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Division 16 has faced critical challenges over the past two to three years related to APA’s reconsideration of the Model Licensure Act (MLA). The challenge was met with much soul-searching for school psychologists individually and collectively and ongoing debates within the profession. Most importantly, the issue has provided an opportunity for professional organizations representing School Psychology to work together in advocating for the profession and proposing resolutions that address our professional concerns while keeping the best interests of children and adolescents in the forefront. One outcome for Division 16 has been a renewed commitment to working together with other organizations such as NASP for the benefit of the profession and the well-being of children and families. As President, I will continue to lead the Executive Committee of the Division in monitoring and responding to developments related to the resolution of MLA. Be assured that we are ever vigilant regarding APA policies that affect School Psychology. The efforts devoted to MLA have resulted in a renewed energy and commitment by the Division’s EC—it is this energy and commitment that I hope to build on as we move forward in 2010.

The stated goal and objectives of Division 16 and current social, cultural, and political forces operating at national and international levels provide the backdrop for this year’s initiatives (see inserts). In particular, these initiatives

Division 16 Goals and Objectives

The ultimate goal of all Division activity is the enhancement of the status of children, youth, and adults as learners and productive citizens in schools, families, and communities.

The objectives of the Division of School Psychology are:

- to promote and maintain high standards of professional education and training within the specialty, and to expand appropriate scientific and scholarly knowledge and the pursuit of scientific affairs;
- to increase effective and efficient conduct of professional affairs, including the practice of psychology within the schools, among other settings, and collaboration/cooperation with individuals, groups, and organizations in the shared realization of Division objectives;
- to support the ethical and social responsibilities of the specialty, to encourage opportunities for the ethnic minority participation in the specialty, and to provide opportunities for professional fellowship;
- to encourage and effect publications, communications, and conferences regarding the activities, interests, and concerns within the specialty on a regional, national, and international basis.

Downloaded from http://www.indiana.edu/~div16/goals.html
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efforts related to Division objectives. This requires expanding our attention beyond ubiquitous guild issues that threaten to divide the profession and refocus our attention on working together toward a shared professional goal: *Enhancement of the well-being of all children and youth by advancing science-based practice and policy*.

The convergence of the Division’s goal and objectives with the current social-cultural-political context provides direction for moving forward. Clearly, the scope of challenges at local, national, and international levels requires concerted efforts among stakeholders (e.g., professionals across disciplines, policy makers, funders, consumers) and adoption of a perspective consistent with interdisciplinary public health models. Drawing on our commitment to science-based practice, social responsibility, and collaboration (as stated in Division objectives), the Division can be a primary partner in efforts to facilitate mental health of children, youth, and families internationally.

The current zeitgeist suggests several possible directions for School Psychology and for the Division: (a) broadening our focus to include global social, cultural, and political issues that are likely to influence the psychological well-being of children, youth, and families; (b) collaborating with professionals not only within psychology and education, but also with professionals across disciplines, policy makers, funders, and consumers.

The current social-cultural-political context includes:

- Inadequate mental health services for children and adolescents not only in US but across the world
- Inadequate services to children, youth, and families due to the shortage of qualified mental health professionals and training programs
- Insufficient research to inform culturally and contextually appropriate practice
- Untapped potential within public education and primary health care as sites for universal access to mental health services
- Call for collaborative (interdisciplinary and inter-organizational) efforts at national and international levels
- Initiatives within American Psychology to ‘internationalize’ psychology in the context of increasing globalization (which can expand our conceptions of multicultural competence)
- UN Millenium Goals related to universal education
- 20th anniversary on the Convention on the Rights of Child
- Social and political forces across the world that affect children’s well-being: ethnic conflict, terrorism, community violence, discrimination, displacement, poverty


**2010 PRESIDENTIAL GOALS**

1. Promote international research and development related to fostering psychological well-being of children and adolescents worldwide (as relates to both practice and policy)
2. Foster commitment to social justice (promotion of personal, interpersonal, collective well-being)
3. Foster cross-disciplinary and cross-specialty partnerships related to Goals 1 & 2
4. Foster leadership capacity of school psychology
but also from other disciplines such as public health, medicine, sociology, anthropology, social work, economics, and political science; (c) positioning school psychology within the intersection of public education and public health; (d) committing ourselves to broad-based service provision, ranging from universal mental health promotion to treatment; (e) conducting research to inform culturally and contextually appropriate science-based practice; (f) providing professional development consistent with this broader focus; and (g) actively participating in policy initiatives that can help to ensure universal access to education and mental health services. With these potential directions in mind, I have proposed several goals that will guide my Presidency (see insert). While remaining cognizant of the long-term nature of the goals, I have proposed several initiatives (see insert) that will start the process for the division and hopefully provide direction for future leadership.

I look forward to this opportunity to contribute to development of the field of School Psychology and to the enhancement of science-based practice and policy for the well-being of children, youth, and families. I welcome your questions, comments, and suggestions about ways that we can accomplish this year’s initiatives.

**2010 PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVES**

- Develop an international research agenda for Division 16 related to promoting psychological well-being and social justice
- Develop and enhance partnerships with CDSPP, ISPA, NASP, SSSP, and TSP related to international research and training initiatives
- Engage in interdivisional and cross-disciplinary efforts related to promoting psychological well-being and social justice on local, national, and global levels
- Recruit international affiliates to Division 16
- Foster leadership potential within the division through increased involvement of early career psychologists in Division initiatives
- Provide leadership training for Division 16’s Executive Committee

I will provide an update in the subsequent edition of *TSP*. In closing, I thank you for your confidence in my leadership of the Division.
Editor’s Message

Amanda Clinton,
Universidad de Puerto Rico

During the past three years, it has been my privilege to work alongside Dr. Michelle Athanasiou as Associate Editor of The School Psychologist (TSP). Michelle has been a patient guide and a supportive friend while I learned the ropes of the editorial world and came to better understand the mission of TSP as a resource for scholarly work and current events in school psychology. Her contributions to TSP are many and I am grateful she has been my mentor. Dr. Linda Reddy – my mentor’s mentor - has been a tremendous source of information and support, as well.

I would like to formally welcome Dr. Rosemary Flanagan as Assistant Editor of TSP. She has proven to be an invaluable colleague in the short weeks we’ve collaborated and I know she will make significant contributions to the publication. I very much look forward to working together.

I have two talented students working as my assistants, Lori Fernández and Kelly Cari. Their creativity and dedication to TSP are impressive even as we design our first issue. It’s a delight to have them as part of the team.

Beginning with the current issue of TSP, Michelle hands the reins over to me as editor, a position I will hold for the next three years. I am excited to have the opportunity to further her work. The electronic format of TSP offers great potential for expanding interactive features and increasing accessibility. In line with the goals of school psychology, I hope to support diverse ideas, as the profession aims to engage young psychologists, continue to promote the voices of graduate students and school psychologists new to the field in addition to those of academics and practitioners with experience under their belts. In sum, I look forward to a dynamic and interesting tenure as editor and welcome your contributions and ideas.
Use of Reliability Data in Score Interpretation or Why to Use the Technical Data When Making Diagnostic Decision

S. Kathleen Krach & Michael P. McCreery, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Abstract

The diagnosis of a specific learning disability (SLD) or a learning disorder often requires that school psychologists use test scores as part of the diagnostic process. The researchers identified cognitive and achievement instruments used by school psychologists when conducting psychoeducational assessments. Specifically, they evaluated subtest specificity for score reliability across ages. Reliability information in the form of internal consistency data was gathered from the manuals that accompanied the test kits for subtest and composite scores across ages. Although most composite scores (98.73%) were consistently reliable regardless of the examinees’ age, many subtest scores (19.06%) were not.

