Relationship Among Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI^2) and Job
Satisfaction of Tennessee School Psychologists

by

Mark Alan Warner

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University

December 2018

Thesis Committee:

Monica Wallace, Ph.D., Chair

James O. Rust, Ph.D.

Aimee Holt, Ph.D.

Greg Schmidt, Ph.D., Psychology Department Chair

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This study is a continuation of a previous master's thesis. Wrenn (2012) found no significant difference among school psychologists' level of job satisfaction when considering the level of involvement in Response to Intervention (RtI). Results from Wrenn (2012) revealed that 67% of Tennessee school psychologists were either *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied* in their profession. In the fall of 2014, the Tennessee Department of Education (TNDOE) mandated the implementation of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI^2) for all districts. The purpose of the present study was to determine if 2012 job satisfaction levels had changed since TNDOE's 2014 mandatory implementation of RtI^2 in Tennessee. Results of the present study did not reveal a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction when comparing survey results collected pre- and post-mandatory implementation of RtI^2. Compared to Wrenn's (2012) job satisfaction results of 67% being *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied,* the present study resulted in 78.1% of Tennessee school psychologists being *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied* in their position.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

For some time now, it has been reported that the role of a school psychologist is changing. Although these changes are reported as occurring nationwide, autonomy of individual states impacts the rate and degree of change in responsibility at the state, district, school and even at the individual practitioner level. School psychology professionals have voiced feelings of both optimism (Braden, DiMarino-Linnen, & Good, 2001) and uncertainty (Reynolds & Shaywitz, 2009) considering these changes. Some school psychologists have expressed concerns about possible loss of professional identity as roles continue to shift and expand. In contrast, many approach these shifting roles with optimism stemming from various reasons. For example, some feel restricted in their current roles (Braden, DiMarino-Linnen, & Good, 2001). At the individual level, a shift in professional roles of school psychologists will be perceived differently depending on whether they prefer either a traditional role, or if they are eager to expand their professional responsibilities.

Roles and responsibilities not only change in form, they can also be added or removed, all of which commonly alter routine due to necessary adjustments regarding time allocation. Uncertainty, or fear of the unknown, often increases anxiety (Jensen, Cohen, Mennin, Fresco, & Heimburg, 2016; Todd, Forstmann, Burgmer, Brooks, & Galinsky, 2015). As such, uncertainty of potential changes in routine likely has a direct impact on job satisfaction. Further, the assumption of additional responsibilities being

added to an already tight schedule could trigger sentiments of resentment and unappreciation. However, new challenges may encourage many professionals. These professionals may approach the mentioned uncertainties as opportunities for professional growth.

The critical importance of job satisfaction is not merely a logical assumption. A plethora of information related to this topic can be seen in the literature when searching the PSYCH Info data base. From 1950 to present, more than 80% of articles that target job-related attitude discuss job satisfaction (Judge, Weiss, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Hulin, 2017). Further, literature from 1990 to present has frequently presented job satisfaction and organizational commitment in tandem (Judge et al., 2017). As commitment represents a "value-based appraisal" of an entity, commitment to a job is directly tied to one's values (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). Therefore, effort applied toward a job is sustained through time when one is committed to the job (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Judge et al., 2017). In contrast, if job satisfaction trends in a downward spiral over time, commitment simultaneously wanes, often resulting in one exiting their job (Bentein, Vandenberghe, Vandenberg, & Stinglhamber, 2005).

Expanding upon the earlier statements regarding job satisfaction being interlaced with commitment, it is important to understand current levels of job satisfaction. A satisfied school psychologist can impact children in a positive manner. The opposite is also true as the dissatisfied school psychologist can impact children in a negative manner. Since the welfare of children is at stake, it is also important to identify and consider current and pending role changes of the profession. Doing so allows for the consideration

of how newly implemented responsibilities may impact job satisfaction – an impact

which ultimately touches the lives of vulnerable children. Comparing current and prior

levels of job satisfaction may proactively reveal declining job satisfaction, thus

presenting an opportunity to turn around this trend. Historically, role expansions to the

school psychologist profession have been positively correlated with job satisfaction

(Huebner, 1993). For example, Huebner (1993) found that school psychologists spending

less time on individual psychological assessments and additional time in activities related

to direct intervention (e.g., individual and group counseling) was positively correlated

with job satisfaction. Further, school psychologists spending additional time in indirect

intervention activities (e.g., consultation) was also positively correlated with job

satisfaction (Huebner (1993). Brown, Holcombe, Bolen, and Thompson (2006) presented

further corroboration of these results, where a survey of school psychologists revealed

that they would prefer to spend more time on direct and indirect interventions,

collaborating with other agencies, and professional development activities associated

with an expanded role.

From a historical perspective, school psychologists' responsibilities have

predominately consisted of psycho-educational assessment (Fagan & Wise, 1994).

Although role changes are common to most jobs, they often result in minimal impact to

daily responsibilities (Todd et al., 2015). As discussed in Burns and Coolong-Chaffin

(2006), it is extremely likely that the implementation of RtI will expand the traditional

roles of school psychologists. This stated, I was curious about the level of involvement

Tennessee school psychologists have with Response to Intervention (RtI) model, how

they are adapting to new roles, and how the new roles have impacted job satisfaction both

positively or negatively. Per the Tennessee Department of Education's *Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI²) Framework*,

> "The RtI² framework is a model that promotes recommended practices for an integrated system connecting general and special education by the use of high-quality, scientifically research-based instruction and intervention. The RtI² framework is a three-tier model that provides an ongoing process of instruction and interventions that allow students to make progress at all levels, particularly those students who are struggling or advancing." (Tennessee Department of Education, 2017, p. 16).

In my opinion, Tennessee's 2013 policy change, which mandated the implementation of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI²) in fall of 2014, is likely to largely expand the roles and responsibilities of Tennessee school psychologists. As such, this study surveyed Tennessee school psychologists regarding current job satisfaction, roles, and responsibilities. A comparison was made between current job satisfaction survey results and job satisfaction survey results from Wrenn's (2012) thesis project sample of school psychologists practicing in Tennessee schools prior to the mandatory RtI² implementation.

Changing and Expanding Roles of School Psychologists

RtI implementation is a massive undertaking and a philosophical shift in how to support struggling students while identifying those with learning disabilities and is expected to expand the roles and functions of school psychologists by requiring a "substantive shift from traditional roles" (Crepeau-Hobson & Sobel, 2010). Crepeau-

Hobson and Sobel (2010) identified potential new roles for school psychologists that may include district-wide design and implementation of RtI models with school boards, administrators, and teachers. School psychologists may be required to provide professional development surrounding RtI to school staff, assist in devising new methods of assessment, and evaluate the effectiveness of RtI via program fidelity measures (Canter, 2006). As RtI becomes more prolific in today's school systems, Burns and Coolong-Chaffin (2006) also discuss the importance of assessing the fidelity of interventions, consulting with parents, teachers, and administrators, serving on district curriculum selection committees, evaluating progress monitoring, and reviewing/evaluating academic screening data to identify specific subject knowledge/ability deficits.

RtI in Tennessee

Shortly following the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA), schools began considering options surrounding identification and remediation models for low achieving children (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005). Of primary consideration was the Responsive to Intervention (RtI) model (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005). RtI was envisioned to fulfill aspects of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), such as to identify and assist low achieving students in general, remedial, and special education, restrict intervention and instruction practices to scientifically based research practices, establish and maintain a proactive, or preventative stance regarding academic problems, and improve educational results for all children (Reschly, 2008).

Aligning with the concept of RtI introduced by IDEIA in 2004, Tennessee legislature mandated the integration of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI^2) in 2013 for all districts within the state. Implementation of this new regulation began in Fall of 2014. RtI^2 is intended to both identify and address low achievers using a preventative model and research-based early intervention strategies (Reschly, 2008). An enormous capital investment included state-wide training, technical assistance, and the addition of reading interventionists and RtI specialists throughout the state. As part of *Tennessee Succeeds*, the Tennessee Department of Education planned to further invest in the continued improvement of RtI^2 (e.g., increased monitoring and support, and collection and provision of specific, useable data), as well as, provide additional RtI^2 guidance and training (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016).

An RtI^2 progress update distributed by the Tennessee Department of Education reported that the rate of students being identified with Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) prior to the implementation of RtI^2 was approximately 15 of every 1,000 students (Tennessee Department of Education, 2018). Further, Tennessee Department of Education (2018) reported that males were identified twice as often as females, and minority students were identified at a rate of 1.5 times greater than non-minorities. However, following TNDOE's mandatory implementation of RtI^2, the number of students identified with an SLD initially dropped to 5 in 1,000 before leveling off at approximately 9 in 1,000 students (Tennessee Department of Education, 2018). Regarding identification rates among both males versus females and minorities versus non-minorities, Tennessee Department of Education (2018) reports that gaps existing

between the groups prior to mandatory implementation of RtI[2] have for the most part

disappeared.

Criticism Surrounding RtI

As previously discussed, Reschly, (2008) reported the expectations of RtI are to

identify and address low achievers in public education. However, this does not equate to

eradicating educational problems in the public school system. The RtI process is

conceptualized as a form of service delivery (Reynolds & Shaywitz, 2009). As with any

set of processes, however, there are concerns or flaws. Two of many potential concerns

are scalability and quality control.

First, scalability is the ability of something to adapt to increased demands

(Dictionary.com). While RtI is a collection of educational processes, a major criticism is

that the research underlying RtI processes was performed in small, highly controlled

environments that greatly differ from the breadth of public education settings (Reynolds

& Shaywitz, 2009). Any elaborate set of processes, system, or method contains flaws. A

more realistic consideration is to ponder how best to remediate the inevitable flaws of RtI

when applied to a scale as infinitely diverse as public education (Reynolds & Shaywitz,

2009).

For example, the average laptop computer is often sufficient to perform most

duties required by home users and employees. Its portability and versatility allow the user

to access its programs and abilities in a number of physical locations. However, although

versatile, powerful, and portable, the average laptop remains insufficient for power users,

such as those using resource-intense graphic design or three-dimensional engineering

software suites. In other words, just because the laptop is sufficient in smaller, average settings, the laptop is not the technological cure all for personal computing – nor is it expected to be. Similar to this analogy, Reynolds and Shaywitz (2009) presents the perspective that RtI processes applied in small, controlled environments fail to capture the broad scope of public education.

