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Abstract

Consultation is expected to become a more predominant part of school psychologists’ role which is shifting from primarily assessment based activities to a problem-solving model of practice (Wilkinson, 2006). Not only are school psychologists expected to extend their scope of practice to include more time spent in consultation, but several studies have found that practicing school psychologists cite consultation as a preferred service (Kratochwill & Stoiber, 2000; Roberts & Rust, 1994). Because consultation is increasingly being viewed as an important model of service delivery in the schools, it becomes essential that the field of school psychology understand what facilitates a successful consultation process.

Research suggests that consultation within the schools in an increasingly relied upon and beneficial model of service delivery. Studies have identified factors both specific to the consultant such as verbal control and social power and to the consultee such as self-efficacy, perception of data source, resistance to consultation, and preference for directiveness that may contribute to more successful process outcomes. It is important to continue to explore the teachers’
involvement in the consultation process, as it ultimately leads to increased intervention implementation. One specific teacher factor that warrants additional research is the issue of teachers’ preference for collaborative-directive versus collaborative-nondirective consultation approach. Tysinger et al. (2007) found promising results indicating teachers rated the consultant as more effective when utilizing the collaborative-directive approach and when expectation for the process matched the consultation scenario that they viewed. However, as this was the first study exploring the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches as proposed by Gutkin (1999) the findings need to be replicated to determine the generalizability to different groups with different personological variables. For example, the current study utilizes behavioral interventions, which aides to determine if the findings hold true when considering consultation for behavioral issues, rather than academic.

Additionally, the current study adds open-ended and closed-ended questions to examine teachers’ perception of consultation utilization. There is currently little known regarding how often teachers actually use consultation or would like to utilize it. The researcher seeks to determine whether teachers’ in the target population perceive consultation as an under-utilized service, and if so what factors may be related to under utilization.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The role of school consultation as a function of part of the job description of a school psychologist is anticipated to expand over the next decade, having become a significant element in the shift from predominantly assessment based activities to a problem-solving model of practice (Wilkinson, 2006). Not only are school psychologists expected to extend their scope of practice to include more time spent in consultation, but several studies have found that consultation remains a preferred service among practicing school psychologists (Kratochwill & Stoiber, 2000; Roberts & Rust, 1994). Because consultation is increasingly being viewed as an important model of service delivery in the schools, it becomes essential that the field of school psychology understand what facilitates a successful consultation process. Much of the consultation literature focuses on the role of the consultant in the process (Echul, Hughes, Myers, Hickman, & Braden, 1992). However, it becomes essential that researchers also examine the role of the teacher in the consultation process, as it relates to the
eventual implementation of interventions and their contribution to the success of the consultation process.

Teacher involvement in the consultation process has been explored through various lenses including the effects of performance feedback (Jones, Wickstrom, & Friman, 1997; Noel, Witt, Gilbertson, Ranier, & Freeland, 1997), teacher self-efficacy (DeForest and Hughes, 1992), teacher resistance (Erchul & Chewning, 1990), data source (Landrum, Cook, Tankersley, & Fitzgerald, 2007), and preference for directiveness (Tysinger, Tysinger, & Diamanduros, 2009).

Noell et al. (1997) explored the addition of performance feedback to the consultation process in order to increase previously adequate levels of implementation integrity. These authors focused on the idea that oral or written instruction may not be sufficiently effective for obtaining accurate implementation procedures. Noel et al. (1997) sought to determine whether the effect of direct supervision of practice of the implementation of the intervention including prompts and feedback (e.g., performance feedback). These authors found that teachers’ level of implementation began to decrease two to four days following initial implementation; however, with the addition of performance feedback by a consultant, teachers displayed a significant increase in implementation. Jones et al. (1997) also showed the benefits of performance
feedback when added to the consultation process; however, these authors showed that it can increase initially low levels of implementation when used to supplement the traditional consultation process. The previously mentioned studies suggest that performance feedback seems to have a more compelling effect than traditional consultation or verbal instruction alone, especially when successful intervention implementation is the ultimate goal of the consultation process.

DeForest and Hughes (1992) assessed the effect of teacher involvement in decision making and teacher self-efficacy on rating of consultant effectiveness and intervention acceptability. These authors had teachers scoring highest and teachers scoring lowest on a measure of teaching self-efficacy view a video of one of two consultation scenarios (high teacher involvement or low teacher involvement). DeForest and Hughes found that the individual who makes the decision in the consultation process was not a highly salient variable; however, the level of teacher self-efficacy significantly affected the acceptability rating of interventions and consultant effectiveness. The findings suggested that teachers with high personal teaching self-efficacy had a greater sense of control over problems and therefore may respond more positively to the consultation process (DeForest and Hughes, 1992). The authors suggest implications related to these findings concerning how consultants can approach the consultation process when working with teachers who lack confidence or personal teaching self-efficacy, such as providing additional guidance and support within the relationship.
Teacher resistance to the consultation process is another lens that researchers have used to examine the effect of teacher involvement in the consultation process. The teacher must view the consultative relationship as one in which there is a trading off of rewards and costs by both parties, and the rewards must ultimately offset the expenditures in order for teachers to fully engage in the consultation process (Erchul & Chewning, 1990). Erchul and Chewning describe possible costs incurred by the consultee as a result of engaging in the consultation experience. For example, the authors note that the consultee must be willing to take on the responsibility of being a change agent (i.e., actually implementing the intervention treatment plan). In addition, Erchul and Chewning point out that many times the consultee must be willing to admit that he or she is unable to handle the problem that he or she is facing in order for the consultation process to begin.

Although the consultee may incur possible costs as a result of engaging in the relationship, Erchul and Chewning (1990) likewise note that there are potential rewards that may be attained by the consultee who chooses to engage in the consultation process. The benefit of having the opportunity to express one’s frustration to another professional may help to offset the potential costs. Additionally, consultation offers the consultee the potential for resolving the presenting problem. Considering the theories of Erchul and Chewning, consultants can understand the importance of creating a scenario in which the
potential rewards of the consultation seem enticing and the potential costs do not seem especially threatening.

Landrum et al. (2007) explored the role of data source as related to intervention acceptability. Consultants can provide teachers with a plethora of research-based interventions; however, unless teachers find the information to be practical they are unlikely to implement the suggested strategy (Landrum et al., 2007). These authors examined teachers’ perceptions of the utility of information describing the effectiveness of reading interventions presented in two formats: data-based (highlighted research findings) and personal (based on the personal experiences of an experienced teacher). Results indicated that regardless of teacher training (i.e., special education versus regular education) they interpreted the information presented in a personal format (as opposed to a data-based format) as more useable. Additionally, more years of teaching experience was correlated with lower utility ratings with regard to either format of information.

These findings have significant implication for practitioners in terms of corroboration of successful treatments by another experienced teacher, as well as considering that working with long-time, experienced teachers who are entrenched in their techniques may require additional finesse and patience.

Another aspect of teacher involvement in the consultant process that is of significant interest concerns teachers’ preference for a specific type of consultation model. There has been a surge of consultation literature that has focused on determining the most effective method for school-based consultation;
however, the research has produced inconsistent results, supporting both the collaborative and the expert approach to consultation (Tysinger et al., 2009).

Tysinger et al. define the collaborative approach as including the consultee in the process of determining the content of consultation to a greater degree than other approaches, with the psychologist providing a means to process the consultee’s ideas without becoming too directive. They describe the expert approach as being directed to a greater degree by the consultant, with the consultant selecting the issue to be addressed, the method of data collection, and a suitable intervention. Considering the inconsistent findings, Erchul (1992) posited a theory that attempted to integrate the outwardly opposing approaches. He explained that the consultant dominance does not indicate the absence of collaboration. Gutkin (1999) expanded upon the idea saying that studies focusing on collaborative versus expert approaches represent a “fundamental error” (p.180) because collaborative and expert are not actually opposite; rather coercive is the opposite of collaborative and nondirective is the opposite of expert/directive. Therefore, consultation actually takes the form of collaborative-directive, collaborative-nondirective, coercive-directive, or coercive-nondirective. Both Erchul and Gutkin noted that the most effective forms were collaborative-directive, and collaborative-nondirective.

In the spirit of the Erchul (1992) and Gutkin’s (1999) theory, Tysinger et al. (2009) investigated the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches and the influence of teacher expectations on their ratings of process
effectiveness. The researchers found significantly higher ratings for the consultants and proposed interventions when the collaborative-directive approach was used. However, effectiveness ratings were not significantly different when their expectations were matched with the condition that they viewed than the teachers that were in mismatched conditions. The results of this study indicate that providing direction within the consultative relationship, yet still allowing room for consultee input seems to provide an optimal situation for effective process outcomes.

Studies have found inconsistent results regarding teacher’s preference for directiveness within the consultative relationship (Tysinger et al., 2009). Further research is needed to continue to explore the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches to consultation and the influence of teachers’ expectations on consultation outcomes. The significance of continuing this previously unexplored line of research examining the consultation approaches of collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective introduced by Gutkin (1999) lies in the practical application of increased consultation success. Both field based practitioners and school psychology trainers alike will benefit from the knowledge of teachers’ preference for consultation approach, and can use this knowledge to guide their own consultation practice.

**Purpose of the Study**

Research suggests that consultation within the schools in an increasingly relied upon and beneficial model of service delivery. Studies have identified
factors both specific to the consultant such as verbal control and social power and to the consultee such as self-efficacy, perception of data source, resistance to consultation, and preference for directiveness that may contribute to more successful process outcomes. It is important to continue to explore the teachers’ involvement in the consultation process, as it ultimately leads to increased intervention implementation.

One specific teacher factor that warrants additional research is the issue of teachers’ preference for collaborative-directive versus collaborative-nondirective consultation approach. Tysinger et al. (2009) found promising results indicating teachers rated the consultant as more effective when utilizing the collaborative-directive approach and when expectation for the process matched the consultation scenario that they viewed. However, as this was the first study exploring the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches as proposed by Gutkin (1999) the findings need to be replicated to determine the generalizability to different groups with different personological variables. For example, the current study utilizes behavioral interventions, which serves to determine if the findings hold true when considering consultation for behavioral issues, rather than academic.

Additionally, the current study adds open-ended and closed-ended questions to examine teachers’ perception of consultation utilization. There is currently little known regarding how often teachers actually use consultation or would like to utilize it. The researcher seeks to determine whether teachers’ in
the target population perceive consultation as an under-utilized service, and if so what factors may be related to under utilization.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study lies in the fact that although Tysinger et al. (2009) found promising results when exploring teachers’ preference for collaborative-directive versus collaborative-nondirective consultation approaches, there has not been any follow up research to confirm their findings. The current study provides an opportunity to generalize the findings to others situations such as in urban elementary schools. It also utilizes behavioral consultation issues rather than academic. Tysinger et al. suggested considering utilizing behavioral interventions in their recommendations for future research, as it helps to further explore the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches to consultation, as well as provide additional insight concerning teachers’ expectations on consultation process.

In addition to creating a more comprehensive literature base, the current study also provides information concerning teachers’ rate of consultation utilization. Noell and Witt (1999) recognize that little is known regarding the degree to which teachers actually implement interventions that have been developed during the consultation process and little is known about the factors that influence implementation; however, there is even less research addressing consultation utilization rates and factors that impact those rates. Therefore, supplying information concerning consultation utilization and the factors that may
influence teachers to seek out those services will speak to the lack of current literature and help to determine how to increase consultation utilization, which is a beneficial endeavor as Noell and Witt (1999) have recognized consultation as a satisfactory model of service delivery.

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between consultant effectiveness and the following two factors: (a) consultation approach and (b) teacher expectations for consultation approach. Five domains of consultant effectiveness will be measured: global effectiveness; interpersonal skills; problem-solving; process and application skills; and ethical and professional skills. Two types of consultation approaches will be measured: collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective. Teacher expectations for consultation approach will be measured and results will allow participants to be grouped into two conditions based on the scores: matched and mismatched. This study seeks to find the answers to the following questions:

**Research Question One:** How often have teachers utilized consultation in the past year? Measure of current utilization includes an open-ended question with a corresponding indicated quantitative response.

**Perceived Current Consultation Utilization:** Current rates of consultation utilization are expected to be fairly low. The rates may be moderately positively correlated with the perceived availability of the school psychologist in the building of employment.
Research Question Two: How often would teachers like to utilize consultation in the future? Measure of future utilization includes a three-point Likert scale question.

**Perceived Future Consultation Utilization:** Future desired rates of consultation utilization are expected to be greater than current rates of utilization.

Research Question Three: Is the school psychologist someone teachers go to for consultation services? Perception of school psychologist as a potential consultation source will be assessed through a four-point Likert scale question.

**Perceived Potential of School Psychologist as Consultant:** Perception of the school psychologist as a consultant is expected to illicit mixed responses. The perception will likely be correlated with the perceived availability of the school psychologist in the respective building.