Regardless of which diagnostic method is used, basic assessment information is often collected and interpreted concerning psychological processing and academic ability. One interpretation technique used to analyze assessment data involves the use of both composite and subtest results (Pfeiffer, Reddy, Kletzel, Schmelzer, & Boyer, 2000; Reschley & Grimes, 1995). To this end, test publishers provide information that allow for subtest interpretation. For example within cognitive testing, the Differential Ability Scales, Second Edition (Elliott, 2008) and the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Second Edition (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2004a) both provide indicators of an individual’s strengths and weaknesses based on a subtest’s normative and/or relative score differences. In the area of achievement assessment, tests such as the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Second Edition (Kaufman & Kaufman, 2004c), the Wechsler Individualized Achievement Test, Second Edition (Wechsler, 2001) and the Woodcock Johnson Tests of Achievement, Third Edition (Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001a) provide composite data that would be used in the general areas of learning disorders (e.g., Reading, Math, Written Expression) as defined by the DSM-IV (1994) but also provide subtest score data relating to the seven diagnostic categories listed under IDEA (2004) (i.e., Basic Reading, Reading of intelligence” taking into consideration an individual’s cognitive processing skills (p. 46).

When making a diagnosis of a specific learning disability (SLD) or learning disorder, psychologists use the legal and professional guidelines set forth in the special education law (IDEA, 2004) and the American Psychiatric Association’s diagnostic manual (DSM-IV; 1994) respectively. Legally, IDEA (2004) requires that practitioners “not use any single measurement or assessment as the sole criterion for determining whether a child is a child with a disability” and that the instruments used are “technically sound” (20 U.S.C. SS 1414 b). Professionally, the DSM-IV (1994) requires examiners to assess if an individual’s academic skills fall “below that expected for age, schooling, and level
Reliability and Interpretation

Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Math Reasoning, Math Calculation, Written Expression, Oral Expression, and Listening Comprehension). It is important to note that there is general disagreement amongst scientists as to the usability of subtest data. Specifically, several researchers (Glutting, & Bear, 1989; Glutting, McDermott, Konold, Snelbaker, & Watkins, 1998; McDermott, Fantuzzo, Glutting, Watkins, & Baggaley, 1992; McDermott & Glutting, 1997) put forth valid arguments against the use of subtest data. McDermott, Fantuzzo, Glutting, Watkins, and Baggaley (1992) as well as McDermott and Glutting (1997) found that subtest analysis added little additional stable data than that provided by the composite scores. Kaufman (1994) and Elliot (1990) suggests that subtest data can be used when taken out of isolation and evaluated within a context of other known information about an individual. For example, if subtest scores are supported by background data, other subtest data, and teacher reports, then these scores can be interpreted in a meaningful manner. Flannagan, Ortiz, Alfonso, and Mascolo (2006) advocate the use of a cross-battery approach using similar subtests from different instruments to triangulate a child’s specific skills. Regardless of the theoretical perspective on subtest interpretation, practitioners in the field describe subtest profile analysis as extremely helpful. Specifically, Pfeiffer, Reddy, Kletzel, Schmelzer, and Boyer (2000), found that more than 50% of school psychologists surveyed believe they derive useful data from subtest analysis.

Therefore, a split exists between what is needed to accommodate IDEA (2004) and DSM-IV (1994) evaluation criteria on the practitioner’s side and the general argument that subtest scores may or may not be interpretable on the scientists’ side. This article will not attempt to suggest which side is correct (scientist or practitioner). Instead, the goal is to discuss the basic psychometric properties of scores within the realm of interpretation. Although composite test score interpretation will be discussed, a special emphasis will be placed on the reliability aspect of subtest score specificity, a concept described by Sattler (1992) as, “the proportion of a subtest’s variance that is both reliable (that is, not due to errors of measurement) and distinctive to the subset” (p. 256). To accomplish this, internal-consistency reliability data presented in test manuals will be used.

Test score reliability considerations

Researchers and test developers alike strive to create reliable test instruments. As best described by Reynolds and Kamphaus (2003), “When an examiner uses an unreliable score, an individual can be tested one day and diagnosed as having a particular deficiency. The individual can be tested again the next day, and the problem has vanished” (p. 75). Urbina (2004) discussed the pernicious myth that, if some scores on a measurement are sometimes deemed reliable, then all scores from all parts of that test are always reliable for everyone. For example, although composite scores may be reliable, the subtest scores from that same instrument may not. In addition, scores may be reliable for one population but not for another (Streiner, 2003). This erroneous assumption may lead examiners to believe that once the publisher reports any test scores as reliable, they no longer need examine specific test score reliability information when making diagnostic decisions.

Given that some examiners use specific subtest or composite scores in diagnostic decision-making, it is important to know whether they also use available data from the technical portions of manuals to determine the reliability
of a specific child’s test scores prior to interpretation. For example, a school psychologist may have administered the Listening Comprehension subtest from the WIAT-II (Wechsler, 2001) to a child who is 7 years old (split-half correlation = .83), and the subtest scores would be considered to meet the reliability expectations of .80 or above (Anastasi & Urbina, 1996; Sattler 2001). However, the same practitioner may test a 10-year old the next week, and not realize that the same subtest on the WIAT-II (Wechsler, 2001) does not produce scores at a level considered to be reliable (split-half correlation = .78). The only way to know if the subtest score is reliable is to check the technical portions of the manual specific to the child that is assessed.

At this time, there are no data available on how often school psychologists check subtest reliability data in the technical manuals. However, this practice may be happening as it is commonly (if briefly) described in most training textbooks (Flanagan & Harrison, 2005; Flannagan, Ortiz, Alfonso, & Mascolo, 2006; Naglieri & Goldstein, 2009; Sattler, 2001). One reason to hypothesize that this reliability check may not be happening is that score reliability data are not provided as part of most testing software output, nor is it easily found in most normative tables. Thus, publishers require an extra step for the practitioner to move between software printouts or norms tables and the technical manual. The purpose of this article is to discuss the need for practitioners to take that extra step to determine score reliability prior to making any diagnostic decisions. As is accurately worded by Stone (1995), “A wary eye must always be kept upon the psychometric aspects of a test to avoid being fooled into thinking that a test attribute is a child attribute. In the absences of sufficient knowledge of psychometrics it is easy to fall victim to overinterpretation and too much non-scientific thinking” (p. 844).

Methodology
Researchers identified relevant assessment tools by reviewing a seminal text of assessment (Sattler, 2001). The text provided 22 cognitive and 21 achievement instruments recommended for use by school psychologists when conducting psychoeducational assessments. Tables 1 and 2 both reflect that a few instruments did not have usable data for the purposes of the study. For example, the manual for the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test, Revised (Woodcock, 1998) did not provide age-based internal consistency data. In addition, a few instruments did not provide any internal consistency reliability data. This list includes: the Piagetian Tests (Fogelman, 1970), Raven’s Progressive Matrices (Raven, Raven, Court, 1998), the Informal Assessment of Multiple Intelligences (Armstrong, 1994), and the Infant Psychological Development Scale (Uzgiris & Hunt, 1975). In addition, the Test of Nonverbal Intelligence, Third Edition (Brown, Sherbenou, & Johnson, 1997) did not provide age-based internal consistency data at the subtest level. This left a revised sample of 18 cognitive tests and 20 achievement instruments. Whenever a listed test had a newer version than the one described in the textbook, the newest version available to the researcher at the time of data collection was evaluated. If a test had multiple versions (e.g., Form A and B), then each version was evaluated separately.

Reliability information in the form of internal consistency data was gathered from the manuals that accompanied the test kits. Test publishers did not use a uniform method of reporting internal consistency data. Some used a Kuder-Richardson formula (Guilford,
1954), some used the Spearman-Brown formula (Kelley, 1925), others used the Rulon formula (1939), coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) or Nunnally’s method (1978), and still others used something described as only a “split-half” method without specifying what type. Each of these types of reliability incorporates an internal consistency method that does not require a second administration of the instrument to be conducted. In addition, each of these methods uses a variation on the “split-half” technique and provides a coefficient score (Streiner, 2003). Reliability information for “power tests” such as timed tests and coding tests, where internal consistency methods were not appropriate, were reported as test-retest data. These data are also reported as coefficients.