A second limitation the RtI process must address is quality control. The RtI term for quality control is treatment fidelity, or treatment integrity (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). To ensure each student's success, RtI implementation guides are distributed to school personnel. These implementation guides are meant to standardize RtI processes for public school systems in areas such as school-wide problem solving and practical decision-making tools (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). A lack of quality control renders any set of processes to mere idealism.

Treatment fidelity is a fundamental requirement of RtI implementation. Fidelity of instructional delivery means that an academic intervention is being executed as intended by the designer (Gresham, MacMillan, Beebe-Frankenberger, & Bocian, 2000). Teachers are required to progress monitor the progress of their students following standardized procedures, and to provide instruction using evidence-based methods to maintain treatment fidelity (Bianco, 2010, p.6). Fidelity monitoring occurs at each of the three RtI tiers and must focus on both the programs implemented and the students themselves (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). Some areas monitored for treatment fidelity as suggested by the implementation guide are as follows: universal screening and benchmarking, progress monitoring of those receiving intervention,

intervention planning, instructional lesson plans, and reporting procedures. As discussed in the next section, this manual discusses specific roles of the school psychologist, such as fidelity monitoring at Tiers 2 and 3.

A critical factor to keep in mind is that regardless of how RtI is presented, it is not a fix for education. As such, RtI is not without criticism. Humans are extremely complex beings. Palmer (2007) states, "The students we teach are larger than life and even more complex" (p.2). Further, education is complex. It is not possible to reduce complex phenomena of which the sum of the phenomena itself is greater than its compilation of parts (Davis, 2003, p.43). Therefore, effectively educating humanity requires educators to acknowledge that anything less than a fluid, multifaceted approach remains an insufficient approach.

School Psychologist Roles within the RtI² Framework

Tennessee Department of Education (2016) discusses specific roles of the school psychologist. Regarding treatment fidelity, for example, school psychologists are responsible for reviewing progress monitoring data for Tier 2, Tier 3, and special education academic interventions. The time involved in monitoring student progress may vary depending on the student's actual gains. For example, flat or minimal progress could be due to a variety of factors, such as using non-research-based interventions, poor implementation of the correct intervention, inaccurate assessment of student progress, student's level of motivation, etc. As such, school psychologists may be required to spend an increased amount of time performing root-cause analyses to determine why the student continues to underperform academically.

Other possible roles for school psychologists are as follows: ensure fidelity of research-based interventions at Tiers 2 and 3 via collaborating with school-based teams, evaluation of interventionist implementation, serve on teams surrounding Specific Learning Disability (SLD) referrals, consult with teachers about research-based curriculum, perform gap analyses to monitor progress and/or suggest changes to interventions, provide in-service training surrounding RtI^2 intervention guidelines, and perform/interpret educational assessments for students flagged with potential intervention needs (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). I believe one new and time-consuming responsibility introduced by RtI^2 likely involves the school psychologist's role in SLD evaluations due to the current SLD form required in Tennessee. Regarding academic interventions, I was curious which roles school psychologists and RtI interventionists have been tasked. For example, RtI specialists and reading interventionists may handle much of teacher consultation that school psychologists were thought to do. If so, the supposed new roles of the school psychologist may not be as expansive as once considered.

Measures of Job Satisfaction

A modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) is frequently used to measure unique domains of job satisfaction. Weiss, Davis, England, and Lofquist (1967) report these twenty domains are: *Ability Utilization, Achievement, Activity, Advancement, Authority, Company Policies and Practices, Compensation, Co-Workers, Creativity, Independence, Moral Values, Recognition, Responsibility, Security, Social Service, Social Status, Supervision – Human Resources, Supervision – Technical, Variety, and Working Conditions*. The MSQ was modified from its original version by

changing 21 of the 100 questions to increase face validity (e.g., changing the word

company to *school*) for school psychologists (Weiss et al., 1967).

Muchinsky (2000) reports that The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) is also a measure

widely used when researching job satisfaction. As such, Reschly and Wilson (1995) used

the JDI's five organized scales to compare previous studies about job satisfaction for

school psychologists. The five organized scales are: *Work, Supervision, Colleagues,*

Promotion, and Pay. The *Work* scale was comprised of descriptors such as, dull, a source

of pleasure, or tiresome. The *Supervision* scale was comprised of descriptors such as,

hard to please or tactful. The *Colleagues* scale was comprised of descriptors such as, talks

too much or helpful. The *Promotion* scale included descriptors like regular promotions or

a dead-end job. Finally, the *Work* scale included descriptors like bad or high income.

Reschly and Wilson (1995) modified the JDI job satisfaction survey by keeping the five

scales, but reducing the number of total questions. Both the current study and Wrenn

(2012) used scales and questions identical to those used by Reschly and Wilson.

Previous Surveys of School Psychologist Job Satisfaction

Surveys surrounding job satisfaction for school psychologists go as far back as the

1980s. Survey results reported by Miller, Witt, and Finley (1981) were indicative of the

dissatisfaction of school psychologists due to continued, extensive volume of

psychoeducational assessment. Miller et al. (1981) survey results also showed

dissatisfaction surrounding minimal, if any, counseling opportunities and school staff's

skewed perceptions of the school psychologist's role.

A survey by Levinson (1990) included 362 school psychologists in the state of Pennsylvania. To obtain a measure of the participants' level of job satisfaction, the modified version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used. Regarding job satisfaction ratings of the participants, role function comprised more than 33% of the variance. Further, when Levinson (1990) accounted for perceived control of the school psychologist, the study combined this perceived control with the 33% variance of role function, ultimately accounting for variance of just under 50%.

Huebner (1993) reported that the roles of school psychologists supporting 7th – 12th grades varied to a larger degree than those supporting primary schools. Although assessment was still reported to be extensive, school psychologists supporting secondary schools were also directly and indirectly involved in intervention planning. Huebner (1993) concluded that with increased responsibilities, job satisfaction for these school psychologists was found to be higher.

VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006) reviewed a variety of research studies regarding school psychologists' job satisfaction. They identified two areas that were negatively correlated with job satisfaction; (1) School System Policies, and (2) Practices and Advancement. Since school psychologists work within predefined school policies and practices, VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006) reported that school psychologists likely perceive their given responsibilities as being out of their control. In contrast to these two areas of job dissatisfaction, role expansion of school psychologists was correlated with increased job satisfaction (VanVoorhis & Levinson, 2006). Some school systems actually advocate for a broader set of responsibilities for their school psychologists. Hagemeier, Bishchoff, Jacobs, and Osmon (1998) performed a study where the results indicated

school personnel welcomed input surrounding the development and implementation of intervention by their school psychologists.

A meta-analysis performed by VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006) also revealed that 84% of school psychologists were either "*satisfied* or *very satisfied* with their current jobs." All jobs will have an element of dissatisfaction. However, as the VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006) results show, an element of dissatisfaction does not equate to overall job dissatisfaction. In fact, this study revealed that school psychologists are much more satisfied with their jobs than many American workers. As discussed by VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006), compared to the 84% of school psychologists reporting being either satisfied or very satisfied, American workers as a whole reported a mere 51% were satisfied with their job.

Brown et al., (2006) performed a study yielding similar results to VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006), which reported that 82% of 97 school psychologists practicing in a southeastern urban area rated their job satisfaction as *Satisfied*. Further, an additional 7.5% rated their job satisfaction as *Very Satisfied* (Brown et al., 2006). Similar to prior research, Brown et al. (2006) also used the modified MSQ to measure job satisfaction of 97 school psychologists.

Although school psychologists in the Brown et al. (2006) study had roles and responsibilities that expanded well beyond performing psychoeducational assessments (e.g., intervention development, counseling, etc.), many of the school psychologists continued to primarily perform assessments. In summary, just under 90% were either *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied*, none were categorized as *Dissatisfied*, and only 10.4% were

Very Dissatisfied. When comparing the participants' expanded roles in the Brown et al. (2006) to the traditional roles of participants in Worrell, Skaggs and Brown (2006), those with expanded roles had a higher level of job satisfaction.

A limitation of the Brown et al. (2006) study was the school psychologists included in the sample were assigned to a single elementary school. This differs from many school psychologists that have more than one school, and the possibility that the multiple schools supported by a single school psychologist may be comprised of both primary and secondary grades. Many school psychologists in Tennessee fit one, if not both, of these two criteria (multiple schools and/or primary and secondary grades). A limitation of VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006) is that the study only included school psychologists that were employed full time.

Prior to Tennessee mandating RtI^2, results from Wrenn's thesis project (2012) were consistent with Williams and Williams' (1990) research, showing the majority (67%) of school psychologists were either *Very Satisfied* (36%) or *Satisfied* (31%) with their jobs. Regarding the relationship between RtI involvement and job satisfaction, there was not a significant difference among the four groups (e.g., *Satisfied, Very Satisfied, Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied*) and the level of RtI involvement. However, for the 126 respondents from the Middle Tennessee region, there was an upward trend of job satisfaction as RtI involvement increased (Wrenn, 2012). Similar to results from Brown, Hohenshil, and Brown (1998), showing approximately 92% of respondents were planning to remain in the field of school psychology within five years, Wrenn (2012) showed that 93.7% of respondents planned to remain in school psychology for the next five years. The

study also reported that school psychologists in urban areas had the highest job satisfaction ($n = 47$, $M = 85.75$, $SD = 9.95$), followed by those in rural areas ($n = 30$, $M = 85.27$, $SD = 12.60$). The mean scores (e.g., 85.75, etc.) were extracted from twenty-five combined 5-point Likert scale items with a possible range of 1 – 125, where 125 was the highest possible job satisfaction rating.

Respondents in both the Wrenn (2012) and Reschly and Wilson (1995) studies reported being *Satisfied* on the Co-Workers Scale. Consistent with prior research, both studies also reported respondents were *Dissatisfied* on the *Promotion* scale (e.g., promotions within the field of school psychology). Wrenn (2012) purports that education received by school psychologists relegates them to their particular field, and further education would be required to assume administrative positions (e.g., acquiring an additional degree in school administration and supervision to be considered for an assistant principal position). Although Reschly's respondents were *Satisfied* on the Work and Supervision Scales, Wrenn's (2012) sample was *Neutral* for these two scales. An important difference between these two studies is the Wrenn's (2012) sample only included Tennessee practicing school psychologists, and Reschly's sample collected data from school psychologists nationwide. Regarding internal consistency, Wrenn's (2012) Job Satisfaction survey had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.85.