Research Question Four: Which type of consultation approach do teachers prefer? Consultation approaches assessed include: collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective. Teacher preference for approach will be measured utilizing total score on the Consultant Role Questionnaire.

**Perceived Preference for Consultation Approach:** It is expected that teachers will rate the collaborative-directive approach as more effective than the collaborative-nondirective approach.

Research Question Five: Does matching preference to approach influence teachers’ rating of effectiveness? Teacher expectation for approach was measured to determine whether each participant aligns strongly with the collaborative-
directive or collaborative-nondirective approach. Participants were then randomly assigned to one of two conditions based on their expectations for approach: matched or mismatched.

**Perceived Effect of Expectations for Consultation Approach:** It is expected that teachers’ who are in the condition where expectation for approach is matched to consultation approach viewed will rate the consultant as more effective than those in the mismatched condition.

**Limitations of the Study**

It is important to note the potential limitations of this study. A major limitation regards the use of a non-random convenience sample which limits the generalizability of results. Results can be verified with further exploration of the problem using a random sample of teachers. Furthermore, it is possible that viewing a video vignette of the consultation session rather than participating in a live consultation session may affect participants’ involvement and effectiveness ratings. Future research should involve teachers in live consultation sessions to negate this limitation. Additionally, the actors in both video vignettes will be Caucasian females. It is unknown if using minority or male actors may differentially affect teachers’ effectiveness ratings. Therefore, it is recommended that future research address this issue by including a more diverse sample of consultants. Additionally, the actors in the videos are both school psychology graduate students, which may also have varying effects on teachers’ effectiveness ratings; however, the researcher attempted to negate this affect by utilizing a
school psychology graduate student who is also a certified school psychologist as the consultant in the video. Additionally, the actor who will play the consultee is a school psychology graduate student but also has prior teaching experience. Finally, because all surveys are self-report, there is no way to ascertain the level of truthfulness or honesty in the participants’ responses.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Consultation** - collaborating with teachers and other educators to give advice and exchange ideas concerning the presenting problem. The goal of consultation is to empower those involved to assist students in academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs.

2. **Collaborative-directive Consultation Approach** - views the consultant as (a) being prescriptive when appropriate, (b) settling disputes through shared decision making, (c) using interpersonal influence techniques as necessary, and (d) being respectful of consultees’ rights to reject ideas. The operational definition of collaborative-directive consultation is derived from Gutkin’s (1999) original description of the approaches.

3. **Collaborative-nondirective Consultation Approach** - may have the consultant as (a) assisting consultees in developing their own solutions to presenting problems, (b) attempting to minimize their own directiveness and control over consultation sessions, and (c) accepting consultee leads throughout the process. The operational definition of collaborative-
nondirective consultation is derived from Gutkin’s (1999) original description of the approaches.

4. **Expectations for Consultation** - the approach (either collaborative-directive or collaborative-nondirective) that teachers are determined to most closely align with prior to viewing the consultation vignette. Tysinger’s et al. (2009) definition of teacher expectations was utilized for this study by adopting the measure these authors created which aligns with Gutkin’s (1999) definition of each approach. Participants were randomly placed in a matched or mismatched condition after determining their consultation preference.

5. **Consultant Effectiveness** - how the teacher views the consultant as effective in global consultation skills that ultimately lead to a successful consultation process including an intervention that is matched to the student’s need.

6. **Interpersonal skills.** Interpersonal skills describes those behaviors and skills that consultants use to build and maintain rapport, trust, and positive relationships with consultees such that the consultation process can ultimately focus on problem solving, intervention development and implementation, and measureable and socially valid outcomes.

7. **Problem-solving skills.** Problem-solving skills describes those behaviors that enable consultants to effectively utilize the four-step problem identification to problem analysis to intervention to evaluation process.
8. **Consultation process and application skills.** Consultation process and application skills refer to the consultant’s ability to implicitly and explicitly negotiate the consultation contract and structure the consultation process.

9. **Ethical and professional practice skills.** Ethical and professional practice skills are those behaviors that school psychologists should demonstrate in order to maintain appropriate levels of professional and ethical standards in the field and to be true to the ethical and professional practice standards of the profession.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The role of school consultation as a function of part of the job description of a school psychologist is anticipated to expand over the next decade, having become a significant element in the shift from predominantly assessment based activities to a problem-solving model of practice (Wilkinson, 2006). Not only are school psychologists expected to extend their scope of practice to include more time spent in consultation, but several studies have found that consultation remains a preferred service among practicing school psychologists (Kratochwill & Stoiber, 2000; Roberts & Rust, 1994). Because consultation is increasingly being viewed as an important model of service delivery in the schools, it becomes essential that the field of school psychology understand what facilitates a successful consultation process. Much of the consultation literature focuses on the role of the consultant in the process (Echul, Hughes, Myers, Hickman, & Braden, 1992). However, it becomes essential that researchers also examine the role of the teacher in the consultation process, as it relates to the eventual implementation of interventions and their effect in the success of the consultation process.
School-Based Consultation: Comprehensive Beliefs

Although there has been an abundance of various and comprehensive writings on the topic of school-based consultation, despite having utility in guiding the specifics of consultation practice, the research has left some central questions unanswered (Nastasi, 2000). Specifically, the research does not fully address how consultation is actually practiced in the schools or teachers’ and school psychologists’ beliefs relating to the aforementioned issue. Athanasiou, Geil, Hazel, & Copeland (2002) conducted a qualitative study in order to address the gap in the consultation research and to pursue a more comprehensive view of the beliefs and experiences of teachers and school psychologists involved in school-based consultation. Through a thematic interpretation of the data from the case studies which involved four school psychologists and four teachers, four nonhierarchical themes emerged: (a) the relationship of causal attributions to beliefs about treatment needed; (b) combination of direct and indirect services; (c) impact of etiological beliefs and academic standards on perceptions of intervention success; and (d) support within the consultative relationship (Athanasiou et al., 2002, p.274).

The authors noted that in regards to the first theme, there were significant differences between the casual attributions that the teachers mentioned as opposed to those mentioned by school psychologists. For example, the teachers tended to focus primarily on internal factors, while the school psychologists were more concerned with external casual attributions. Findings in relation to the second
theme suggested that both teachers and school psychologists believed that increased direct service in consultation would be beneficial for both the consultation relationship, as well as the child’s outcomes. The results suggested that the teachers that participated in the consultation study did not view consultation-derived interventions as successful unless the involved child showed simultaneous academic gains. The aforementioned desire for academic gains as a requirement for intervention success was for students who were the recipients of behavioral interventions as well. The last theme to be addressed in the study was that of support within the consultative relationship. The teachers valued the support provided by the consultant greatly, stating that they did not expect the process to alleviate the student’s problem, rather they were willing to engage in consultation simply because of the team approach and the intervention and emotional support that the consultant provided.

The previously mentioned findings have practical significance in terms of ensuring a successful consultation experience. Specifically, because teachers may weigh internal factors more heavily in terms of casual attributions of behavior, it may behoove the consultant to consider some form of intervention that focuses directly on the student, rather than just environmental manipulation. The researchers also found that teachers in the study defined success in a very narrow way. Specifically, they did not view a problem behavior as having improved unless it was accompanied by academic gains. If consultants are aware of this phenomenon, perhaps candidly discussing that the behavior intervention is
targeted to change only behaviors prior to implementation may alleviate some of the misconception. The authors also noted that consultees valued the supportive aspect of the consultative relationship more so than the possibility that the student’s behavior might actually change. Therefore, it may be essential that the consultant recalls how the teachers value that aspect of the relationship and strive to be as supportive and available to the consultee as possible in order to ensure that the consultee is willing to engage in future consultative relationships.

**Factors Leading to Intervention Implementation**

Although consultation has been shown to be a satisfactory model of service delivery, relatively little is known regarding the degree to which teachers actually implement interventions that have been developed during the consultation process and even less is known about the factors that influence the implementation (Noell & Witt, 1999). Studying the variables that impact intervention implementation is an advantageous exercise when considering that behavior change is the ultimate goal of consultation. Noell and Witt state that when the purpose of consultation is to improve student outcomes then consultation that does not result in intervention implementation serves little purpose. The authors also call attention to the issue that although teacher satisfaction with the consultation process is a desirable outcome, it does not lead to the delivery of an intervention to a targeted student. In addition, Noell and Witt note that variables influencing intervention implementation is an emerging area of research and that the majority of studies focus on the addition of
performance feedback to consultation to increase initial low levels of treatment implementation (Jones et al., 1997) or to recover previously adequate levels of implementation (Noell et al., 1997).

The Effect of Performance Feedback

Noell et al. (1997) demonstrated that general education teachers tended to maintain adequate levels of treatment integrity for two to four days, following which their levels of implementation began to deteriorate. However, with the addition of performance feedback by a consultant, the teachers showed significant improvement in treatment integrity. Jones et al. (1997) expanded upon the findings of Noell et al. by showing that supplementing traditional consultation with performance feedback increases initially low levels of treatment integrity. The implications of the previously mentioned studies suggest that performance feedback appears to have a more compelling effect than traditional consultation, or simple verbal instruction alone. Therefore, consultants may consider the addition of performance feedback in order to ensure the greatest likelihood of intervention implementation.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

In order to assess the effect of teacher involvement in decision making and teacher self-efficacy on rating of consultant effectiveness and intervention acceptability, DeForest and Hughes (1992) conducted a study in which they had 30 teachers scoring highest on a measure of personal teaching efficacy and 30 teachers scoring lowest on a measure of personal teaching efficacy view a video
of 1 of 2 consultation scenarios (high teacher involvement or low teacher involvement). DeForest and Hughes found that who makes the decision in the consultation process was not a highly salient variable; however, the level of teacher self-efficacy significantly affected the acceptability rating of interventions and consultant effectiveness. The findings suggested that teachers with high personal teaching self-efficacy had a greater sense of control over problems and therefore may respond more positively to the consultation process (DeForest & Hughes, 1992). These authors also suggest that consultants may consider providing more guidance and support when working with teachers who lack the confidence and personal teaching self-efficacy.

**Teacher Resistance**

The teacher must view the consultative relationship as one in which there is a trading off of rewards and costs by both parties, and the rewards must ultimately offset the expenditures in order for teachers to fully engage in the consultation process (Erchul & Chewning, 1990). Erchul and Chewning also describe possible costs sustained by the consultee as a result of engaging in the consultation experience. For example, the authors note that the consultee must be willing to take on the responsibility of being a change agent (i.e. actually implementing the intervention treatment plan). In addition, Erchul and Chewning point out that in many instances for the consultation process to begin the consultee must be willing to admit that he or she is unable to handle the problem that he or she is facing.
Despite the possible costs the consultee may incur, Erchul and Chewning (1990) likewise note that there are potential benefits that may be presented to the consultee who chooses to engage in the consultation process. The reward of having the opportunity to express one’s frustration to another professional may help to balance the costs. Additionally, the consultation process offers the consultee the potential for resolving the presenting problem. Considering the theories of Erchul and Chewning regarding the cost and reward balance as applied to the consultative relationship, it would seem that potential consultees may be more likely to engage in the process if they see it as more likely to effectively resolve the presenting problem. Perhaps having past consultees that are willing to share their successful experiences would be an effective means of persuading potential consultees.

Gonzalez, Nelson, Gutkin, and Shwery (2004) similarly sought to examine factors that contribute to teacher resistance to school-based consultation with school psychologists. The researchers randomly surveyed a sample of elementary teachers in Iowa to measure their resistance to school-based consultation. In primary findings, factor analysis of survey items yielded eight proximal variable factors; however, stepwise regression of actual reported teacher consultations on the factor revealed they were not significant. Using stepwise regression, a secondary analysis of the distal variables was conducted; the number of hours the school psychologist is in the building was the only variable to make a significant, although small, contribution to the prediction of the actual reported consultations.
Although school psychologists may not have complete control over hours spent in a specific school building, there may be tactics that they can employ in order to seem more available to potential consultants. If availability is a key factor in teacher resistance to school-based consultation, school psychologists need to exhaust all possible strategies to increase their perceived availability and ultimately increase the likelihood that teachers may engage in consultation. This also may be an area of research that needs to be further developed.