Although reliability coefficients vary somewhat based on the method used, the range of variability should not be high given that the techniques share a common foundation. Several scholars have set standards of acceptable reliability. Nunnally (1967) believed that a clinical instrument needed a minimal reliability of .90. Streiner (2003) described this as too strict of a standard and proposed that a .90 or higher coefficient reflects item redundancy and is not indicative of a strong instrument. He proposed a lower level needed for clinical interpretation. Anastasi and Urbina, (1996) and Sattler (2001) described .80 or above as the desired minimum level.

For the purposes of this study, all of the internal consistency measures were evaluated together. The total number of either subtest or composite coefficients was counted based on the following categories: coefficient is .50 or less, between .51 - .60, between .61 - .70, between .71 - .80, between .81 - .90, and .91 or higher. Finally, the percentage of reliability coefficients falling above .80 was calculated to indicate how frequently measurements met this level of reliability.

**Results**

All the data for cognitive tests are presented in Table 1, and for achievement tests in Table 2. Composite data for the cognitive and achievement tests listed found that approximately 99.76% of the cognitive coefficients and 97.7% of the achievement coefficients presented fell above the threshold of .80. This percentage was much lower for subtest results. Approximately 76.58% of the cognitive and 85.30% of the achievement subtest coefficients presented fell above the same mark of .80.

**Conclusions**

Research shows that practitioners use both composites and subtests to make diagnostic decisions (Pfeiffer, Reddy, Kletzel, Schmelzer, & Boyer, 2000). Therefore, it is important to examine the reliability of subtests as well as composite scores prior to any possible interpretation. The researchers in this study tallied the reliability data on cognitive and achievement instruments across composites and subtests. Given the results, practitioners should consider it best practices to refer to the reliability tables that describes data specific to the test and the client prior to subtest or composite interpretation. This information is easily obtained in the reliability tables available in the technical properties section of most test manuals for the age of the client. Unfortunately, only age or grade data are usually reported. No reliability information specific to second language, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or geographic differences is available in these tables.

Although previous research documents the use of subtests in making diagnostic decisions, future research must be conducted on practitioner use...
of subtest score reliability data prior to interpretation. In addition, publishers may wish to consider the need to provide subtest and composite score reliability data as part of the printouts provided by their computer scoring software or in the normative chart data. This would make it easier for practitioners to use best practices when making decisions. Finally, publishers may want to consider providing more reliability information than just the coefficient score for a given age. The more information provided from the publisher, the better that school psychologists can utilize the data collected.

References


Reliability and Interpretation


Table 1  
Reported Internal Consistency of Cognitive Ability Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Acronym</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.50</th>
<th>.60</th>
<th>.70</th>
<th>.80</th>
<th>.90</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>Total # of tests</th>
<th>Total # of age ranges</th>
<th>% of age range/subtests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-2 - Sub</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-2 - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS - Sub</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>98.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTONI-2 - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTONI-2 - Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS-2: EY - Sub</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS-2: EY - Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS-2: SA - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAS-2: SA - Comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTLA-4 - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTLA-4 - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAMI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPDS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC-II - Sub</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC-II - Comp</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIT - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIT - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBIT-II - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBIT-II - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiter-R-AM - Sub</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiter-R-AM - Comp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiter-R-VR - Sub</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiter-R-VR - Comp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-V - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-V - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT-P - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT-P - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT-R3 - Sub</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI-4:A - Sub</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI-4:A - Comp*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI-4:B - Sub</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONI-4:B - Comp*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued from page 13

Reliability and Interpretation
Table 1
Reported Internal Consistency of Cognitive Ability Test Scores, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Acronym</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.51</th>
<th>.61</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>.81</th>
<th>.91</th>
<th>Total # of age ranges</th>
<th>% of age &gt;.80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub = Subtest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp = Composite</td>
<td>reported</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT- Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>47.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIT - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 99.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIS-III - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14 13 73.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIS-III - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7   13 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASI-Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4   23 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASI-Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4   23 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC-IV- Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20 11 69.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC-IV - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5   11 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ-III: COG - Sub</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20 25 79.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ-III: COG - Comp</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>24 25 97.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPSSI-R - Sub</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 9 54.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPSSI-R - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3   9 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT-Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4   4 93.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT-Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3   4 100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
Reported Internal Consistency of Achievement Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Acronym</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.51</th>
<th>.61</th>
<th>.71</th>
<th>.81</th>
<th>.91</th>
<th>Total # of age ranges</th>
<th>% of age range/subtests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comp = Composite</strong></td>
<td>reported</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub = Subtest</strong></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI-10</td>
<td>No data reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAB-3 – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAB-3 – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA-2 – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA-2 – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>98.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDRT-2:A – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDRT-2:A – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDRT-2:B – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDRT-2:B – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORT 4:A – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORT 4:A – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORT 4:B – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORT 4:B – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMAT:A – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMAT:A – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMAT:B – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMAT:B – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyMath- R – Sub</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeyMath- R – Comp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTEA-II:A – Sub</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTEA-II:A – Comp</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTEA-II:B – Sub</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTEA-II:B – Comp</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTEA-II:brief – Sub</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTEA-II:brief – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIAT-R – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIAT-R – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMA-3:A – Sub</td>
<td>No data reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMA-3:A – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMA-3:B – Sub</td>
<td>No data reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMA-3:B – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERA3:A – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERA3:A – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERA3:B – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERA3:B – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMA-2 – Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMA-2 – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORC-3 – Sub</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORC-3 – Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2**  
**Reported Internal Consistency of Achievement Test Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Acronym</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.51</th>
<th>.61</th>
<th>.71</th>
<th>.81</th>
<th>.91</th>
<th>Total # of age ranges</th>
<th>% of age range/subtests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub = Subtest</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp = Composite</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Acronym</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.51</th>
<th>.61</th>
<th>.71</th>
<th>.81</th>
<th>.91</th>
<th>Total # of age ranges</th>
<th>% of age range/subtests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIAT-S - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAT-S - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAT-II - Sub</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAT-II - Comp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ III:ACH - Sub</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ III:ACH - Comp</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ III DRB - Sub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ III DRB - Comp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT-4:A - Sub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT-4:A - Comp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT-4:B - Sub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT-4:B - Comp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRMT-R</td>
<td>Scores only available across grades not age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMW</td>
<td>Test no longer in print.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Twilight, the young adult book and film series, has generated much excitement and adoration among audiences, primarily adolescent females. Broadly stated, the first installation in the series by Stephenie Meyer explores a romantic relationship between a 17-year-old girl and a male vampire. While the story has been widely viewed by avid consumers as portraying eternal love, there is some reason for concern. In actuality, Twilight explores themes of lust, and also touches on more serious issues such as suicide and aggression. Given the story’s mass appeal, this presents consumers with a unique opportunity to engage our youth in frank discussions regarding positive romantic relationships, and the qualities of a healthy self.

The impact of the Twilight book series and subsequent film franchise has been of significant proportions, making it a cultural phenomenon of sorts. Although intended as a young adult novel, its legion of readers and fans ranges from pre-teens to adults. Websites such as TwilightDisorder.com attest to the near obsessive fascination with the books, films, and other associated paraphernalia. Allusions to Twilight are evident across various domains, from fashion (fans can now purchase the female protagonist’s coat; http://www.bbdakota.com/twilight1.htm), to academics (one can now study for the SAT exam using a Twilight companion vocabulary book; Leaf, 2009), to dance (an episode of the television show “So You Think You Can Dance” featured a Twilight-inspired dance routine; Fuller, Lythgoe, & Adelman, 2009).