Regarding RtI survey data by Wrenn (2012), on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 representing *Never* and 5 representing *Very Often*, school psychologists in Tennessee spent the majority of their time performing *Team Collaboration* ($M = 3.5$). This was followed by both *Serving Individual Students* ($M = 3.29$) and assisting with *System*

Design (*M* = 2.26). These findings were contradictory to prior research, where the

psychoeducational assessment component of *Serving Individual Students* consumed the

majority of school psychologists' time. Regarding internal consistency, Wrenn's (2012)

RtI survey had a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.89.

Watkins, Crosby, and Pearson (2001) reported that school psychologists have

consistently reported their desire to increase time spent in various services, such as

collaboration and intervention. As such, the majority of Wrenn's (2012) job satisfaction

ratings being *Satisfied* and *Very Satisfied* are unsurprising because school psychologists

in Tennessee have been able to increase time spent in *Team Collaboration* activities.

However, unlike national samples used in other research, job satisfaction ratings from

Wrenn's (2012) survey were limited to the state of Tennessee. Another limitation of

Wrenn's survey is that the concept of RtI was new to Tennessee school psychologists and

the implementation of RtI was optional to Tennessee school districts. Therefore, the

number of school psychologists working within a school district using RtI was unknown.

Purpose of the Current Study

Since RtI has become mandatory in Tennessee, no studies are known to have

measured the extent to which roles have expanded and/or changed, and how these

expanded roles correlate with job satisfaction for school psychologists in Tennessee.

Surveys were sent to practicing school psychologists in Tennessee to gauge their current

level of job satisfaction, and to gauge whether they perceived their roles have changed

substantially since the state of Tennessee's mandatory implementation of RtI[2]. The

demographics and general information portion of the survey helped identify school

psychologists' perception of whether roles had changed substantially, and the RtI portion

of the survey measure whether roles and responsibilities of *Serving Individual Students*

had changed (e.g., consulting with teachers and parents, student observations,

assessments, etc.). The balance of the survey focused on job satisfaction of these school

psychologists and their perception of their supervisor and other school staff being

supportive of their expanded roles.

Hypothesis

1. The level of job satisfaction of Tennessee School Psychologists has changed

    significantly from 67% being either *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied* (Wrenn, 2012) since

    the state of Tennessee mandated the implementation of RtI^2.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Participants selected for this study were school psychologists currently practicing in the middle Tennessee area. Participants did not include private examiners, part-time examiners, or university faculty.

Procedures

I sent an email to Special Education Directors in the middle Tennessee area and members of the Tennessee Association of School Psychologists (TASP). This email included a cover letter addressed to practicing school psychologists requesting participation in my research. This email also asked the Special Education Directors to forward the participation request email to each school psychologist within their respective district. See Appendix B for a copy of the cover letter sent to potential participants. A hyperlink was embedded in the email, as well. Selecting this hyperlink opened a web browser and automatically connected each participant to https://www.qualtrics.com where they completed the survey. All data entered into the https://www.qualtrics.com survey site by participants was captured and managed and the data was stored in a secure database. The online survey was available for two weeks. Following the survey's expiration, all participant data collected was extracted from the database. Following this data extraction, the data was imported into Microsoft Excel to prepare pertinent data for statistical analysis in JASP version 0.9.0.1.

Note: Procedures used in this study were modeled after Wrenn (2012).

Measure

This study used a survey that was comprised of the following three sections: (1) a demographics and general information questionnaire, (2) a job satisfaction measure, and (3) a component specific to Response to Intervention (RtI). Wrenn (2012) originally created the demographics and general information questionnaire by collecting various demographic-related questions from previous studies. I modified this questionnaire to include items pertinent to post-implementation of Tennessee's requirement that districts perform the RtI process. The Reschly and Wilson (1995) job satisfaction measure used in the present study is identical to the version modified by Wrenn (2012). The third component of questions specific to RtI is based on a modified publication by NASP (2006). This publication discussed potential changes in responsibility and role expansion of school psychologists while serving individual students, assisting with system design, and performing team collaboration.

Section one: Survey of demographics and general information. The first section of the survey asked 15 specific questions related to demographics and general, nonidentifiable information for each participant. Information captured in this section included: (a) gender; (b) age; (c) current degree status of participant; (d) the number of full-time school psychologists employed by the school district; (e) an estimated ratio of school psychologists to students; (f) an approximated percentage of time spent annually on a variety of tasks (e.g., assessment, team meetings, etc.); (g) type of community surrounding the participant's school (e.g., rural, city, etc.); (h) whether the participant plans to remain a school psychologist for the next five years; (i) type of position direct supervisor holds; (j) whether the participant is interested in administrative positions; (k) a

question to see how the participant views their overall level of job satisfaction as a school psychologist; (l) whether their roles have substantially changed since the implementation of RtI^2; (m) the number of schools the school psychologist serves; (n) the number of positions open in the respondent's district; and (o) the number of RtI^2 Interventionists in each of the respondent's schools. See Appendix C for a copy of this survey.

Section two: Survey of job satisfaction. The second section of the survey measured job satisfaction of Tennessee school psychologists. This portion of the survey was originally created by Reschly and Wilson (1995) and adapted by Wrenn (2012). Only the Job Satisfaction Scales section of Reschly and Wilson (1995) were used in this study. A request to Whitney Wrenn Haley, Ed.S. NCSP asking permission to use her adapted version was granted. The Job Satisfaction Scales section was comprised of five subscales: (a) Colleagues; (b) Work; (c) Supervision; (d) Pay; and (e) Promotion. A Likert scale was used to measure job satisfaction for 25 questions. Rating options for items on the Likert scale were 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Agree*, and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. See Appendix D for a copy of this survey.

Colleagues subscale. The *Colleagues* subscale was comprised of five questions that measured perceptions of involvement among school psychologists and their colleagues: (a) item 5, working well together; (b) item 10, having good rapport; (c) item 15, being interesting; (d) item 21, being supportive of their professional work and personal development; and (e) item 25, being capable.

Work subscale. The *Work* subscale was comprised of five questions that measured work perceptions of each school psychologist: (a) item 1, having a sense of

accomplishment; (b) item 6, challenging work; (c) item 11, satisfying work; (d) item 16, performing routine work; and (e) item 20, performing tasks that fully represent their capabilities.

Supervision subscale. The *Supervision* subscale was comprised of five questions that measured various perceptions of the supervision of each school psychologist: (a) item 4, having a competent supervisor; (b) item 9, having the correct amount of supervision; (c) item 14, having a supervisor who offers both constructive criticism and good suggestions; (d) item 18, having a supportive supervisor; and (e) item 24, evaluating interpersonal skills of supervisor.

Pay subscale. The *Pay* subscale was comprised of five questions that measured each school psychologist's perception of pay: (a) item 2, having adequate pay that meets their needs; (b) item 7, salary satisfaction; (c) item 12, believing compensation matches type of work and level of education; (d) item 17, having adequate employer benefits; and (e) item 22, feeling salary is sufficient compared to effort applied to their job.

Promotion subscale. The *Promotion* subscale was comprised of five questions that measured each school psychologist's perceptions of promotion ability: (a) item 3, limited opportunities; (b) item 8, promotion decisions; (c) item 13, promotions based on productivity and quality of work; (d) item 19, increased efficiency leading to promotion; and (e) item 23, promotion frequency of other school psychologists.

Section Three: Survey of response to intervention (RtI). The final section of the survey measured the level of school psychologists' involvement with RtI and perception of school psychologists' expanded roles. This section of the survey was

originally published in 2006 by the National Association of School Psychologists, titled

The Role of the School Psychologist in the RtI Process. It was later adapted by Wrenn

(2012) with her thesis advisor's assistance. For example, Wrenn (2012) converted each

bullet point into statements allowing them to be rated on a Likert scale. To improve

readability of statements, some were reworded by Wrenn (2012). Finally, efforts to

eliminate redundancy included removing statements containing content that had been

previously stated. The RtI survey was comprised of the same three areas (e.g., System

Design, Team Collaboration, and Serving Individual Students) as Wrenn (2012) and two

additional areas specific to respondents' perception. Together, the five areas in the RtI

survey section are as follows: (a) System Design; (b) Team Collaboration; (c) Serving

Individual Students; (d) Perception of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI^2);

and (e) Perception of Role Expansion. Multiple bullet points specific to school

psychologists' roles were listed under each of the five areas.

The Likert scale used for the first three areas, System Design, Team

Collaboration, and Serving Individual Students, was as follows: 1 = *Never*; 2 = *Once or

Twice*; 3 = *Sometimes*; 4 = *Regularly*; and 5 = *Very Often*. This Likert scale was selected

to measure the frequency behaviors were performed by the school psychologist. The

Likert scale used for the last two areas, Perception of RtI^2 and Perception of Role

Expansion, was as follows: 1 = *Strongly Disagree;* 2 = *Somewhat Disagree;* 3 = *Neutral;*

4 = *Somewhat Agree;* and 5 = *Strongly Agree.* This Likert scale was selected to measure

perceptions of the school psychologist. See Appendix E for a copy of the Response to

Intervention survey.

System design. *System design* was targeted by question numbers one through three. As referenced in Wrenn (2012), school psychologists are known within the school as highly qualified professionals that are able to assist in the development, implementation, and evaluation of system-level service delivery models.

Team collaboration. *Team collaboration* was targeted by question numbers four and five. NASP (2010) encourages school psychologists to undertake leadership roles and responsibilities that involve collaboration. Examples of these consultative roles are being a liaison between the school and providers or agencies of the community, overseeing data-based decision making, and consulting with teachers and parents for early behavioral and academic intervention. (NASP, 2010, pg. 25).