**Social Power**

*Social influence* is defined as a change in the belief, attitude, or behavior of a target of influence which results from the action or presence of an influencing agent originally defined by French and Raven (1959) and later expanded by Raven (2008). Raven defines *social power* as the potential for this influence to occur. Although it may seem like a controversial topic, Noell, Witt, LaFleur, Mortensen, Ranier and LeVelle (2000) note the utility of studying the construct of social power within the consultative relationship, as it is closely tied to treatment integrity and ultimately intervention effectiveness. Because social power may eventually cause increased intervention effectiveness, it is essential to gain a greater understanding of how social power strategies affect the consultation process. The following definitions of social power are essential to understanding social power constructs within the consultation process.
Table 1: The Six Original Bases of Social Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercion</strong> Person B's perception that Person A can punish B if B does not comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reward</strong> B's perception that A can reward B if B complies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legitimate</strong> B's obligation to accept A's influence attempt because B believes A has a legitimate right to influence, perhaps because of A's professional role or position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert</strong> B's perception that A possesses knowledge or expertise in a specific area of interest to B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referent</strong> A's potential to influence B based on B's identification with A and/or desire for such identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong> A's potential to influence B because of the judged relevance of the information contained in A's message. Informational power is attributed to A by A's providing B with a logical explanation or new information favoring change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The six original bases of social power are from French and Raven (1959) and Raven (1965).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Consultation Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’s perception that A is capable of delivering tangible rewards. Example: Consultant, very pleased with how much effort teacher has put forth in consultation, brings in a box of extra classroom supplies for her to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’s perception that A is capable of delivering tangible punishments. Example: Teacher is reluctant to confide in consultant, believing such a discussion would reveal professional weaknesses that somehow could be transmitted to the principal and result in a poor performance review and possible dismissal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’s perception that A possesses knowledge or expertise in a specific area of interest to B. Example: Teacher views consultant as knowledgeable because of her doctoral degree in school psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’s potential to influence B based on B’s identification with A and/or desire for such identification. Example: Teacher is likely to follow the consultant’s lead in consultation because she wishes to enter the field of school psychology herself in order to consult with teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct informational</td>
<td>A’s potential to influence B because of the judged relevance of the information contained in A’s message. Example: Teacher views the consultant’s treatment plan as likely to succeed—not because of the consultant’s expertise or other factors—but because the teacher made up her mind long ago that boys with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder always benefit from a classroom point system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal legitimacy</td>
<td>B’s perception that A has a right to influence based on A’s professional role or organizational position. Example: Teacher views the consultant as a member of a “healing profession” and, thus, feels obligated to follow through with what the consultant suggests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of dependence</td>
<td>B’s perception that there is an obligation to help people like A who cannot help themselves and who are dependent upon others. Example: Consultant asks for teacher’s help in assisting a student through consultation because the student’s test scores do not qualify him for a special education placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of reciprocity</td>
<td>B’s perception that he/she is obligated to respond in-kind for what A has done already to benefit B. Example: Consultant has spent several lengthy sessions with the teacher working out a reasonable intervention plan, so now the teacher feels an obligation to implement the plan as well as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2 Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy of equity</td>
<td>B’s perception that he/she is obligated to respond to A’s request due to an imbalance of expended effort and possible inconvenience incurred previously by A. Example: Consultant has spent much time working with teacher developing an intervention plan, but teacher has failed to start implementation, causing consultant to return to classroom unnecessarily to begin what would have been an initial evaluation of the plan. Teacher, then feeling somewhat guilty, begins plan implementation immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reward</td>
<td>B’s perception that A’s personal approval can potentially influence B. Example: Consultant compliments teacher for collecting baseline data for five days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal coercion</td>
<td>B’s perception that A’s personal disapproval can potentially influence B. Example: Consultant expresses disapproval when teacher has not implemented intervention as agreed upon previously.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Absent from this list are negative expert, negative referent, and indirect informational power (Raven, 1992, 1993). These three power bases are not measured by Raven et al.’s (1998) Interpersonal Power Inventory.
In an effort to gain insight into the influence of social power constructs within the school-based consultative relationship, researchers recruited practicing school psychologists to complete a survey examining their perceived effectiveness of power strategies (Erchul, Raven, & Ray, 2001). Erchul, et al. found that when school psychologists are asked to apply a power perspective to analyze their consulting relationships with teachers they favor soft power strategies (e.g. informational, expert, and referent) over harsh power bases (e.g. impersonal coercion, personal coercion, and legitimate position).

Expanding upon the previous relevant findings, researchers sought to investigate the likelihood of use of power strategies, rather than just the perceived effectiveness (Wilson, Erchul, & Raven, 2008). Researchers recruited practicing school psychologists to complete a survey regarding likelihood of use of various power strategies. Results indicated that psychologists overall reported a greater likelihood of using soft versus harsh power strategies. In addition, findings showed that psychologists overall also reported a greater likelihood of using direct informational, positive expert, and positive referent power versus the remaining eight power strategies measured by the Interpersonal Power Inventory. The pattern of results is promising and suggests that future research in this area may produce meaningful insights into the consultant-teacher relationship.
Verbal Behavior

In the debate over the most effective model of school-based consultation, many researchers have emphasized the possible significance of collaboration within the consultative relationship. Consultees’ preference for collaboration when surveyed is one piece of evidence in support of a collaborative model of consultation (Witt, Erchul, McKee, Pardue, & Wickstrom, 1991). Witt et al. also notes that when asked whether they would prefer having input versus not having input most teachers indicate the desire for input in the process. Although according to Witt et al. teachers express a preference for input and collaboration, it is critical to determine their actual level of participation in the process and the possible effects that it has on the outcome. Witt et al. sought to determine the level of control that consultants and consultees had during the consultation process as reflected by the frequency of topic determination for each participant.

Using separate one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures the authors found that consultants executed a statistically significant larger proportion of topic changes than the consultees. The differences in topic determination were significant in that they seemed to be related to consultation outcome measures. Specifically, the variable, topic determination, for the consultant was positively related to both consultant and consultee perceptions of outcome, whereas topic determination for the consultee had a low and often a negative relationship with outcome measures. For example, the variable that most closely associated with willingness to implement a treatment plan was topic
determination for the consultant during the problem identification and interview phase of consultation. However, topic determination for the consultee was negatively associated with this variable. The author’s findings indicate that when the consultant took verbal control of the consultation process during the problem identification and interview phase, the consultee was subsequently more likely to carry out the treatment plan. The results suggest that consultants may consider assuming a greater degree of verbal control over the consultation process in the problem identification and interview phases in order to ensure a greater probability of treatment implementation.

A principal way that consultants direct the consultation process is through the use of questions (Hughes, Erchul, Yoon, Jackson, & Hennington, 1997). Because it is reasonable to conclude that the use of questions may have a significant effect on the outcome of the consultation process, the aforementioned authors sought to determine the relationship between consultant use of questions and consultees’ evaluation of the consultant. The researchers audiotaped consultation sessions and coded them according to frequencies of total questions (open-ended questions, inference questions, and accepted questions) and then converted the category frequencies into percentages prior to data analysis due to the varying length of the interviews. Results indicated that correlations based on frequency data showed a positive relationship between the use of inference questions and accepted questions and consultees’ evaluation of the consultation process. However, when analyzing percentages the data were not supportive of a
positive relationship. These results contribute to a body of literature that reports inconsistent associations between verbal behavior and process outcomes.

Erchul and Chewning (1990) explored aspects of interpersonal control within the consultative relationship by using a coding scheme that analyzes the requests and responses to those requests. Findings showed that consultants tended to control the relationship with their frequent initiation of requests, while consultees were characterized as passive, accepting, and cooperative within the relationship. The researchers also identified a general pattern suggesting that a greater number of requests by consultees are associated with poorer consultation outcomes. The results of the study add to a body of inconsistent outcomes concerning interpersonal control within the relationship; however, it may be that interpersonal variables affect the process outcome differentially in specific relationships. Therefore, the effective consultant needs to be responsive to the personal and situational factors involved.

Erchul and Convington (1995) expanded upon Erchul and Chewning’s (1990) initial investigation of request-centered communication within school-based consultation; however, their study differed methodologically in that the sample employed was larger and more diverse and the authors coded only the initial problem identification interviews. The types of consultant and consultee bids were correlated with a measure of consultation effectiveness. All correlations were non-significant; however, it is interesting to compare the results to the earlier findings of Erchul and Chewning. The authors suggest several
explanations as to the reason for the lack of significant correlations in their study as compared to the initial exploration by Erchul and Chewning. First they note that both the consultants and consultees in their study were more controlling than in the earlier study; therefore, it is possible that interactions with different levels of interpersonal control may have affected the results and created a more convoluted comparison. A second explanation is related to the increased diversity of the sample employed. Although it is a strength of this particularly study in terms of generalizability of results, the heterogeneity of the consultants may have worked to lower the correlational results. The inconsistent findings regarding the role of request-centered communication in consultation suggests that further research in this area is warranted in order to determine the effect that it may have on the process outcomes.

**Language Preference**

Because the nature of the consultation process often requires consultants to rely upon a third party (e.g. teachers) to implement the prescribed intervention, the manner in which they present the intervention plan to the teacher can be crucial in terms of acceptance and eventual implementation (Hyatt, Tingstrom, & Edwards, 1991). Therefore, examining the effect of the manner in which interventions are presented can be beneficial in creating recommendations concerning the most successful method of presentation.

Hyatt et al. (1991) designed a study in which they isolated the effects of the use of technical language and evaluated the effects on intervention acceptance
within school-based consultation. The researchers measured a group of teachers’ (enrolled in various graduate level education courses) and a group of undergraduate students’ (enrolled in an introductory psychology course) acceptability of an intervention (time-out procedure) as a factor of the language (technical versus non-technical) that was used to describe the intervention. Using ANOVAs and independent t-tests to examine the group differences in acceptability ratings, the authors found that overall acceptability ratings did not differ significantly between teachers and students. Teachers rated the technical description of time-out as significantly more acceptable than the non-technical description; however, no significant difference was found between undergraduates’ ratings of technical versus non-technical descriptions of time-out. The results of this study were noteworthy in that they indicated technical intervention descriptions might be positively correlated with teachers’ acceptability ratings of interventions. Intervention acceptability is a critical goal as it is a necessary step that proceeds intervention implementation.

Rhoades and Kratochwill (1992) conducted a study to further explore the complexity of the consultant-consultee relationship by assessing consultee involvement and consultant language in a randomized design for their influence on intervention acceptability. Participants in the study (regular education teachers) were assigned to one of four conditions: technical language with teacher involvement, technical language without teacher involvement, nontechnical language with teacher involvement, and nontechnical language without teacher involvement.
involvement. Teachers then viewed a videotape of their assigned consultation condition and completed a measure assessing their acceptability of the intervention presented during the process. A two-way ANOVA was completed with consultant language and consultee involvement as the independent variables and acceptability as the dependent variable.

Results indicated no main effect for consultee involvement and no main effect for consultant language. Participants gave the highest acceptability ratings to the condition in which teacher involvement was low and the consultant used technical language. Nontechnical language and low teacher involvement was rated as the least acceptable. Results of the study contribute to the literature in showing that consultee involvement may have an indirect effect on other consultation process variables, such as consultation language. The current study shows that consultees do not necessarily prefer high teacher involvement which may be a factor of the language used and acceptability of the intervention proposed. In addition, the authors conducted a second analysis of scores that indicated differences in consultant language (technical versus nontechnical) did not cause the acceptability ratings to differ significantly. Therefore, there may not be a direct relationship between language and acceptability; rather it is possible that intervening variables may be convoluting the relationship. Rhoades and Kratochwill (1992) suggest that consultants may fair well from utilizing a mix of technical and nontechnical language so that the consultee may be more likely to perceive them as an expert with a wealth of knowledge to share.
Data Preference

School psychologists are required not only to determine the specific need of a child and appropriate level of support or intervention, but they must be able to show that the child is making progress or if alternative interventions are warranted (Hojnoski, Caskie, Gischlar, Key, Barry, & Hughes, 2009). Progress monitoring involves the collection of data, displaying of data in graph form, and comparing of data to a pre-determined benchmark goal or normative group. Hojnoski et al. note that school psychologists are trained in progress monitoring; however, teachers rarely report training in the skill. Expecting teachers to participate in progress monitoring when involved in consultation may be a daunting task for some. Exploring the relationship between teachers’ preference for methods of data display and acceptability then can bring insight to the consultation process.

Hojnoski et al. (2009) explored several issues related to teachers’ use of data in data-based decision making. Participants (teachers at Head Start) completed a survey packet that aimed to measure their acceptability of different data display methods, overall preference for data display, and accurate use of data displays. Results indicated that teachers preferred methods of data display varied, and that their accuracy and acceptability varied per method. Teacher educational level did not appear to be correlated to either preference or acceptability. The table format was the most preferred method and the line graph the least preferred method in the study. Teachers tended to be able to use the data for simple
descriptive purposes; however, interpretative tasks were more difficult and were affected by the data format. The findings of this study can provide guidance to consultants in the way that they approach teachers regarding data collection and progress monitoring. Asking the consultee the preferred method of data display may be best practice and produce better implementation outcomes. In addition, consultants may not want to assume that the consultee has the training and skills to graph and interpret data, rather they should consider providing additional guidance.

**Data Source**

Consultants can provide teachers with a plethora of research-based interventions; however, unless teachers find the information to be practical they are unlikely to implement the suggested strategy (Landrum et al., 2007). Landrum et al. proposes that valuable research can be conducted to examine methods to convey intervention information to teachers to make them more useable. These authors sought to follow their own recommendation by designing a study to examine the effects of teachers’ perceptions of the utility of information describing the effectiveness of reading interventions presented in two formats: data-based (highlighted research findings) and personal (based on the personal experiences of an experienced teacher). Results indicated that regardless of teacher training (i.e. special education versus regular education) they interpreted the information presented in a personal format (as opposed to a data-based
format) as more useable. Additionally, more years of teaching experience was positively correlated with lower utility ratings.