While the “saga,” as it is being touted by the brand, may be entertaining to a wide audience, there may also be cause for concern, particularly with respect to young females. According to the American Library Association, “young adult” refers to the 12-18 age group (Young Adult Library Services Association, 2009). Developmentally, there are ostensible differences between the maturity levels of such a broad age range. Given Twilight’s branding as young adult, and thus inclusion of pre-teens into its readership, this series is unsuitable for this audience. The story touches on several themes that parents, educators, and other consumers should be ready to discuss with young readers, as such media can be catalysts for important discussions and learning opportunities (Rosser, 2007). In addition to mistaking lust for love, additional harmful themes intertwined in Twilight include suicide and aggression.
History of Vampires, Film, and Mental Health

Research indicates that among the horror film genre, the number one favorite movie monster across all demographics is the vampire (Fischoff, Dimopoulos, Nguyen, & Gordon, 2002). It is unsurprising then that the legend of vampires has seeped into the fields of mental health and psychiatry. Some researchers have suggested a relationship between schizophrenia and vampirism, positing that the vampire theme may provide insight into such aspects of schizophrenia including delusions and nightmares (Kayton, 1972). Also, vampire films and television shows have been used for therapeutic purposes with adolescents (Priester, 2008; Scholzman, 2000). One such case study follows a 13-year-old girl who had recently read Twilight and New Moon and uses the film, Interview with the Vampire (Geffen, Morris, & Woolley, 1994) metaphorically for counseling (Priester, 2008).

Aside from its use with a clinical population, vampire culture is a prevalent force in the mainstream. Given its mass appeal, the first book (Meyer, 2006a) and film (Mooridian, Morgan, & Godfrey, 2008) of this series are reviewed below with respect to harmful themes. As there is much overlap in content between the film and novel, attempts will be made to delineate which medium is being referred to in particular examples; however, the themes themselves are present in both sources.

Synopsis of Twilight

Stephenie Meyer’s novel Twilight is told through the eyes of Bella Swan, a 17-year old girl who moves her junior year of high school from Phoenix, Arizona to Forks, Washington. It is there that she becomes enchanted with a vampire, Edward Cullen, who she repeatedly describes as seraphic, god-like, and an Adonis. Edward comes from a wealthy adoptive family made up of his father (who is also the local physician), mother, two sisters, and two brothers. They are all devastatingly beautiful, pale in color, and the family’s teenage children sit at a table segregated from the rest of the school.

Through a series of events, Bella and Edward’s paths cross, and Edward ends up saving Bella’s life several times; in one instance he pushes a speeding van away from her and saves her from being pinned against a car, and in a second instance, he saves her from a hoard of men in a dark alley at night. Bella comes to question Edward’s superhuman strength and ability to appear in times of danger, and eventually learns he is a vampire. The two fall in love, despite the danger and impossibility of their romance. Though Edward appears 17, he is immortal and has lived for over 100 years. In order for their budding romance to work, Bella must convert to being a vampire, yet Edward desires her to have a normal human existence.

Love or Lust?

Perhaps the most singular and intriguing feature of Twilight is Bella and Edward’s intoxicating love story. In the book, as well as the film, Bella and Edward’s attraction is heady, marked by a lack of caution, and teetering at the edge of connection and death. Indeed, on numerous occasions, Edward comes perilously close to ending Bella’s life due to his exceptional thirst for her blood. Edward, for example, must summon all his strength to keep from draining Bella’s veins dry when her scent precedes her imminent arrival at the lab table they share in biology class. Further, during two biology film lectures, when the lights are dimmed, Bella and Edward struggle, muscles taut with the electricity of attraction, to maintain control over...
their respective hormonal and appetitive urges. Indeed, while the novel and film have been billed a love story, Bella and Edward’s relationship mirrors a passionate crush or lust with its attendant euphoria and obsession.

Bella and Edward’s relationship reveals the first harmful theme of _Twilight_: mistaking lust for love. Such a phenomenon renders adolescent girls emotionally and physically vulnerable at a time when they may be least able to protect themselves. For example, Bartels and Zeki (2000) found that the brain activity of young adults in the first stages of passionate love share startling similarities with the brain activity of cocaine addicts given an intravenous injection of cocaine. In the novel and the film, Edward acknowledges that Bella, whose scent he finds deliciously unprecedented, is his own “personal brand of heroin.” Likewise, Bella’s reaction to Edward is visceral; she describes his eyes as mesmerizing and his scent as mouth watering.

Figuratively speaking, those bitten by the love bug are in a perpetual state of seeing the world and the objects of their attraction through rose-colored glasses. In addition to activating the reward centers of the brain, passionate love (as well as euphoria-inducing drugs, such as cocaine) deactivate the brain regions involved in critical thought, social judgment, and the ability to assess the intentions and emotions in others (Bartels & Zeki, 2000). For example, the amygdala, a brain region which monitors the environment for fearful or dangerous stimuli, is far less active in those who are experiencing passionate love than in a control group of singles or among individuals in a long-term monogamous relationship (Aron et al., 2002). As a result, violations of personal boundaries, aggression, and manipulations on the part of the beloved are unlikely to be viewed as a cause for concern or as a trigger for normal self-protective and self-preserving behaviors (Murray & Holmes, 1997). Adolescent girls are additionally vulnerable when in the throws of passionate love because the frontal lobe, the region of the brain thought to control social cognition, executive control, and behavioral inhibition of context inappropriate behavior, may not be fully mature until they are in their late 20’s (Sowell et al., 2003).

Young female audiences, with little to no relationship experience, may internalize the message of the _Twilight_ love story, experience similar physical attraction, and identify it as love. It is here that a candid discussion of the qualities and criteria of a healthy relationship and a healthy self is warranted. Loving, healthy, and enduring relationships include such aspects as mutual respect, non-violence, and equality— all of which are lacking in Bella and Edward’s relationship. While Bella and Edward’s mutual obsession can appear sweet and loving at times, the intensity of their addictive devotion lays a thoroughly solid foundation for other troubling themes; namely, suicide.

**Suicide**

Throughout the novel, allusions are made to the ill-fated tragedy of Romeo and Juliet. When discussing their future and whether or not Bella should be transformed into a vampire, Edward confesses that should he remain with Bella until she ages and dies, he would not want to live much longer and would find a way to end his own life. Although somewhat of a “spoiler,” in _New Moon_ (Meyer, 2006b), the second installment of the _Twilight_ series, Bella’s risky behaviors after Edward’s departure are interpreted by some characters in the story as a suicide attempt, and subsequently Edward swiftly begins
planning to end his own life. Although this takes place in the second book and film, and this review is primarily concerned with the first in the series, this implication is still very much extant in the first story. The notion of being together forever, and not being able to live without each other propels the notion of dealing with lost love through suicide and death, rather than coping in healthy, life-affirming manner.

Research has indicated that teenage suicide attempts are sometimes linked to romantic relationships (Shrier, 1981). A sequential model of suicide indicates several risk factors among teens; included in the list are interpersonal loss and the romanticization of suicide that is promulgated by the media (Shaffer, Gould, & Hicks, 2007). Further examples of precipitants include such factors as a breakup with one’s boyfriend (Schaffer et al., 2007). Thus, although fictional for Twilight, this issue of love and suicide may have very serious consequences and its implications should be discussed with young readers.

Aggression

Intrinsic to the powerful nature of the Twilight romance is the frequent aggressive, threatening, and short-tempered manner in which Edward addresses Bella. Throughout the novel and film, he is easily angered. His exceptional strength makes him a danger to Bella. He warns her about this, claiming he is a threat to her, prompting the famous line, “and so the lion fell in love with the lamb” (p. 274).
possibly to a lesser degree. Exclusive and highly passion-driven romances have the potential for harm, especially for young adults and teenagers who lack maturity, social skills, and judgment to adequately assess dangerous relationships. If allowed to continue so tumultuously, there is the risk of such a relationship becoming dangerous. In *Twilight*, the secrecy and physical dominance of Edward is intended as thrilling and alluring. Yet, for young readers, this is a dangerous message. Dominance and violence when confused for love often have devastating psychological consequence for all adults, but most especially for impressionable teenagers and young adults.