Serving individual students. *Serving individual students* was targeted by question numbers six through thirteen. NASP (2010) emphasizes the importance of school psychologists continuing to serve individual students throughout the implementation of the RtI framework. The Serving Individual Students subscale was comprised of responsibilities and roles, such as developing progress monitoring goals for individual students, student observation within the classroom, consultation with teachers and parents regarding school and home interventions respectively, evaluating student progress for those receiving special education services, and individual assessment (e.g., cognitive, behavioral, academic).

Perception of RtI^2 Implementation. *Perception of RtI^2 Implementation* was targeted by question numbers fourteen through twenty. As stated in Reschly (2008), the original vision of the RtI process was to identify and assist students who struggled to

achieve in general education, remedial (e.g., early intervention, targeted intervention, etc.), and special education. Further, RtI was to be limited to scientifically-based research practices and implemented in a proactive manner for all children. The Perception of RtI^2 Implementation subscale was comprised of how school psychologists feel RtI^2 benefits their school (e.g., positive impact on student academics), their perception of RtI^2 being implemented with fidelity, and perceptions concerning SLD evaluation documentation (e.g., cumbersome, efficient, etc.).

Perception of role expansion. *Perception of role expansion* was targeted by question numbers twenty-one through thirty. Results from Miller et al. (1981) reported that school psychologists' minimal counseling opportunities correlate with school staff's inaccurate perceptions of the school psychologist's role. The Perception of Role Expansion subscale was comprised of academic intervention involvement, if administrators and teachers understand the roles of school psychologists are changing, if supervisors support these changing roles, and if school staff views the school psychologists as a resource in various areas.

Data Analysis

Data was entered into https://www.qualtrics.com by each respondent. Collected data was then exported into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Respondents answering seventy-two of the seventy-eight survey questions (i.e., answered 97.5% of the questions) were included in the results. Missing values were specified. The data export program automatically accounted for skipped items by recording a "-99" for missing data. The researcher replaced all instances of "-99" with a blank entry to prevent inadvertent

miscalculations within JASP version 0.9.0.1. This indicated an item was skipped by the respondent. Following the data export process from www.Qualtrics.com, quality control was performed to verify internal consistency of related variables. Prior to importing data into JASP version 0.9.0.1, job satisfaction survey items: 2, 3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, and 25 were reverse scored. Remaining items were scored using the exact rating selected by the respondent. Upon completion of the quality control process, data was exported to JASP version 0.9.0.1 for analysis.

In order to identify the mean value of all survey items, the means procedure was performed first. In order to identify the frequency and percentages of individual answer categories, the frequency procedure was performed next. To measure internal consistency, a Cronbach's alpha calculation was performed on job satisfaction survey and its five factors. A Cronbach's alpha calculation was also performed on the Response to Intervention surveys and its five factors.

The demographics survey contained one criterion item, "Overall, how satisfied are you with your position as a school psychologist?" There were four possible answers for the criterion item, and the respondent's answer to this item was used to divide the overall sample into four separate groups: (a) *Very Satisfied*; (b) *Satisfied*; (c) *Dissatisfied*; or (d) *Very Dissatisfied*.

To calculate the total job satisfaction score from Reschly and Wilson's (1995) 25-question Job Satisfaction Scales survey, the ratings were tallied for all of the items. As a whole, each item's score of 1 – 5 was awarded, which equals a total range of 25 – 125 per respondent on the job satisfaction scale. Respondents were then grouped together based

on the demographic survey's criterion item and Reschly and Wilson's 25-question Job Satisfaction Scales survey scale scores. The average score of total job satisfaction was compared of the each of the four groups from the criterion question.

Finally, ratings from the first three sections of the adapted version of school psychologists' involvement with RtI survey (NASP, 2006; Wrenn, 2010), System Design, Team Collaboration, and Serving Individual Students, were also tallied to create each respondent's total Response to Intervention score. This included 13 items, with each item's score of 1 – 5, equaling a total range of 13 – 65. The total RtI scale score represents the frequency school psychologists are involved in each of three primary areas within the RtI framework. The average total RtI score of all respondents was compared to each of the four groups from the criterion question (e.g., *Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Dissatisfied, and Very Dissatisfied*). Finally, RtI survey data was gathered through the Perception of RtI^2 Implementation and the Perception of Role Expansion sections. The data acquired from these latter two RtI survey sections were reported for informative purposes.

The survey questions on the demographics survey used in this study are virtually identical to the surveys used in Wrenn's Thesis Project (2012). The use of identical methods on one particular item provided the option to perform a direct comparison between some of Wrenn's Thesis Project (2012) results and the results of this study. It is this direct comparison that was used to test my hypothesis that job satisfaction has not significantly changed since mandated implementation of RtI^2 in Tennessee. Specifically, data gathered from item number 11 of this current study's demographics survey was

compared to question number 11 on Wrenn's (2012) survey (i.e., "Overall, how satisfied are you with your position as a school psychologist?"). Wrenn's thesis (2012) reported that 67% of respondents were either *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied* with their position as a school psychologist.

Note: Data Analysis of the Job Satisfaction survey used in this study is modeled after Wrenn (2012).

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Below are the obtained results from the present study's survey. Internal

consistency ratings of the job satisfaction and Response to Intervention surveys are

presented first, followed by results from the demographics survey. Overall job

satisfaction levels of participants are discussed third, followed by the results of the

hypothesis testing. The fifth section reports job satisfaction levels of respondents working

in different settings (e.g., suburban, urban, etc.), followed by the results from the Job

Satisfaction and RtI surveys. Finally, the results regarding perception of RtI^2

implementation and role expansion of school psychologists are presented.

Surveys Internal Consistency Ratings

The Job Satisfaction survey in its entirety resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.83.

Cronbach's Alphas for each of this survey's five factors are as follows: *Work* ($\alpha = 0.64$),

Pay ($\alpha = 0.84$)*, Promotion* ($\alpha = 0.68$)*, Supervision* ($\alpha = 0.82$)*, and Coworkers* ($\alpha = 0.77$).

The Response to Intervention survey in its entirety resulted in a Cronbach's Alpha of

0.87. Cronbach's Alphas for each of its five factors are as follows: *System Design* ($\alpha =$

0.75), *Team Collaboration* ($\alpha = 0.74$), Serving Individual Students ($\alpha = 0.75$), *Perception*

of RtI^2 Implementation ($\alpha = 0.74$), and *Perception of Role Expansion* ($\alpha = 0.79$). See

Table 1 for the Cronbach's Alpha ratings for the Job Satisfaction and Response to

Intervention surveys and each of their respective factors.

Respondent Demographics

The sample of school psychologist respondents (n = 119) consisted of 10.1%

males and 89.9% females. Ages of respondents were as follows: under 25 years old

(0.8%), 25-34 years old (37.0%), 35-44 years old (27.7%), 45-54 years old (21.9%), 55-

64 years old (7.6%), and over 64 years old (5.0%). Respondents' education levels were as

follows: 10.1% hold a masters, 9.2% hold a masters plus additional hours, 71.4% hold an

Ed.S., and 9.2% hold a Ph.D. Of the respondents, 26.3% are employed by a school

system in a rural area, 43.2% are employed by a school system in a suburban area, and

30.5% are employed by a school system in an urban setting. See Table 2 for the

respondents' descriptive statistics regarding demographics.

Overall Job Satisfaction Levels

The sample of school psychologists included 84% (n = 100) that plan on

remaining a school psychologist for the next five years, and 16% (n = 19) reported they

do not. The present study's sample also included 68.1% (n = 81) that report their job has

changed substantially since the mandatory implementation of RtI^2, and 30.3% (n = 36)

reported their job has not substantially changed. Regarding the demographics survey's

criterion question (i.e., "Overall, how satisfied are you with your position as a school

psychologist?"), respondent (n = 119) results are as follows: 21.9% (n = 26) were *Very*

Satisfied, 56.3% (n = 67) were *Satisfied,* 18.4% (n = 22) were *Dissatisfied,* and 3.4% (n

= 4) were *Very Dissatisfied.*

Hypothesis Testing

The current study hypothesized that "the level of job satisfaction of Tennessee School Psychologists has changed significantly from 67% being either *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied* (Wrenn, 2012) since the state of Tennessee mandated the implementation of RtI^2." The hypothesis was tested by conducting a two-tailed independent groups *t*-test to determine if job satisfaction had changed significantly, and if so, in which direction. The independent groups *t*-test failed to confirm the researcher's hypothesis, showing there was not a statistically significant difference in Tennessee school psychologists' job satisfaction of the combined *Satisfied* and *Very Satisfied* groups between Wrenn (2012) and the present study (e.g., pre- and post-mandatory implementation of RtI^2), $t(118) = 0.05$, $p = 0.9606$.

Satisfaction Levels in Different Settings

Of the respondents ($n = 26$) in the *Very Satisfied* group, 23.08% worked in a rural area, 50.0% worked in a suburban area, and 23.08% worked in an urban setting. Of the respondents ($n = 67$) in the *Satisfied* group, 29.85% worked in a rural area, 38.81% worked in a suburban area, and 31.34% worked in an urban setting. Of the respondents ($n = 22$) in the *Dissatisfied* group, 22.73% worked in a rural area, 50.0% worked in a suburban area, and 27.27% worked in an urban setting. Of the respondents ($n = 4$) in the *Very Dissatisfied* group, 0.0% worked in a rural area, 25.0% worked in a suburban area, and 75% worked in an urban setting.

Job Satisfaction Survey Category Results

The Job Satisfaction survey was comprised of 25 items. Each item was rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = *Never* to 5 = *Very Often.* Each item's score was tallied with others within the same category and then divided by the category's total number of items to compute a categorical average. Greater categorical averages represent greater job satisfaction in the respective area. The categorical averages of the Job Satisfaction survey are as follows and presented from greatest to least: *Coworkers* ($M = 4.3$), *Supervision* ($M = 4.0$)*, Work* ($M = 3.5$)*, Pay* ($M = 2.8$)*,* and *Promotion* ($M = 2.5$).