These findings have significant implications. First, the authors note that one important type of endorsement regarding the utility of an intervention is the corroboration of another experienced teacher who has used the treatment successfully. It may also be important for consultants to keep in mind that veteran teachers may be more likely to resist implementing interventions, as they are likely entrenched in techniques known to work for them. Considering methods to confront their resistance will prepare consultants to handle such situations and permit a greater likelihood of adequate implementation integrity.

**Agreement within the Consultative Relationship**

It is reasonable to assume that considering the consultation process from an interpersonal perspective and collecting variables on both the consultant and consultee is a beneficial research endeavor, as dyadic variables have more explanatory and predictive power than monadic variables in human interactions (Erchul, Hughes, Meyers, Hickman, & Braden, 1992). Due to the perceived value of the study, Erchul et al. used an interpersonal perspective to investigate the statistical relationships among dyadic process variables and consultation outcomes. Results showed that the more the consultant and consultee saw the process in a similar way, understood their roles, and worked together as a team, the more favorable were the consultees’ perceptions of (a) the beneficialness of consultation, (b) consultee competence, (c) client improvement, and (d) consultant
effectiveness. The findings of this study are promising and suggest the usefulness of clarifying consultation expectations prior to commencement, as well as involving some consultees in the process as team members to the appropriate extent.

**Preference for Directiveness**

There has been a surge of consultation literature that has focused on determining the most effective method for school-based consultation; however, the research has produced inconsistent results, supporting both the collaborative and the expert approach to consultation (Tysinger et al., 2009). Tysinger et al. define the collaborative approach as including the consultee in the process of determining the content of consultation to a greater degree than other approaches, with the psychologist providing a means to process the consultee’s ideas without becoming too directive. They describe the expert approach as being directed to a greater degree by the consultant, with the consultant selecting the issue to be addressed, the method of data collection, and a suitable intervention. Considering the inconsistent findings, Erchul (1992) posited a theory that attempted to integrate the outwardly opposing approaches. He explained that the consultant dominance does not indicate the absence of collaboration. Gutkin (1999) expanded upon the idea saying that studies focusing on collaborative versus expert approaches represent a “fundamental error” (p.180) because collaborative and expert are not actually opposite; rather coercive is the opposite of collaborative and nondirective is the opposite of expert/directive. Therefore,
consultation actually takes the form of collaborative-directive, collaborative-nondirective, coercive-directive, or coercive-nondirective. Both Erchul and Gutkin noted that the most effective forms were collaborative-directive, and collaborative-nondirective.

In spirit of the Erchul (1992) and Gutkin’s (1999) theory, Tysinger et al. (2009) investigated the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches and the influence of teacher expectations on their ratings of process effectiveness. The researchers found significantly higher ratings for the consultants and their interventions when the collaborative-directive approach was used. The teachers also gave significantly higher ratings when their expectations were matched with the condition that they viewed than the teachers that were in mismatched conditions. The results of this study indicate that providing direction within the consultative relationship, yet still allowing room for consultee input seems to provide an optimal situation for effective process outcomes. In addition, taking time to interview consultees prior to beginning the consultation process in order to determine their expectations and preferences is advisable.

**Perception of Consultation Model**

In addition to the body of literature examining interpersonal variables within the consultation process, researchers have developed a series of studies exploring teachers’ preference for a specific consultation model (Kaiser, Rosenfield, & Gravois, 2009; Schulte, Osborn, & Kauffman, 1993). This line of
research can be useful in providing guidance to consultants in terms of research-based practices to utilize in the field.

Kasier et al. (2009) sought to investigate teachers’ perceptions and practices within a specific model of consultee-centered consultation: Instructional Consultation (IC) (Rosenfield, 2008). According to Rosenfield, IC is characterized by collaborative problem solving and addresses both academic and behavioral referral concerns of the teacher. The consultant utilizes professional development in order to aid in creating and maintaining student success in the general education classroom through teacher application of research-based instructional techniques.

Kasier et al. (2009) explored teachers’ satisfaction with IC, their perceptions of skills and strategies learned as a result of engaging in the process, and the relationship between the two. The authors examined teachers’ self-reports to establish teachers’ satisfaction as well as to determine their overall perception of effectiveness of the process. Analysis of the data indicated that teachers were highly satisfied, their perceived outcomes met or exceeded their expectations, and they tended to feel confident about handling similar problems in the future. The findings of the previously mentioned study were encouraging, suggesting that teachers were not only generally satisfied with the IC process, but they were also willing to generalize the skills and strategies they learned to other students in the future.
Schulte et al. (1993) conducted a study of a similar nature; however, they sought to determine teachers’ preference for an indirect service model of consultation consisting solely of consultation (C/I) versus a combined model consisting of consultation and direct instruction (C/D). In addition, the consultants in the study were experienced special education teachers; rather than school psychologists. The teachers in the study completed pre/post questionnaires and an interview assessing their perceptions of the two models. Researchers found that all three conditions (C/I, C/D, and control group) initially expressed a preference for consultation over referral. At post-test teachers in the C/D and control conditions continued to prefer consultation over referral; however, mean preference rating for teachers in the C/I condition did not differ significantly from neutral. These findings suggest a weak shift in preference from consultation for teachers’ who participated in the C/I. Additionally, results showed that teachers preferred the model that allowed for more collaboration (C/D).

The results indicating teacher preference have important implications for service delivery. They suggest that allowing teachers to have an opportunity to work in a partnership and take a greater degree of ownership over the consultation experience may produce better outcomes. However, the results may be limited in their generalizability considering the practitioners in the study were special education teachers as opposed to school psychologists. In addition, the results must be interpreted within the context of the existing body of consultation
literature which has produced mixed results in regards to teachers’ preference for collaboration versus directiveness within the consultative relationship.

**Conjoint Behavioral Consultation**

Another consultation model that researchers have explored is conjoint behavioral consultation (CBC), which attempts to address the needs of the student by creating successful partnerships among parents, educators, and other support providers (Sheridan, Erchul, Brown, Dowd, Warnes, Marti, Schemm, & Eagle, 2004). In an attempt to further explore the implications for service delivery, Sheridan et al. examined the extent to which teachers’ and parents’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the CBC consultant are congruent and the influence on case outcomes.

The study provided evidence suggesting that parents’ and teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the consultant are not necessarily related, and as the differences among perceptions increases, the congruence of perceptions of case outcomes for both parties decreases. These findings provide additional support for the Erchul et al. (1992) study that found when consultees and consultants see the process in a more similar way, understand their roles, and work together as a team, the outcomes are more positive. Additionally, the study demonstrates that gathering information about teacher and parent goals prior to implementing CBC may increase both parties’ perceptions of case outcomes.

Garbacz, Woods, Swanger-Gangé, Taylor, Black, and Sheridan (2008) expanded upon the findings of the previously mentioned study and explored the
extent to which a partnership orientation in CBC was related to case outcomes and implementation integrity. Consultation sessions were coded to determine the degree to which each partnership oriented theme was demonstrated during the sessions. Partnership orientation scores were recorded and process integrity data was collected across all interviews.

A simple linear regression analysis revealed that a partnership orientation in CBC was significant in predicting teachers’ acceptability and satisfaction with the process; however, parents’ acceptability and satisfaction with the process was not predicted by a partnership orientation. Additionally, there was no significant relationship between treatment integrity and a partnership orientation. While this study provides some important insight into teachers’ perceptions regarding parent involvement in the consultation process, it does have some notable limitations. First, the sample size was small and consisted only of graduate students which restricts the generalizability of the findings. Further research is also needed to control for and explain the effect of the range of interventions implemented during CBC. Keeping the aforementioned limitations in mind, school psychologists would be wise to consider the potential positive influence of parent involvement via a partnership orientation in future consultation situations.

An additional case study examining CBC as a method of means of providing behavioral support for two students with emotional and behavioral difficulties (EBD) in regular education classrooms (Wilkinson, 2005). The author employed a non-concurrent multiple baseline design across participants and
utilized a follow-up phase to assess the intervention of choice (self-management) which was implemented within a CBC model. The effects of CBC and the intervention on the problem behavior were evaluated by replicating the procedures several times throughout the course of the same academic semester and keeping data on baseline, treatment, and follow-up phases for each student. The authors also collected data to determine perceived levels of acceptability, effectiveness, and consumer satisfaction.

Analysis of the data revealed that both consultees and parents viewed CBC as acceptable (average rating of 5.63 and 5.83 on a 6 point Likert scale respectively). Both teachers and parents also reported their subjective perception of CBC as effective (average item ratings 5.07 and 5.08 respectively). Additionally, out of a possible score of 7, the average score for consultant effectiveness for teachers and parents was 6.69 and 6.67 respectively. Although more research is necessary to determine the possibility for generalization across populations, settings, and behaviors, the results of this study provide promising data regarding the utility of CBC and teachers acceptance of the model. It is reasonable to assume that acceptability and perceived effectiveness will ultimately lead to a greater likelihood of treatment integrity.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

The above studies show that teachers play a critical role in the dynamic, interpersonal process of school-based consultation; however, a void still exists in the literature regarding the degree to which teachers actually implement
interventions as a result of consultation and what factors have the greatest influence on implementation (Noell & Witt, 1999). Striving to determine not only the actual level of implementation, but the factors that contribute to its’ likelihood would benefit the practitioners, educators, and students alike.

Additionally, there has been a plethora of consultation research produced exploring the most effective method in terms of collaboration versus expert-driven; however, the results of those studies have been inconsistent, supporting both approaches at times (Tysinger et al., 2009). Directing research efforts towards replicating studies in order to clarify the understanding of teacher preference for consultation style may also prove useful.

Finally, much of the consultant research to date has involved the use of graduate students as consultants (Erchul et al., 1992; Erchul & Covington, 1995; Garbacz et al., 2008; Hughes et al., 1997; Kaiser et al., 2009; Sheridan et al., 2004; Witt et al., 1991). Although the consultants were trained on the consultation procedures, there may be some limitations to consider in terms of generalizability. Consultees may perceive school psychologists in training differently than those who are experienced practitioners. Therefore, consultees may have reacted differently in the consultation situations in which they were working with a student consultant. Attempting to create additional studies utilizing experienced practitioners would be a worthwhile endeavor.
Implications in Relation to Consultation Approach and Expectations

Because studies conducted on teachers’ preference for a directive versus a nondirective consultation approach have obtained conflicting results, it is unclear what approach teachers generally prefer and if that preference differs depending on setting, personality, or other variables. The current research study attempts to clarify teachers’ preference for a collaborative-directive or collaborative-nondirective approach to consultation as well as determine the effect of teachers’ expectations for consultation approach on their ratings of consultant effectiveness by expanding upon the work of Tysinger et al. (2007). Additionally, the current study examines the current rate and desired future consultation interaction, as well as teachers’ perspective of factors that might contribute to those rates. Similar to the findings of Tysinger et al. (2007) it is expected that the teachers will prefer the collaborative-directive consultation approach and that when teachers’ expectations for approach are matched to the consultation vignette that they view, consultant effectiveness ratings will be higher. In conclusion, this study examined the relationship of two factors with consultant effectiveness including consultation approach and teacher expectations for consultation approach.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A cross-sectional online survey was employed to answer the proposed research questions. This method of research study does not allow for the implementation of treatments or manipulation of variables (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorenson, 2010). Therefore, the design is non-experimental which implies that the researcher did not manipulate the variables in any way. Non-experimental designs are correlational in nature because the variables cannot be manipulated experimentally (Crano & Brewer, 2002). Rather, research is predicting and explaining relationships among variables (Creswell, 2008). This type of design is particularly fitting for this study because it involves the attitudes and opinions of participants (Ary et al., 2010).

Sample

Elementary teachers were targeted because literature indicates that Response to Intervention (RTI) is most developed in the primary grades (Fuchs, Mock, Morgan & Young, 2003). As consultation can be viewed as a step in an
effective RTI system, the researcher is interested in assessing teachers’ perspectives of the process who have a greater familiarity with RTI and the problem solving model. Because teachers volunteered to participate in the study, it is considered a non-random convenience sample.

**Sampling Procedure**

The sample for this study is a non-random, convenience sample. The researcher utilized a convenience sampling procedure to recruit participants. The researcher selected three elementary schools based on familiarity with interventions and RTI procedures from Westerville City schools, a suburban school district in Columbus, Ohio. The researcher also selected three elementary schools based on prior established relationships and familiarity with interventions from Columbus City Schools, an urban school district in Columbus, Ohio. The researcher chose to utilize two different districts to obtain the necessary sample size so that comparison can be made regarding possible differences between teachers’ preferences for consultation and consultation utilization in an urban and suburban district.