**Conclusion**

The story of *Twilight* is entertaining at best, destructive at worst. Inherent in the writing style of Meyer is a soap opera-esque ability to lure in the reader with timeless themes of attraction, danger, and mystery. However, soap operas are intended for adult audiences. As much as *Twilight* can be a vehicle for educating young females about engaging in healthy relationships, it also runs the risk of misleading young girls when left unexplored with parental or other guiding figures. It may indeed prove fruitful for therapeutic uses as done with previous vampire stories (Priester, 2008; Scholzman, 2000). However, given many of the harmful themes discussed above, it appears the risk necessitated may not outweigh the benefits of introducing this book as a story with positive messages to be gained. Yet, for young readers already entrenched in this saga, discussions regarding healthy relationships must take place.

The stories are appropriate for older populations; it is for the readership of younger audiences that there should be caution. On her website, the author states that the original sequel of the story was leading into a tale unintended for a young adult population (Meyer, n.d.). Thus, there is some indication that the first story was in some ways prefacing the more mature themes that the author states were in the original sequel. Later books in the four-part series go on to openly discuss infidelity, sex, and pregnancy. Thus this article should also serve to admonish publishing companies and media franchises that seek to advance their own economic interests above those of adolescent girls, as the series is not appropriate for 12-year olds. *Twilight* is a culturally relevant topic today, much as Harry Potter was a few years ago, and another exciting story will supercede all of them. What these stories will always share, though, is the power to fuel discussions and illustrate life scenarios.
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Behavioral Interventions in Schools: Evidence-Based Positive Strategies: A Book Review

Mark D. Terjesen
St. John’s University

Since I made the transition from a practicing school psychologist to a trainer of school psychologists a little over a decade ago, I have often struggled to identify resources and texts that would work for the practicing school psychologist as well as provide a theoretical foundation and technique driven approach to incorporate in my course syllabi. Too often I found that the texts and resources available were not always school specific or would teach techniques while failing to address the scientific theory and empirical basis behind them. This struggle has led me to use some older solid books that are geared toward the practice of school psychology (Wielkiewicz, 1995) and supplement them with recent journal articles and readings from a number of additional sources that provide both the theory and somewhat more advanced clinical techniques (Friedberg & McClure, 2001; Goldfried & Davison, 1994). I have found that this approach was needed to introduce cognitive behavioral theory and related strategies when discussing the practice of school-based interventions. With that in mind, I was quite pleased to have the opportunity to review the edited book Behavioral Interventions in Schools: Evidence-Based Positive Strategies, the sixth volume in the School Psychology Book Series which is collaboratively published by Division 16 of the American Psychological Association (APA) and APA books. This edited volume provides both a strong, empirical, fundamental text for the graduate student in school psychology and serves as a valuable resource for the practicing school psychologist to assist in refining their skills in behavioral assessment, system-wide programming, and academic and behavioral interventions.

Too often edited volumes have the potential to be a nice collection of individual chapters in a related area with little overall conceptual framework to guide them. That is not the case with this volume. In the introductory section, the authors clearly outline the rationale for the book: “with a consistent body of empirical support for behavioral interventions, coupled with the need for school psychologists and other personnel to be equipped with knowledge of these interventions, this book was designed…” (Akin-Little, Little, Bray, & Kehle, 2009, p. 5). They recognized the importance

“This edited volume provides both a strong, empirical, fundamental text for the graduate student in school psychology and serves as a valuable resource for the practicing school psychologist to assist in refining their skills in behavioral assessment, system-wide programming, and academic and behavioral interventions.”
of having the science to guide clinical practice and the challenges faced with implementing evidence-based practice with children and adolescents.

The editors organized the text in four major areas: Foundations for Designing School-Based Behavioral Interventions; Systematic Approaches to Prevention and Intervention; Specific Behavioral Techniques; and Customizing Behavioral Strategies for Special Populations. The structure and order of these sections is logical in nature and each section builds upon and references the prior sections when necessary. The contributors read like a “who’s who” list of recognized experts in their respective areas who can speak not just to the techniques themselves but to the theory and the research that guides and supports these approaches.

Foundations for Designing School-Based Behavioral Interventions

This section provides readers with five chapters that address many of the fundamental practices that guide the use of behavioral strategies within the school setting. The first four chapters cover in-depth, with a number of clear examples, many of the core tenets of behavioral practice: behavioral consultation, behavioral assessment, functional behavioral assessment and treatment integrity. A solid knowledge of these areas will better serve the reader as they move forward into more specific interventions later on in the volume.

I initially questioned the inclusion of a behavioral consultation chapter in an intervention book, along with the fact that the section on designing school-based behavioral interventions began with the behavioral consultation chapter. Upon further reflection on this section in its entirety, I found that the inclusion and location of this chapter did in fact make sense. That is, consultation (and referral for consultation) is often the first step in the process of behavioral intervention. This well-written chapter discusses the history of behavioral consultation along with a step-by-step approach towards the process and evaluation of consultation. This initial chapter served as a model for the rest of the text, as it presented the techniques along with an evaluation of the science behind them, discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the model, and the future directions of the area.

The second and third chapters address behavioral and functional behavior assessment (FBA). These chapters define the core concepts and approaches attached to each area along with a guiding conceptual framework. Greater elaboration and discussion of selection of specific behavioral assessment tools and visual examples of both observational coding systems and an FBA may have been useful to the beginning behavioral interventionist, but it is assumed that this was due to the limited space available. The discussion of single-subject methodology in chapter two is believed to be essential to school psychologists, as it may be more practical than more methodologically rigorous designs. While this section is brief in nature, the authors do provide references to guide school-based practitioners in implementation of single-subject designs.

The third chapter provides an in-depth discussion of FBAs, their history, the legal mandates behind them, and the concerns in their use. The authors are quick to note that it is not the assessment approach for all individuals, and offer numerous examples throughout the chapter as to when and with whom it may be appropriate. The authors find a way to give a “Learning Theory 101” refresher for the reader during the course of the chapter, as they link specific learning...
principles (e.g., negative reinforcement) to the conduction of an FBA. This may be particularly helpful for the beginning practitioner, but is also a good review for the seasoned interventionist. The concluding section of this chapter links FBAs to intervention design and treatment planning, which is a helpful reminder that unless the FBA leads to an environmental change in reinforcing consequences, it will not lead to a change in child behavior simply because it was conducted.

Although we have an extensive body of literature demonstrating support for behavioral interventions, the best designed intervention plan is only as effective as the integrity with which it is carried out. As such, it was quite pleasing to see an entire chapter (Chapter 4) dedicated to the issue of treatment integrity in school-based interventions. Among the recognized barriers to treatment integrity that the chapter addresses is that of treatment acceptability. Too often I have found that our graduate students in school psychology have their hearts broken and get increasingly frustrated when they have put considerable effort into designing an intervention for a parent or teacher only to find that these individuals did not implement it. Typically, anecdotal reports of lack of acceptability of the parent or teachers for the intervention have been the barrier to implementation. The chapter links treatment integrity to legal mandates as well as discusses the importance of it within research to enhance the internal and external validity. What was particularly noteworthy for me in this chapter, and may be useful to others working within the school setting, was the strategies offered at the end of the chapter to promote treatment integrity within the schools.

I believe that the final chapter in this section is unique and essential to consider, as it relates to a possible reluctance often seen in consumers of behavioral intervention. That is, I have often experienced parents or teachers who believe that they “shouldn’t have to bribe the child for doing what they should be doing all along.” The editors recognize this anti-behavioral bias and define and address the relationship among external and intrinsic motivation, as well as provide research and engage in the debate about the impact of extrinsic reinforcers on intrinsic motivation. The “best practices” section at the end of the chapter does not really offer strategies to use reinforcement, but further provides fuel for this continued debate within the field of education.