Response to Intervention (RtI) Survey Results

The RtI survey was comprised of 36 items. Responses to the first 13 items were tallied to achieve a total RtI score with each item on a scale of 5 = *Very Often,* 4 = *Regularly,* 3 = *Sometimes,* 2 = *Once or Twice,* and 1 = *Never.* Possible total RtI scores range from 13 – 65, with 65 being the highest total RtI score. Greater total RtI scores represent greater overall involvement among the three RtI areas of *System Design, Team Collaboration,* and *Serving Individual Students.* Subsequently, the total RtI scores of all respondents within each of the four job satisfaction groups were averaged. The total RtI score results, representing the overall level of RtI involvement, are as follows for each job satisfaction group: ($n = 119$), (a) *Very Satisfied* ($n = 26, M = 42.96, SD = 8.84$) with response ranges from 25 to 64; *Satisfied* ($n = 67, M = 42.94, SD = 7.46$) with response ranges from 22.0 to 57.0; *Dissatisfied* ($n = 22, M = 41.32, SD = 10.08$) with response ranges from 26.0 to 63.0; and *Very Dissatisfied* ($n = 4, M = 45.25, SD = 11.87$) with response ranges from 30.0 to 59.0.

With the RtI survey's items ranging on a Likert scale from 5 = *Very Often* to 1 = *Never,* the overall level of involvement within each of the *System Design, Team Collaboration,* and *Serving Individual Students* categories were then tallied and averaged. Greater categorical averages represent more time spent performing activities in the respective area. The following 3 categories of the RtI survey were ranked from greatest to least: (*n* = 119), *Serving Individual Students* (*M* = 3.49), *Team Collaboration* (*M* = 2.97), and *System Design* (*M* = 2.96).

Perceptions of RtI^2 Implementation Survey Results

The final two categories of the RtI survey were intended for informational purposes only. As such, the 13 items in the Perceptions of RtI^2 Implementation category were not computed to achieve an overall score. See Table 3 for the percentages of how all respondents rated each item regarding perceptions of RtI^2 implementation. An item of possible importance is that 70.6% of respondents either *Somewhat Agree* or *Strongly Agree* that they are satisfied with the overall concept of RtI^2. Further, 72.3% of respondents either *Somewhat Agree* or *Strongly Agree* that RtI^2 has had a positive impact on student academics. In contrast, only 42.9% *Somewhat Agree* or *Strongly Agree* they are satisfied with their district's RtI^2 implementation.

Perceptions of Role Expansion Survey Results

The 10 items in the Perceptions of Role Expansion category were intended for informational purposes only, and item responses were not computed to achieve an overall score. See Table 4 for the percentages of how all respondents rated each item regarding perceptions of school psychologist role expansion. An item of possible importance is that

less than 38.0% of respondents perceive their administrators understand the expanding roles of school psychologists, and less than 27.0% perceive teachers in their assigned school(s) understand the expanding role. Another item of possible importance is that less than 40.0% of respondents perceive school counselors in their assigned school(s) view school psychologists as capable of providing mental health services to students.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Validity of Surveys

The 25 items of the Job Satisfaction Survey ($\alpha = 0.83$) was comprised of the following five factors: (a) *Work*; (b) *Pay*; (c) *Promotion;* (d) *Supervision*; and (e) *Coworkers.* The first 36 items of the Response to Intervention (RtI) survey ($\alpha = 0.87$) was modified from Wrenn (2012) and was comprised of 5 factors: (a) *Team Collaboration*; (b) *Serving Individual Students*; (c) *System Design*; (d) *Perception of RtI^2 Implementation*; and (e) *Perception of Role Expansion.* Both surveys were shown to be technically adequate to use for research purposes.

Comparison to Previous Research

The results obtained from the Tennessee sample of school psychologists showed that 21.9% were *Very Satisfied* ($n = 26$) and 56.3% were *Satisfied* ($n = 67$)*.* These results are consistent with previous research reporting the majority of school psychologists were, at minimum, *Satisfied* with their current position (Brown, Hohenshil, & Brown, 1998; Reschly & Wilson, 1995; Williams & Williams, 1990; Wrenn, 2012). In addition, 84.0% of the present study's respondents reported they planned to remain in the field for the next five years. Results from the present study are similar to data reported by VanVoorhis and Levinson (2006) and Wrenn (2012). Wrenn (2012) reported than only 6.3% of Tennessee school psychologists planned to leave the field in the next five years. A rise to 16%, based on current survey results, may be related to the aging of the workforce and reflect anticipated retirement plans.

The results from the present study's Job Satisfaction Survey were compared to the results obtained by Reschly and Wilson (1995) and Wrenn (2012). Respondents in the present study, the Reschly and Wilson (1995) study, and Wrenn's (2012) study were *Satisfied* with their *Coworkers.* Similar to Reschly and Wilson (1995), the present study's respondents were *Satisfied* with their *Supervision,* whereas Wrenn's (2012) sample was *Neutral.* Similar to Wrenn (2012), the present study's respondents were *Neutral* with their *Work,* whereas the Reschly sample was *Satisfied.* Also similar to Wrenn's sample, the present study's respondents were *Dissatisfied* with their *Pay,* whereas Reschly's sample was *Neutral.* It is important to note that some of these differences may be due to the present study and Wrenn (2012) only including respondents from Tennessee, while Reschly and Wilson's (1995) sample was comprised of nation-wide respondents.

Reschly's and Wilson's (1995), Wrenn's (2012), and respondents of the current study all were *Dissatisfied* in the area of *Promotion* opportunities. This is unsurprising since previous studies involving school psychologists have reported dissatisfaction with their opportunities regarding promotion within the field (Brown et al., 1998; Levinson, 1990; Reschly and Wilson, 1995; Wrenn (2012). However, it is important to note that 77.3% of the present study's respondents ($n = 119$) did not want to be promoted to a school administrator position. These results are similar to Anderson et al. (1998), which reported that school psychologists are mostly disinterested in a school administration role. Further, Anderson et al. (1998) purports that various career ladders must be investigated which may offer increased job satisfaction levels for school psychologists desiring to remain in the profession.

Response to Intervention Data

The present study's results showed that school psychologists in Tennessee are more involved in the RtI category of *Serving Individual Students* than either *System Design* or *Team Collaboration.* This differs from Wrenn's (2012) study, where respondents were more involved in *Team Collaboration.* The present study and Wrenn (2012) both reported that of the three RtI survey categories, respondents were least involved in *System Design.* Crepeau-Hobson and Sobel (2010) reported new legislation would likely require a "substantive shift from traditional roles." However, even with expanded roles following TNDOE's mandatory implementation of RtI^2, it seems as though Tennessee school psychologists are still spending the majority of their time in the more traditional school psychologist role of student assessment. The *Serving Individual Students* category is predominately comprised of traditional school psychologist roles (e.g., student observation and assessment, student data collection, etc.). Of the three RtI survey categories shown in the following data, greater categorical averages represent more time spent performing activities in the respective area: ($n = 119$), *Serving Individual Students* ($M = 3.49$), *Team Collaboration* ($M = 2.97$)*, and System Design* ($M = 2.96$)*.

Perceptions of RtI^2 Implementation

Respondents in the present study reported being more involved in RtI roles that fit within the survey's *Serving Individual Students* category. However, the *Serving Individual Students* category includes additional time-consuming tasks beyond working directly with children. One additional component in this category involves time spent writing assessment reports. In the RtI survey's Perceptions of RtI^2 implementation

section, 60.5% of respondents reported they either *Somewhat Agree* or *Strongly Agree* that Tennessee's required Specific Learning Disability (SLD) evaluation form reduces the amount of time that could be spent working with other children. It seems that even though Tennessee school psychologists report being more involved in the *Serving Individual Students* category, completing Tennessee's required SLD evaluation report form consumes time that could otherwise be spent working directly with students. These results are consistent with my assumption discussed in the above literature review regarding RtI^2 and SLD evaluations, and specifically about Tennessee's required current SLD report form introducing a time-consuming responsibility for school psychologists.

While 70.6% of respondents reported they either *Somewhat Agree* or *Strongly* agree they are satisfied with the concept of RtI^2, only 42.9% of respondents report being satisfied with their school district's overall implementation of RtI^2. This discrepancy between concept and actual implementation is of concern, particularly since 43.7% of respondents reported they either *Strongly Disagreed* or *Somewhat Disagreed* with the item stating RtI^2 fidelity is appropriately carried out in their school(s). As discussed in Gresham et al., (2000), treatment fidelity, also known as quality control, is a fundamental requirement of RtI implementation where instructional delivery must be carried out in a manner that it was both designed for and how it was intended to be presented. However, as reported in Tennessee Department of Education (2018), it is important to reiterate the positive impact that RtI^2 has had on academics in Tennessee (e.g., lower SLD identification rates of males versus females, closing the achievement gap between minorities, and non-minorities, etc.), since not all aspects of RtI^2 involve intervention.

Regarding the disparity between some respondents being satisfied with the concept of RtI^2 while being dissatisfied with their district's RtI^2 implementation, one hypothesis might be linked to limited resources of certain districts. The present survey did not collect data identifying respondent results with their respective district. As such, it is possible that a portion of respondents reporting they *Somewhat Disagreed* or *Strongly Disagreed* with their district's RtI^2 implementation may be employed by districts with limited resources. Limited resources (e.g., being understaffed, lacking appropriate materials, minimal training and/or continued professional development, etc.) could affect the implementation fidelity of RtI^2.

Perceptions of Role Expansion

Another one of my assumptions discussed in the literature review questions the roles school psychologists will fulfill as compared to RtI interventionists. I believe this assumption stemmed from Tennessee's capital expenditures of hiring and training RtI interventionists and RtI specialists (Tennessee Department of Education, 2016). For example, I was curious whether RtI specialists or RtI interventionists may handle much of teacher consultation that school psychologists are capable of doing. Of the respondents, 77.3% reported they either *Somewhat Disagree* or *Strongly Disagree* that they have a greater role in academic interventions than RtI specialists.

In part, this is understandable because interventionists will provide direct services. Conversely, school psychologists may be discouraged when not allowed to perform skillsets acquired in training – skills they are capable of performing and eager to use. It is also possible that a better representation of RtI^2 consultation activities could have been

captured by parsing the survey item into multiple questions. Current survey results show that school psychologists are more involved in *Serving Individual Students* (e.g., assessments, reports, etc.) than *Team Collaboration.* This may be due to RtI interventionists being tasked with the consultation surrounding student academic intervention. If so, the new roles of Tennessee school psychologists may not be as expansive as discussed by Burns and Coolong-Chaffin (2006). However, as the behavior side of RtI is expanded, school psychologists have an opportunity to expand roles in the area of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), small-group counseling, and tiered support of mental health services.