**Study Variables**

**Demographic Variables**

Participants were asked to provide demographic information including: age, gender, race, grade currently taught, educational attainment, students currently taught, and teaching experience. These variables were collected by asking participants to complete a demographic form (see Appendix A).
Participants’ age and teaching experience are ratio scale variables and were collected using open-ended questions asking for the age of the participant and the years of teaching experience of the participant respectively. Gender is a categorical, dichotomous variable with two levels, male and female. Students currently taught is a categorical variable with three levels, regular education, special education, and other. Grade currently taught is an ordinal variable with six levels: kindergarten, 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 4\textsuperscript{th}, and 5\textsuperscript{th} grade. Race is a categorical variable with eight levels: Caucasian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino/a, Asian/Asian American, American Indian, Arab American, Mixed, and other. Educational attainment is also a categorical variable with four levels: Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, Doctorate degree, and other.

The researcher also collected descriptive information that includes teachers’ prior utilization of consultation services. Prior consultation utilization is a ratio scale variable that will be collected using an open-ended question asking for the number of times in the past year that the participant has utilized consultation. Future consultation utilization is an ordinal variable with three levels: (1) more often (2) satisfied with current rate (3) less often. Participants were asked to indicate if they would use consultation more often if given the opportunity. Perception of school psychologist as a consultant is an ordinal variable with four levels: (1) Strongly Disagree (4) Strongly Agree. This variable was collected by asking participants to respond to the following statement: I feel that the school psychologist in my building is a valuable resource whom I can
approach to seek out consultation services. Problems to bring to consultation is a categorical variable with three levels: academic, behavioral, and other. Participants were asked to indicate what types of problems have most often caused them to seek out consultation. Appropriate problems is a categorical variable with three levels: academic, behavioral, and other. Participants were asked to indicate what types of problems they feel are most appropriate to bring to consultation. Access to school psychologist is a dichotomous categorical variable with two levels, yes and no. Participants were asked if they would like to have better access to the school psychologist for consultation purposes.

**Dependent variables**

The dependent variables that were measured in this study are five domains of consultant effectiveness: global effectiveness; interpersonal skills; problem-solving; process and application skills; and ethical and professional skills. Consultant effectiveness is defined in various ways and is constructed of multiple components. For this study, consultant effectiveness is defined as how the teacher views the consultant as effective in global consultation skills that ultimately lead to a successful consultation process including an intervention that is matched to the student’s need. Global consultant effectiveness will be measured by asking participants to complete the Consultant Effectiveness Form (CEF: Erchul, 1987). The variable is ordinal with rankings from one to seven. The remaining four domains of consultant effectiveness will be measured by asking participants to complete the Consultant Effectiveness Scale (CES: Knoff, Sullivan, & Liu,
1995: Knoff, Hines, & Kromery, 1995). The variables are ordinal with rankings from one to five.

**Interpersonal skills.** Interpersonal skills describes those behaviors and skills that consultants use to build and maintain rapport, trust, and positive relationships with consultees such that the consultation process can ultimately focus on problem solving, intervention development and implementation, and measurable and socially valid outcomes.

**Problem-solving skills.** Problem-solving skills describes those behaviors that enable consultants to effectively utilize the four-step problem identification to problem analysis to intervention to evaluation process.

**Consultation process and application skills.** Consultation process and application skills refer to the consultant’s ability to implicitly and explicitly negotiate the consultation contract and structure the consultation process.

**Ethical and professional practice skills.** Ethical and professional practice skills are those behaviors that school psychologists should demonstrate in order to maintain appropriate levels of professional and ethical standing in the field to be true to the ethical and professional practice standard of the profession.

**Independent Variables**

There are two independent variables, each with two levels that were measured in this study. They are outlined below.

**Collaborative-directive Consultation Approach** views the consultant as (a) being prescriptive when appropriate, (b) settling disputes through shared
decision making, (c) using interpersonal influence techniques as necessary, and (d) being respectful of consultees’ rights to reject ideas. The operational definition of collaborative-directive consultation is derived from Gutkin’s (1999) original description of the approaches.

**Collaborative-nondirective Consultation Approach** - may have the consultant as (a) assisting consultees in developing their own solutions to presenting problems, (b) attempting to minimize their own directiveness and control over consultation sessions, and (c) accepting consultee leads throughout the process. The operational definition of collaborative-nondirective consultation is derived from Gutkin’s (1999) original description of the approaches.

**Expectations for Consultation** - the approach (either collaborative-directive or collaborative-nondirective) that teachers are determined to most closely align with prior to viewing the consultation vignette. Tysinger’s et al. (2009) definition of teacher expectations was utilized for this study by adopting the measure these authors created which aligns with Gutkin’s (1999) definition of each approach. Participants were randomly placed in a matched or mismatched condition after determining their consultation preference.

**Instruments**

Participants were asked to complete one questionnaire prior to viewing to the consultation video, which assessed their expectations for consultation approach. Participants were then be assigned to either a matched or mismatched condition based on the consultation approach that they most closely align with.
After being assigned to a group, participants then viewed a consultation video (showing either the collaborative-directive or collaborative-nondirective approach) and were asked to complete two questionnaires assessing their perception of the consultant’s effectiveness. These instruments are outlined below.

**Consultant Role Questionnaire**

Participants were screened using the Consultant Role Questionnaire (Tysinger et al., 2009) to determine which consultation approach they most closely aligned with (see Appendix B). The questionnaire consists of seven semantic differential items that correspond to Gutkin’s (1999) description of each approach. Each item contains two statements. One of the statements for each item corresponds with the collaborative-directive approach and the other corresponds with the collaborative-nondirective approach. Participants were given the option to strongly or mildly agree with one of the two contrasting statements. All items were given a score (strongly agree with 1=1; agree with 1=2; strongly agree with 2=3; agree with 2=4). Based on their scores on the measure, participants were placed in either the collaborative-directive or collaborative-nondirective group. Half of each group was randomly selected to be in the matched condition and half of each group was randomly selected to be in the mismatched condition, creating a total of four groups.

**Consultant Effectiveness Form**

Global perception of consultant effectiveness was measured using the
Consultant Effectiveness Form (CEF: Erchul, 1987) (see Appendix C). This questionnaire uses a Likert-scale format. The questions are posed using positive wording (e.g., The consultant offered useful information). The variable is ordinal with values ranking from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Based on a principal-components factor analysis with Varimax rotation (Derby, 1977), five CEF items (2, 4, 6, 8, and 10) presented loadings of .68 to .82 on a factor labeled as "Consultant Usefulness." Five other items (3, 5, 7, 9, and 11) had loadings of .46 to .63 on a factor Derby named "Consultant Professional Manner." CEF item 1, though not derived through factor analysis, was referred to by Derby as the "General Helpfulness Item." Finally, CEF item 12 was taken from Sirridge and Fine's (1973) inventory designed to measure teacher satisfaction with consultation. Additionally, Cronbach’s alpha for the CEF is .95 which indicates good internal reliability.

**Consultant Effectiveness Scale**

Four specific domains of consultant effectiveness will be measured using the Consultant Effectiveness Scale (CES: Knoff, Sullivan, & Liu, 1995: Knoff, Hines, & Kromery, 1995) (see Appendix D). This questionnaire uses a Likert-scale format. Each item is posed as a consultant characteristic (e.g. empathetic, identifies clear goals, understands school system). The variable is ordinal with values ranking from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (To a very larger degree). Based on a combination of results from four separate analyses Knoff, Howard, Hines, and Constance (1995) were able to determine construct validity of the CES. First, a
series of t-tests were conducted to determine whether respondents' ratings of the most effective versus least effective consultants, on each CES item, significantly differed. Next, a stepwise discriminant function analysis was conducted to identify those items that best discriminated between the most and least effective consultant ratings. Then, independent common factor analyses using the principal axis factor extraction technique were completed with the most effective and least effective consultant data, respectively. Finally, another factor analysis was completed with only those factor items considered appropriate to the CES and its construct as a way to finalize the scale.

The CES consists of 52 items which load on 4 factors. Factor I (Interpersonal Skills) consists of 24 items with factor loadings ranging from .41 to .78. Factor II (Problem-solving) consists of 14 items with factor loadings ranging from .41 to .81. Factor III (Consultation Process and Application Skills) consists of 11 items with factor loadings ranging from .40 to .71. Factor IV (Ethical and Professional Practice Skills) consists of 7 items with factor loadings ranging from .41 to .70. The internal consistencies reliabilities for the four factors are as follows: Factor I (.95), Factor II (.89), Factor III (.88), Factor IV (.81), which indicates adequate internal reliability.

**Data Collection Procedures**

In the winter of 2013 the researcher began contacting school districts seeking permission to recruit teachers through their school. The researcher
provided principals with a letter informing them of the intent of the study and the corresponding procedures. The researcher then contacted principals to discuss any questions and whether they agreed to allow the researcher to recruit teachers through their schools.

After the researcher obtained principals’ support, the researcher requested permission for the primary investigator to attend school staff meetings during which the primary investigator shared the intent of the study with teachers and solicited their participation in an online survey. The primary investigator asked that interested teachers sign a consent form. Those teachers that signed a consent form were then asked to complete the Consultant Role Questionnaire, consisting of seven semantic differential questions that assess consultation expectations. The Consultant Role Questionnaire took approximately five minutes for participants to complete. The researcher used the results of the Consultant Role Questionnaire to determine which consultation approach the participants align with most closely. Half of all participants in the collaborative-directive group were randomly placed in the matched condition and half in the mismatched condition and half of the participants in the collaborative non-directive group were randomly placed in the matched condition and half in the mismatched condition. Therefore, there was a total of four groups created for the purpose of this study.

After completing the Consultant Role Questionnaire, participants were told that they would be sent an email containing a link to take the online survey. The consultation video was embedded directly into the survey to streamline the
process. Therefore, two version of the survey were created. Each version was identical with the exception of the video. Participating teachers were given a timeline of when to expect the link for the survey. It is the goal that approximately 80 elementary school teachers will complete the online survey. Participants first viewed an eight-minute consultation video and then completed a demographic and two consultant effectiveness questionnaires, assessing global effectiveness as well as specific consultant behaviors. The survey took approximately 15-20 minutes for participants to complete.

Participants viewed one of two eight-minute consultation videos that will either be aligned with the collaborative-directive or collaborative-nondirective approach. Each video portrayed a consultation session consisting of problem identification, problem analysis, and proposed intervention. The consultant was played by the researcher, a school psychology graduate student, who is also is also a certified school psychologist and the consultee was played another school psychology graduate student who has previous teaching experience.

**Issues with Validity**

It is necessary for all researchers to examine the validity of their study (Ary et al., 2010). Campbell and Stanley (1963) expanded upon the idea of research design validity to include internal and external validity. Creswell (2008) defines internal validity in relation to correlational studies to mean the accuracy and quality of the study. External validity then refers to the generalizability of the results of the study.
Because the current study is a survey the researcher must consider that the data is self-reported which introduces the possibility that participants may provide socially desirable answers, rather than being truthful. For example, teachers might indicate that they would like to utilize consultation services more often in the future than they truly desire to because they perceive it to be the socially desirable response. Also, teachers may be more inclined to rate the consultant in the video session as effective if they see it as a socially desirable response. Additionally, because this study is correlational rather than experimental in nature, the researcher cannot manipulate and account for all the variables that may be associated with the dependent variable. Therefore, there may be unaccounted confounding variables influencing the dependent variable in this study.

A major threat to the external validity of this study concerns the utilization of a convenience sample. A convenience sample is chosen for the study not because they are representative of the desired population, but because it is convenient to use them, which may introduce bias into the results (Vogt, 2011). Biased results lead to findings that may not be generalizable to the entire population; rather only applicable to the sample being studied. Additionally, online surveys are restrictive in that only participants with access and knowledge of technology may participate (Heiervang & Goodman, 2009). The aforementioned phenomenon may introduce further bias to the study sample which will ultimately affect the generalizability of the results. The researcher must also consider the non-response bias which may also pose a threat to the
external validity of the study. Specifically, this occurs when those selected for the study who choose not to respond are in some way fundamentally different than those who do respond (Vogt, 2011). The non-response bias can also lead to inaccurate generalizations of results.

**Recommended Data Analysis**

Data was analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). First, descriptive statistics were analyzed to determine the frequencies for the demographic variables. Descriptive statistics for consultation utilization (current and future rate) answered research questions one and two. Descriptive statistics for perception of the school psychologist answered research question three. In order to answer research question four, the research looked at the frequencies and descriptive statistics of the Consultant Role Questionnaire. Research Question Five was answered through the examination of independent $t$-test data which was run on each item of the CEF and the variables match and survey. Independent $t$-tests were also conducted in order to investigate the relationship between each factor of the CES and the variables survey and match.