**Systematic Approaches to Prevention and Intervention**

The seven chapters that make up this section are diverse in nature (i.e., Cognitive Behavioral Therapies vs. Classroom Applications of Reductive Procedures) and while they do not build upon one another as seen in the previous section, such a progression is really not essential. Each chapter stands on its own, discusses the extant literature in each area, and focuses on school based practice. The graduate student in school psychology and school-based practitioner could selectively choose a chapter to guide them in their professional practice within that specific area.

As mentioned at the beginning of this review, traditionally books for the school-based practitioner have either ignored or minimized the potential role of cognitive behavioral interventions for students within the schools. It was encouraging to see that this section begins with a summary of cognitive behavioral theories and therapies and discusses them within the context of school-based practice.

“As mentioned at the beginning of this review, traditionally books for the school-based practitioner have either ignored or minimized the potential role of cognitive behavioral interventions for students within the schools. It was encouraging to see that this section begins with a summary of cognitive behavioral theories and therapies and discusses them within the context of school-based practice.”
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some of the core intervention techniques that are associated with the varied cognitive-behavioral models of therapy as they apply to children in schools. More detailed cognitively based practices for specific child and school-based problems are offered in subsequent chapters.

At the same time, the second chapter in this section that reviewed evidence-based academic interventions is one that also seems to be rarely seen within behavioral intervention in the school books, but nonetheless it is essential and is a welcome addition to this volume. The school psychologist who believes that academic interventions are left to the educators may be deluding themselves as our role continues to expand into this arena. Knowing what works to improve the academic performance of students across many of the core academic areas (i.e., reading, mathematics, spelling, and writing) may greatly assist them in their role as a consultant as well as in their ability to evaluate existing academic programming. The authors of this chapter do a commendable job in condensing what could have been its own edited volume into 15 pages that describe specific techniques and report on the effectiveness research in these academic areas. While this chapter does not discuss the specific role of the school psychologist with regard to these areas, the earlier chapters on consultation and treatment integrity provide the basis and the context in which the school psychologist may apply the information offered from this chapter.

Many of the other chapters in this section focus on behavior management and offer interventions that may be school or classroom-wide approaches that are proactive in nature or involve a group based approach. While the chapters often provide a review of the behavioral principles that are at the core of school or classroom based work, they also tend to overlap somewhat with the earlier foundational chapters. In my opinion, this is not particularly problematic, as this continues to reinforce the learning of these concepts along with providing the reader with an understanding of the theoretical and empirical basis for which these concepts are based. At the same time, the reader may not read the entire volume in order and having this background in each chapter may be beneficial.

Consistent with earlier sections, these chapters provide both the legal and educational rationale and importance of the interventions presented along with a review of the research in this area. The chapter on proactive instructional strategies stood out to me as an excellent example of what the research has demonstrated are effective strategies to facilitate change and structure within the classroom (i.e., proximity; opportunities to respond; choice making) to enhance learning.

The chapter on proactive instructional strategies stood out to me as an excellent example of what the research has demonstrated are effective strategies to facilitate change and structure within the classroom (i.e., proximity; opportunities to respond; choice making) to enhance learning.
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to physics and Newton’s second law of motion took me back to high school science, it was an effective approach for allowing the reader to re-conceptualize and challenge some of their views as to how behavior develops and is maintained. The five strategies reviewed and discussed at the end of the chapter may be quite helpful for the school-based consultant to recall and reinforce when working with educators.

The final chapter in this section, while it may have been more appropriately placed in the first section, is nonetheless a unique and important contribution to this volume. Although we may have evidence-based practices and may be able to implement them with integrity that leads to behavioral change, this change has less social validity if it is not maintained and generalized. That is the focus of this chapter, and the authors do an excellent job in defining the concepts of generalization and offering clear examples when elucidation may be necessary. What may be more helpful to the reader are the procedures offered for generalization of behaviors. The strategies presented here, the frequent examples offered, and the integration of these approaches with the problem-solving model seen earlier in the consultation chapter will be a great asset in my teaching and I would imagine would also be considerably helpful to the school-based practitioner.

Specific Behavioral Techniques

With the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004), it seems that one could not find a book related to the field of school psychology or attend a conference that did not make mention of the concept of Response to Intervention (RTI) and identification of a Specific Learning Disability (SLD). As such, I read with caution and questioned the inclusion of a chapter on RTI and SLD within an edited volume that focused on behavioral interventions within the schools. The chapter gets into a discussion about the debate of RTI and discrepancy models towards identifying a SLD. If the focus moves away from this and rather focuses on the problem-solving approaches within the model, the measurement of behavior and instruction, and the integrity with which academic interventions are delivered the chapter may fit more logically with the rest of the edited volume. However, it is quite difficult to ignore the debate and the author’s argument for consideration of the use of RTI, and even upon re-reading the chapter for the review, it still felt somewhat out of place.

The other two chapters offered in this section focus on two general strategies for changing behavior: daily report cards and self-modeling. Daily report cards are a strategy that is often discussed in training and practice, and this chapter presents what they are, their advantages, and the research support behind it. While this approach may often be considered in the context of changing disruptive behaviors to more adaptive ones, the authors offer examples and research for both behavioral and academic systems targeted for change. The clearly described steps in the implementation of a daily report card will no doubt be helpful to the reader and may serve as a good checklist for the practitioner to follow to increase the likelihood of success. The chapter on self-modeling is also well-written and includes both a theoretical argument behind how it would work as well as the research behind it for disruptive classroom behavior, selective mutism, and in an area that was somewhat new and surprising to me: autism. The authors provide a step-by-step procedural outline that is quite clear. Despite the reported success and somewhat quick and non-intrusive nature of the intervention, the fact that such...
technology may not be available to all schools and that some schools, parents, or students may not philosophically agree to this approach may be a barrier to implementation.

**Customizing Behavioral Strategies for Special Populations**

The final section, and the six chapters within, focus on customizing behavioral strategies for the specialized population that the practicing school psychologist is most likely to come into contact. I liked that the first chapter in this section was not diagnostically driven but rather fairly general in nature (i.e., working with difficult students) and the strategies offered were very practical. As other chapters have done, the authors start out with a general review of some basic behavioral principles and also discuss how practicality is defined and the importance of considering practicality in the intervention development. The authors describe varied characteristics of “difficult students” and then proceed to offer a number of research-proven antecedent based strategies that may be quite helpful when the school based practitioner is either engaging directly with the student or providing consultation to parents or educators.

The use of classroom rules and positive and reductive consequences for behavior accompanied with the enclosed examples are thoroughly discussed, and strategies are offered to enhance their effectiveness and avoid pitfalls. The programs discussed and references provided to motivate the difficult student that concludes this chapter is also quite useful.

The chapters that focused on externalizing and internalizing disorders tended to focus much more on the definition, identification, and assessment of anxiety, fear, and mood problems and less on the interventions themselves. Perhaps this was done in order to educate the practitioner about problems that may go under-identified within a school setting and to assist in consultation to further inform educators about the disorders which may lead to better identification, but regardless it reads like a chapter in a psychopathology textbook. When we do get to the brief section on school-based interventions, they are limited in their depth of description and the research to support their effectiveness, at least in comparison with other chapters in this edited volume.

The next two chapters focus on areas that continue to emerge as regions of
practice that school psychologists may seek and warrant further professional training in: preschool aged students and students with autism. The chapter on preschool interventions addresses the challenges inherent in addressing these behaviors and offers a positive, preventive approach to change. These antecedent based strategies are offered with consideration of working with parents as well as in classroom based approaches. A number of straightforward practices are offered to create positive behaviors (e.g., incidental teaching) along with some simple heuristics to increase effectiveness. These practices are supported by references and examples to help clarify concepts. The authors also offer what they refer to as “high impact interventions,” which appear to be more environmentally and peer driven to promote positive behavior. This chapter was among the shortest of the chapters in terms of length and a more in-depth discussion of implementation of these strategies and methods for overcoming barriers may have been warranted.