Limitations

The present study was limited to school psychologists working in Tennessee, but it may not adequately represent school psychologists across the state. Not all school psychologists practicing in Tennessee received the request to participate in the study (e.g., some districts require researchers to submit additional paperwork for approval prior to distribution of research-based studies). Further, elected members of the Tennessee Association of School Psychologists (TASP) agreed to distribute my survey to TASP members. It is possible that respondents holding membership in an organization specific to school psychology may have responded differently than would non-members. While it is not possible to know which respondents responded to TASP's invitation to participate in the study, it is possible that a good portion of respondents were TASP members.

Another limitation of the present study is its sample size. Fewer than 120 completed 97.5% of the entire survey, which excluded 18 respondents. Of these 18

respondents excluded, 7 participants discontinued the survey at the question, "What is your sex?" The answer options were limited to male and female. Further, 6 respondents discontinued the survey at the beginning of the second section, and 5 others discontinued immediately after beginning the survey. Due to time constraints, it is possible the entire survey was too time consuming to complete.

Future Research

Data from the current study is an addition to prior research regarding job satisfaction within the school psychology profession. The results offer a job satisfaction comparison between school psychologists practicing before and after the mandated implementation of Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI^2) in Tennessee. The present study also presents results of how school psychologists perceive the overall concept of RtI, and how effective they feel the RtI^2 implementation was conducted in their respective school district in Tennessee.

Tennessee school psychologists seem to maintain many traditional roles of the profession. Future research is needed to determine if a factor limiting role expansion is due to RtI interventionists assuming much of the intervention responsibilities. Consistent with the National Association of School Psychologists' (NASP) position of expanded roles, it was previously believed intervention responsibilities would be performed by school psychologists. Further, I believe it would be beneficial to query school counselors, administrators, special education directors, and other school staff (e.g., speech-language pathologists, special education teachers, occupational therapists, etc.) regarding their perceptions of traditional versus expanded roles of school psychologists. It is possible

that many outside the field of school psychology remain unaware of the field's expanding roles, such as mental health counseling. School Researchers wanting to expand the data regarding school psychologist job satisfaction, RtI involvement, and perceptions of role expansion are encouraged to use either individual sections or the entire survey used in the present study.

It may also be beneficial if future research expands the present study to include a sample more representative of the nation. As states continue to require the implementation of RtI in public schools, it would be useful to collect data surrounding job satisfaction and perceptions of RtI implementation. Job satisfaction may differ between those choosing to implement RtI and those who are mandated to comply by law.

Future research using the present study's survey may consider changing the question regarding gender (e.g., changing "sex" to "gender," offering additional options beyond male and female, etc.). It is important to capture a diverse set of respondent data, and verbiage that may be deemed offensive or non-inclusive may degrade the sample's level of diversity.

The disparity between satisfaction with the concept of RtI^2 and the dissatisfaction of its perceived implementation is concerning. Insufficient training, staff shortages, and the absence of high-quality, research-based intervention material can each affect the implementation fidelity of RtI^2. As such, I believe it would be beneficial to ascertain whether a district's limited resources bear a strong correlation to the perceived dissatisfaction of how RtI^2 is being implemented. At minimum, additional information regarding what underlies these perceptions may help explain this disparity.

In summary, results of the present study did not reveal a statistically significant difference between job satisfaction levels before and after the mandatory implementation of RtI^2 in Tennessee. However, the percentage of respondents in the present survey reporting that they were either *Satisfied* or *Very Satisfied* was 11% greater than respondents of Wrenn's thesis (2012). These findings seem consistent with prior research where expanded roles of school psychologists, such as those created by the implementation of RtI^2, correlate to increased job satisfaction. Further, 84% of the present study's respondents plan to remain in the field of school psychology for another five years.

REFERENCES

Bentein, K., Vandenberghe, C., Vandenberg, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 468-482. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.468

Bianco, S. D. (2010). Improving student outcomes: Data-driven instruction and fidelity of implementation in a response to intervention (RtI) model. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, *6*(5), 6. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ907036

Braden, J. S., DiMarino-Linnen, E., & Good, T. L. (2001). Schools, society, and school psychologists history and future directions. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 203-219. doi: 10.1016/S0022-4405(01)00056-5

Brown, M. B., Hohenshil, T. H., & Brown, D. T. (1998). Job satisfaction of school psychologists in the United States: A national study. *School Psychology International,* (1), 86. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy. mtsu.edu/doi/pdf/10.1177/0143034398191006

Brown, M. B., Holcombe, D. C., Bolen, L. M., Thomson, W. S. (2006). Role function and job satisfaction of school psychologists practicing in an expanded role model. *Psychological Reports, 98,* 486-496. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/doi/pdf/10.2466/pr0.98.2.486-496

Burns, M. K., & Coolong-Chaffin, M. (2006). Response to intervention: The role of and

    effect on school psychology. *School Psychology Online, 1*(1), 3-15. Retrieved

    from http://sss.usf.edu/resources/presentations/2010/fasp_summer_inst2010/

    Resource_SLD/Professional%20Development/RTI%20Effect%20on%20School%

    20Psychology_Burns.pdf

Canter, A. (2006, February). Problem solving and RTI: New roles for school

    psychologists. *Communique*, *34*, 1-3, Retrieved from

    http://www.nasponline.org/publications/cq/mocq345rti.aspx

Crepeau-Hobson, F, & Sobel, D. M. (2010, Winter). School psychologists and RTI:

    Analysis of training and professional development needs. *School Psychology*

    Forum- Research in Practice, *4*(4), 22-32. Retrieved from

    http://www.nasponline.org/publications/periodicals/spf/volume-4/volume-

    4-issue-4-(winter-2010)/school-psychologists-and-rti-analysis-of-training-and-

    professional-development-needs

Davis, B. (2003). Toward a pragmatics of complex transformation. *Journal of the*

    Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 1(1), 39-45. Retrieved from

    https://jcacs.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/jcacs/article/viewFile/16848/15654

Fagan, T. K. & Wise, P. S. (1994). *School psychology: Past, present, and future.* White

    Plains, NY: Longman.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2005). Responsiveness to intervention: A blueprint for

    practitioners, policymakers, and parents. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 38*(1),

    57-61. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/

    004005990503800112?journalCode=tcxa

Gresham, F.M., MacMillan, D.L., Beebe-Frankenberger, M.E., & Bocian, K.M. (2000).

    Treatment integrity in learning disabilities intervention research: Do we really

    know how treatments are implemented? *Learning Disabilities Research &*

    Practice, 15(4), 198–205.

Hagemeier, C., Bischoff, L., Jacobs, J., & Osmon, W. (1998). Role perceptions of

    the school psychologist by school personnel. Paper presented at the annual

    meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, Orlando, FL.

Huebner, E. S. (1993). Psychologists in secondary schools in the 1990s: Current

    functions, training, and job satisfaction. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *8*, 50-56.

    doi: 10.1037/h0088831

Jensen, D., Cohen, J. N., Mennin, D. S., Fresco, D. M., & Heimberg, R. G. (2016).

    Clarifying the unique associations among intolerance of uncertainty, anxiety, and

    depression. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, (6), 431. Retrieved from

    https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?

    direct=true&db=edsbl&AN=vdc.100034721278.0x000001&site=eds-

    live&scope=site

Judge, T. A., Weiss, H. M., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Hulin, C. L. (2017). Job

    attitudes, job satisfaction, and job affect: A century of continuity and of change.

    Journal of Applied Psychology, *102*, 356-374. doi:10.1037/apl0000181

Levinson, E. M. (1990). Actual/desired role functioning, perceived control over role

    functioning, and job satisfaction among school psychologists. *Psychology in the*

    Schools, 27, 64-74. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/

    10.1002/1520-6807(199001)27:1%3C64::AID-PITS2310270110%3E3.0.CO;2-6

Miller, C. D., Witt, J. C., & Finley, J. L. (1981). School psychologists' perceptions of

   their work; Satisfactions and dissatisfactions in the United States. *School*

   Psychology International, 2, 1-3. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.

   com/doi/abs/10.1177/014303438100200201

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and*

   organizational psychology. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub., c2000.

Palmer, P. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's*

   life. Wiley: San Francisco.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational

   commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians.

   Journal of Applied Psychology, *59*, 603-609. doi:10.1037/h0037335

Reschly, D. J. (2008). School psychology paradigm shift and beyond. In *Best Practices in*

   School Psychology V, *1*(1), 3-15. Bethesda, MD: NASP Publications.

Reschly, D. J., & Connolly, L. M. (1990). Comparisons of school psychologists in the

   city and country: is there a "rural" school psychology? *School Psychology*

   Review, *19*(4), 534–549. Retrieved from: https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?

   url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ofm&AN=

   508364368&site=eds-live&scope=site

Reschly, D. J., & Wilson, M. S. (1995). School psychology practitioners and faculty: 1986 to 1991-92 trends in demographics, roles, satisfaction, and system reform. *School Psychology Review*, *24*, 62-80. Retrieved from http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/eds/detail/detail?vid=3&sid=d1c2547d-a3ec-4dfb-9a91-d0d588c9ab0b%40pdc-v-sessmgr03&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzL WxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=RN000213019&db=edsbl

Reynolds, C. R., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2009). Response to intervention: Ready or not? Or, from wait-to-fail to watch-them-fail. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *24*(2), 130-145. doi:10.1037/a0016158

Tennessee Department of Education (2018). *Four years of learnings from RtI^2 Implementation in Tennessee.* Retrieved from: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/ tn/education/reports/rpt_rti_report_assessing_progress.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education (2017). *Response to instruction and intervention framework.* Retrieved from: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/special-education/rti/rti2_manual.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education (2016). *Supporting early grades student achievement: An exploration of RTI^2 practices.* Retrieved from: https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/education/attachments/rpt_an_exploration_ of_rti2_practices.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education (2016). *TN CORE revised-RTI^2 implementation guide, 2016*. Retrieved from: https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/education/ special-education/rti/rti2_implementation_guide.pdf

Todd, A. R., Forstmann, M., Burgmer, P., Brooks, A. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015).

