Dear Ayfer Gokalp,

Below is an itemized list of the revisions you requested I make to my manuscript prior to its publication in *Current Issues in Education* along with an explanation of my efforts to comply with each request. I’ve included a list of references for the citations contained within my responses at the end of this letter for your convenience. Please contact me if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Kara M. Styck, MA

**1. Revise the title to better represent the study. The title of the manuscript does not represent the study well. Although the study is about the characteristics of School Psychology Training Programs, the main emphasis is on the comparison between approved/accredited programs and non-accredited/non-approved programs. The title should represent it.**

The title was changed from, “Preparing to Work With Racially, Ethnically, and/or Linguistically Diverse Students: Characteristics of School Psychology Training Programs” was changed to, “Preparing School Psychologists for Working with Diverse Students: Does Institution Accreditation Matter?”

**2. Provide page numbers.**

A running head and page numbers were added to the manuscript.

**3. The literature review leading to the purpose statement was very**

**well-written and comprehensive. However, I noticed that most of the key citations are old publications. If you could update the literature, the manuscript would be in better shape.**

The “key citations” contained in the literature review are the only publications to date that have surveyed school psychology training programs nationwide. There are no other publications in existence to add to the manuscript in order to “update the literature.” Furthermore, it is important to provide readers with a comprehensive overview of the results of previous surveys in order to draw comparisons between previous research and the results of the present study as well as to identify longitudinal trends in school psychology training program characteristics. All supporting research cited in the introduction was published between 2000 and 2009, which represents current information.

**4. On page 12 (by my count), you provided two purpose statements one of**

**which stated that your purpose was to evaluate the training characteristics**

**in schools psychology program. The second one, which you called the primary**

**purpose, stated that your purpose was to assess the degree to which**

**differences exist between characteristics of accredited/approved and**

**non-accredited/non-approved programs. The second statement aligns better**

**with the study. I suggest removing the first one.**

The first purpose statement was removed.

**5. On page 13, you presented the research questions. Although you listed 4**

**questions, I think you have 5 questions. The last research question (#4)**

**could be broken down into two.**

The last research question was disaggregated into two separate questions.

**6. RELD clientele in practicum and internship was operationally defined as**

**the percent of time that students work with RELD clients in practicum and**

**internship experiences. I think the actual number of hours spent with RELD**

**will be a better measure. Because practicum and internship experiences may**

**vary in length from one program to next, 25% in program may not be the same**

**in another program.**

One purpose of the present study was to gather updated information regarding the current nature and extent of specific training characteristics thought to be indicative of exemplary school psychology training programs because a nationwide study on this topic has not been conducted since Rogers, Ponterotto, Conoley, and Wiese (1992). In order to draw comparisons between the results of previous research and the results of the present study as well as to identify longitudinal trends in school psychology training characteristics, the survey developed by Rogers et al. was used to gather data. The Rogers et al. survey did not collect the number of hours graduate students spend with RELD students, but rather the percent of time graduate students spend with RELD students. I cannot provide the information requested in item 6 as a result.

Additionally, the *percent* of time devoted to working with RELD students in practica and internship experiences has been previously identified by Rogers et al. (1992), Rogers (2006) and Rogers, Hoffman, and Wade (1998) as an important school psychology training characteristic for preparing graduates for working with diverse students. However, the *number* of hours devoted to working with RELD students in practica and internship experiences has not been previously identified as an important school psychology training characteristic for working with diverse students. The Rogers et al. study was added to the revised manuscript in an appendix in order to clarify this and other points of confusion listed by the section editors.

**7. Under the analysis section, you stated that the percent of time devoted**

**to instruction on working with RELD clientele in specified courses was a**

**categorical variable. I do not see this as a categorical variable,**

**therefore, the analysis could be done through an independent samples t-test.**

As stated in my response to the previous item, the survey developed by Rogers et al. (1992) was used to gather data for the present study in order to draw comparisons between the results of previous research and the results of the present study as well as to note longitudinal trends in school psychology program training characteristics. Item 1 requested that survey participants provide a check mark under the appropriate category to indicate the percent of time specified coursework devoted specifically to minority issues: (a) 0%, (b) 1-5%, (c) 6-15%, (d) 16-25%, and (e) 25+%. The resultant responses are categorical, not continuous. The survey is provided in an appendix of the revised manuscript in order to clarify this and other issues for the readers.

**8. In the results section, you presented all the tables under the subheading**

**“Descriptive Statistics.” Although you have descriptive statistics, you**

**also provided inferential statics. Therefore, you may need to remove this**

**subtitle.**

The headings, “descriptive statistics” and “inferential statistics” were removed.

**9. Table 2 presents the percent of time devoted to multicultural issues in**

**coursework. Then the table is broken into four sections: assessment,**

**consultation, intervention, and roles and functions. Until this point, the**

**reader does not know that treated the coursework information around these**

**four topic areas. Some explanation of how these 4 topic areas were selected**

**should be included ahead of time.**

A sentence was added to the instrumentation section describing the rationale for collecting information on the specified coursework (i.e., assessment, consultation, intervention, and roles and functions).

**10. Chi-square and t-tests seem appropriate. However, given the considerable**

**difference between the accredited and non-accredited groups in the sample,**

**nonparametric group comparison, specifically Mann Whitney U, could be more**

**appropriate for analysis instead of t-test. Or, results of the t-tests could**

**be confirmed with Mann Whitney tests.**

I believe the confusion on this item will be clarified by the addition of the survey in the appendix of the revised manuscript. There were no statistically significant differences between programs that were accredited and those that were not-accredited. Therefore, I cannot use the Mann Whitney U test to “confirm” the “considerable difference between the accredited and non-accredited groups.” Additionally, the Mann Whitney U test is not appropriate for use with the data collected in the present study. The Mann Whitney U test is used to compare the sums of ordinal data (Mann & Whitney, 1947; Wilcoxon, 1945), but the data collected in the present study consists of interval data. As a result, I cannot comply with this request.

**11. Readers would like to know how accredited and non-accredited programs**

**differ. Are non-accredited programs non-accredited by choice (i.e. they**

**chose not to apply for accreditation) or because they were denied**

**accreditation. Explaining this difference will help the reader better**

**interpret your results.**

I’ve included an explanation that clarifies this notion on page 27.
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