**Descriptive statistics**

Descriptive statistic analyses were conducted with demographic variables to obtain the mean and range of age of the participants and percentages of gender, grade, grade taught, and students taught. To address Research Questions One, Research Question Two, and Research Question Three the researcher also examined descriptive data to better understand teachers’ past consultation
utilization, the types of problems most often associated with seeking out consultation, the types of problems teachers perceive as most appropriate for consultation, and whether teachers would like better access to consultation.

Research Question Four was addressed through the examination of descriptive statistics (frequencies, mean, range, median, and standard deviation) which were collected on the Consultant Role Questionnaire.

**Independent t-tests**

To address Research Question Five independent t-tests were conducted to investigate the results of the CEF and the CES to determine whether participants in the matched condition rated the consultant as significantly different than those in the mismatched condition on any item of the CES or any of the four factors of the CES. Independent t-tests are appropriate statistical tests to use with the CEF and CES as the researcher is interested in determining if there is a difference between the means of two independent samples (the matched and mismatched groups) (Lomax, 2007).

Prior to running the independent t-tests the researcher will conduct tests of assumption. Lomax (2007) identifies three assumptions that must be met in order to successfully carry out the independent t-test, including normality, homogeneity of variance, and independence. The first assumption concerns whether each of the populations follows a normal distribution (King, Rosopa, & Minium, 2011). When using a two-tailed test, violation of the normality assumption is minimal for
samples larger than 10 and disappears for samples of at least 20 (Tiku & Singh, 1981).

According to Lomax (2007) the homogeneity of variance assumption is concerned with whether the variances of the population are equal. To determine whether this is the case the researcher conducted Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance.

The third assumption concerns whether observations are independent of one another. Lomax (2007) notes that this assumption can be met by doing the following (a) keeping the participant assigned to separate groups through the design of the experiment, and (b) keeping participants separated through experimental control so that scores on the dependent variable $Y$ for sample 1 do not influence the scores for sample 2.

Once it was established that the above three assumptions were met, data was entered into SPSS to determine if the means of the match group differed from the means of the mismatched group. A test statistics was computed for each independent $t$-test and the computed test statistic was then compared to the critical value(s) from the $t$ distribution. If the test statistic that was calculated fell into the appropriate critical region and was greater than the critical value at the .05 level then the researcher rejected the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the sample means.
Results and Discussion

Although there is a general consensus that consultation is becoming an accepted model of service delivery, there is little research addressing the specifics of how it is practiced in the schools or teachers’ beliefs regarding the practice (Natasi, 2000). With little research to reference in regards to levels of consultation utilization, it is difficult to predict how often teachers are actually utilizing the service. The rate of current utilization may be correlated with the availability of the school psychologist in the specific school being studied and how teachers in the school perceive him/her as a potential source for consultation services.

Past research has found that teachers rated the collaborative-directive approach as more effective than the collaborative-nondirective approach of consultation (Tysinger et al., 2009). This finding was supported by the same dependent variable measures that will be used in the current study (e.g. the CEF as well as two factors on the CES: Factor II [Problem-Solving] and Factor III [Consultation Process and Application Skills]). These results suggest that consultees may prefer consultants who provide content as well as a guided process in consultation sessions (Tysinger et al., 2009). The addition of specific content to consultation sessions such as feedback, interpretations, and ideas; rather than just a forum and loose structure for processing ideas associated with the collaborative-nondirective style may allow for a more successful consultation experience.
Tysinger et al. (2009) also examined the effect of matched versus mismatched conditions with regard to teacher expectations for consultation style on their reports of consultation effectiveness. These authors found that teachers who were in matched conditions reported higher effectiveness ratings as measured by the CEF and two factors on the CES (e.g., Factor II [Problem-Solving Skills] and Factor III [Consultation Process and Application Skills]). This finding is consistent with the views of other researchers who contend that teachers’ expectations for school-based consultation are a key aspect of the consultation process (Conoley, Conoley, Ivey & Scheel, 1991; Erchul, Hughes, Meyers, Hickman, & Braden, 1992; Harris, Ingraham & Lam, 1994; Martens, Lewandowski, & Houk, 1989). Because these findings have been replicated in a number of studies, it is expected that the current study will find that teachers who view consultation sessions that match their expected style will rate the consultant as more effective.

It is important to note the potential limitations of this study. A major limitation regards the use of a non-random convenience sample which limits the generalizability of results. Results can be verified with further exploration of the problem using a random sample of teachers. Furthermore, it is possible that viewing a video vignette of the consultation session rather than participating in a live consultation session may affect participants’ involvement and effectiveness ratings. Future research should involve teachers in live consultation sessions to negate this limitation. Additionally, the actors in both video vignettes will be
Caucasian females. It is unknown if using minority or male actors may differentially affect teachers’ effectiveness ratings. Therefore, it is recommended that future research address this issue by including a more diverse sample of consultants. Additionally, the actors in the videos are both school psychology graduate students, which may also have a varying affect on teachers’ effectiveness ratings; however, the researcher attempted to negate this affect by utilizing a school psychology graduate student who is also a certified school psychologist as the consultant in the video. Additionally, the actor who played the consultee is a school psychology graduate student but also has prior teaching experience. Finally, because all surveys are self-report, there is no way to ascertain the level of truthfulness or honesty in the participants’ responses.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter results of the quantitative analysis are presented. Results of descriptive analysis are presented first in order to answer research question one, two, and three. Then the researcher will explain why the two-factor analysis of variance and the multivariate analysis of variance was not run as proposed in order to answer research questions four and five.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics will be discussed first. The survey was trying to answer several questions: (1) How often do teachers currently utilize consultation services from the school psychologist? (2) How often would teachers like to utilize consultation services from the school psychologist in the future given the opportunity? (3) Is the school psychologist someone that teachers seek out for consultation services? (4) Which consultation approach do teachers prefer? (5) Does matching approach to expectation influence teachers’ rating of consultant
effectiveness? In addition there were open-ended questions regarding their experience with consultation.

In regards to frequencies of descriptive statistics, a total of 39 participants responded to the survey, 34 being female, 4 being male, and one did not indicate gender. Data was also analyzed looking at cross-tabulation to determine if there were differences between those who took Survey A (collaborative-directive) and those who took Survey B (collaborative-nondirective). There was not a significant difference in regards to the gender of those who took Survey A versus Survey B, the majority of participants in all groups were female. Three males and 19 females completed Survey A, while 1 male and 15 females completed Survey B. Lastly, data was also analyzed using cross-tabulation in order to determine if there were any significant differences in regards to participants who were in the matched condition (those who viewed the consultation video which matched the style that they aligned with as determined by the Consultant Role Questionnaire) versus the mismatched condition (those who viewed the consultation video that was the opposite of the style that they aligned with as determined by the Consultant Role Questionnaire). Based on crosstabulation, there was not a significant difference in regards to gender and the variable match. As the majority of the participants were female, this finding was not surprising. Of those in the matched condition, there was 1 male and 18 females. In the mismatched condition, there were 3 males and 16 females.
The next variable that was examined was ethnicity. All participants responded that they were European American/White with the exception of one participant who did not respond to the question. As there was no variability in responses, it can be assumed that there was no variability in the crosstabulation with regards to the variables survey or match.

When asked about highest level of educational attainment, 38 participants responded. Fifteen had Bachelor’s degrees and 23 had Master’s degrees. When considering the variable survey, of those who completed Survey A, 11 held a Bachelor’s degree and 11 held a Master’s degree. Survey B participants did seem to have a higher level of educational attainment, as 4 held Bachelor’s degrees and 12 held Master’s degrees. In terms of the variable match, participants in the matched condition seemed to have a higher overall level of educational attainment. Of those in the matched condition, 5 held a Bachelor’s degree and 14 held a Master’s degree. In the mismatched condition, 10 participants held a Bachelor’s degree and 14 held a Master’s degree.

When asked what their current primary role was the majority of participants responded that they were regular education teacher (n=30). In addition, five participants were special education teachers, one was a reading specialist, one was a speech-language pathologist, and one was a principal. With regards to the variables survey and match, there was not great variability in response pattern, so there was not much room for differences between survey form or match condition. The following individuals took Survey A: 17 regular
education teachers, 4 special education teachers, and 1 reading specialist. Survey had the following breakdown of participants: 13 regular education teachers, 1 special education teacher, 1 principal, and 1 speech-language pathologist. In regards to the variable match, the participants who were in the matched condition included: 17 regular education teachers, 1 special education teacher, and 1 speech-language pathologist. Participants in the mismatched condition included: 13 regular education teachers, 4 special education teachers, 1 reading specialist, and 1 principal.

**Research Question One**

When asked to indicate the approximate number of students over the past year with whom participants had used consultation with the school psychologist, responses ranged from 0 to 570. The most frequent response was three students, which was nine participants. Please see the Table 3 below for specific data.
Table 3: Consultation Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering the variables survey and match, although there was variability within responses, the variability was fairly evenly distributed between survey forms and match conditions. There were individuals who took both Survey form A and form B and who were in both match and mismatched conditions that reported seeking consultation for zero students in the past year, and participants who reported seeking consultation for a greater number of students. Please refer to Table 4 and Table 5 below for specific data.

Table 4: Consultation Utilization by Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>570</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Consultation Utilization by Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>570</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Two

Participants were asked given their consultation experiences during the past year how often they would use consultation services from the school psychologist in the future given the opportunity. A total of 28 participants responded that they would use services about the same amount, while 9 responded that they would use services more often. No participants responded that they would prefer to utilize consultation services less often. Examining the variable survey, there was not significant variability among the response pattern of those that completed Survey A versus Survey B. Of those who completed Survey A, 17 participants indicated they would use consultation services about the same amount and 4 responded they would utilize services more often. Survey B participants were similar in their responses, 11 participants indicated they would use services the same amount and 5 responded that they would use services more often.

"Examining the data by crosstabulating it with the variable match did not produce significant results. Of those participants in the matched condition, 12 responded they would use consultation services at the same rate, while 6 indicated that they would utilize services more often. Participants in the mismatched condition were similar in their preferences, as 16 indicated they would use consultation services at the same rate and 3 indicate they would use them more often. Please reference the tables below for specific data.
Table 6: Future Consultation Utilization by Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired rate</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>More often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Future Consultation Utilization by Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired rate</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>More often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question Three**

When asked to respond to a statement that read: “I feel that the school psychologist in my building is a valuable resource, who I can approach to seek out consultation services,” the majority of all participants indicated they agreed to some extent. Thirty-one participants agreed or strongly agreed, while six disagreed or strongly disagreed. When examining the data using crosstabulation to determine if differences existed between the groups who took Survey A or Survey B, or those who were in the matched or mismatched condition, there was little difference when considering either variable. Because the majority of all participants answered that they agreed, the similarity in responses was consistent with the difference between those who completed Survey A and Survey B and
those who were in the matched and mismatched conditions. Please reference Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10 below for specific data.

Table 8: Consultant as Valuable Resource (n=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Ag</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Consultant as a Valuable Resource by Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Dis</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Ag</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Consultant as Valuable Resource by Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Strongly Dis</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Ag</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those participants who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the school psychologist was a valuable resource were asked to respond to an open-ended question that prompted them to explain why they disagreed. There were two people who responded that they had accidentally checked disagree and actually feel that the school psychologist at their building is a valuable resource. However, of those who disagreed, every response was related to the theme of time. Participants indicated that the school psychologist had “brilliant” ideas but was required to spend time in back-to-back meetings and was often hard to access. Others responded that the school psychologist’s time was spread thin, and was not able to spend much time in their building and when they did they were often testing.

The author also sought to answer what types of problems most commonly caused teachers to seek out consultation services from the school psychologist. Participants indicated that they most commonly sought out consultation for behavioral problems (n=18), followed by academic problems (n=13), fewer
participants noted seeking consultation for social issues (n=2) and family issues (n=2). See Table 11 below for data.

Table 11: Reasons for Seeking Out Consultation (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining data by crosstabulation indicated those participants who took Survey A and Survey B or those that were in the matched and mismatched conditions were not different in terms of the problems that caused them to seek out consultation from the school psychologist. All groups were relatively equally distributed in terms of the reasons that caused them to seek out consultation. Please reference Table 12 and 13 below to see results.
Consistent with the previous questions that most participants responded that they believed that the school psychologist in their building was a valuable resource to approach for consultation services, the majority of participants also responded that they would like more access to the school psychologist in their building (n=28). Only seven participants responded that they would not like greater access to the school psychologist in their building.
Table 14: School Psychologist Access (n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author also examined the data using crosstabulation to determine if differences existed with regard to the variable survey or match and desire for greater access to the school psychologist in the building. Of the participants who took Survey A, only one indicated that he or she did not want greater access, while six participants who completed Survey B indicated no desire for greater access. Although there is some difference, the overwhelming majority of all participants still responded that they desired greater access, so it is difficult to attribute much meaning to such a small difference.