    Anxious and egocentric: How specific emotions influence perspective

    taking. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *144*, 374-391. Retrieved

    from https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.

    aspx?direct=true&db=edsbl&AN=RN600299874&site=eds-live&scope=site

VanVoorhis, R. W., & Levinson, E. M. (2006). Job satisfaction among school

    psychologists: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly, 21*, 77-90.

    Retrieved from http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/eds/pdfviewer/

    pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=690ff71f-7616-4fb4-a118-109e57622b8b%

    40sessionmgr120

Watkins, M. W., Crosby, E. G., & Pearson, J. L. (2001). Role of the school psychologist:

    Perceptions of school staff. *School Psychology International*, *22*, 64-73. Retrieved

    From http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/eds/detail/detail?vid=2&sid=

    0872d0ab-0aba-42c7-9ad3-fe4bbf017633%40sessionmgr4006&bdata=JnNpdGU

    9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=RN092013078&db=edsbl

Weiss, D. J., Davis R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the*

    Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota

    Press.

Williams, K. J., & Williams, G. M. (1990). The relation between performance feedback

    and job attitudes among school psychologists. *School Psychology Review,* 550-

    564. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.mtsu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebsco

    host.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ479097&site=eds-

    live&scope=site

Worrell, T. G., Skaggs, G. E., & Brown, M. B. (2006). School psychologists' job

    satisfaction: A 22-year perspective in the USA. *School Psychology International,*

    27, 131-145. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/

    doi/pdf/10.1177/0143034306064540

Wrenn, W. K., (2012). *Response to intervention and its relationship to school*

    psychologists' job satisfaction (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle Tennessee

    State University, Murfreesboro, TN.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Office of Research Compliance,
010A Sam Ingram Building,
2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
Murfreesboro, TN 37129

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE

Friday, August 31, 2018

Principal Investigator	**Mark Alan Warner** (Student)
Faculty Advisor	Monica Wallace
Co-Investigators	NONE
Investigator Email(s)	*maw5y@mtmail.mtsu.edu; monica.wallace@mtsu.edu*
Department	Psychology
Protocol Title	***Relationship among resonse to instruction and intervention (RT12) and job satisfaction of Tennessee school psychologists***
Protocol ID	**19-1017**

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category *(1) Educational Settings & Instructional Strategiesnd medical devices* A summary of the IRB action and other particulars in regard to this protocol application is tabulated as shown below:

IRB Action	EXEMPT from furhter IRB review***	Date	8/31/18
Date of Expiration	NOT APPLICABLE		
Sample Size	300 (THREE HUNDRED)		
Participant Pool	**Healthy Adults (18 years or older) - Tennessee school psychologists**		
Exceptions	NONE		
Mandatory Restrictions	1. Participants must be 18 years or older 2. Informed consent must be obtained from the participants 3. Identifying information must not be collected		
Restrictions	**All requirements for exemption apply.**		
Comments	NONE		

***This exemption determination only allows above defined protocol from further IRB review such as continuing review. However, the following post-approval requirements still apply:
- Addition/removal of subject population should not be implemented without IRB approval
- Change in investigators must be notified and approved
- Modifications to procedures must be clearly articulated in an addendum request and the proposed changes must not be incorporated without an approval
- Be advised that the proposed change must comply within the requirements for exemption
- Changes to the research location must be approved – appropriate permission letter(s) from external institutions must accompany the addendum request form
- Changes to funding source must be notified via email (irb_submissions@mtsu.edu)
- The exemption does not expire as long as the protocol is in good standing

Institutional Review Board   Office of Compliance   Middle Tennessee State University

- Project completion must be reported via email (irb_submissions@mtsu.edu)
- Research-related injuries to the participants and other events must be reported within 48 hours of such events to compliance@mtsu.edu

Post-approval Protocol Amendments:

The current MTSU IRB policies allow the investigators to make the following types of changes to this protocol without the need to report to the Office of Compliance, as long as the proposed changes do not result in the cancellation of the protocols eligibility for exemption:
- Editorial and minor administrative revisions to the consent form or other study documents
- Increasing/decreasing the participant size

Only THREE procedural amendment requests will be entertained per year. This amendment restriction does not apply to minor changes such as language usage and addition/removal of research personnel.

Date	Amendment(s)	IRB Comments
NONE	NONE.	NONE

The investigator(s) indicated in this notification should read and abide by all applicable post-approval conditions imposed with this approval. Refer to the post-approval guidelines posted in the MTSU IRB's website. Any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918 within 48 hours of the incident.

All of the research-related records, which include signed consent forms, current & past investigator information, training certificates, survey instruments and other documents related to the study, must be retained by the PI or the faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) at the sacure location mentioned in the protocol application. The data storage must be maintained for at least three (3) years after study completion. Subsequently, the researcher may destroy the data in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity. IRB reserves the right to modify, change or cancel the terms of this letter without prior notice. Be advised that IRB also reserves the right to inspect or audit your records if needed.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board
Middle Tennessee State University

Quick Links:
Click here for a detailed list of the post-approval responsibilities.
More information on exmpt procedures can be found here.

Appendix B

Cover Letter Requesting Participation

Good morning. This email is being sent to supervisors of TN school psychologists.

My name is Mark Warner, and I'm an MTSU school psychology graduate student. I ask you to forward this email to your team of school psychologists to help me collect data for my thesis. The online survey takes less than 20 minutes. I understand everyone is extremely busy, and I greatly appreciate the few minutes of each participating school psychologist.

Respectfully,

Mark A. Warner

Study Title: *Relationship Among Response to Instruction and Intervention (RtI²) and Job Satisfaction of Tennessee School Psychologists*

Survey Link (*expires 09/24/2018*): **https://mtsupsychology.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_7QW3zD5NAG5gJJb**

School Psychology Program at Middle Tennessee State University
Principal Investigator: Mark A. Warner, B.A.
Thesis Advisor: Monica Wallace, PhD

Study Description: The study is a follow-up to Whitney (Wrenn) Haley's 2012 thesis, which was conducted prior to the Tennessee Department of Education's (TNDOE) mandatory implementation of RtI². The study consists of completing a survey that asks about demographic information, job satisfaction, and RtI². The RtI² portion includes questions pertaining to both involvement and perceptions of RtI² since its mandatory implementation by TNDOE in fall of 2014.

According to Tennessee's Revised-RtI² Implementation Guide (2016), possible new roles for school psychologists are as follows: ensure fidelity of research-based interventions at Tiers 2 and 3 via collaborating with school-based teams, serve on teams surrounding Specific Learning Disability (SLD) referrals, consult with teachers about research-based curriculum, perform gap analyses to monitor progress and/or suggest changes to interventions, provide in-service training surrounding RtI² intervention guidelines, and perform/interpret educational assessments for students flagged with potential intervention needs.

Changes in roles often impact job satisfaction. Greater job satisfaction of school psychologists likely results in a more positive impact to students, families, and school staff. Although RtI² was mandated by TNDOE, it is understood by the researcher that TNDOE allows individual districts and schools to implement RtI² with a degree of autonomy to best fit the needs of their students. This likely results in varied roles and responsibilities required of school psychologists. As such, each TN school psychologist is encouraged to take the survey in order for the researcher to obtain a diverse participant sample.

Target Participant Pool: Licensed school psychologists in the state of Tennessee

Additional Information: Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and no identifiable information will be collected.

Contact Information: Should you have any questions or need further information, please contact me at either (615) 504-5934 or maw5y@mtmail.mtsu.edu (email is preferred). Questions can also be directed to Dr. Monica Wallace, thesis advisor, at monica.wallace@mtsu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Middle Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by phone at (615) 898-2400 or by email at irb_information@mtsu.edu.

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Middle Tennessee State University, 2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd, Murfreesboro, TN 37129
URL: www.mtsu.edu/irb – Tel: 615 898 2400 – Email: irb_information@mtsu.edu

Appendix C

Demographics and General Information Survey

School Psychologist Demographics

1. What is your sex? _____ Male   _____ Female

2. What is your age?
   _____ Under 25   _____ 25 - 34   _____ 35 – 44
   _____ 45 - 54   _____ 55 - 64   _____ over 64

3. What is your current degree status?
   _____ Masters   _____ Masters plus 30 semester (or 45 quarter) hours
   _____ Ed.S.   _____ Ph.D.

4. How many full-time school psychologists are employed by your school system?
   _____ 0   _____ 1 - 5   _____ 6 - 10
   _____ 11 - 20   _____ 21 - 35   _____ 36 or more

5. What is the approximate school psychologist to student ratio in your system?
   _____ 1:1000 or less   _____ 1:2000 – 1:2500   _____ 1:3500 – 1:4000
   _____ 1:1000 – 1:1500   _____ 1:2500 – 1:3000   _____ 1:4000 – 1:4500
   _____ 1:1500 – 2000   _____ 1:3000 – 1:3500   _____ 1:4500 and over

6. Please estimate the approximate percentage of time per year you spend working
   within each area listed below: (e.g., less than 10%, 25%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 75% or
   more)
   _____ Psychoeducational assessment and report writing
   _____ Multidisciplinary team meetings (e.g., placement, data meetings, review,
          etc.)
   _____ Direct Intervention (e.g., individual or group counseling of students or
          parents)
   _____ Indirect Intervention (e.g., teacher consultation, etc.)
   _____ Professional Development Activities
   _____ Administrative Duties
   _____ Fidelity Checks
   _____ Behavioral Prevention/Intervention
   _____ Networking or interacting with other community agencies (e.g., public
          relations, providing/exchanging information, community task forces,
          interagency program development, etc.)

