sandoval, & Corder, 1975; Waters, 1973) consider non-assessment functions as important job roles for school psychologists. The belief is held by many that school psychologists can become more effective change agents serving greater numbers of students by adopting the more proactive consultation method of delivering psychological services. This approach necessarily results in reducing school psychologists' involvement in traditional individual testing while concomitantly increasing their involvement in consulting with teachers and other school personnel.

The proposed consultant role for school psychologists has often met with resistance in tradition-rich educational organizations. There is apt to be a lack of fit between the assignment imposed by schools having a

long history with the more traditional testing model of service delivery and the goals of a school psychology consultant (Bardon, in press). This so-called "port-of-entry" problem has been discussed by several theoreticians (Glidewell, 1959; Meyers, 1973; and Sarason, Levine, Goldenberg, Cherlin & Bennett, 1966).

Schmuck and Miles (1971) contend that "entry, as the first step in the planned organizational change effort, is very important and deserves systematic treatment." They further theorize, along with others (Galleich, 1973; Schein, 1969), that there are significant relationships between organization characteristics, consultant entry, and effectiveness within that organization. An increased understanding of relevant organizational variables should help consultants to properly channel their entry efforts as they work to overcome organizational resistance to change.

These hypotheses have not yet been empirically tested, however, as there have been few studies which have investigated organizational variables as they relate to usage of consultation services by professional school personnel. Preliminary research (Kuehnel, 1975) indicates that the more "open" the organizational climate of

a school, as perceived by teachers, the more receptive school personnel are to mental health consultation in general.

Another variable which has been frequently cited as being important to the organizational functioning of schools is leader behavior (Sarason, 1971; Williams, Wall, Martin, & Berchin, 1974). The leader behavior of the principal certainly would seem to have an impact on the acceptance and usage of consultation services. As Sarason (1971) has pointed out, "We begin with the principal because any kind of system change puts him in the role of implementing the change in his school." The leadership style or behavior of the principal as it influences the provision of consultation services in schools, however, has not been investigated.

Gallesich (1973) theorizes that the consultant's competencies, as they interact with organizational variables, also contribute to the entry process. Although it seems likely that consultant skill contributes to teacher usage of consultation services, this variable has only recently begun to be empirically investigated (Curtis and Zins, 1979; Savage, 1979). The predictive power of consultant skill to consultation usage as well as its joint contribution with organizational variables to predicting consultation usage remains a research question that warrants further investigation.

In summary, while there is general theoretical agreement that a consultant's entry into a school organization is a complex function of the consultant's skills, the organizational characteristics of the school, and the leader behavior of the principal, there has thus far been little investigation of these interrelationships. The empirical explication of these relationships is crucial to school psychologists who function as consultants. Such knowledge would help consultants to know how best to allocate their entry efforts in order to maximize their consultative effects.

The specific problem of this study was, what are the relationships which exist between consultant skill, organizational openness of schools, and principal leader behavior; and a school's preference for and use of consultation services? Furthermore, how are consultant perceived organizational variables related to teacher perceived organizational variables?

The exploratory intent of the study was to examine whether existing measures of the aforementioned variables are valid for answering the problem. Moreover, the nature of this study was to explore leads for further research as well as to suggest to school psychologists how their school-based consultative efforts might best be allocated.

Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The traditional medical model approach to delivering psychological services in schools has increasingly been challenged by psychologists and educators as offering little benefit to children (Gutkin & Tieger, 1979). Recognition of the inadequacies of the medical model as well as the potential preventive role that schools can play in deterring mental health problems has lead to the development of consultation as a viable alternative model of service delivery (Bardon, 1968; Meyers, 1973; Meyers, Parsons, & Martin, 1979; Reger, 1967).

Unfortunately, the current enthusiasm for the consultation approach in schools is based more on unproven theory than it is on empirically supported evidence (Bloom 1977, and Mannino & Shore, 1975). A major weakness in previous research has been the lack of clear descriptions of the specific consultation techniques utilized by consultants (Meyers, Pitt, Gaughan, & Freidman, 1978). Since there are a diversity of consultation "models" reported in the literature (Gibbins, 1978), one has little basis for comparison of studies. In addition,

much of the previous consultation research has been conducted in military, business, or medical contexts, all of which have questionable applicability to school-based consultation (Berkowitz, 1971; Lambert, 1974; Schmuck, in press).

Previous studies have had limited success in identifying variables which predict school personnel's use of consultation. Haas (1977) investigated several theoretically-derived organizational and individual parameters as they related to the use of consultation but found that the variables hypothesized to predict consultation use explained very little of the variance. Even so, Haas concluded that, "The results indicate that further investigation of the context in which consultation is sought may yet pay dividends in the increased understanding of consultation's place in the array of help sources available to teachers." Similarly, Savage (1979) reported "There seems to be institutional factors or variables affecting the initiation of consultation but these were not identifiable." Savage, whose study primarily focused on consultant variables which had relevance to facilitating the request for assistance, also recommended further research to identify institutional factors which influence teacher request for psychological

consultation.

There clearly is a need for further research in the schools which will elucidate institutional or individual characteristics which enhance the probability of providing effective consultation programs. Such research must describe the specific consultation techniques employed in operational terms so that the methods are readily replicable.

Problem Characteristics and Use of Consultation

Research investigating types of referral problems and their relationship to consultation use has yielded equivocal results. Haas (1977) found that the mere presence of problems was a poor predictor of consultation usage. Gutkin, Singer, and Brown (in press) investigated teacher preference for consultation versus traditional services as a function of the type (i.e., academic, acting out, withdrawal), perceived severity of presenting problems, and the availability of a consultant in the school. Their findings indicated that the teachers' preference was not a function of problem type nor was it a function of the availability of a consultant. They did find, however, a slight, but significant ($r = .27$) relationship between the severity of the presenting problem and teachers' preference for non-consultative,

referral services. Since the relationship was small, the authors concluded that consultation services were seen by teachers as being useful for a wide variety of problems along the severity dimension.

Because there has been a paucity of research conducted in this area, conclusive judgments cannot yet be made. Present evidence suggests, however, that problem characteristics bear only a negligible relationship with the degree to which school personnel utilize consultation services.

Consultee Characteristics and Use of Consultation Services

Use of consultation services has been related by theorists and researchers to several individual consultee characteristics. In general, however, these relationships have not been consistently supported in the existing literature. For example, the age and experience of the teacher have correlated both positively (Baker, 1965; Gilmore & Chandy, 1973) and negatively (Iscoe, Pierce-Jones, & McGearty, 1967; Sonlit & Stark, 1971) with teachers' use of consultants in their schools.

Various consultee personality traits and attitudes have also been discussed and investigated with little additional insight gained in understanding the nature of "willing" consultees. Grieger (1972) identified six

teacher-held attitudes which tend to undermine behavioral consultation efforts, but he offered no empirical evidence to support his observations. Based upon 224 personally administered interviews with 31 elementary school teachers, Friedman (1976) theorized that four qualitatively different consultee "locus of control consultation styles" exist which may relate to "situational expectancies for professional role power." However, evidence supplied by Goldman and Cowan (1976) from a small sample suggests that teachers who used consultation were no different in locus of control than teachers who used little or no consultation.

Preliminary research does seem to indicate a possible link between consultee anxiety and the outcomes of consultation. The consultee's anxiety during consultation has been shown to be related to some consultation outcomes by Meyers, Friedman, Gaughan, and Pitt (1978). That is, more anxious teachers showed greater reduction of negative verbal classroom behavior after consultation. There is no present evidence, however, that links consultee anxiety levels with their usage of consultation services.

Other personality factors have not discriminated well between consultation users and non-users. Haas'

(1977) findings typify the ambiguities which still exist with regard to consultee characteristics as they relate to the use of consultation. He found that consultee characteristics hypothesized to predict the difference in use were insufficient to do so. The degree to which teachers considered attention to psychosocial issues appropriate aspects of their job, the degree to which teachers were interested in enlarging their skills as teachers, and the teachers' tolerance for novel, unstructured, or puzzling situations all were inadequate variables for explaining who did and who did not use consultation services. Thus, no clear-cut differences between users and non-users of consultation have yet been identified.

Consultant Characteristics and Use of Consultation

There have been a number of studies which have investigated how consultant characteristics relate to teacher use of consultation. Present evidence suggests that particular consultant skills may indeed influence teacher perceptions and use of consultation. After reviewing the relevant literature Savage (1979) theorized that three consultant variables seemed to be relevant to "facilitating the request for assistance." His empirical results suggested, however, that proximity of

the consultant to teachers (his/her presence and availability), the consultant's degree of agreement with teachers (agreement between their goals and objectives), and the authority of the consultant (his/her power and influence within the system) as rated by teachers on an author-devised questionnaire were not generally predictive of a teacher's request for consultation.

Curtis and Zins (1979), on the other hand, found a strong positive relationship ($r = .82$) between a consultant's perceived effectiveness as measured by the total score on the Consultant Observational Assessment Form (COAF) (Curtis & Anderson, 1976) and the willingness of teachers to work with that consultant. Bergan and Tombari (1976) identified more specifically those consultant skills which relate to effectiveness. With the aid of regression analysis, they found that a consultant's efficiency in rendering service (average time from the referral to the initial interview and psychologist caseload), a consultant's interviewing skills (as coded by a consultation-analysis technique (Bergan & Tombari, 1975)), and a consultant's flexibility in applying psychological principles (defined in terms of the variety of psychological principles applied by the consultant), influenced the initial problem identification phase of the consultation

process. Moreover, those consultants lacking in the aforementioned skills not only failed to identify consultee problems but, as a result, failed to reach plan development and implementation.

Following this line of research, Cirbes (1979) evaluated the consulting skills of eight special education teachers using the COAF. Cirbes formed a high-skilled group of consultants and a low-skilled group and found that there was significant improvement in consultee problem identification skills when placed with high-skilled consultants, while some consultee skills actually decreased when assigned to low-effective consultants.

Research thus seems to indicate that specific consultant skills do have an effect on the consultation process and on the outcomes of consultation interventions. Therefore, it is reasonable to hypothesize a link between consultant skills and the use of consultation services.