Table 15: School Psychologist Access by Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When considering desire for access to the school psychologist in building by examining crosstabulation data using the variable match, the variability between the two conditions was even less than between survey variations. The majority of participants desire greater access and a few participants from both matched and mismatched conditions reported no desire for greater access. See Table 16 below for results.
Table 16: School Psychologist Access by Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author sought to ascertain which individuals were most often sought out when a teacher needed help implementing interventions. The most frequent responses were as follows: another teacher (n=15), principal (n=7), and school psychologist (n=6). The most frequently listed other professional that participants chose to write in was instructional coach.
Table 17: Most Sought Out Individuals for Intervention Help ($n=36$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psych</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Couns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining crosstabulation data, there was not a significant difference between participants who completed Survey A or B nor was there a significant difference between those who were in the matched or mismatched conditions in regards to which educational profession they listed as most likely to seek out for help implementing interventions. The distribution between all groups was relatively equal. See Table 18 and 19 below for results.
Table 18: Most Sought Out Individuals for Intervention Help (Crosstabulation by Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Vice Principal</th>
<th>School Psych.</th>
<th>School Counselor</th>
<th>Another teacher</th>
<th>Other professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Most Sought Out Individuals for Intervention Help (Crosstabulation by Match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Vice Principal</th>
<th>School Psych.</th>
<th>School Counselor</th>
<th>Another teacher</th>
<th>Other professional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Four

In order to determine which consultation approach teachers preferred, the researcher utilized the scores obtained on the Consultant Role Questionnaire (CRQ). The majority of participants aligned with the collaborative-nondirective approach (see Table 20 below for results). The results obtained in the current study differ from those found in the Tsyinger et al. (2009) study in which the majority of participants aligned with the collaborative-directive approach. The mean for the total sample was 14.3 ($sd=2.8$), with a median of 15 (range 8-19).

Table 20: Consultant Role Questionnaire Frequencies by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRQ Score</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-D match</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-D mismatch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-ND match</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-ND mismatch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: C-D is “Collaborative-Directive.

The cut point to be placed in the collaborative-nondirective group was 14.
Table 21: Consultant Role Questionnaire Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-D match</td>
<td>11.3571</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-D mismatch</td>
<td>11.3846</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-ND match</td>
<td>16.5714</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-ND mismatch</td>
<td>15.7826</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Five

CEF

In an attempt to determine whether matching preference to approach influenced teachers’ ratings of effectiveness, the researcher examined the results of both the Consultant Effectiveness Form (CEF) and the Consultant Effectiveness Scale (CES). The means of the CEF and CES were examined using the independent sample t-test by Survey and Match. Group means are shown in Table 22 and Table 23.

Table 22: Means and standard deviations for the CEF by Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEF mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0345</td>
<td>.93915</td>
<td>.23479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7487</td>
<td>.66102</td>
<td>.17666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Means and standard deviations for the CEF by Match.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF mean</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1970</td>
<td>.78611</td>
<td>.20297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.6053</td>
<td>.76732</td>
<td>.19812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics for the independent sample t-tests are in table 24-25.

Table 24: Independent samples t-test by survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.950</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.28580</td>
<td>-.33027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Independent samples t-test by match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.59169</td>
<td>.01068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent t-tests were conducted to investigate the relationship between the CEF and the variables survey and match. T-tests were conducted between the total mean of the CEF and the variables survey and match. There was not a significant difference between the sample means on the CEF for those participants who took survey A as compared to those who took survey B. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference between sample means was not rejected. However, there was a significant difference between the sample means on the CEF of those participants who were in the matched condition compared to those who were in the mismatched condition. This resulted in rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between the sample means. The mean score of those participants in the mismatched condition was higher in comparison to those participants in the matched condition on the CEF. To test for homogeneity of variance, Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was conducted and did not result in rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between the variance for any of the item analyses.
**CES**

Independent $t$-tests were conducted to further investigate the relationships between the following variables: match and Factor I of the CES (Interpersonal Skills); match and Factor II of the CES (Problem-Solving Skills); match and Factor III of the CES (Consultation Process and Application Skills); Match and Factor IV of the CES (Ethical and Professional Practices Skills); survey and Factor I of the CES; survey and Factor II of the CES; survey and Factor III of the CES; and survey and Factor IV of the CES. The results from these analyses were outlined in this section.
Table 26: CES Group Statistics by Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>factor_I</td>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9300</td>
<td>.72335</td>
<td>.19332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5521</td>
<td>.78619</td>
<td>.22695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor_II</td>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.8913</td>
<td>.73303</td>
<td>.19591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4583</td>
<td>.94046</td>
<td>.27149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor_III</td>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1623</td>
<td>.72655</td>
<td>.19418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4848</td>
<td>.92979</td>
<td>.26841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor_IV</td>
<td>Survey A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2398</td>
<td>.68946</td>
<td>.18427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7619</td>
<td>.93843</td>
<td>.27090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: CES Group Statistics by Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Match Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>factor_I</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.2294</td>
<td>.66776</td>
<td>.18520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2818</td>
<td>.52730</td>
<td>.14625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor_II</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1796</td>
<td>.69965</td>
<td>.19405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2033</td>
<td>.69854</td>
<td>.19374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor_III</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3427</td>
<td>.72076</td>
<td>.19990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.3566</td>
<td>.75191</td>
<td>.20854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor_IV</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5549</td>
<td>.62959</td>
<td>.17462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4835</td>
<td>.65345</td>
<td>.18124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor I: Interpersonal Skills.** Results from the correlational analysis signified that participants in the match condition and the mismatched condition rated the consultant as significantly different on Factor I of the CES. Specifically those who were in the mismatched condition rated the consultant more positively than the participants in the matched condition. Results from the correlational analysis signified that participants who took survey A (collaborative-directive approach) did not rate the consultant significantly different on Factor I of the CES than those who completed survey B (collaborative-nondirective approach). To test for homogeneity of variance, Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was conducted and did not result in rejection of the null hypothesis of no difference between the variances. (see Table 28).

Table 28: Means and standard deviations for Factors I through IV of the CES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.7556</td>
<td>3.6915</td>
<td>3.8497</td>
<td>4.0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.76221</td>
<td>.84678</td>
<td>.87950</td>
<td>.83288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29: Independent t-test for Match and Survey by Factor I (Interpersonal Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Error Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.947</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.377</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The equal variances assumed row was interpreted when Levene’s test was not significant.

**Factor II: Problem-Solving Skills.** Results of the independent t-test indicated that participants in the matched condition rated the consultant as significantly different on Factor II of the CES when compared to those in the mismatched condition. Those in the mismatched condition rated the consultant more positively than participants in the mismatched condition. Survey condition was not significantly related to Factor II of the CES. Levene’s test for both Factor II and match condition and Factor II and survey condition was insignificant. Therefore it is assumed that the variances are equal.
Table 30: Independent t-test for Match and Survey by Factor II (Problem-Solving Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Error Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.976</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The equal variances assumed row was interpreted when Levene’s test was not significant. In this case, the independent t-test was conducted.

**Factor III: Consultation Process and Application Skills.** Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not significant for either Factor III and match condition or Factor III and survey condition, indicating that the variances of the groups were equal. Participants in the matched condition rated the consultant as significantly different on Factor III of the CES as compared to participants in the mismatched condition. Participants in the mismatched condition rated the consultant more positively than those in the matched condition. Similarly, participants who completed survey A rated the consultant as significantly different on Factor III of the CES as compared to those who completed Survey B. Those participants who completed Survey A rated the consultant more positively than those participants who completed Survey B.
Table 31: Independent t-test for Match and Survey by Factor III (Process & Application Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Error Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.986</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.677</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The equal variances assumed row was interpreted when Levene’s test was not significant. In this case, the independent t-test was conducted.

**Factor IV: Ethical and Professional Practice Skills.** Participants in the matched condition rated the consultant as significantly different on Factor IV of the CES as compared to those in the mismatched condition. Those participants in the mismatched condition rated the consultant more positively than those in the matched condition. Survey type was not significantly related to Factor IV of the CES. Results of the correlational analysis signified that the variances of the groups for both match condition and survey type were equal as indicated by the insignificant values obtained on Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance (see Table 32).
Table 32: Independent t-test for Match and Survey by Factor IV (Professional and Ethical Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Error Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>-4.25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.071</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.477</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The equal variances assumed row was interpreted when Levene’s test was not significant. In this case, the independent t-test was conducted.

Results indicated that participants who completed survey A did not rate the consultant as significantly different on the CEF than those participants who completed survey B. However, participants who were in the mismatched condition rated the consultant more positively on the CEF than did those participants who were in the matched condition. When considering the results of the CES, participants in the matched condition rated the consultant as significantly different on all four factors of the CES as compared to those in the mismatched condition. Participants who completed survey A rated the consultant as significantly different on Factor III of the CES as compared to those who
completed survey B; however, survey was not significantly related to Factors I, II, or IV of the CES. These results differed from those obtained by Tysinger et al. (2009). Specifically, in the current study, the majority of participants tended to prefer the collaborative-nondirective approach, as measured by the Consultant Role Questionnaire. In addition, when expectation was mismatched with consultation approach, participants rated the consultant as more effective on both the CEF and all four factors of the CES. Implications of the findings will be discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between consultant effectiveness and the following two factors: (a) consultation approach and (b) teacher expectations for consultation approach. Traditional consultation literature has focused on the role on the consultant in the consultation process (Erchul, Hughes, Myers, Hickman, & Braden, 1992). However, it is also important to ascertain the role of the teacher in the consultation process and how that role may impact implementation of interventions and overall success.

Several studies have addressed the role of the teacher in the consultation process in various aspects including performance feedback (Jones, Wickstrom, & Friman, 1997; Noel, Witt, Gilbertson, Ranier, & Freeland, 1997), teacher self-efficacy (DeForest and Hughes, 1992), teacher resistance (Erchul & Chewning, 1990), data source (Landrum, Cook, Tankersley, & Fitzgerald, 2007), and preference for directiveness (Tysinger, Tysinger, & Diamanduros, 2009). A body of research has produced inconsistent results regarding teachers’ preference for directiveness within the consultative relationship (Tysinger et al., 2009). In an attempt to
advance the line of research begun by Tysinger et al. (2009) which was the first study that explored the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective approaches as proposed by Gutkin (1999) the current study expanded upon the idea by attempting to determine if the findings held true when considering consultation for behavioral issues as opposed to academic issues. Tysinger et al. (2007) found that teachers rated the consultant as more effective when utilizing the collaborative-directive approach; however, when expectation for the approach matched the consultation scenario that they viewed it did not result in higher consultant effectiveness ratings. Although the small sample size prohibited the researcher from analyzing the data using the proposed statistical tests which would have allowed greater comparison to the Tysinger et al. (2009) study, the data obtained does provide unique information in its’ own regard which will be discussed.

This was the first study to examine the relationship between consultant effectiveness and the following two factors: (a) consultation approach and (b) teacher expectations for consultation approach while considering behavioral issues as opposed to academic issues during the consultation session. The Consultant Role Questionnaire was distributed to teachers during staff meetings. After scoring the questionnaire and determining which approach teachers aligned with, all participants were randomly assigned to either the matched or mismatched condition. Participants then received an email approximately one week later with a link directing them to a Qualtrics survey. Two versions of the survey were
created. Each version was identical, with the exception of the consultation session video that was embedded into the survey. One video depicted the collaborative-directive approach, while the other depicted the collaborative-nondirective approach. Teachers were not informed which approach they were viewing. A total of 39 educational professionals participated in the online survey (not all responded to every question).

**Descriptive characteristics of teacher variables**

This study investigated some unique descriptive variables that were not examined by Tysinger et al. (2009). Teachers’ most frequent response when asked for how many students they had sought out consultation with the school psychologist in the past year was three students. Responses ranged from 0 to 570. The individual who responded that they had sought out consultation for 570 students happened to be a principal and so it was likely that his role in the consultative relationship differed from that of a classroom teacher. Although no participants responded that they desired to utilize consultation services less often, the majority responded that they would prefer to use service about the same amount (n=28). Nine participants did respond that they would like to utilize services more often. This was an interesting finding considering the response pattern that was produced when participants were asked whether they felt that the school psychologist in their building was a valuable resource who they could seek out for consultation services. Six responded that they disagreed while 31 people indicated that they agreed that the school psychologist was a valuable resource.
Of those who disagreed, two explained that they incorrectly marked disagreed and the other four provided explanations centered around the theme of limited time and access to the school psychologist in their building. One response included the following:

“Our psych is valuable when she is there but we only get to have her once a week and that day is typically taken up with back to back meetings or observations. She has brilliant ideas but you just can't get to her.”

Therefore, it is surprising that the majority of participants stated that they desired the same amount of access to the school psychologist for consultation services when responses such as the previous one were common among participants who did not view the school psychologist as a valuable resource.

The participants in this study listed behavioral problems (n=18) as the most frequent reason for seeking out consultation, followed by academic problems (n=13). Although this was the first study of its kind that utilized behavioral issues in the consultation vignette that the teachers viewed, it seems that these would be familiar issues and should be further explored in future research as behavioral issues are cited as the most common reason for seeking out consultation from a school psychologist.