7. How would you describe the community of your assigned school(s)?
   _____ Rural   _____ Suburban   _____ Urban

1. Do you plan to remain in the profession of school psychology for 5 more years?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

2. Which position does your direct supervisor hold?
   _____ School   _____ RTI   _____ Other
   Psychologist   Interventionist/Coach
   _____ Administrator   _____ Special Education Director

3. Are you interested in promotion to an administrative position?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

4. Overall, how satisfied are you with your position as a school psychologist?
   _____ Very Dissatisfied   _____ Dissatisfied
   _____ Satisfied   _____ Very Satisfied

5. My roles and responsibilities have substantially changed due to the implementation of RtI.
   _____ Yes   _____ No

6. How many schools do you serve?
   _____ 1   _____ 2   _____ 3   _____ 4 or more

7. What is the number of open school psychologist positions in your district?
   _____ 0   _____ 1 - 2   _____ 3 - 4   _____ 5 or more

8. What is the number of RtI^2 Interventionists in your school(s)?
   _____ 0   _____ 1 - 3   _____ 4 - 6   _____ 7 or more

Appendix D

Job Satisfaction Survey

Job Satisfaction Survey

For each statement, choose the response that best describes your level of agreement with the statement.	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Regularly	Very Often
Job Satisfaction Scales					
1. I have a sense of accomplishment through my work.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My present income is not adequate for my needs.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Opportunities for advancement are limited in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My supervisor is competent in my field.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My colleagues work well together.	1	2	3	4	5
6. On most days my work is *not* challenging.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I am satisfied with my salary.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Promotion decisions at my work place are often *unfair*.	1	2	3	4	5
9. The amount of supervision provided to me is about right.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I have good rapport with most of my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My work is satisfying.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am *well paid* for my level of education and kind of work.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Promotions are based on work quality and productivity.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My supervisor offers good suggestions and constructive criticism.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My colleagues are not very interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
16. My work is often routine.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The job benefits are *poor* (e.g., insurance, retirement plan).	1	2	3	4	5
18. My supervisor is *not* supportive of my work.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Working more effectively in my present job would lead to a promotion.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My work does not fully utilize my capabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My colleagues are supportive of my professional work and personal development.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I am well paid for the amount of effort I devote to my job.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Persons in my job are *rarely* promoted to positions with more responsibilities and higher pay.	1	2	3	4	5
24. My supervisor has poor interpersonal skills.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Most of my colleagues are *not* very capable.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E

Response to Intervention Survey

Response to Intervention Survey

For each statement, choose the response that best describes your level of agreement with the statement.	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Regularly	Very Often
System Design					
1. I help design the school's specific RtI procedures that fit our local needs and resources.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I conduct staff training to support RtI implementation (e.g., training in evidence-based interventions and student progress monitoring).	1	2	3	4	5
3. I engage in consultation with administration, teachers, and parents regarding their concerns about the school's RtI procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Regularly	Very Often
Team Collaboration					
4. I help parents understand each tier of intervention and how each tier provides specific types of supports for their child.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I help to ensure that parent input is integrated into each tier of intervention.	1	2	3	4	5
	Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Regularly	Very Often
Serving Individual Students					
6. I consult with teachers regarding intervention activities at school.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I consult with parents regarding intervention activities at home.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I assist teachers in implementing progress monitoring strategies as part of the individual student intervention plan.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I observe students in the instructional environment in order to help identify appropriate intervention strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I collect RtI data.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I spend time in assessment activities that target individual student functioning (e.g., cognitive, behavioral, academic, and mental health).	1	2	3	4	5
12. I determine the most useful procedures to address referral concerns and the needs of the individual student.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I help evaluate student progress for those receiving special education services using RtI and other data.	1	2	3	4	5

For each statement, choose the response that best describes your level of agreement with the statement.	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
Perception of RtI^2 Implementation					
1. RtI^2 fidelity is being performed appropriately in my school(s).	1	2	3	4	5
2. RtI^2 has had a positive impact on student academics.	1	2	3	4	5
3. RtI^2 has had a positive impact on school staff cohesion.	1	2	3	4	5
4. RtI^2 has helped to close the achievement gap in my school(s).	1	2	3	4	5
5. My district uses the EasyRtI application.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I attended RtI^2 training by TNDOE.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I am satisfied with my district's overall RtI^2 implementation.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am satisfied with the overall concept of RtI^2.	1	2	3	4	5
9. There are Tier 3 math and reading RtI^2 Interventionists in my school(s).	1	2	3	4	5
10. Since the implementation of RtI2, SLD evaluations are more time consuming than evaluations for other special education categories.	1	2	3	4	5
11. SLD evaluations are more time consuming due to the SLD evaluation form.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I spend an unnecessary amount of time completing the SLD evaluation form due to required information that is redundant.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Time spent on the current SLD evaluation form reduces the amount of time I could spend working with other children.	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
Perception of Role Expansion					
14. I have a sufficient platform to address RtI^2 suggestions/concerns.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I am directly involved with academic interventions.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I am **in**directly involved with academic interventions.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I have a greater role in academic interventions than RtI^2 Interventionists.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Administrators at my school(s) seem to understand the expanding roles of school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Teachers at my school(s) seem to understand the expanding roles of school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My direct supervisor supports the role expansion of school psychologists.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Administrators view me as a resource for understanding RtI^2 data.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Teachers seem to view me as a resource for understanding RtI^2 data.					
23. Counselors at my school(s) seem to view me as capable of providing mental health services to students.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

Tables

Table 1

Internal Consistency Measures for the Job Satisfaction Survey and Response to Intervention Survey

Instrument or Factor	Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Job Satisfaction Survey	1-25	0.83
Work	1,6,11,16,20	0.64
Pay	2,7,12,17,22	0.84
Promotion	3,8,13,19,23	0.68
Supervision	4,9,14,18,24	0.82
Coworkers	5,10,15,21,25	0.77
Response to Intervention Survey	1-36	0.87
System Design	1-3	0.75
Team Collaboration	4,5	0.74
Serving Individual Students	6-13	0.75
Perception of RtI^2 Implementation	14-26	0.74
Perception of Role Expansion	27-36	0.79

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample ($n = 119$)

Characteristic	Number	Percentage
Gender:		
Male	12	10.1%
Female	107	89.9%
Age		
Under 25	1	0.8%
25-34	44	37.0%
35-44	33	27.7%
45-54	26	21.8%
55-64	9	7.6%
Over 64	6	5.0%
Education Level		
Masters	12	10.1%
Masters plus 30 hours	11	9.2%
Ed.S.	85	71.4%
Ph.D.	11	9.2%
School Psychologist to Student Ratio		
1:1000 or less	16	13.4%
1:1,000-1:1,500	41	34.5%
1:15,00-1:2,000	27	22.7%
1:2,000-1:2,500	19	16.0%
1:2,500-1:3,000	5	4.2%
1:3,000-1:3,500	5	4.2%
1:3,500-1:4,000	1	0.8%
1:4,000-1:4,500	1	0.8%
1:4500 or more	1	0.8%
School Setting		
Rural	31	26.1%
Suburban	51	42.9%
Urban	36	30.3%
Remain 5 More Years		
Yes	19	16.0%
No	100	84.0%
Supervisor's Position		
School Psychologist	37	31.1%
Administrator	15	12.6%
Special Education Director	47	39.5%
Other	20	16.8%

Table 2 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample $(n = 119)$

Characteristic	Number	Percentage
Interest in Promotion to Admin Position		
Yes	27	22.7%
No	92	77.3%
Roles Changed Since Mandatory RtI^2		
Yes	81	68.1%
No	36	30.3%
Number of Schools Served		
1	20	16.8%
2	47	39.5%
3	30	25.2%
4 or more	22	18.5%
Open School Psychologists Positions in District		
0	49	41.2%
1-2	30	25.2%
3-4	22	18.5%
5 or more	18	15.1%
RtI^2 Interventionists in Assigned School(s)		
0	20	16.8%
1-3	75	63.0%
4-6	12	10.1%
7 or more	12	10.1%

Table 3

Percentages of School Psychologist Perceptions of RtI ^{2} Implementation

Survey Question	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
RtI^{2} fidelity is being performed appropriately in my school(s).	18.5%	26.1%	11.8%	37.0%	6.7%
RtI^{2} has had a positive impact on student academics.	7.6	7.6	12.6	51.3	21.0
RtI^{2} has had a positive impact on school staff cohesion.	21.9	28.6	22.7	22.7	4.2
RtI^{2} has helped to close the achievement gap in my school(s).	13.5	16.0	26.1	37.0	7.6
My district uses the EasyRtI application.	68.9	8.4	16.8	3.4	2.5
I attended RtI^{2} training by TNDOE.	6.7	1.7	3.4	13.5	74.8
I am satisfied with my district's overall RtI^{2} implementation.	20.2	18.5	18.5	32.8	10.1
I am satisfied with the overall concept of RtI^{2}.	10.1	13.5	5.9	40.3	30.3
There are Tier 3 math and reading RtI^{2} Interventionists in my school(s).	19.3	13.5	9.2	21.9	36.1
Since the implementation of RtI2, SLD evaluations are more time consuming than evaluations for other special education categories.	10.9	16.8	11.8	27.7	32.8
SLD evaluations are more time consuming due to the SLD evaluation form.	7.6	13.5	12.6	27.7	32.8
I spend an unnecessary amount of time completing the SLD evaluation form due to required information that is redundant.	6.7	15.1	11.8	27.7	32.8
Time spent on the current SLD evaluation form reduces the amount of time I could spend working with other children.	6.7	16.0	16.8	27.7	32.8

Table 4

Percentages of School Psychologist Perceptions of Role Expansion

Survey Question	Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
I have a sufficient platform to address RtI^2 suggestions/concerns.	10.9	21.0	22.7	40.3	5.0
I am directly involved with academic interventions.	35.3	32.8	15.1	13.5	3.4
I am **in**directly involved with academic interventions.	4.2	10.9	14.3	52.1	18.5
I have a greater role in academic interventions than RtI^2 Interventionists.	52.9	24.4	17.7	2.5	2.5
Administrators at my school(s) seem to understand the expanding roles of school psychologists.	20.2	30.3	11.8	31.9	5.9
Teachers at my school(s) seem to understand the expanding roles of school psychologists.	28.6	25.2	19.3	25.2	1.7
My direct supervisor supports the role expansion of school psychologists.	3.4	10.1	16.0	31.1	39.5
Administrators view me as a resource for understanding RtI^2 data.	3.4	7.6	8.4	42.0	38.7
Teachers seem to view me as a resource for understanding RtI^2 data.	4.2	5.0	12.6	41.2	37.0
Counselors at my school(s) seem to view me as capable of providing mental health services to students.	12.6	21.0	26.9	30.3	9.2