Organizational Characteristics and Use of Consultation

Research addressing the impact of individual characteristics upon the use of consultation services has resulted in a less than complete understanding of those factors which influence the use of consultation in schools. Many theorists believe that the behavior of

individuals in school settings may be best understood in terms of the organizational characteristics of the school in which the individual resides. For example, Sarason (1971) asserts, ". . . in many situations it is likely that one can predict an individual's behavior far better on the basis of knowledge of the social structure and his position in it than one can on the basis of his personal dynamics." Similarly, general systems (Miller, 1955), organizational (Getzels & Guba, 1957), and ecological (Barker, 1968; Minor, 1972) theories call for an analysis of organizational characteristics as well as those characteristics associated with individuals for the purposes of predicting individual behavior within an organization. Thus, it becomes important to explore a school's culture or climate as an important variable which may influence a school's acceptance and use of consultation services.

Organizational Climate

Organizational climate has been recognized as a concept which can be helpful in understanding the functioning of organizations. After a comprehensive review of the relevant literature, Helriegel and Slocum (1974) defined this concept as, "a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its

subsystems, and that may be induced from the way that organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment." A more intuitive description of "climate" has been offered by Halpin (1966):

Anyone who visits more than a few schools notes quickly how schools differ from each other in their "feel". In one school the teachers and the principal are zestful and exude confidence in what they are doing. They find pleasure in working with each other; this pleasure is transmitted to the students, who thus are given at least a fighting chance to discover that school can be a happy experience. In a second school the brooding discontent of the teachers is palpable; the principal tries to hide his incompetence and his lack of a sense of direction behind a cloak of authority, and yet he wears this cloak poorly because the attitude he displays to others vacillates randomly between obsequious and the officious. And the psychological sickness of such a faculty spills over on the students who, in their own frustration, feed back to the teachers a mood of despair. A third school is marked by neither joy nor despair, but by hollow ritual. Here one gets the feeling of watching an elaborate charade in which teachers, principal, and students alike are acting out parts. The acting is smooth, even glib, but it appears to have little meaning for the participants; in a strange way the show just doesn't seem to be "for real". And so, too, as one moves to other schools, one finds that each appears to have a "personality" of its own. It is this "personality" that we describe here as the "Organizational Climate" of the school. Analogously, personality is to the individual what Organizational Climate is to the organization (p. 131).

There have been many studies of organizational climate using different definitions and measures of climate. Most of these studies agree, however, that organizational climate can be considered an employee's subjective impressions or

perceptions of his organization (Lawler, Hall & Oldham, 1974).

The Open Climate

Even as one regards minds as open or closed, so can we view Organizational Climates. Nor does our conceptualization differ very much in essence, from Lewin's hypothesis about the structure of the "mind". To use Lewin's terms, we can describe the Open Climate as marked by "functional flexibility", and the Closed Climate as distinguished by "functional rigidity" (Halpin, 1966, p. 170).

The "open" organizational climate has been significantly related to job satisfaction (Schneider, 1972; Pritchard & Karasick, 1973) as well as job performance (Friedlander and Greenberg, 1971; Schneider, 1973). Open climates in schools have been noted to be indicative of a positive mental health orientation (Ford, 1977). Moreover, Christian (1972) states that the literature generally supports the hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between openness of organizational climate and a high degree of school innovativeness. Thus, it seems plausible to conclude, as did Halpin (1966), that, ". . . it becomes clear to us that the 'best' climate is the Open one." There have been few studies, however, that have specifically investigated the relationship between organizational climate and acceptance or use of consultation.

One such study was done by Kuehnel (1975) who assessed

the organizational climate of 12 elementary schools by using the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) (Halpin & Croft, 1963). She found that certain dimensions of climate were related to schools' use of consultation services. Specifically, the less a faculty felt it was hindered by busywork and the more they saw the principal as doing little close supervision or directing of their activities, the more use they made of consultation services. Furthermore, the more open the climate of a school, the more schools reported liking mental health consultation in general. Kuehnel's (1975) pioneering research on use of mental health services supports the hypothesis that the open school climate is more conducive to utilizing mental health resources.

Principal Behavior and Use of Consultation

The leader behavior of the principal has traditionally been held to be the greatest influence on the overall feeling-tone or atmosphere of the school (Brown and House, 1967). Supportive evidence is offered by Kuehnel (1975) who found that faculties' perception of the way they interacted with their principal was the most important variable in predicting faculties' liking for an expert versus a co-equal relationship with a consultant. Additional empirical evidence of the principal's impact on the school was supplied

by Anderson (1965) who found a correspondence between principal personality and the overall openness or closedness of the school climate. Principal behavior would therefore seem to be an important factor to consider in understanding the school organization's acceptance and use of consultation services.

"The system is faulty and must be changed"--this is the most frequent comment one hears, and I, for one, cannot disagree. However, what is missing in these proposals for change (and missing in those instances I have observed where some of these proposals have been put into effect) is any recognition that the principal is the crucial implementor of change. That is to say, any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal (Sarason, 1971, p. 148).

Remarkably, the behavior of the principal has been a variable whose influence on the acceptance and use of consultation has been virtually ignored. Other than Kuehnel's work which related certain OCDQ subscales to teachers' liking for an expert versus a co-equal relationship with a consultant, this area has been unexplored.

The Getzels-Guba Model (Getzels, Lipham & Campbell, 1968) identifies two broad categories of behaviors which describe a principal's role as a leader. One category involves the principal's efforts to fulfill the expectations the school as an organization has for him. The other category has to do with the principal being concerned with the needs and expectations of his staff members. Hemphill and

Coons (1950) developed an instrument, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), that measures these two broad categories of leader behavior. The two categories are named Initiating Structure and Consideration, respectively. The LBDQ has been utilized in numerous studies which have examined the impact of leader behavior on organizational functioning (Erickson, 1967; Williams, Wall, Martin, & Berchin, 1974). Much remains to be investigated, however, with regard to the principal's impact upon the preference for and use of consultation by school personnel.

Current Study

This study investigated the relationship between individual and organizational variables as they relate to teacher preference for, and use of, consultation services. Previous research suggests that psychologists' skills as consultants may be an important variable in predicting a school's collective response to the availability of consultation services. Based on the theory and research cited in this literature review, measures of organizational climate and principal leader behavior may also be particularly useful in analyzing teacher use or nonuse of psychological consultation services.

Prior research concerning organizational climate and principal leader behavior has typically been based on the

perceptions of teachers. Unfortunately, instruments measuring these dimensions are often seen as threatening by many school personnel and thus have limited applicability in many school settings. It would be particularly enlightening, therefore, to determine whether psychological consultants themselves could utilize instruments to measure organizational climate and principal leader behavior as an entry phase assessment of schools to predict the attitudinal acceptance and actual usage of consultation by school personnel.

This study sought to answer the following questions. Are a school's organizational climate, principal's leader behavior, and school psychologist's consultation skills related to school personnel's acceptance and use of consultation services? If there is a relationship among these variables, what is the strength and direction of these relationships?

Chapter III

METHODS

The Methods chapter includes in order a description of the subjects utilized in this study, a description of the procedures employed, a discussion of the instrumentation employed, a description of the independent and dependent variables of this study, and an explanation of how anecdotal data was gathered and from whom it was solicited. A list of the hypotheses of this study concludes the Methods chapter.

Subjects

Subjects for this study were drawn from 12 schools. Each school was assigned a graduate school psychology student (one student served both the elementary and secondary buildings of a parochial school) to serve as a psychological consultant in conjunction with a consultation practicum course. The sample consisted of the entire professional staffs from these 12 schools (12 principals and 185 teachers). The 11 graduate students each had, at a minimum, previously completed graduate coursework in: a) Systems of Consultation, including didactic instruction, audio-recordings of consultation sessions, group discussions, and role playing, b) special education (two semesters), c) psycho-educational assessment (two semesters), d) human behavior

analysis, e) practicum in behavior management techniques, f) developmental psychology, and g) psychopathology of childhood and adolescence.

Procedures

The consultants spent two half days each week for 14 weeks in their assigned schools. The consultants did not test children while working in the schools, as any testing necessary was accomplished by the regularly assigned school psychologist. The consultants participated primarily in consultation-related interactions while at their schools. Assignment of the consultants to their schools was accomplished by the consultation practicum instructor in collaboration with administrators from each respective school district. The instructor asked for schools in which the principal might be open to having student consultants providing psychological consultation services. Prior to the consultants entering their respective schools, the supervisor of the consultation practicum contacted each principal and made a preliminary explanation of the consultation services to be provided.

Initial Entry Contacts

During the first few weeks in their assigned schools, each consultant began the entry process by:

- 1) meeting with the principal, during which he/she

explained his/her role as a consultant, 2) meeting with other administrative personnel (counselors, team leaders, etc.) to explain his/her role as a consultant, and 3) subsequently providing a short inservice at a faculty meeting to explain to teachers his/her role as a consultant. The explanation of the consultant's role was aided by, and structured around, a handout entitled, "Consulting in Educational Settings: A Collaborative Approach" (Curtis & Anderson, 1976 (Appendix A)). This standard method for entering the schools was followed by each consultant and ensured a basic uniformity in their initial approaches to their schools.

Ongoing Consultation Contacts

Throughout the 14-week intervention, each consultant was available for consultation in his/her school at the times most opportune for teacher contacts as determined by the school's principal (e.g., before or after school, during lunch). The specific consultation approach employed by the consultants aligned very closely with that described by Meyers, Parsons, and Martin (1979):

Consultation is a technique that, at a minimum, always has the following six characteristics:
(1) it is a helping or problem-solving process;
(2) it occurs between a professional help-giver and a help-seeker who has responsibility for the welfare of another person; (3) it is a voluntary relationship; (4) the help-giver and help-seeker

share in solving the problem; (5) the goal is to help solve a current work problem of the help-seeker; and (6) the help-seeker profits from the relationship in such a way that future problems may be handled more sensitively and skillfully (p. 4).