It was significant to note that the individual most frequently cited as someone that teachers would go to when they need help implementing interventions was another teacher (n=15). Seeking out help from another teacher
may become problematic when teachers are not always trained in the problem solving model and intervention implementation. Research has revealed that many regular education teacher training programs do not provide training in the area of interventions. The educational professional who was cited second most frequently as someone who teachers would approach for help implementing interventions was the principal (n=7) and the school psychologist was listed third most frequently (n=6). Although school psychologists likely have the most extensive training in the area of intervention implementation and consultation, they were not indicated most frequently as the go to person for help in this area. Perhaps it is the factor of time that is preventing teachers from viewing the school psychologist as being able to fulfill the role of consultant. School psychologists often have large case loads and share their time between multiple buildings, rushing to ensure that they complete evaluations within the legal timelines. However, if school psychologists desire to expand their role in the consultation realm, it is up to them to advocate for their skills and help to change their colleagues’ perceptions of their role. An alternative explanation regarding why teachers may not perceive the school psychologist as a valuable resource in terms of consultation may be due to the traditional role of assessment that school psychologists have fulfilled. Teachers may not have knowledge of school psychologists’ training in the area of consultation and intervention. Again, it is the duty of the school psychologist to convey the ability and desire to fulfill the
role of consultant if the perception is to be shifted from one of predominantly assessment activities to include the scope of consultation in one’s practice.

**Consultant Effectiveness Form**

The results of the CEF were significant in that when participants expectations for consultation were mismatched with the consultation approach that they viewed, they rated the consultant in an overall more positive manner. Tysinger et al., (2009) found that when participants’ expectations for consultation were matched with the approach that they viewed, they rated the consultant more positively. The sample size in the current study was limited ($n=39$) as compared to the Tysinger et al. study ($n=202$) which may account for a difference in findings. In addition, the researcher in the current study sought to include a sample that had greater familiarity with interventions and consultation. Tysinger et al. studied a sample that may have been fundamentally different in this regard. Specifically, 36 percent of their sample was not actively teaching at the time that they conducted the study and 54 percent of the sample had never before utilized consultation with a school psychologist. The aforementioned sample characteristics of the Tysinger et al. study may account for difference in the findings of the current study.

**Consultant Effectiveness Scale**

Similar to the Consultant Effectiveness Form, participants tended to respond in a similar manner on the Consultant Effectiveness Scale (CES). The results of the independent $t$-tests indicated that those who completed survey A
rated the consultant more positively on Factor III of the CES as compared to those who completed survey B; however, there was no difference in sample means when considering Factors I, II, or IV of the CES and the variable survey. Participants in the mismatched condition rated the consultant more positively than those in the mismatched condition on all four factors of the CES. As discussed in the previous section, these results differed from those obtained in the Tysinger et al. (2009) study and may be partially explained by the sample size and differing sample characteristics.

**Implications for schools and school psychologists**

The results of this study suggest consequences for school psychologists and the future of school psychology. Wilkinson (2006) noted that the role of school psychologists is anticipated to expand from primarily assessment based activities to include the role of school consultation as the practice shift to a problem-solving model of practice. Despite this anticipated change the current study found that some teachers have not sought out consultation at all from the school psychologist in the past year and the most frequently cited number was three students in the past year. In addition, 6 participants out of a total of 37 indicated they did not view the school psychologist in their building as a valuable resource who they could seek out for consultation services. Those who elaborated as to why they do not view the school psychologist as a valuable resource for consultation purposes reported that the school psychologist did not have enough time in their building to dedicate to consultation. Despite the aforementioned
findings the majority of participants (n=28) responded that given their experience with consultation in the past year they would desire to utilize services about the same amount. Only nine participants indicated that they would like to increase their consultation utilization.

Given teachers perceptions of the school psychologist as a consultant it seems essential that if school psychologist desire to expand their role as a consultant they must advertise their skills and services to colleagues. It is well known that school psychologists have large caseloads and often split their time between multiple buildings; however, if they want to increase their time spent in consultation, they must use their time efficiently and make their presence in the building and skills in the area of consultation and intervention known to their colleagues. Teachers indicated that the educational professional who they would most often approach for help implementing an intervention is a fellow teacher. Regular education teacher training program often do not include courses in the area of the problem-solving model or intervention implementation. Consultation has been identified as a skill which school psychologists can utilize to help children succeed academically, socially, and emotionally (Yesseldyke&Geenen, 1996). Despite school psychologist training in consultation and intervention, teachers do not view them as the person to approach first when they need help. School psychologists need to recognize this hesitancy on the part of the teacher and advocate for a change. Asserting one’s desire to become an active member of
the school IAT team, or helping to create one when necessary may be a helpful step in the process.

The current study did not provide findings that suggested the collaborative-directive approach yields higher consultant effectiveness ratings as in the Tysinger et al., (2009) study. Although the sample size in the current study was limited and the results should be replicated, it may suggest that the personal characteristics of the consultant (e.g. ability to show empathy and reinforce the consultant) are just as important as those characteristics related to the operational definition of collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective as introduced by Gutkin (1999). Additional research and replication will yield an answer to whether there is specific consultation style that teachers most prefer.

**Limitations and directions for future research**

There were several limitations of this study. The first limitation was the use of a non-random, convenience sample. A convenience sample limited the generalizability of the results. In addition, the limited sample size was a limitation to the study. This study warrants replication using larger, random sample of teachers to increase power and generalizability of the results. A second limitation was the exclusion of potentially related variables, as it was not possible to include every possible variable that may constitute a relationship. For example, including teachers rating of the effectiveness of the intervention used in the consultation session would have been interesting to examine and may well be worth examining in future studies. A third limitation was related to the consultation videos. In the
Tsinger et al. (2009) study the consultation approach videos differed only with respect to those characteristics that were specific to the operational definitions of collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective as introduced by Gutkin (1999). Keeping with the collaborative-directive and collaborative-nondirective nature of the approaches the researcher utilized the same technique and the consultant displayed equal amounts of empathy and consultee reinforcement in each consultation video and differed only the characteristics related to the operational definitions of the approaches. However, in the current study the researcher did not have a panel of graduate students match the videos to the approach as Tysinger et al., (2009) did which may be a limitation of the study. It could be that the videos were too similar and did not depict each consultation style as clearly as the researcher anticipated.

Despite the limitations of the current study, it provides direction for future research. It is suggested that replication of the findings of Tysinger et al., (2009) is still necessary in order to create generalizability in terms of settings and other types of interventions to be judged as effective in the consultative relationship, specifically behavioral. In addition, school psychologists are given the charge of increasing their colleagues’ awareness and willingness to rely on their consultative skills in order to expand their role from the assessment realm to include consultant. Additionally, training programs in education and administration should explore the role of other professionals during pre-service training, so that teachers and principals enter the school building with an
understanding of the broader role of school psychologists.
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Appendix A: Demographic and Consultation Utilization Questionnaire

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF:

1. How old are you (in years)? ______________________

2. Are you male or female? Please circle one.
   (1) male
   (2) female

3. What grade(s) do you currently teach? ________________

4. How many years of teaching experience do you currently have?
   __________________

5. What is your ethnicity?
   (1) Arab American
   (2) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
(3) Black or African American
(4) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others
(5) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
(6) American Indian/Native American
(7) Mixed; Parents have at least two ethnicities
(8) Other (write in): ________________________________

6. What is your level of educational attainment? Please circle one.
   (1) Bachelor’s degree
   (2) Master’s degree
   (3) Doctoral degree
   (4) Other (write in): ________________________________

7. What is your current primary role? Please circle one.
   (1) Regular education
   (2) Special education
   (3) Other (write in): ________________________________

8. Please indicate the approximate number of students in the past year with whom you have used consultation services from the school psychologist ____________________.
9. Please indicate how often you would use consultation given the opportunity. Please circle one.

   (1) Less often
   (2) Satisfied with current rate
   (3) More often

10. Please respond to the following statement: I feel that the school psychologist in my building is a valuable resource whom I can approach to seek out consultation services.

   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly Agree

If you disagree please indicate why you feel this way

__________________________________________________________________

11. Please indicate the type of problems that have most often caused you to seek out consultation services in the past. Please circle one.

   (1) Academic
   (2) Behavioral
   (3) Other (write in): ___________________________________________
12. Please indicate the type of problems that you believe are most appropriate to bring to consultation. Please circle one.

   (1) Academic
   (2) Behavioral
   (3) Other (write in):

13. Please indicate if you would like to have more access to the school psychologist in your building for consultation purposes. Please circle one.

   (1) Yes
   (2) No

14. What is the name of the school that you currently work at?

__________________________________________________________________

15. Who in your school do you think that you could go to if you needed help implementing interventions? (please list any and all individuals, by title).

__________________________________________________________________

16. How often is the school psychologist in your building (days per week)?

__________________________________________________________________
**Appendix B:** Consultant Role Questionnaire

Assume that consultation will take place between a teacher (consultee) and a school psychologist (consultant). The teacher has requested the consultation to discuss a problem that she is having with a student in her classroom. You will see seven pairs of sentences below describing different perspectives of how school psychologists and teachers should behave during consultation. Place an X in the blank that best describes your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>Strongly Agree with 1</th>
<th>Agree with 1</th>
<th>Agree with 2</th>
<th>Strongly Agree with 2</th>
<th>Statement 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The school psychologist should make recommendations to the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The school psychologist should primarily assist the teacher with deciding among his/her own ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school psychologist should ensure teacher makes the best decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher should always make the final decisions in consultation regardless of what the school psychologist recommends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The school psychologist should always defer to the teacher in a dispute.

4. The school psychologist should direct the consultation session.

5. The consultant should remain neutral regarding the intervention the teacher chooses.

6. Both the school psychologist and the teacher should be equally involved in brainstorming possible solutions to the consultation problem.

7. The consultant should ensure that the consultee develops all possible solutions.

Disputes between the teacher and the school psychologist should be settled through shared decision making.

Consultation should be equally directed by the school psychologist and the teacher.

The school psychologist should encourage the teacher to choose the best intervention.

The teacher should brainstorm ideas only with the school psychologist facilitating brainstorming.

The consultee is not responsible for developing all problem solutions.
Appendix C: Consultant Effectiveness Form

Thinking about the consultation video that you just viewed, please use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Disagree somewhat
(4) Undecided
(5) Agree somewhat
(6) Agree
(7) Strongly agree

1. The consultant was generally helpful.
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

2. The consultant offered useful information.
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

3. The consultant's ideas as to the primary goals of schools were similar to my own ideas.
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

4. The consultant helped me find alternative solutions to problems.
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

5. The consultant was a good listener.
6. The consultant helped me identify useful resources.

7. The consultant fit well into the school's environment.

8. The consultant encouraged me to consider a number of points of view.

9. The consultant viewed his or her role as a collaborator rather than as an expert.

10. The consultant helped me find ways to apply the content of our discussions to specific pupil or classroom situations.

11. The consultant was able to offer assistance without completely "taking over" the management of problems.

12. I would request services from this consultant again, assuming that other consultants were available.
Appendix D: Consultant Effectiveness Scale

Thinking about the consultation video that you just viewed, please use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each consultant characteristic.

(1) Not at all
(2) To a slight degree
(3) To a considerable degree
(4) To a large degree
(5) To a very large degree
1. Empathetic
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

2. Encouraging
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

3. Expresses affection (supportive)
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

4. Shows respect for the consultee
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

5. Warm
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

6. Maintains an “I’m OK -- you’re OK” position
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

7. Interested (concerned)
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

8. Approachable
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

9. Accepting (non judgmental)
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

10. Tolerant
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

11. Tactful
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

12. Collaborative (shares responsibility)
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

13. Pleasant
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

14. Positive attitude
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
15. Self-discloses
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

16. Encourages ventilation
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

17. Open-minded
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

18. Gives and receives feedback
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

19. Flexible
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

20. Team player
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

21. Trustworthy
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

22. Willing to get involved
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

23. Attentive
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

24. Effective at establishing rapport
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

25. Skilled in questioning
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

26. Aware of relationship issues
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

27. Good at problem-solving
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

28. Astute observer/perceptive
    (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
29. Skillful
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

30. Anticipates possible consequences
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

31. Good facilitator
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

32. Able to overcome resistance
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

33. Skilled in conflict resolution
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

34. Efficient user of time
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

35. Active listener
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

36. Clear sense of identity
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

37. Takes risks/willing to experiment
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

38. Active
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

39. Is specific
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

40. Documents for clear communication
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

41. Identifies clear goals
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

42. Reviews client records
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
43. Specifies the contract (time, effort, cost)  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

44. Gives clear, understandable directions  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

45. Pursues issues/follows through  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

46. Evaluates/focuses ideas  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

47. Clarifies role  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

48. Emotionally well-adjusted/stable  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

49. Feelings and behaviors are consistent  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

50. Maintains confidentiality  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

51. Practices in an ethical manner  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

52. Employs appropriate personal distance  
   (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)