With only one chapter dedicated to interventions for autism, I did not think it would be possible to address all that could be considered in a behavioral intervention volume for this disorder. Apparently neither did the authors, and they wisely chose to focus on one specific target (social skills) of behavioral intervention and refer the reader to other chapters that would address the complexity of behaviors that are demonstrated in children with autism. The chapter focuses on early intensive behavioral interventions (EIBIs), naturalistic strategies, and social skills development. They address some of the common misconceptions about applied behavior analysis (ABA), discrete trial instruction (DTI) and EIBIs, and the research behind the support of these approaches to produce social gains. The authors provide the readers with some backgrounds on naturalistic strategies (i.e., incidental teaching; pivotal response treatment) and the research that supports behavioral interventions for social skills training.

The final chapter is the briefest chapter in the volume and addresses trauma-focused cognitive-behavior therapy (TF-CBT). The brevity of this chapter is not a function of the lack of research to support the approach. In fact, the authors go a long way to describe the empirical support of the approach and many of the studies that have led to its efficacy. While many of the components of TF-CBT are described here and in other chapters in this volume, perhaps further elaboration on the unique narrative component of this treatment would have been helpful. The authors describe the only TF-CBT study conducted in the schools that was published, though they do not discuss some of the barriers and concerns about implementing this type of mental health programming in a school setting. Finally, the authors provide the reader with a weblink for a 10-hour, web-based educational course for individuals seeking to learn TF-CBT.

Summary

Overall, Behavioral Interventions in Schools: Evidence-Based Positive Strategies is a welcome addition to the behavioral interventions literature. The editors have developed a text that provides the necessary theoretical and empirical framework to guide students, trainers, or practitioners to deliver evidence based practices when working with students in the schools. The offering of the foundational theory and science behind the approaches is essential for both novice and sophisticated practitioners.

“The offering of the foundational theory and science behind the approaches is essential for both novice and sophisticated practitioners.”
Behavioral Interventions in Schools: Evidence-Based Positive Strategies:
A Book Review

“Overall, the book is recommended for trainers, school psychologists, and anyone looking to implement evidence based behavioral practices in schools.”

text. The regular integration of current research is also important for both new and experienced school psychologists to be aware of in order to determine what the current best practices are in these areas. Overall, the book is recommended for trainers, school psychologists, and anyone looking to implement evidence based behavioral practices in schools.
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To continue the national dialogue between students, researchers, and practitioners in school psychology that began with the summer edition of TSP, SASP again asked fellow students to voice their questions regarding current research and practice issues in the field. In the spirit of the previous issue, numerous, thoughtful questions and responses were received by students, faculty, and practitioners. The following is the latest installment of this “Q&A.”

Q: As a doctoral student who is interested in academia, what opportunities should one seek out prior to graduation? Are there specific expectations regarding research experience, dissemination (i.e. number of publications), and teaching that search committees tend to look for? How does this differ from “research” and “teaching” institutions?

-Submitted by D’Andrea Jacobs, Michigan State University

A: I think that there are few “pure” teaching and/or research institutions anymore (aside from community colleges which are entirely teaching focused as a rule). Many four-year colleges and universities expect faculty to have some competency in research, even the more teaching oriented institutions. What you find is that there is a lot of “mission creep” in higher education. The teaching mission institutions expect faculty to do research but are more likely to place an emphasis on faculty research that can involve undergraduates in the research process.

The more that an institution sees itself as having a research- mission (or a wanna be research mission) the more that faculty research is valued and is seen as important to recruitment, merit increases, and tenure and promotion. Research mission institutions also place more emphasis on writing and obtaining grant funding for research, and the higher up the research food chain that an institution is the more likely that there will be some sort of spoken or unspoken quota for external funding support. Teaching-oriented institutions want to know how your research can become another form of pedagogy; research oriented institutions want to know how your research can inform your teaching.

The notion on hiring a junior faculty member is that you want to hire people who are likely to be successful in obtaining tenure and promotion. I’m tempted to say that institutions want you to be good at everything! That is somewhat tongue-in-cheek, but not too far off. To be optimally prepared, you want to have a good research history, a good dissertation project, and, hopefully, some publications when you apply. How many publications depends to some degree on the type of institution you are applying to. We are seeing that many applicants tend to have from a couple to a half dozen publications when they apply. It is an advantage to you if you have worked with a faculty mentor on a grant funded project, especially for jobs in the more research oriented institutions. You will be able to point to your experience in a work group, and if you have had some experience mentoring/supervising undergraduates or masters
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level students in the project it is to your
benefit at whichever type of institution
to which you apply. Understanding
how to manage research projects is a
good thing. Hiring institutions also like
it when you get some presentations in,
so do so where you can. Professional
organizations frequently make it easy for
graduate students to present their work,
and its always good to do presentations
with your faculty mentors as well. As
you approach research/presentation/
publication try to have projects and ideas
that “hold together” into a research area.
Departments want you to be able to
articulate a coherent research agenda and
develop it by the time you come up for
tenure and promotion.

Teaching is important everywhere,
although how important varies from place
to place. In the more teaching oriented
institutions a greater weight is placed
on excellent teaching. At more research
oriented institutions you must be at least
a good teacher. The size of the institution
and where your program is located is also
a factor. Some programs are in graduate
level training programs only, and the main
emphasis is on graduate teaching. Other
institutions, especially larger institutions,
may have an expectation that you can do
undergraduate teaching as well. Graduate
and undergraduate teaching typically
require some different focus to your
skills; graduate teaching is more collegial,
more coaching/mentoring in nature.
Undergraduate teaching is more likely to
consist of larger classes and perhaps less
emphasis on individual mentoring. These
are some generalizations, but useful to
keep in mind when you do interviews.
You should ask about expectations for
teaching, the model and emphasis of
teaching, and the relationship between
teaching/research/service and promotion
and tenure.

You should definitely seek out
some opportunities to teach as part of
your doctoral program. You may have
choices and you may know what type of
institution you want to aim for and that
could help you select what experiences
you want if you have a choice. If you can
do some undergraduate teaching you
should, especially if you can work up
to having your own section of courses.
Most institutions have undergraduate
teaching so this will help you. If you can
do practicum supervision for masters
students this is also very helpful, both
to help you become more comfortable
doing this and because many institutions
look for junior faculty who can supervise
practicum.

I think it’s also important to get
an idea of how departmental, college
and university governance works if you
can. This is likely to be the area that
students have more difficulty in obtaining
experience. But, if your department
has graduate student representatives
on department committees, or hiring
committees, or award committees, etc.
then I would suggest that you volunteer
for one or more. You can even sometimes
get some notion of this from being
involved in university-wide graduate
student organizations or committees. For
example, our institution has a graduate
student association and some of the
officers of the association get to interact
with deans and such in a way that helps
them learn more about how the university
works.

Finally, my own notion is that
different programs place a different level
of emphasis on your practice experience
and practice skills. For those of us who
were practitioners before we became
academics, we think that the trend is more
toward bringing faculty on-board as soon
as possible following doctoral program
completion. There are, of course, pros and
cons to this. One thing to keep in mind
is that there is generally an advantage to
you to be able to obtain a state license.
to practice psychology. So, think about this when you choose your internship (get an internship that meets state board of psychology requirements, typically an APPIC and/or APA approved internship). You should also give some thought to how you plan to obtain the requisite post-doctoral hours of experience and supervision (although there is some move afoot to change the traditional one year pre-doctoral and one year post-doctoral experience requirements). I made the decision to get my post-doctoral experience and supervision done and take the license exam prior to applying for academic positions. Others have not done so; the biggest issue that presents is that you have to figure out how to get post-doctoral experience which is not easy to fit in with all the other requirements for tenure and promotion. It is something to consider and negotiate when you are on the job market.