The help-giver, who may also be referred to as the consultant, thus acted more as a collaborative resource to the help-seeker (consultee) than as an authoritative expert. That is, the consultative relationship was between co-equal professionals who shared responsibility for solving problems. The consultant assisted the consultee (teacher) to make appropriate environmental alterations for remediating the student's problem rather than the consultant working directly with the student. Thus, the operational level was indirect service to the student by helping the teacher deal more effectively with the student problem.

The problem-solving process which each consultant followed in their consultation contacts was similar to that sequence described by D'Zurilla and Goldfried (1971). More specifically, the sequence included the following steps:

1. Establish a calm, rational atmosphere.
2. Define and clarify the problem.
 - A. State the problem in concrete behavioral terms. Be specific.
 - B. When appropriate, divide the problem into its component parts and determine which component or

combination of components should be dealt with first.

- C. Clarify the terminal goals.
3. Analyze the forces impinging on the problem.
 - A. Identify major forces which may contribute to the problem or may impede its solution.
 - B. Identify major forces which may contribute to the problem's solution.
 - C. Identify major forces which are neutral but which must be taken account of.
4. When appropriate, identify and prioritize the component dimensions of the problem.
5. Brainstorm multiple alternative solutions for the problem (or for each dimension).
6. Choose among the alternatives.
7. Specify specific responsibilities.
8. Implement the solution(s).
9. Evaluate the effectiveness of the action and re-cycle if necessary.

In various situations the consultants were not always able to cover every step of the problem solving sequence nor did they always follow the same order. They did, however, attempt to follow the aforementioned sequence as closely as possible in each case.

Instruments

Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

There are a number of available organizational climate measures, most of which are intended for use in business organizations (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). The OCDQ was chosen for the present study because it was specifically designed for use in school systems, it has adequate psychometric properties for the purposes of the present study, it taps the desired "Openness" dimension of organizational climate, and it has been widely used in related research.

Based upon a factor analysis of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), three subtests of the OCDQ were used to measure the "Openness" of organizational climate in each school. Each school's score for Openness was obtained by adding the school mean scores for Esprit and Thrust and subtracting the school mean score for Disengagement (Halpin, 1966, p. 189). The Organizational Climate Openness Scale thus consists of a total of 29 Likert-type questions (Appendix D). Halpin (1966) explains,

Esprit refers to teacher morale. The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment. Disengagement refers to the teachers' tendency to be "not with it." This dimension describes a group which is "going through the motions", a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand. "Thrust" refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization." Thrust behavior is marked not by close

supervision, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through the example which he personally sets (pp. 150-151).

The internal reliability estimate for the Openness factor score equals .83. This was calculated using subtest reliabilities and inter-correlations reported by Halpin (1966, p. 155 & p. 160) and a formula explained by Tellegen and Briggs (1967). The OCDQ Openness factor score has been used successfully by Christian (1973) in predicting an elementary school's rate of introduction and utilization of innovative educational practices. Furthermore, Kuehnel's (1975) findings indicate that the more Open the climate of a school as measured by the OCDQ, the more positive are teachers' attitudes towards mental health consultation. Other studies which have used the OCDQ were reviewed by Brown and House (1967) and Hellriegel and Slocum (1974).

Lake, Miles, and Earl (1973) point out the possible response set, social desirability, and fakeability problems that could influence the OCDQ and that no attempt has been made to examine these problems. It is felt, however, that emphasizing the absolute confidentiality of individual responses should alleviate any such problems with teachers and there should be no reason to doubt the authenticity of the consultants' OCDQ responses in the present study.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) consists of two dimensions, Initiating Structure and Consideration, which were identified on the basis of a factor analytic procedure (Halpin, 1966). Halpin further explains that:

Initiating Structure refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work-group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff (p. 86).

There are 15 items on each dimension so that there are a total of 30 Likert-type items (Appendix E). The estimated reliabilities (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula) are reported by Halpin (1966) to be .93 and .86 for each dimension, respectively.

Halpin (1966) reports several studies which have successfully employed the LBDQ and Erickson (1967) provides a review. Williams, Wall, Martin, and Berchin (1974) found a significant relationship between teacher's perceptions (using the LBDQ-Form XII) of a principal as more concerned with their personal dispositions than with the role expectations of the institution and the ability to achieve organizational change. The form of the LBDQ employed in the present study will

evaluate the same two dichotomous leader behavior dimensions.

Consultant Observational Assessment Form

The Consultant Observational Assessment Form (COAF) was used by two consultation experts to measure each consultant's consultation skills. The mean of the two experts' ratings for each consultant was used as the measure for consultation skills. The COAF utilizes a 5-point Likert-type rating system and consists of 21 specific consulting dimensions which, when summed, yield a Total Score (Appendix B).

Items 16, 17, and 18 of the COAF, which relate to the development of problem solving strategies, were not, however, included in the total score. Since the consultant's skills were rated in a 15-minute standardized interview, the problem solving process did not usually go beyond the problem identification stage. Even so, Bergan and Tombari (1976) showed that the problem identification stage is by far the most crucial consultation stage in determining the implementation and outcomes of consultation. They demonstrated that 97% of those consultants who succeeded at the problem identification stage were able to generate useful solutions through the consultation process. Therefore, it was felt that consultant's consultation skills could be validly assessed in a 15-minute interview and without items 16, 17, and 18 of the COAF.

Correlations between individual dimensions of the COAF and its Total Score range from .52 to .83 and interrater reliability for the Total Score as rated by experts has been shown to equal .74 (Curtis and Zins, 1979). Concurrent validity of the COAF with the Index of Content Relevancy on the Consultation Analysis Record (Bergan and Tombari, 1975) was determined to be .84 (Curtis and Watson, 1979). The COAF has been used to evaluate the effect of high and low skilled consultants on consultee problem identification skills (Cirbes, 1979) and Curtis and Zins (1979) have shown that there are no significant differences between COAF ratings by experts and classroom teachers, or between teacher groups preferring differing approaches to consultation.

School Psychology Service Delivery Preference Scale

The School Psychology Service Delivery Preference Scale (SPSDPS) (Appendix G) was specifically developed for use in this study to measure each principal's and each teacher's self-reported preference for the consultation model of service delivery as opposed to the traditional testing model. The CPS contains written descriptions of the major distinguishing characteristics of the two major approaches to service delivery. Descriptions of the two approaches were designed to differ along the dimensions of psychologist role

(authoritarian expert vs. collaborative resource), target (student centered vs. teacher centered), and operational level (direct vs. indirect service) (Gallesich, 1974). The social desirability of each written description was evaluated by two measurement experts at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln to insure that they were equivalent along this dimension.

Teachers stated their preference for one of the written descriptions on the SPSDPS along a 7-point Likert Scale. Each school's mean rating of the consultation model on the SPSDPS thus yielded a measure of its collective preference for the consultation approach.

Consultation Use Score

To facilitate accurate recordings of consultation contacts, the consultants completed a Consultation Contact Record Form (Appendix I) on a daily basis. Two consultation experts evaluated all written records of consultation contacts turned in by the consultants in terms of the operational definitions of a consultation contact listed in Appendix H. The total number of consultation contacts for a school as determined by the average of the post hoc ratings of the two consultation experts divided by the number of professional educators in the school yielded a consultation use score.

Independent Variables

Assessment of Consultant Skills

During the final week of the intervention, the consultative skills of each consultant were rated by two experts in consultation techniques using the Consultant Observational Assessment Form (COAF) (Curtis and Anderson, 1975) (Appendix B). The experts had successfully completed one year of formalized training in consultation, had acquired at least one year of fulltime experience as a school psychologist following the completion of training, and were not knowledgeable of any of the study's hypotheses. A videotape of a 15-minute consultation interview between each consultant and the same consultee was viewed and rated by these consultation experts using the COAF. Prior to viewing and rating the consultation videotapes, the experts were given a set of operational definitions for the dimensions included in the COAF (Appendix C). The expert raters were given the opportunity to view a practice session of a consultation interaction and rate the consultant on the COAF to familiarize themselves with the assessment instrument.

The consultee, who was used in all 11 sessions, was a school psychologist equally familiar to all of the consultants. The case discussed in each of the sessions was based on an actual child related problem experienced by a teacher.

Before each session the consultant was given a brief adaptation period to adjust to the observation room. Prior to each session, each consultant was presented a standard set of information which included the consultee's name, approximate age, class taught, name of the school, and the general characteristics of the community in which the school was located.

Assessment of Organizational Climate and Principal Leader Behavior

During the 14th week of the consultation intervention, which is deemed an adequate amount of time to, "grasp the systemic complexities and internal norms that govern the system" (Broskowski, 1973), the consultants evaluated their respective schools by completing the "Openness" factor of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) (Halpin, 1966) (Appendix D) and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Halpin, 1966) (Appendix E). Several weeks later, the "Openness" factor of the OCDQ and the LBDQ were administered to the teachers and principal in each school by disinterested volunteers who had been trained in their proper administration. The volunteers introduced the questionnaires to each school staff following the guidelines listed in Appendix F.

Dependent Variables

Assessment of Consultation Preference

At the same time that the "Openness" factor of the OCDQ and the LBDQ were administered to school faculty, the School Psychology Service Delivery Questionnaire (SPSDQ) (Appendix G) was also administered by a disinterested volunteer. The order of the presentation of questionnaires was counterbalanced to control for possible sequence effects.

Assessment of Consultation Use

Each graduate student consultant kept an ongoing record of all consultation contacts throughout the 14-week intervention period. Consultation contacts, for the purposes of this study, are operationally defined in Appendix H. Two disinterested consultation experts rated all written records of consultation contacts turned in by the consultants according to the guidelines listed in Appendix H.

Collection of Anecdotal Data

Approximately 3 to 4 weeks after all questionnaires were administered and collected, each consultant, each principal, and a teacher from each school were interviewed. A "funnel" form of open-ended questioning was

used in which the interviewer started with an open general question and then followed with more specific, closed questions (Kerlinger, 1973). The broad opening question asked was, "What, in your mind, were some of the most significant factors which contributed to the consultant being utilized?" The probing which followed varied depending upon the initial answer and who the interviewee was (consultant, principal, or teacher). However, there were several questions which were consistently asked of the interviewees at some point during the interview. These centered on the interviewee's evaluation of the impact of organizational, principal, and/or consultant characteristics upon teacher utilization of consultation services. Pertinent anecdotal data gathered in this way is presented in the Discussion section.

Hypotheses

Predicting Use of Consultation Services

1. There is no relation between the dependent variable, Use of Consultation by professional school personnel and the independent variables, consultant Skill and consultant-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Initiating Structure, and principal Consideration) taken together.

2. There is no relation between the dependent variable, Use of Consultation by professional school personnel and the independent variables, consultant Skill and teacher-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Initiating Structure, and principal Consideration) taken together.

3. There is no relation between the dependent variable, Use of Consultation by professional school personnel and the independent variables, consultant Skill and both consultant-perceived and teacher-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Initiating Structure, and principal Consideration) taken together.

Predicting Preference for Consultation Services

4. There is no relation between the dependent variable, Preference for Consultation of professional school personnel and the independent variables, consultant Skill and consultant-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Initiating Structure, and principal Consideration) taken together.

5. There is no relation between the dependent variable, Preference for Consultation of professional school personnel and the independent variables, consultant Skill and teacher-perceived organizational variables (Openness,

principal Initiating Structure, and principal Consideration) taken together.

6. There is no relation between the dependent variable, Preference for Consultation of professional school personnel and the independent variables, consultant Skill and both consultant-perceived and teacher-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Initiating Structure, and principal Consideration) taken together.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

All statistical analyses were based upon a sample of ten elementary schools and did not include two available junior high schools because of substantial organizational differences between elementary and secondary schools and because of vast differences in the experiences of the consultants assigned to the two junior high schools as opposed to those consultants assigned to the ten elementary schools. Information concerning the two junior high schools will, however, be discussed in terms of solicited anecdotal data.

Descriptive Statistics

Group means and standard deviations of all independent and dependent variables were computed for the ten elementary schools (See Table 1). Each mean can be compared with the possible score ranges of each instrument. An exception to this rule is the Use of Consultation score which had no upper limit. This score was based upon the total number of consultation contacts at each school divided by the number of school personnel.

Correlational Analyses

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed for all the variables investigated in the study (See Table 2). Several hypotheses-generating relationships were noted. First, the only statistically significant relationship found between the four predictor variables and the two

Table 1

Elementary School (N=10) Means and Standard Deviations
for Independent and Dependent Variables

	Range Possible	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Independent Variables*</u>			
Climate (C)	-21 to 66	45.20	8.77
Consideration (C)	0 to 60	42.60	5.95
Initiating Structure (C)	0 to 60	40.70	5.79
Climate (T)	-21 to 66	44.49	5.10
Consideration (T)	0 to 60	43.97	5.59
Initiating Structure (T)	0 to 60	42.04	4.13
Consultant Skill	18 to 90	61.15	10.57
<u>Dependent Variables</u>			
Preference for Consultation	1 to 7	5.45	0.85
Use of Consultation	NA	1.70	0.66

*Variables followed by a (C) are based upon the consultants' perceptions while those followed by a (T) are based upon the teachers' perceptions.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Dependent and Independent Variables
Including Consultants' and Teachers'
Ratings of Organizational Variables.

	Use	Pref	CCLIM	CCONS	CIS	TCLIM	TCONS	TIS
PREF	0.19439							
CCLIM	0.13566	-0.12458						
CCONS	0.31857	0.17122	0.68789*					
CIS	-0.35481	-0.61974	0.11945	-0.38111				
TCLIM	0.39286	-0.31320	0.83792**	0.46877	0.27791			
TCONS	-0.08096	-0.35589	0.65364*	0.72260*	0.02327	0.51007		
TIS	-0.08842	-0.67727*	0.56547	-0.05564	0.77565**	0.67232*	0.30100	
SKILL	0.41490	-0.04236	-0.40977	-0.52017	0.32188	-0.06061	-0.70538*	0.03654

*p < .05

**p < .01

USE - Use of Consultation by teachers
 PREF - Preference for Consultation by teachers
 CCLIM - Openness of school climate as perceived by consultants
 CCONS - Principal Consideration as perceived by consultants
 CIS - Principal Initiating Structure as perceived by consultants
 TCLIM - Openness of school climate as perceived by teachers
 TCONS - Principal Consideration as perceived by teachers
 TIS - Principal Initiating Structure as perceived by teachers
 SKILL - Consultant Skill

criterion variables was one between the teacher rating of the principal's Initiating Structure and the teachers' preference for the consultation model of psychological service delivery ($r = -.68, p < .05$). Surprisingly, this relationship was in a negative direction. The consultants' rating of the Initiating Structure variable also yielded a strong negative correlation with teachers' preference for the consultation model, ($r = -.62, ns$), though it was not statistically different from zero ($\alpha = .05$).

Another important set of relationships are those between the consultants' and teachers' ratings of the same variables in the same schools. These findings indicate strong positive relationships between consultants' and teachers' ratings of organizational openness ($r = .84, p < .01$), the principals' Consideration ($r = .72, p < .05$), and the principal's Initiating Structure ($r = .78, p < .01$). Analyses of these data suggest that consultants perceive the aforementioned organizational variables quite similarly to the teachers' perceptions even though the consultants' time in each school was limited to only two half days per week for 14 weeks before making this assessment.

Perhaps the most striking correlation was that found between the two dependent variables, Preference for Consultation and Use of Consultation ($r = .19, ns$). This finding

indicates no significant relationship between a self-report measure of teachers' preference for the consultation model of school psychological service delivery and their actual usage of such services.

Other secondary statistically significant relationships were noted between the consultants' rating of each school's climate (Organizational Openness) and both the consultants' rating of principal Consideration ($r=.69, p < .05$) and the teachers' rating of principal Consideration ($r=.65, p < .05$). Also, the teachers' ratings of principal Initiating Structure correlated significantly with the teachers' rating of climate ($r=.67, p < .05$). Finally, a strong negative relationship found between consultant Skill and the teachers' rating of principal Consideration ($r=-.71, p < .05$) was indicative of the systematic assignment by the instructor of the consultation practicum of more skilled consultants to schools with principals who were rated low on the Consideration variable.

Multiple Regression Analyses

Preliminary data analyses revealed a small correlation ($r=.19, ns$) between the two measures employed as dependent variables. Consequently, multivariate multiple regression analysis was not used as planned. Rather, research questions were answered through six multiple regression analyses which examined the ability of the independent variables as

perceived by the teachers, consultants, or both to predict each dependent variable separately.

Use of Consultation:

Table 3 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis where consultant skill and consultant-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Consideration, and principal Initiating Structure) were the independent variables and Use of Consultation was the dependent variable. Although the global test ($F_{4,5} = 3.44$, ns) was not significant, indicating that Hypothesis One should be retained, the four independent variables, taken together, accounted for a meaningful proportion of the variance of consultation use (i.e., 73%).

Table 4 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis where consultant Skill and teacher-perceived organizational variables were the independent variables and Use of Consultation was the dependent variable. Again, the global test ($F_{4,5} = 2.08$, ns) was not significant, indicating that Hypothesis Two should be retained. It should be noted, however, that a majority of the variance of consultation use was accounted for by these predictor variables (i.e., 62%).

To evaluate the interrelationships between consultant and teacher rated independent variables, both consultants' and teachers' perceptions of organizational variables were regressed on the Use of Consultation variable (Table 5).

The global test was not significant ($F_{7,2} = 3.60, ns$), indicating that Hypothesis Three should be retained.

Table 3
 Stepwise Multiple Regression with Consultants' Perceptions
 of Independent Variables and Use of Consultation
 as Dependent Variable

Step #	Variable Entered	Mult. R	S.E. Est	df Error	F for Inclusion	R ²	Increase R ²	Adjusted ¹ R ²
1	SKILL	.415	.637	8	10.63	.172		.069
2	CCONS	.751	.495	7	0.71	.564	.392	.439
3	CIS	.834	.446	6	3.12	.696	.132	.544
4	OCLIM	.856	.458	5	0.71	.733	.038	.520

Table 4
 Stepwise Multiple Regression with Teachers' Perceptions
 of Independent Variables and Use of Consultation
 as Dependent Variable

Step #	Variable Entered	Mult. R	S.E. Est	df Error	F for Inclusion	R ²	Increase R ²	Adjusted ¹ R ²
1	SKILL	.415	.637	8	1.53	.172		.069
2	TCLIM	.590	.605	7	3.86	.348	.175	.161
3	TIS	.789	.497	6	3.69	.623	.276	.435
4	TCONS	.791	.543	5	0.03	.625	.002	.325

Interestingly, the first three independent variables entered in Table 5 were consultant Skill, consultant rating of principal Consideration, and consultant rating of principal Initiating Structure, in that order. These three predictors accounted for approximately 70% of the variance of consultation use, while all six independent variables cumulatively accounted for 93% of the variance.

Preference for Consultation:

Table 6 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis where consultant Skill and consultant-perceived organizational variables (Openness, principal Consideration, and principal Initiating Structure) were the independent variables and preference for consultation was the dependent variable. The global test ($F_{4,5} = 0.88$, ns) was not significant for these variables indicating that Hypothesis Four should be retained. The regression analysis produced three steps using consultant ratings of organizational variables which accounted for only 41% of the variance of teacher preference for consultation. By far the largest share of that amount was attributable to the Initiating Structure variable (i.e., 38%).