Higher education has a great deal in common between institutions, but each institution has a personality of its own. There is a big difference in culture between “research I” type institutions and a masters comprehensive institution. There may be a difference in culture based on whether you are hired into a psychology department or an educational psychology department or whether your department is in the College of Arts and Sciences or a College of Education. Expectations vary and one thing to find out about in the job search process is culture and expectations that can vary between institution, departments, and programs.

-Submitted by Michael Brown, PhD, Associate Dean, East Carolina University

A: Research, teaching, and professional service/leadership are the 3 major domains. It’s never too early to start developing your vita in all 3 of these areas.

- Attend NASP and APA conventions, as well as state-level conferences if you can, and present as many posters and other presentations as possible.
- Take the initiative to author or co-author one or more journal articles as a grad student. Co-authoring book chapters with a faculty member would get you great visibility. Also, consider submitting unsolicited articles to your state school psych association and state psych association newsletters. They may not be refereed publications, but they still show that you have the energy and vision to contribute to the field!
- Having good teaching ratings from teaching undergraduate classes, and/or a strong teaching letter of reference from supervising faculty, would be a plus – especially if your goal is to seek a trainer position in Ed.S. programs, which may not emphasize research background/potential as strongly.
- Seek out professional service experiences through leadership in SASP and/or in your school psych program’s student organization, etc.
- Completing an APA-approved predoc internship is helpful. Once you’ve completed that, pass the EPPP. Training programs value having licensed psychologists on their faculty for supervision purposes.

-Submitted by Georgette Yetter, PhD, Assistant Professor, School Psychology, Oklahoma State University
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1) Become an expert in something; don’t piddle around with knowing a little in many areas...focus your publishing and research areas...make it obvious to the readers of your curriculum vitae that you have a systematic research agenda
2) Learn the methods in your field well...do not be afraid of statistics/quantitative methods...otherwise, you will be perpetually ignorant of how to evaluate research in your field
3) Learn how to write to an audience (every journal will have different readership and different expectations...learn how to write for specific journals)
4) Hang around professors (either in graduate school or a post-doc) who are scholars; notice how they allocate time and resources
5) Learn to write grants early
6) Don’t be afraid of being rejected by journals and granting agencies...submit early and submit frequently
7) If you want to work at a teaching college, don’t worry about research skills...doubtful it will count toward tenure if you publish...if you want to work at a research university, focus on developing research and writing skills...don’t waste time preparing a lot for classes...students like it better at those institutions if you don’t have everything planned out in a lecture and are flexible with the content

-Submitted by Alex Beaujean, Assistant Professor of Education, Baylor University

A: When planning your dissertation, it is helpful to think in advance about all the possible publications that you can get from your dissertation. You can plan this with members of your committee and other faculty. Even if you do not plan this in advance, it is important to develop as many publications as possible as soon as your dissertation is completed. When you finish your dissertation defense, you might be very tempted to put it aside and take a rest, but that would be a big mistake. If you wait too long, your data and findings are very likely to become outdated quickly, or others will publish what you did not. Even if you have no plans at this time to work at a university, you cannot predict the future and do not know whether your plans might change so that publications become necessary or helpful. Your dissertation is a rich source of publications, so make sure that you take full advantage of it now.

-Submitted by Joan Silverstein, retired practicing and academic school psychologist
Oliver Edwards was recently promoted to associate professor with tenure at the University of Central Florida. He also assumed the role of Coordinator of the School Psychology Program. UCF is now the nation’s third largest free-standing traditional university exceeded in enrollment by Arizona State University and Ohio State University.

This year the American Academy of School Psychology awarded six $1,000 Irwin Hyman and Nadine Lambert Memorial Scholarships, thanks to the generosity of Pearson Assessments, ProEd, PAR, WPS, and numerous Fellows who contributed. The recipients were:
- Ashley Gibb, Indiana University
- Emily Graybill, Georgia State University
- Allison Lundahl, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Joni Splett, University of Missouri
- Michael Sulkowski, University of Florida
- Kathryn Woods, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

For 2010, the American Board of School Psychology will be comprised of Clifford Hatt (President, SPLR Representative), Thomas McKnight (Vice President, Treasurer, Credentials Reviewer), Barbara Fischetti (Vice President, Secretary, SPLR Representative), Shelley Pelletier (Director of Mentoring, AASP Liaison), Jeffrey Miller (Director of Examinations), and Giselle Esquivel (Practice Sample Reviewer).

The 2010 AASP Executive Committee will consist of David McIntosh (President), Judith Kaufman (President-Elect), Michael Tansy (Past-President), Shawn Powell (Treasurer), and Linda Caterino (Secretary).

At the 2009 APA Convention in Toronto, Walt Pryzwansky received the 2009 ABPP Distinguished Service and Contributions to the Profession of Psychology Award, and Jeffrey Miller received an exemplary service award from AASP and ABSP.

Dr. Reuben Castagno is now the Director of the Touro College (New York) Specialist Program in School Psychology. He joins a faculty that includes Giuseppe Costantino, Rosemary Flanagan, Dominick Fortugno, Pamela Jacobs, and Janet Kiliian.

Dr. Valerie Cook-Morales, Professor of School Psychology at San Diego State University, received the College of Education Dean’s “Excellence Award” for Making a Difference. The award recognized the work that she and 16 school psychology students did in a small school in Oaxaca, Mexico, during their annual immersion this past summer. Under her supervision, the students completed eight individual intervention case studies (behavioral and academic) with documented effectiveness, conducted a series of workshops for teachers on effective reading instruction that were highly rated, and transformed the school from a “don’t do” to a positive behavior support environment.
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**Walter B. Pryzwansky**, Ed.D. received the American Board of Professional Psychology’s 2009 Award for Distinguished Services and Contributions to the Profession of Psychology. The presentation took place at the ABPP convocation held in Toronto this past August. His writings included work in the areas of consultation and professional issues.

Dr. Pryzwansky is Professor Emeritus at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. A member of the School of Education faculty from 1969 to 2005 in the School Psychology Program, he has served in a variety of leadership roles in the state, School and University including chair of the School Psychology Program and Associate Dean.

Finally, Dr. Pryzwansky is a former President of the Division of School Psychology, and in addition to his other Division service, he has been involved in the work of numerous APA Boards and Committees. A former President of ABPP he led the effort to establish the American Board of School Psychology and the School Psychology Specialty Council.
ANNOUNCEMENT:

PAUL E. HENKIN TRAVEL GRANTS
American Psychological Foundation
(APF) Mission and Funding

The APF provides financial support for innovative research and programs that enhance the power of psychology to elevate the human condition and advance human potential both now and in generations to come. It executes this mission through a broad range of scholarships and grants. For all of these, it encourages applications from individuals who represent diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

The Paul Henkin Grant program funds travel awards for qualifying students through Division 16, school psychology. Its description, application requirements, and procedures appear below.

Description
This program seeks to promote the development of students oriented toward careers in school psychology, providing grants to student members of APA Division 16 (school psychology) to help offset registration, lodging, and transportation costs incurred in convention attendance.

Program Goals
• Enrich the field of school psychology by supporting its promising younger members
• Facilitate growth of aspiring school psychology professionals through experiential learning opportunities afforded by the APA convention

Funding Specifics
• Up to $1,000 annually for registration, lodging and transportation expenses

Eligibility Requirements
• Student membership in APA Division 16
• Demonstrated commitment to pursuit of a school psychology career
• Those receiving any APA travel reimbursement for convention attendance are ineligible

Evaluation Criteria
• Conformance with stated program goals
• Demonstrated understanding of the field of school psychology, including its demands, research and application opportunities, and the value of continuing professional development for contributing to its advancement
• Applicant’s scholarly accomplishments and potential in this field

Proposal Requirements
• Completed application form
• 500 word essay with reference to program goals and criteria
• CV
• Letter of recommendation

Submission Process and Deadline
Submit a completed application online at http://forms.apa.org/apf/grants/ by April 15, 2010.

Questions about this program should be directed to Kim Palmer Rowsome, Program Officer, at krowsome@apa.org.
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