Table 7 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis where consultant Skill and teacher-perceived organizational variables were the independent variables and preference for consultation was the dependent variable. The

Table 5

Stepwise Multiple Regression including both Consultants' and Teachers' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Use of Consultation as Dependent Variable

Step #	Variable Entered	Mult. R	S.E. Est	df Error	F for Inclusion	R ²	Increase R ²	Adjusted R ²
1	SKILL	.415	.637	8	3.10	.172		.069
2	CCONS	.751	.495	7	1.04	.564	.392	.439
3	CIS	.835	.446	6	5.27	.696	.132	.544
4	TIS	.923	.340	5	1.77	.853	.157	.735
5	TCONS	.941	.336	4	0.02	.885	.032	.741
6	CCLIM	.948	.364	3	1.04	.899	.014	.696
7	TCLIM	.963	.380	2	0.76	.926	.027	.669

Table 6
 Stepwise Multiple Regression with Consultants' Perceptions
 of Independent Variables and Preference for Consultation
 as Dependent Variable

Step #	Variable Entered	Mult. R	S.E. Est	df Error	F for Inclusion	R ²	Increase R ²	Adjusted R ²
1	CIS	.620	.707	8	3.95	.384		.307
2	SKILL	.642	.739	7	0.27	.412	.028	.244
3	CCLJM	.642	.797	6	0.01	.413	.001	.119

Table 7
 Stepwise Multiple Regression with Teachers' Perceptions of
 Independent Variables and Preference for Consultation
 as Dependent Variable

Step #	Variable Entered	Mult. R	S.E. Est	df Error	F for Inclusion	R ²	Increase R ²	Adjusted R ²
1	TIS	.677	.663	8	5.94	.459		.391
2	TCLIM	.704	.684	7	2.40	.496	.037	.351
3	TCONS	.754	.683	6	2.90	.569	.073	.353
4	SKILL	.824	.644	5	1.75	.681	.112	.425

global test ($F_{4,5} = 2.66, ns$) was not significant, indicating that Hypothesis Five should be retained. However, the predictor variables in this analysis accounted for a meaningful amount of the variance of preference for consultation (i.e., 68%). Again, the Initiating Structure variable contributed the largest portion of that amount (i.e., 46%).

Table 8 provides a method for evaluating the interrelationships between consultant and teacher rated independent variables for predicting teacher Preference for Consultation since both consultant and teacher rated organizational variables were employed as independent variables in this multiple regression analysis. The global test ($F_{7,2} = 1.20, ns$) was not statistically significant for these variables indicating that Hypothesis Six should be retained. However, it should be emphasized that the first three independent variables entered accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance (i.e., 76%) of Preference for Consultation and the teacher rating of principal Initiating Structure accounted for the bulk (i.e., 46%) of that amount.

Table 8

Stepwise Multiple Regression including both Consultants' and Teachers' Perceptions of Independent Variables and Preference for Consultation as Dependent Variable

Step #	Variable Entered	Mult. R	S.E. Est	df Error	F for Inclusion	R ²	Increase R ²	Adjusted R ²
1	TIS	.677	.663	8	1.29	.459		.391
2	CCLIM	.746	.641	7	0.24	.557	.098	.430
3	TCONS	.869	.514	6	1.42	.756	.199	.634
4	SKILL	.882	.537	5	0.42	.778	.022	.601
5	CIS	.891	.578	4	0.27	.794	.016	.538
6	CCONS	.895	.656	3	0.10	.801	.007	.403
7	TCLIM	.899	.790	2	0.07	.808	.007	.134

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

This exploratory investigation was conducted to determine whether a school's Organizational Openness, principal's leader behavior (Consideration and Initiating Structure), and school psychologist's consultation Skill are related to school personnel's preference for and use of school psychological consultation services. Furthermore, this study was undertaken to determine the concurrent validity of consultant-perceived organizational variables as related to teacher-perceived organizational variables.

The results of this study indicate that the aforementioned predictor variables were able, in concert, to account for a substantial portion of the variance of both dependent variables, Preference for Consultation and Use of Consultation. However, in spite of some rather large correlations between some independent and dependent variables, none of the multiple regression analyses reached statistical significance due largely to the small sample size. Since none of the global tests reached statistical significance, interpretations must be made with caution. Nevertheless, the very high amounts of variance accounted for are believed to be meaningful. Therefore, the results are discussed in terms of the ordering of the independent variables as well as their relative contribution to the variance of each dependent variable. Further support is

offered by both correlational and anecdotal data. The two dependent variables, Preference for Consultation and Use of Consultation are examined separately since they were not sufficiently correlated to be examined as a construct in a multivariate analysis.

Prediction of Preference for Consultation

The results indicate that nearly half of the total variance of teacher Preference for Consultation can be accounted for by one predictor variable, the principal's Initiating Structure score as rated by the teachers themselves (See Table 7). Surprisingly, this statistically significant relationship is in a negative direction (See Table 2). That is, the higher the teachers rated the principals' Initiating Structure behavior, the lower was their Preference for Consultation score.

In light of the assumption that "effective leadership is characterized by high Initiation of Structure" (Halpin, 1966, p. 126), why should this trait be related to teachers' lower preference for the consultation model of psychological service delivery? It is apparent from anecdotal evidence, as acquired through post-treatment interviews with the consultants, that those principals who were rated high on the Initiating Structure factor were those who tended to have a strong need for control in their schools. Comments such as, "Every time I started a behavior modification project I had

to check with the principal first" or "He sent me into rooms where the teacher was definitely not receptive" were typical descriptions of the principals who were rated high on Initiating Structure in this study. It follows that this type of principal leader behavior would be incongruous with the requirements of a consultation service delivery model which emphasizes a voluntary, confidential, and collaborative relationship between consultant and teacher.

It seems then that the Initiating Structure score may not simply be a measure of a principal who "endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and methods of procedure" (Halpin, 1966, p. 86), but it may also describe a principal who initiates action to the extent that s/he interferes in professional interactions where his/her input is not sought. Certainly, items such as "He assigns staff members to particular tasks" or "He sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated" could be interpreted to be descriptive of this latter type of principal. Teachers finding themselves in a school with a controlling principal would realize that the relationship required in the consultation model might be more trouble than it was worth. They would therefore prefer a service delivery model offering less collaboration with the psychologist, who might be construed as an intruder into the principal's domain.

Prediction of Use of Consultation

Results indicate that the relative contributions of the independent variables in predicting the Use of Consultation were in the following order: 1) Consultant Skills, 2) teacher and consultant perceived leader behavior, and 3) Organizational Openness (See Table 5). Moreover, in both the case of consultant-rated organizational variables and teacher-rated organizational variables, consultant Skill proved to be the best predictor of the Use of Consultation services (See Tables 3 and 4).

Anecdotal data supplied by post-treatment teacher interviews provided support for the notion that the consultant's skill, style, or personality was of preeminent importance to the teachers' actually using the services which the consultant offered. Six out of ten elementary teachers interviewed stated that the consultant was the single most important factor in determining whether consultation services were utilized in their school and eight out of ten elementary teachers at least mentioned the consultant as an important factor. Eight out of ten principals interviewed also mentioned the consultant's skill as one of the determining factors in their school's use of consultation services.

One particularly facilitative principal at a particularly "open" school said, "After the team leaders and I did our utmost to encourage teacher utilization of the

consultation services, it was really up to the consultant then to sell himself and his services if the utilization was to continue for any length of time." Another experience related by a high-skilled consultant points up the importance of consultant skill to the utilization of consultation services in a school which had the lowest Organizational Openness score and the principal with the lowest Consideration score in this sample. "I didn't feel that the principal trusted the consultation approach. He even said, 'come back when you can bring your test kit.' But, I didn't let the principal affect me too much. I just went ahead and worked with the teachers. I just did it."

Teachers indicated that certain personality traits were conducive to the consultant's being utilized: "He was very open and easy to talk to. . .", "He was friendly, outgoing, and not threatening. . .", or "She wasn't pushy and waited until we came to her." One other comment heard repeatedly was, "An empathy existed since he had been a teacher" or "She hadn't been a teacher, but she just knew what we could handle." All of the aforementioned comments are as much a description of the proper implementation of the consultation model by skillful consultants as they are descriptions of consultants' "personality" traits.

The relative importance of the principals' behavior in contributing to the utilization of consultation services was

apparent not only in the regression ordering (See Table 5), but in the comments of consultants as well. Seven out of ten consultants placed primary emphasis on the principal's role in determining the eventual outcome of their consultation experience. The remaining three mentioned the principal as a definite factor. In one consultant's experience, as many as 50% of the consultation contacts were initiated by the principal. In another, the consultant felt that because the principal was not particularly supportive, "I came as an outsider and left as an outsider." Perhaps the ultimate facilitator was the principal who, "offered to take the teacher's class while I consulted with her." All in all, both statistical and anecdotal evidence seem to provide some support for Sarason's (1971) observation that "the principal is the crucial implementor of change."

Comparative Validity of Teachers' and Consultants' Ratings

There were two major findings of this study with regard to the comparative validity of teacher and consultant ratings. First, a high degree of interrater agreement was demonstrated between teacher and consultant assessments of all three organizational variables (See Table 2). Upon viewing the instruments for assessing organizational variables, the consultants voiced reservations that they lacked adequate exposure to the formal and informal structures of their schools to reliably complete them. However, it is apparent that

their relatively brief involvement was sufficient to give them a reasonably accurate picture of their school at least as compared with the picture painted by teachers who are assumed to have had substantially longer and more intimate involvement. Thus, there is now empirical evidence that the Openness factor of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and both factors of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, all of which were designed to be utilized by teachers, may also be validly employed by psychological consultants to assess school organizational factors after a relatively brief entry period (e.g., two half days per week for 14 weeks).

The second major finding was that consultant-rated organizational variables generally accounted for as much variance of teacher Preference for Consultation and Use of Consultation services as did teacher-rated organizational variables. In the case of predicting teacher Preference for Consultation, the results indicate that the teachers' rating of principal Initiating Structure had only a slightly stronger relationship with Preference for Consultation than did consultants' ratings of principal Initiating Structure (See Table 3). In the case of teacher Use of Consultation, the results indicate that after consultant Skill, the regression analysis ordered consultant-rated principal behaviors followed by teacher-rated principal behaviors. Consultant and

teacher ratings of Organizational Openness were ordered last (See Table 5). Thus, it appears that consultants are as effective as teachers in predicting teacher Preference for Consultation and Use of Consultation by utilizing the instruments employed in this study. The implications of this finding are that consultants may, after only a short stay, be able to determine which schools will prefer and/or utilize consultation services.

Secondary Findings

There are a number of interesting and some unexpected secondary findings of this study (See Table 2). One interesting association found was a strong positive relationship between principal Consideration and the Openness of his/her school. This finding indicates that behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the principal and his faculty seems to correlate with an open climate in schools.

The teachers' perceptions of the principal's Initiating Structure behavior was also positively related to the Openness of the school's climate while the consultants' perceptions of principal Initiating Structure behavior was not related to the school's Organizational Openness. This discrepancy may be explained by the teachers' more intimate and perhaps more accurate evaluation of their principal's behavior. In any case, these results further underscore the

influence which principals may exert on the overall climate of their schools.

The relationship between actual adoption and use of educational innovations and Organizational Openness has not been shown to be consistently positive or negative in previous research (Kuehnel, 1975). Present results add no further clarification to this issue as Organizational Openness was not significantly related to Preference for Consultation or Use of Consultation. However, present results do seem to support the contention (Christian, 1973; Kuehnel, 1975) that the faculties' relationship with the principal may be of more importance than the openness of organizational climate in influencing their attitudes and behavior.

Another finding which was not anticipated was the small relationship found between teacher Preference for Consultation and teacher Use of Consultation. Perhaps this finding should not have been surprising since it is consistent with evidence summarized by Guilford (1959) and a viewpoint expressed by Nunnally (1970) that, "A verbalized attitude usually does not correlate highly with behavior pertaining to the attitude (p. 422)." In any case, these findings raise serious questions about the validity of self report measures of teacher acceptance of the consultation model of psychological service delivery. Apparently, teacher statements to the effect that they prefer the

consultation approach do not necessarily translate into actual usage of such services.

This finding should, however, be interpreted with caution since consultants had a relatively brief exposure to their schools in this study. It is entirely possible that the relationship might be stronger had the consultants been at their respective schools for a longer period of time. This line of logic is supported by Bardon (1977) and Cherniss (1978) who state that teacher Preference for Consultation could be a function of their mental set or preparedness. Bardon explains that since teachers are not trained how to be consultees in teacher preparation institutions, there is the unfortunate and time consuming need for consultants to explain the consultative relationship via inservices and prolonged discussions with individual teachers. It follows that much of the 14-week consultation intervention in the present study could have been inexpediently spent on preparing consultees rather than actually delivering consultation services. By the end of the intervention period, teachers may have developed informed opinions about consultation, but may not yet have utilized available consultation services to the extent indicated by their avowed preferences.

Finally, anecdotal evidence indicates that schools which had adopted the "open-education" concept were

particularly conducive to the utilization of psychological consultation services. This finding is consistent with Ford and Migles (1979) statement that, "open education users have a significantly stronger preference for the school psychologist as an active co-participant or collaborative consultant than do other teachers, in keeping with the emphasis in 'open education' on team-teaching, utilizing all available teaching resources, and providing for experiential learning so as to maximize students' long-term growth (p. 376)."

Limitations

The study would have been strengthened had there been a larger sample of research participants. It is apparent that one important reason that none of the regression analyses reached statistical significance was the small sample size available for this study. The problem of acquiring a large sample is characteristic of field research efforts which examine innovations which have not yet been widely adopted in the field. To date, such is the status of research examining psychological consultation services in the schools. It is felt, therefore, that the present exploratory study was warranted and necessary to lay the groundwork for subsequent more rigorous testing of hypotheses. It should be emphasized that present findings should be replicated before their validity may be accepted.

Another shortcoming of this study is the limited degree to which the findings may be generalized beyond the sample populations. The subjects used as consultants were graduate students who may not be representative of the target population of school psychologists. However, the use of practicum students as consultants allowed considerable control over their consultative approaches to the schools. The random selection of practicing school psychologists as consultants may have afforded more external validity but less experimental control and probably would have been more of a liability than an asset.

As the reader will recall, sample schools were selected for the assignment of consultants by central office administrators in each respective school system. In each case, the principal accepted the services of a psychological consultant on a voluntary basis. Thus, there may have been an unknown degree of self-selection involved. That is, the sample of principals may have been relatively "open" to have voluntarily submitted themselves to the services of "outsiders." In actuality, this did not seem to be a problem as both empirical and anecdotal evidence indicated a high degree of variance in the school and principal attributes investigated.

The elimination of the junior highs from data analyses was necessary in order to narrow the focus to elementary

schools so that any conclusions drawn might have more validity. As previously mentioned, not only are organizational structures of secondary schools appreciably different from elementary schools (Kramer & Nagle, 1980), but as a result the experiences of consultants vary as well. In the present study, one of the consultants assigned to a junior high stated, "It was difficult to find a time to explain the consultation model to the faculty. Only about half of the faculty attended the initial explanatory meeting because many had after-school duties. For the most part, the faculty seemed strongly disinclined to discuss problems after school which was one of the few times I had access to them." Another problem which is particularly characteristic of secondary schools is the increased numbers of professional support personnel encountered. With the increased numbers of professional staff (i.e., assistant principals and guidance counselors) comes a greater risk of role overlap for the psychological consultant. One junior high principal noted, "Our counselor handles most of the behavior problems. Since she is here every day the teachers tend to go directly to her." The consultant in this school stated that he facilitated the counselor's consultative involvement and his own involvement in the school consisted primarily of presenting inservice projects.

The consultants assigned to junior highs also noted that secondary teachers are generally responsible to teach only one academic area, for less than one hour, to as many as 130 students each day. Thus, teachers at this level, unlike elementary teachers, may not see themselves as responsible for the overall development of their students. As a result of this constricted view of their role in student's lives, secondary teachers may be less interested in a time-consuming consultative relationship.

Since including junior highs with elementary schools seemed tantamount to mixing apples with oranges, the decision was made not to include the junior high data in the statistical analyses. This further limits the sample size but improves the quality of inferences made.

Suggestions for Further Research

Since the study reported here was exploratory and did have methodological limitations, the findings herein are tentative and should be replicated to verify their validity. Future replications might ideally employ representative (randomly selected) samples of principals, teachers, and psychological consultants from the target populations.

The sample sizes also need to be large enough to minimize the possibility of biased sampling and reduce the likelihood of error or deviation from population values.

In addition to a more refined sampling effort, it might be profitable to refine the instruments employed to measure organizational and principal traits with regard to their use by psychological consultants. Instruments which are designed for use by teachers ask some questions which are not within the realm of the normal experience of consultants. Though consultants in this study compared well with teachers by answering such questions with their "best estimate" based upon their consultative experiences, the reliability and validity of instruments like the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire might be improved for use by consultants through an item analysis.

These also suggest a more detailed examination of the discrepancy between teacher self-reported preferences for service delivery systems and their actual usage of such systems in future research. Although a concerted effort was made to remove the possible influence of social desirability in the Preference for Consultation scale employed in this study, it remains a possible explanation for the incongruence between teacher self-reported Preference for Consultation and teacher Use of Consultation. Perhaps other measures of such attitudes could be compared with the scale employed in this study. As previously mentioned, one other plausible explanation

for the trivial relationship between Preference for Consultation and Use of Consultation is that the treatment period in this study (14 weeks) was not long enough to get a valid picture of teacher Use of Consultation services. Future research might extend the consultation intervention to a full year in order to get a better picture of a school's collective response to an available consultant.

The results indicate that consultant Skill correlated with the Use of Consultation better than any of the organizational independent variables employed in this study. This would suggest that a major focus for future research should be on delineating those specific skills which are especially important to the consultant's services being utilized.

Future studies might also profitably focus on principal leader behavior as a critically important variable in determining the Organizational Openness of a school as well as the school's collective response to the availability of a consultant. Further delineation of relevant principal behaviors is needed as well as ways to modify those behaviors so that the principal might improve the likelihood of a consultant being used.

Summary

The focus of the present research was to identify relationships which might exist between openness of

organizational climates, principal leader behavior, and consultant skill; and a school's preference for, and use of consultation. This study was designed to begin to address the question posed by Gallesich (1973) concerning the interaction between consultant variables and organizational variables as they relate to consultation in schools. Moreover, the exploratory intent of the study was to point out leads for further research as well as to suggest to school psychologists in a broad sense how best to allocate their efforts when attempting to gain entry as a consultant into a school or school system. As Alpert, Ludwig, and Weiner (1979) have pointed out, "Since consulting with one consultee limits a consultant's professional time and energy to consult with other consultees, the pre-entry issues of with whom will we consult need to be carefully conceptualized. . ." (p. 65).

The results of the study provide tentative evidence that consultant Skill had more predictive power than organizational variables in predicting the Use of Consultation by professional school personnel. Follow-up interviews with teachers and principals also supported this finding. Results indicated that principal leader behavior influenced not only the climate of a school but also the preference by teachers for consultation services. The critical influence of the principal was also supported by

anecdotal data gathered from consultants. Unexpectedly, the Organizational Openness of schools was found not to be related to Preference for Consultation or Use of Consultation. Anecdotal evidence did support, however, the contention (Ford & Migles, 1979) that open education users prefer the consultation approach.

In conclusion, this study resulted in findings with implications for practice and further research. These findings support Sarason's (1971) assertion that the principal is a crucial implementor of change in schools. Consultants need to be cognizant of the role that principals can play in facilitating the utilization of their services.

For consultants to maximize their system-wide effect, they must be able to make a reliable and valid assessment of each organization in which they are contemplating working. Anecdotal evidence from this study indicates that available instruments to assess organizational factors in schools need refinement for use by consultants.

Perhaps most importantly, both empirical and anecdotal data from this study provide some evidence that the consultant may be the ultimate determiner of his/her own destiny with regard to the use of his/her consultation services. A major focus for future research should be the delineation of specific skills which the consultant may acquire to improve the likelihood that his/her services will be utilized when offered.

Footnote

1. According to Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent (1975) in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, "The Adjusted R^2 is an R^2 statistic adjusted for the number of independent variables in the equation and the number of cases. It is a more conservative estimate of the percent of variance explained, especially when the sample size is small." (p. 358).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albee, G. Mental health manpower trends. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Alpert, J. Conceptual basis of mental health consultation in the schools. Professional Psychology, 1976, 7, 619-625.
- Alpert, J., Ludwig, L., & Weiner, L. Selection of consultees in school mental health consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 1979, 17, 59-66.
- Anderson, D. Relationships between organizational climate of elementary schools and personal variables of the principal. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 1965, Columbus: Ohio State University, 15 pp.
- Baker, H. Psychological Services: From the school staff's point of view. Journal of School Psychology, 1965, 3, 36-42.
- Barbanel, L., & Hoffenburg-Rutman, J. Attitudes toward job responsibilities and training satisfaction of school psychologists: A comparative study. Psychology in the Schools, 1974, 11, 425-429.
- Bardon, J. School psychology and the school psychologist: An approach to an old problem. American Psychologist, 1968, 73, 187-195.
- Bardon, J. The consultee in consultation: Preparation and training. Presented as part of a Symposium on Training and Research in Consultation, American Psychological Association, San Francisco, California, August 29, 1977.
- Bardon, J. The psychology of school psychology. In Cecil Reynolds & Terry Gutkin (Eds.). Handbook of School Psychology. New York: John Wiley, in press.
- Bardon, J., & Bennett, V. Preparation for professional psychology: An example from a school psychology training program. American Psychologist, 1967, 22, 652-655.

- Barker, R. G. Explorations in ecological psychology. American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 1-14.
- Bergan, J. Behavioral consultation. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1977.
- Bergan, J., & Tombari, M. The analysis of verbal interactions occurring during consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 1975, 13, 209-226.
- Bergan, J., & Tombari, M. Consultant skill and efficiency and the implementation and outcomes of consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 1976, 14, 3-14.
- Berkowitz, H. Clinical child psychology in the schools. In Fred Holt & Richard Kicklighter (Eds.). Psychological services in the schools. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1971, 30-33.
- Bersoff, D. School psychology and state divisions of special education: A suggestion for change. Journal of School Psychology, 1971, 9, 58-60.
- Bloom, B. Community mental health: A general introduction. Brooks/Cole, Monterey, 1975.
- Broskowski, A. Concepts of teacher-centered consultation. Professional Psychology, 1973, 4, 50-58.
- Brown, A., & House, J. The organizational component in education. Review of Educational Research, 1967, 37, 399-416.
- Caplan, G. The theory and practice of mental health consultation. New York: Basic Books, 1970.
- Cherniss, C. The consultation readiness scale: An attempt to improve consultation practice. The American Journal of Community Psychology, 1978, 6, 15-21.
- Christian, C. Organizational climate of elementary schools and the introduction and utilization of innovative educational practices. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 83-A.
- Cirbes, K. The effect of high and low skilled consultants on consultee problem identification skills. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 4862-A.

- Cook, V., & Patterson, J. Psychologists in the schools of Nebraska: Professional functions. Psychology in the Schools, 1977, 14, 371-376.
- Curtis, M., & Anderson, T. Consultant Observational Assessment Form. Unpublished instrument, 1975. Department of Educational Leadership, University of Cincinnati.
- Curtis, M., & Anderson, T. The relationship of behavioral variables to consultant effectiveness. In M. Curtis and T. Anderson (Chair), Critical issues in school consultation: Research and application. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, Kansas City, Missouri, 1976.
- Curtis, M., & Watson, K. Changes in consultee problem clarification skills following consultation. Journal of School Psychology, in press.
- Curtis, M., & Zins, J. Consultative effectiveness as perceived by experts in consultation and classroom teachers. The Theory and Practice of School Consultation. Charles C. Thomas, in press.
- D'Zurilla, T., & Goldfried, M. Problem solving and behavior modification. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 78, 107-126.
- Erickson, D. The school administrator. Review of Educational Research, 1967, 37, 417-432.
- Fairchild, T. School psychological services: An empirical comparison of two models. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 156-162.
- Finn, J. A general model for multivariate analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1974.
- Ford, G. School organizational climate: Mental health implications and a proposed process for psychological consultation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 4042-A
- Ford, J., & Migles, M. The role of the school psychologist: Teachers' preferences as a function of personal and professional characteristics. Journal of School Psychology, 1979, 17, 372-378.

- Friedlander, F., & Greenberg, S. Effect of job attitudes, training and organizational climates on performance of the hard-core unemployed. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 287-295.
- Friedman, L. Locus of control consultation styles: A theoretical model for increasing teacher-centered consultation effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 2074-A.
- Gallesich, J. Organizational factors influencing consultation in schools. Journal of School Psychology, 1973, 11, 57-65.
- Gallesich, J. Training the school psychologist for consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 1974, 12, 138-149.
- Getzels, J., & Guba, E. Social behavior and the administrative process. School Review, 1957, 65, 423-441.
- Getzels, J., Lipham, J., & Campbell, R. Educational administration as a social process, Harper & Row, New York, 1968.
- Gibbins, S. Public Law 94-142: An impetus for consultation. School Psychology Digest, 1978, 7, 18-25.
- Giebink, J., & Ringness, T. On the relevancy of training in school psychology. Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8, 43-47.
- Gilmore, G., & Chandy, J. Teachers perceptions of school psychological services. Journal of School Psychology, 1973, 11, 139-147.
- Glidewell, J. The entry problem in consultation, Journal of Social Issues, 1959, 15, 51.
- Goldman, R., & Cowan, P. Teacher cognitive characteristics, social system variables and the use of consultation. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1976, 4, 85.
- Grieger, R. Teacher attitudes as a variable in behavior modification consultation. Journal of School Psychology, 1972, 10, 279-287.

- Guilford, J. Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, Chs. 7,9.
- Gutkin, T., Singer, J., & Brown, R. Teacher reactions to school based consultation services: A multi-variate analysis. Journal of School Psychology, in press.
- Gutkin, T., & Tieger, J. Funding patterns for exceptional children: Current approaches and suggested alternatives. Professional Psychology, 1979, 10, 670-680.
- Haas, L. The relationship of consultant, consultee, and organization characteristics to the use and perceived benefit of mental health consultation in schools. Unpublished dissertation. University of Colorado, 1977.
- Halpin, A. Theory and research in administration. New York: McMillan Company, 1966.
- Halpin, A., & Croft, D. The organizational climate of schools. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. Organizational climate: Measures, research and contingencies. Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17, 255-280.
- Hemphill, J., & Coons, A. Leader behavior description. Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, 1950.
- Iscoe, I., Pierce-Jones, J., McGehearty, L., & Friedman, S. A brief description of a project and some preliminary results. In Cowen, E. L., Garner, E., & Zax, M. Emergent Approaches to Mental Health Problems. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1967.
- Kennedy, D. A practical approach to school psychology. Journal of School Psychology, 1971, 9, 484-489.
- Kerlinger, F. Foundations of behavioral research. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, New York, 1973, p. 484.
- Kirschner, F. School psychology as viewed by the supervisors of school psychological services. Journal of School Psychology, 1971, 9, 343-346.

- Kramer, J., & Nagle, R. Suggestions for the delivery of psychological services in secondary schools. Psychology in the Schools, 1980, 17, 53-59.
- Kuehnel, J. Faculty, school, and organizational characteristics, and schools' openness to mental health resources. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 2716-A.
- Kurpius, D. Defining and implementing a consultation program in the schools. School Psychology Digest, 1978, 7, 4-17.
- Lake, D., Miles, M., & Earl, R. Measuring human behaviors; tools for the assessment of social functioning. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.
- Lambert, N. A school-based consultation model. Professional Psychology, 1974, 5, 267-276.
- Lambert, N., Sandoval, J., & Corder, R. Teacher perceptions of school-based consultants. Professional Psychology, 1975, 6, 204-216.
- Lawler, E., Hall, D., & Oldham, G. Organizational structure, process and performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 11, 139-155.
- Mannino, F., & Shore, M. The effects of consultation: A review of empirical studies. American Journal of Community Psychology, 1975, 3, 1-21.
- Meacham, M., & Peckham, P. School psychologists at three-quarters century: Congruence between training, practice, preferred role and competence. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, 195-206.
- Medway, F. A social psychological approach to internally based change in schools. Journal of School Psychology, 1975, 13, 19-27.
- Meyers, J. A consultation model for school psychological services. Journal of School Psychology, 1973, 11, 5-15.
- Meyers, J., Freidman, M., Gaughan, E., & Pitt, N. An approach to investigate anxiety and hostility in consultee-centered consultation. Psychology in the Schools, 1978, 15, 292-296.

- Meyers, J., Pitt, N., Gaughan, E., & Freidman, M. A research model for consultation with teachers. Journal of School Psychology, 1978, 16, 137-145.
- Meyers, J., Parsons, R., & Martin, R. Mental health consultation in the schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss Publishers, 1979.
- Miller, J. Toward a general theory for the behavioral sciences. American Psychologist, 1955, 10, 513-553.
- Minor, M. Systems analysis and school psychology. Journal of School Psychology, 1972, 10, 227-232.
- Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Nunnally, J. Introduction to psychological measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970, p. 422.
- Pritchard, R., & Karasick, B. The effects of organizational climate on managerial job performance and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 9, 110-119.
- Rechsly, D. School psychology consultation: Frenzied, faddish, or fundamental? Journal of School Psychology, 1976, 14, 105-113.
- Reger, R. The technology of school psychology. Journal of School Psychology, 1967, 5, 148-155.
- Sarason, S. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Sarason, S., Levine, M., Goldenberg, I., Cherlin, D., & Bennett, E. Psychology in community settings. New York: Wiley, 1966, pp. 59-73.
- Savage, J. The effect of teachers' familiarity with their psychologists and their beliefs about psychologists agreement and influence on the frequency and type of teacher request for psychological consultation. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 5420-A.

- Schein, E. Process consultation: Its role in organization development. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Schmuck, R. Organization development in the schools. In Cecil Reynolds & Terry Gutkin (Eds.). Hand-Book of School Psychology. New York: John Wiley, in press.
- Schmuck, R., & Miles, M. Organization development in schools. Palo Alto: National Press Books, 1971, 139-154.
- Schneider, B. Organizational climate: Individual preferences and organizational realities. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 211-218.
- Schneider, B. The perception of organizational climate: The customer's view. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 248-256.
- Singer, D., Whiton, M., & Fried, M. An alternative to traditional mental health services and group processes approach. Journal of School Psychology, 1970, 8, 172-179.
- Sonlit, A., & Stark, M. Learning with teachers. Community Mental Health Journal, 1971, 7, 218-226.
- Tellegen, A., & Briggs, P. Old wine in new skins: Grouping Wechsler subtests into new scales. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 499-506.
- Waters, L. School psychologists as perceived by school personnel: Support for a consultant model. Journal of School Psychology, 1973, 11, 40-46.
- Williams, R., Wall, C., Martin, W., & Berchin, A. Effecting organizational renewal in schools: A social systems perspective. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1974.
- Wolfensberger, W. Diagnosis diagnosed. The Journal of Mental Subnormality, 1965, 11, 62-70.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Consulting in Educational Settings:
A Collaborative Approach

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

83-93

99-108

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

APPENDIX C
COAF Operational Definitions

CONSULTANT OBSERVATIONAL ASSESSMENT FORM (COAF)Operational Definitions

1. Expert-Facilitator - focuses on the consultant's approach to solving the problem. "Expertness" is shown by advice giving, taking over the responsibility for problem resolution, and analyzing the problem according to the consultant's frame of reference. Facilitation is shown by the consultant's attempts to elicit the consultee's observations, ideas, what s/he has already tried. The consultee is a significant part of the problem of clarification and solution.
2. Relationship - focuses on the way the consultant seems to view the consultee. Is the consultee viewed as a colleague or contributor to the process? Or is the consultee viewed only as a recipient of the consultant's ideas and information?
3. Value - Do the questions and/or suggestions of the consultant convey a clear bias regarding the consultant's values toward the problem, specific remedial approaches, actions of the consultee, etc? Or does the consultant accept the possible differences between self and consultee matter-of-factly?
4. Empathy - statements or nonverbal actions which do or do not reflect an effective understanding of the consultee's feelings. Does the consultant try to terminate or interrupt the consultee's descriptions of concern or refocus on the actual too soon. Does the consultant identify with the consultee's effect?
5. Support - moral support - does consultant convey agreement with the consultee over the reality of the problem, its difficulty, and reinforce the consultee's efforts to obtain assistance in dealing with the problem? Is there reinforcement for positive things that the consultee is already trying?
6. Interest (Non-verbal) - Does the consultant convey interest and involvement in the problem-solving process through such nonverbal indicators as eye contact, body posture, hand fidgeting, note taking (too much or too little), and/or facial expression?
7. Interest (Verbal) - Is interest suggested through asking questions which show that the consultant has been listening

- carefully to the consultee? Is consultant's voice monotone or does it show inflection? Does the consultant actually express interest in the discussion?
8. Trust - Does the consultant receive the consultee's opinions or statements etc. without apparent surprise? Does the consultant avoid evaluating statements or opinions of the consultee?
 9. Ventilation - Does the consultant allow the consultee to express feelings of frustration, concern, confusion and acknowledge the reality of those feelings, yet try to keep the consultee's feelings from compounding themselves to the point where the consultee is unable to objectively discuss the problem? Does the consultant relate to the feelings, and then refocus on the problem?
 10. Data Generation - Was the consultant successful in drawing out information which was relevant and helpful in gaining a better understanding of the problem in focus? Did the consultant ask questions which seemed to be "off target" or did not generate information which helped to clarify such things as the specific problem of concern, the onset, frequency, duration, or social context of the problem?
 11. Follow-Through - Did the consultant probe for further information as a result of specific comments by the consultee? Does the consultant start with such phrases as "You said earlier that..." and proceed with a question that draws out additional information which relates to the consultee's earlier statement?
 12. Questioning - Does the consultant phrase questions in such a way that they stimulate the consultee to carefully review the problem or a particular aspect of the problem? Are the questions "closed", i.e., do they allow for essentially a yes or no answer? Are the questions more "open" in structure to facilitate more thought on the part of the consultee in answering them? Does the questioning generally contribute to the effectiveness of the problem-solving process or do they just seem to fall flat?
 13. Summarization - Did the consultant periodically try to summarize or briefly review information or developments to that point? Did the consultant effectively encapsulate several pieces of information into one or two concepts? Did the summarization help to clarify or focus some of the discussion? Was the summarization too frequent so as to interrupt or disrupt the conversation?

14. Thought Clarification - Did the consultant check his/her understanding of comments by the consultee? Did s/he use phrases such as "Do you mean that he...?" or "When you said that he..., did you mean that...?"
15. Problem Clarification - Was the consultant able to identify the specific concern of the consultee? If the consultee expressed more than one concern, was the consultant able to identify or clarify the concern which was of the most importance or highest priority to the consultee? Was the consultant able to clarify specifics relating to the problem in focus, e.g., exactly what behaviors the child exhibited, when the problem occurs, what is happening just before the problem, the onset of the problem, etc.?
16. Strategy Generation - Did the session result in any specific ideas for dealing with or solving the problem under discussion? Strategies might relate to further clarification of the problem and other factors which might be of import.
17. Responsibility - Rather than dictating or using "I think" statements to suggest the strategy to be used, did the consultant help the consultee explore various considerations relating to the most workable solution and its implementation? Did the consultant share information, but not "pressure" the consultee to choose one particular strategy?
18. Follow-Up - Did the consultant impose him- or herself in following up on the session? Did the consultant express a willingness and interest in further contact with the consultee, but leave the decision of whether there should be additional sessions and when to the consultee?
19. Evaluator - Did the consultant make statements which seemed to be evaluative or critical of the consultee, or his/her ideas, actions, or attitudes? Did the consultant non-verbally demonstrate an evaluative attitude through smiles, frowns, body posture, etc.?
20. Consultee Feelings - Did the consultant act more like a counselor or therapist than like a consultant? Did s/he seem to focus more on the feelings of the consultee than on the problem or concern that the consultee was describing? Did the consultant ask questions like "How did that make you feel?", "Does that frustrate you when he acts like that?", or makes statements such as "You seem to be expressing a great deal of anger toward him." The consultee's feelings become the focus, rather than the problem that the consultee wants to discuss.

21. Threat - Did the consultant's questions, statements, or nonverbal actions seem to be threatening to the consultee?
"The principal said you were having a lot of problems and asked if I would stop in and see what I could do." "Have you always had this much trouble with the slower kids?"
"Are you treating him like you do all the other kids?"

APPENDIX F

Guidelines for Administration of Questionnaires

GUIDELINES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Report directly to the principal. Give your name and explain that you are there to administer the questionnaires for Mr. Bossard at the faculty meeting.
2. When introducing the questionnaires to the faculty, explain that (a) they are being asked to participate in a research effort on a volunteer basis, (b) responses will be completely confidential, (c) results will be reported in terms of group averages and not individual responses, and (d) questionnaires will take about 20 minutes to fill out.
3. Hand out the questionnaires; the principal's copy to the principal and the rest to the teachers. Ask them all to read the top agreement form, sign and date it if they agree to participate, and then tear it off and send it in to you immediately. After collecting all of the signed agreement forms, hand out the participant's copy of the agreement form to all of those who want it. (State that results of the entire study will be sent to each of the 12 schools to be posted or whatever. Results will deal with relationships between variables and will not identify individual schools.)
4. Hold up one packet of questionnaires that you have kept for yourself. State that there are 3 questionnaires which have been stapled together in different orders. Each questionnaire is self-explanatory, but note that:
 - (a) The School Psychology Service Delivery Preference Scale (hold it up and ask them to find it) asks that they circle one number and one number only at the bottom.
 - (b) The 30 questions concerning the leader behavior of the principal have a 5 choice format (0, 1, 2, 3, & 4), while
 - (c) The questionnaire that begins with page 71 in its upper right hand corner has a 4 choice format (1, 2, 3, & 4).
 - (d) State that it is very important that every item be answered and that if they have trouble knowing the answer to just put down their "best estimate."
 - (e) Point out the demographic information on p. 72 and ask that they all fill it out so that the researcher has an average description of teachers in each school.
5. Collect all of the completed questionnaires and thank the principal and the faculty for their cooperation.

APPENDIX G

School Psychology Service Delivery
Preference Scale

School Psychology Service Delivery Preference Scale

Suppose a school psychologist was available to provide assistance to you using one of two methods of service delivery. After carefully comparing the descriptions of Method A and Method B below, indicate your preference for one of these methods of school psychology service delivery on the scale provided.

	Method A	Method B
Primary Methods of Evaluation:	Diagnostic tests. Observation of child in testing situation.	Teacher interview. Classroom observation of child and/or classroom events.
Recommendations result primarily from:	School psychologist's expertise in test interpretation.	Problem-solving interactions between the psychologist and the teacher.
Communication of recommendations:	Emphasis on the school psychologist's written report and a meeting(s) between the school psychologist and teacher to explain the school psychologist's conclusions for recommending the child's problem.	Emphasis on ongoing interactions between the school psychologist and the teacher for purposes of collaboratively developing and revising solutions for the presenting problem.

We recognize that your preference for Method A or Method B will vary according to the specifics of each presenting problem. Please circle the number (one number only) below which most closely corresponds to your preference for either Method A or Method B for the majority of cases for which you would seek assistance from a school psychologist.

Strongly Prefer Method A	Moderately Prefer Method A	Slightly Prefer Method A	Neutral	Slightly Prefer Method B	Moderately Prefer Method B	Strongly Prefer Method B
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX H

Operational Definition of Consultation Contacts

Operational Definition of Consultation Contacts

1. The following should be counted as consultation contacts:
 - A. The contact may be with a single consultee or a group of consultees. There must be a problem focus (student problems, organizational problems), and the consultant must take an active part in either problem-solving or process consultation.
 - B. Each problem focused upon will be counted as a consultation contact. Thus, there may be several consultation contacts within a single meeting between consultant and consultee.
 - C. Not only will initial consultation contacts be counted, but all followup contacts concerning a particular problem will be counted, as long as they can be considered one of the steps of the problem-solving sequence.

2. The following should not be counted as consultation contacts:
 - A. Any inservice or explanation to individuals about the consultation model of service delivery.
 - B. Attending regularly scheduled faculty or group meetings unless there is a problem focus at that meeting and the consultant has taken an active part in problem-solving or as a process consultant.
 - C. Consultant's attendance at social functions.
 - D. Exchanging greetings.

APPENDIX I
Consultation Record Form

Consultation Contact Record

Consultant: _____

Consultee: _____

Focus: _____

Date: _____

Facts of Consultation:

Interpretation of Events:

Planned Follow-up: