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The purpose of the study was to determine the predictive value of the level of implementation of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model, several demographic variables, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping styles and responses, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict on school counselors’ level of burnout (research question one). Additionally, the purpose of this study was to determine the impact of several demographic and environmental factors to explain the variance in the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings (research question two). A demographic survey and several instrumentations were used to investigate the research questions. Participants completed the instrumentations in Qualtrics.

The participants were 208 school counselors working full-time with at least one year of experience as a school counselor and a member of the ASCA. Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted for the research questions. Results of research question one showed perceived job stress, level of role conflict, perceived job satisfaction, level of role ambiguity, and the amount of time engaged in consultation monthly accounted for 62.0% of the variance in level of burnout for school counselors. Results of research question two revealed the percentage of non-counseling duties school
counselors engaged in weekly and level of role ambiguity accounted for 35.3% of the variance in level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. A discussion of the results, implications, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research were presented in relation to the present study.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter one provides an overview of the study. The purpose and rationale are specified, along with the research questions and research problem. The definitions of the terms are outlined, followed by a literature review of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model (2012). Next, a literature review of the impact of demographic variables, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, level of role conflict, and overall impact of the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict are described in relation to level of burnout in school counselors. Chapter one concludes with a summary of the literature review.

Purpose of the Study and Rationale

Burnout has been documented as a statistically significant concern for the school counseling profession throughout several decades (e.g., Moyer, 2011; Stickel, 1991, Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Burnout has been described as a combination of negative individual and environmental work factors that contribute to feelings of exhaustion and incompetence, devaluing clients, and deterioration in one’s personal life (S. M. Lee et al., 2007; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). School counselors may be adversely affected by burnout within their personal, ethical, and professional domains, having the potential to negatively impair client or student care and their personal lives (S. M. Lee, Cho, Kissinger, & Ogle, 2010). The American Counseling Association’s (ACA) Code of Ethics (2014) calls for counselors to be alert for signs of impairment and engage in
preventative measures so it does not negatively affect client care. Similarly, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2010) identifies the importance of school counselors to practice wellness and ensure optimal effectiveness and competence within their practice. Therefore, identifying burnout and engaging in preventative measures for school counselors may have positive personal and professional implications.

Roles of school counselors have often become conflicted and ambiguous due to the changing educational system (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The difference between ideal roles learned in graduate school and actual roles on the job may lead to experiencing role ambiguity (Warnath & Shelton, 1976). Receiving conflicting messages on the role of the school counselor (i.e., counselor or educator first; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001) may lead to role conflict (Coll & Freeman, 1997). The ASCA first developed the ASCA National Model in 2003 for school counselors to integrate the framework into their comprehensive school counseling programs (ASCA, 2012). Main components of the ASCA National Model were to educate stakeholders (i.e., other school personnel, parents/guardians, community members, etc.) on the appropriate roles and duties of school counselors, provide a framework for practice, which included performing appropriate roles related to advocating for the needs of every student through a program-centered, comprehensive school counseling program, incorporating the National Standards for school counseling programs, and align the professional practice of school counselors with the educational standards of the school’s academic mission (ASCA, 2012). In spite of the ASCA National Model, school
administrators and other personnel who are directly supervising school counselors (i.e., principals) often do not understand the appropriate roles of school counselors (e.g., Graham, Desmond, & Zinsser, 2011; Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008; Zalaquett, 2005). Therefore, misinformed understandings of school counselor roles can steer school counselors to engage in inappropriate roles (e.g., administrative duties, clerical work, state testing coordination, etc.) on a daily basis, which can contribute to burnout (e.g., Moyer, 2011; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006).

The literature supports the linkage between role ambiguity and role conflict, and higher burnout levels in school counselors (e.g., Coll & Freeman, 1997; Lambie, 2006; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). A review of the school counseling literature yielded a lack of discussion of the impact the ASCA National Model implementation may have on school counselors’ roles and susceptibility to burnout. This study seeks to determine the impact of the ASCA National Model implementation, demographic factors (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, estimated student-to-school counselor ratio, estimated amount of time engaged in supervision, estimated amount of time engaged in consultation, estimated percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, and perceived principal support), perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict may have on the level of burnout in school counselors. Additionally, this study seeks to determine
the extent to which demographic and related factors predict the level of the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings for school counselors.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The research questions, null hypotheses, and alternative hypotheses for this study are as follows:

*Research Question One:* Which of the following variables are significant predictors of the level of burnout in school counselors: level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict?

*Null Hypothesis One:* Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict will not predict the level of burnout in school counselors.

*Alternative Hypothesis One:* Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict will predict the level of burnout in school counselors.
district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predict the level of burnout in school counselors.

Research Question Two: What demographic and environmental factors can be used to explain the variance in the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings?

Null Hypothesis Two: Age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict will not predict the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model by school counselors in different school settings.

Alternative Hypothesis Two: Age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress,
coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predict the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model by school counselors in different school settings.

**Research Problem**

School counselors are in a unique position to assist students with their academic, career, and personal/social needs (ASCA, 2012). A study determined that 70% of students with the potential to benefit from mental health care received the services primarily at school (Farmer, Burns, Philips, Angold, & Costello, 2003). With this evidence, there is a clear need for adequately trained school personnel to address the mental health needs of students while enhancing their academic achievement. There are several staff members available to students within the school system. Yet, few are adequately trained to provide mental health services to students. School counselors are in a unique position to provide preventative and responsive mental health services to students in need. The ASCA developed and disseminated the ASCA National Model in 2003, providing school counselors with a framework to advocate for appropriate roles and duties within the school system to meet all students’ needs (ASCA, 2012). However, school counselors’ training to meet the academic, career, and personal and social needs of students does not always align with their actual roles engaged in the school setting (Moyer, 2011; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). These roles (i.e., test administrator, substitute teaching, bus duty, lunch duty, and clerical tasks) are often not related to the appropriate duties as outlined by the ASCA National Model (2012). The regular engagement in inappropriate roles creates stress for school counselors (Scarborough &
Culbreth, 2008). Stress experienced by school counselors may, in turn, negatively impact students’ success and the services provided to them. With the large amount of inappropriate role and duties placed on school counselors, it is unknown the potential effects of implementing the ASCA National Model and related factors may have on school counselors’ burnout. This study is intended to increase the understanding of the effects of implementing the ASCA National Model, demographic factors, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict on school counselors’ levels of burnout.

**Definition of Terms**

This section includes a definition of terms relevant to the current study. The ASCA National Model, burnout, consultation, coping responses and styles, duties of school counselors, job satisfaction, job stress, role ambiguity, role conflict, and supervision are described below.

*ASCA National Model*—refers to a framework for school counseling programs. The ASCA National Model was implemented in order to standardize and align comprehensive school counselor programs (ASCA, 2012). Its inception marked the goal to engage in proactive services ensuring every student’s academic, career, and personal and social needs are met within the school setting. For more information regarding the ASCA National Model, please access the ASCA website: www.schoolcounselor.org

*Burnout*—refers to physical or emotional exhaustion due to work overload leading to difficulty with competently performing clinical tasks on the job and devaluing
clients due to a combination of individual and environmental factors (S. M. Lee et al., 2007; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

Consultation—refers to an indirect service in the school setting that includes problem solving between a consultant (i.e., school counselor) and consultee (e.g., teacher) to support, advocate, and promote clients (i.e., students) academic achievement (ASCA, 2012; Dollarhide & Saginak, 2012).

Coping responses and styles—refers to a combination of factors that impact individuals’ responses to life events or stress and the ways to overcome the negative effects of the life events or stress (Carver, 1997; Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989).

Duties of School Counselors—The ASCA National Model outlined school counselors’ duties in the delivery of a comprehensive school counseling program and distinguishes between appropriate activities and roles for school counselors (i.e., counseling duties) and inappropriate activities and roles for school counselors (i.e., non-counseling duties; ASCA, 2012).

Appropriate school counselor (i.e., counseling) duties include: individual student academic program planning; providing counseling services to students who are tardy or absent; have disciplinary problems; are inappropriately dressed; and other topics for individual and small group counseling services; helping school principals identify and resolve student issues, needs, and problems; and collaborating with teachers to present school counseling core curriculum lessons (ASCA, 2012, pp. 44-45).

Inappropriate school counselor (i.e., non-counseling) duties include: coordinating paperwork and data entry of all new students; teaching classes in absence of teachers;
keeping clerical records; providing long term therapy at school to address psychological disorders; coordinating cognitive, aptitude, and achievement testing programs; and assisting with duties in the principal’s office. For a full list of appropriate and inappropriate school counseling activities, see the ASCA National Model (2012, pp. 44-45).

Job Satisfaction—refers to the evaluative feelings or attitudes in which a person enjoys their employment (Spector, 1985).

Job Stress—refers to the negative internal responses that individuals may have when experiencing work related demands and pressures (Carver et al., 1989; S. Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983; World Health Organization, 2015).

Role Ambiguity—refers to the lack of a clear role definition (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970) or a discrepancy between the ideal roles wanting to perform on the job and the actual roles performed on the job (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008).

Role Conflict—refers to contradictory role demands between the employer (i.e., school administrator or principal, teacher, counselor educator) and the employee (i.e., school counselor). The engagement of one role (i.e., a non-counseling duty assigned by a principal) leads to difficulty engaging in another role (i.e., a counseling duty; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Rizzo et al., 1970).

Supervision—refers to the intervention of providing services (i.e., learning, professional development) from a senior level professional to a junior member of the same profession that is evaluative and hierarchical, extends over time, and monitors the
services to the clients, and the supervisor serves as a gatekeeper to the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

**Review of the Literature**

A summary of the professional literature follows. The literature review begins with the historical foundation of school counseling, culminating in the implementation of the ASCA National Model and research of the ASCA National Model. Then, the significance of burnout within the human services profession and school counselors in relation to the demographic and other related variables of the study is presented. Finally, the relationship between the ASCA National Model, role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout are presented in relation to the rationale for this study.

**Historical Foundation of School Counseling**

From a historical perspective, the profession of school counseling first emerged within the school system during the late 1800s and was closely connected to vocational education (Paisley & Borders, 1995). Frank Parsons is often termed the “father of guidance” (Lambie & Williamson, 2004, p. 125) and his attention to vocation education with an emphasis on ensuring youths’ successful growth and development in schools became a major influence of the early development of the school counseling profession (Stone & Dahir, 2006). School counseling was originally based on remedial-reactive approaches with evolvement towards increasing student competencies and outcomes (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). However, the inception of the comprehensive school counseling programs (CSCPs) and subsequent adoption of the ASCA National Model
(2012) moved school counseling practice to professionalizing their roles and duties and advocating for every students’ success (Cinotti, 2014).

Major influences that shaped the practice and roles of school counselors throughout the 20th century included various federal legislations and historical events. School counseling was first recognized as a profession around the turn of the 20th century (i.e., late 1800s). The profession’s name emerged as vocational guidance and their duties included a list set mainly by administrators and teachers (Gysbers, 2010). The early 1900s marked the emergence of the profession. In 1913, the founding of the National Vocational Guidance Association emerged (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006) and Jesse B. Davis began infusing vocational guidance curriculum into English classes in the middle and high school settings (Cinotti, 2014).

School counselors of the 1920s became more clinically focused on personal adjustment due to the child study movement (Gysbers, 2010). John Dewey also introduced the cognitive development movement, shifting guidance strategies into curriculum to support student development (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This transition led into the guidance services movement of the 1930s. An emphasis began to form on personnel responsibilities and duties of school counselors to provide students with information to influence and change their behavior (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). In 1936, An Act to Provide for the Further Development of Vocational Education was passed and strengthened vocational counseling in the schools (Gysbers, 2001).

The early 1940s shifted focus towards World War II efforts in schools and communities across the United States. After 1945, focus returned to the need for
counseling and improving the services within the schools (Gysbers, 2010). This led to the passing of The Vocational Education Act of 1946, which further strengthened vocational guidance’s presence in the schools (Gysbers, 2010). Additionally, Carl Rogers published a book in 1942 that changed the counseling practice overall from Freud’s psychoanalytic movement to one of psychological humanism. As a result of Rogers’ ideas, school counseling directly shifted and shortly began replacing guidance with counseling services (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This shift led vocational guidance to be renamed as personnel adjustment counseling during the late 1940s (Cinotti, 2014).

The 1950s marked a professional strengthening because the ASCA was established in 1952 under the American Personnel and Guidance Association, and the flagship journal, The School Counselor, began disseminating literature on professional school counseling issues (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was implemented after the launch of Sputnik in 1957 and allocated funds to provide school counseling programs to identify and guide gifted students towards college (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

An amendment was made to the NDEA in 1964 and included resources to identify gifted students at the elementary school level (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 was implemented and strengthened the presence of school counselors in grades kindergarten through 12th (Gysbers, 2010). In 1966, ACES and ASCA described the three most important roles of school counselors as: (a) counseling, (b) consultation, and (c) coordinating. This provided clarification to
school counselors’ roles and duties (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). The Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968 provided funds for disadvantaged students and students with disabilities to receive counseling and career services in all grade levels (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Throughout the 1960s, the professional identity of school counselors began to surface as to whether the profession primarily identified with the education or mental health needs of students (Paisley & Borders, 1995). Additionally, during this time, school counselors became assigned primarily within the pupil personnel services of the school, whose primary foci were counseling and ancillary services to teachers and administrators, not the students. This shift in assignments moved school counselors to primarily supportive roles of educators and administrators and decreased the amount of counseling services provided to students (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

In response to the changes of the 1960s, the 1970s brought service delivery into a Comprehensive School Counseling Program (CSCP) framework and outlined types of services school counselors could offer through a programmatic approach that focused on the career, personal-social, and academic development of all students (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). The 1970s also marked a decline in student enrollment and many school counselors lost their jobs (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Despite the CSCP framework, the debate of the roles of school counselors heightened during the late 1970s and continued throughout the next several decades.

The debate of school counselors’ amount of engagement in counseling and non-counseling duties continued to heighten in the 1980s and 1990s with a preference to increase counseling duties (Gysbers, 2010). During the 1980s, the accountability of
education movement emerged when the National Commission of Excellence in Education published, *A Nation at Risk*, in 1983, which reported an examination of the quality of education. Accountability of education emerged from the results of the report that indicated students’ declining academic achievement (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

During the 1990s, CSCPs began focusing more on the program and not the roles of school counselors (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). The program included a systematic approach to school counseling that focused on limiting assignments of non-counseling duties and attempting to decrease ambiguous role definitions (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). In 1997, the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (NSSCP; Campbell & Dahir, 1997) were introduced to the profession. A goal of the NSSCP was to align with the Education Trust’s Transforming School Counseling Initiative in 1997, ensure academic success for all students, and transform the roles of school counselors.

The 2000s were marked with several changes within the school counseling profession. Evaluation, accountability, and the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 significantly affected school counselors’ practices (Gysbers, 2010; Stone & Dahir, 2006). Teacher assessments were the primary measure of accountability for school professionals (i.e., school counselors). A lack of assessment tools and procedures measuring school counselors’ performances further added to unclear definitions of their appropriate roles and duties (Studer & Sommers, 2000). The ASCA National Model (2012), now in its third edition, was introduced in 2003, providing a framework for practice within a comprehensive program and aligning appropriate roles of school counselors. Professional school counseling has shifted its roles and foci over several decades to its
current form due to educational reform emphasizing teaching and learning outcomes (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2012; Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

The roles of school counselors have transformed since the profession’s emergence during the late 1800s. Paisley and McMahon (2001) and Cinotti (2014) discussed role conflict arising due to the inconsistent philosophies within the profession. The transformation of school counselors’ roles over several decades have resulted in a discrepancy between whether their practice should primarily focus on students’ academic or personal and social developmental needs (Paisley & Borders, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). In other words, are school counselors educators with mental health training or mental health workers in an educational setting?

In defining roles, the issue of professional identity has arisen in the literature. Professional identity can generally be termed as a process of integrating professional training and personal attributes within the context of the larger community of professionals (Nugent & Jones, 2009).

The ASCA implemented a statement in 2009 titled, *The Role of the Professional School Counselor*. The document described the appropriate roles and functions of the school counselor with the following summary statement:

Professional school counselors are certified/licensed educators with the minimum of a master’s degree in school counseling and are uniquely qualified to address the developmental needs of all students through a comprehensive school counseling program addressing the academic, career, and personal/social development of all students. (p. 2)
Understanding the roles of school counselors is a complex process and has evolved throughout several decades. Their roles have shifted with educational reform and other historical events. Despite the continued evolution of the school setting, school counselors continue to be assigned and perform additional tasks outside of their practice, which may lead to role ambiguity and role conflict (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Incorporating the ASCA National Model (2012) into practice may lead to greater role alignment, clear definition of practice and professional identity, and appropriate support and supervision from school personnel.

**The ASCA National Model as a Framework for Practice**

The ASCA National Model, now in its third edition, was first disseminated in 2003 by the ASCA. It is a framework for comprehensive school counseling programs to be “comprehensive in scope, results-oriented in design, and developmental in nature” (ASCA, 2012, p. xi). Its purpose is to be an integral part of the academic mission that promotes and enhances learning of all students in the academic, personal/social, and career domains and interventions based upon data-driven decisions, along with aligning the roles of the school counselor (ASCA, 2012). The ASCA National Model is built upon the following documents that guides school counselors: (a) The ASCA Role Statement (ASCA, 2009); (b) The ASCA School Counselor Competencies (ASCA, 2008); (c) National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), now revised to the ASCA Mindsets & Behaviors for Student Success: K-12 College and Career-Readiness Standards for Every Student (2014); and (d) The Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2010).
The documents identify the functions and responsibilities of school counselors and outcomes of CSCP to ensure students’ knowledge, skills, and abilities (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2012). The ASCA National Model provides tools for school counselors to assess, measure, and impact students’ needs through the implementation of a comprehensive and developmental school counseling program (ASCA, 2012). The National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) linked with the Transforming School Counseling Initiative from The Education Trust in 1997 added a theoretical and practical inception to the development of a school counseling program rooted in the principles of being comprehensive in scope, developmental in nature, and results based in design (ASCA, 2012; Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Additionally, the Transforming School Counseling Initiative, now in practice since 1997, shaped graduate level preparation and training, along with focusing on the roles that school counselors have in ensuring educational opportunities for students’ academic success through collaboration, advocacy, and leadership (The Educational Trust, 2009a).

The ASCA National Model contains three components: (a) themes, (b) elements, and (c) flow of the model (ASCA, 2012; Dollarhide & Saginak, 2012). The four themes drive school counselors’ practice and close the achievement gaps of students through: (a) leadership, (b) advocacy, (c) collaboration, and (d) systemic change (ASCA, 2012). To guide school counselors within the school, four elements outline the fundamentals of a comprehensive school counseling program: (a) foundation, (b) management, (c) delivery, and (d) accountability (ASCA, 2012). The flow indicates the directionality of the elements and guides school counselors’ efficacy of practice (Dollarhide & Saginak,
The flow begins with the foundation section, moving upward to management and delivery, with accountability at the highest level.

The ASCA National Model includes four themes (i.e., leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change) that signify school counselors’ work in improving student achievement and systemic change to ensure equal opportunity for success of all students (ASCA, 2012). School counselors are called upon to engage in leadership that “supports academic achievement and student development, advances effective delivery of the comprehensive school counseling program, promotes professional identity, and overcomes challenges of role inconsistency” (ASCA, 2012, p. 1; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). Advocacy is a key component for school counselors in ensuring every student meets the academic, career, and personal/social standards set by the NSSCP (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Advocacy happens when school counselors act with students through empowerment and acting on behalf of students at the micro-level (i.e., student advocacy, school/community collaboration, and systemic advocacy) to macro-level (i.e., public information and social/political advocacy; ASCA, 2012; Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003). School counselors are in a position to engage in collaboration with stakeholders within the school, family, and community systems. Establishing relationships with stakeholders is essential to ensuring student success (ASCA, 2012). Finally, school counselors are charged with identifying barriers to student success and engaging in systemic change that close the achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps of all students within a CSCP (ASCA, 2012). The four themes described above were incorporated from the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (The Education
Trust, 2009b) as part of the systemic awareness of transforming the school environment (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2012).

The Foundation element of the ASCA National Model is the establishment answering the “what” (ASCA, 2012, p. 21) of the program that defines student knowledge, attitude, and skills. Explicit goals of the school counseling program are defined in the Foundation section and are an essential component of a CSCP (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). The Foundation element contains: (a) program focus, (b) student competencies, and (c) professional competencies. The program focus is comprised: (a) beliefs of, (b) vision statement of, (c) mission statement of, and (d) program goals. The student competencies include the ASCA Student Standards that covers the knowledge, attitude, and skills students should possess as a result of a school counseling program. The professional competencies contain the ASCA School Counselor Competencies and the ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors (ASCA, 2012). For a full review of the ASCA National Model Foundation element, please review pp. 21-39 of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012).

The Management element of the ASCA National Model is the assessments and tools that ensure effective delivery of the program. The Management element contains: (a) school counselor competency and school counseling program assessment; (b) use-of-time assessment of appropriate and inappropriate school counseling activities; (c) annual agreements; (d) advisory councils; (e) how to use data through disaggregation and Program Results Data of process data, perception data, and outcome data; (f) Action Plans containing curriculum, small-group, and closing-the-gap action plans; (g) Lesson
plans; and (h) Annual and weekly calendars (ASCA, 2012). For a full review of the ASCA National Model Management element, please view pp. 41-81 of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012).

The Delivery System includes the method of delivery of services to ensure success of all students within the program. Direct and indirect student services are outlined with a recommendation for school counselors to engage at least 80% of time in direct services. Direct services include counseling related activities: (a) school counseling core curriculum of instruction and group activities, (b) individual student planning of appraisal and advisement, and (c) responsive services of counseling and crisis response (ASCA, 2012). Methods for interacting with students include large groups, classroom guidance, small group counseling, and individual counseling. Indirect student services should comprise no more than 20% of school counselors’ time and include the completion of referrals, consultations, and collaborations. For a full review of the ASCA National Model Delivery System element, please view pp. 83-98 of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012).

The Accountability element of the ASCA National Model includes evaluations to determine program effectiveness. The school counselor utilizes this section to answer the question, “How are students different as a result of the school counseling program?” (ASCA, 2012, p. 99). Data analysis informs decisions about the program and includes the school data profile analysis and use-of-time assessment analysis. Program results are created based on action plans and can include: (a) curriculum results report, (b) small-group results report, and (c) closing-the-gap results report. Evaluation and
improvement reviews school counselors’ strengths and areas of improvement of their programs. It contains the following assessments: (a) analysis of School Counselor Competencies assessment, (b) analysis of School Counseling Program assessment, (c) School Counselor Performance Appraisal, and (d) program goal analysis. For a full review of the ASCA National Model Accountability element, please view pp. 99-124 (ASCA, 2012).

The ASCA National Model (2012) is a framework to align school counselor practice and roles. Historically, the lack of association between school counselor training, actual practice and roles, professional identity, and support or supervision received, has led to role ambiguity and role conflict (Collins, 2014). Prior to the inception of the ASCA National Model in 2003, school counseling leaders defined school counseling as a supportive role to the mission of school and in the facilitation of academic success of students (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009). Essentially, the ASCA National Model shifted the focus from an ancillary service driven model to an intentional, programmatic delivery system that incorporates outcomes that includes accountability of student success (Dahir et al., 2009). This section consisted of a review of the ASCA National Model, the framework for school counseling practice. The next section reviews the research of the ASCA National Model.

**Research of the ASCA National Model**

A description of the research of the ASCA National Model begins with a presentation of research on CSCPs, a major component of the ASCA National Model. CSCPs outline school counselors’ specialized work activities that is comprehensive in
scope, developmental in nature, and results oriented in design. CSCPs include components of individual student planning, small group counseling, classroom guidance lessons, responsive services including crisis counseling, and consultation and collaboration with other stakeholders to achieve students’ personal-social, career, and academic needs (Brown & Trusty, 2005; Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007; Lapan, Gysbers, & Sun, 1997; C. C. Lee, 2005). Lapan et al. (1997) conducted the first known study on the positive effects of students’ academics with fully implemented CSCPs in 236 schools in Missouri. Several studies and commentaries have followed with discussion on its potential to impact student achievement (i.e., Brown & Trusty, 2005) and the profession’s perceptions of a CSCP (Scarborough & Luke, 2008; Sink & Yilik-Downer, 2001). However, limited research has been completed on CSCPs and the ASCA National Model, along with the impact of demographic (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling related duties, and perceived principal support) and other related variables (i.e., perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role conflict, and level of role ambiguity) in school counselors’ ability to implement the ASCA National Model.

Understanding and implementing the ASCA National Model has become an integral component throughout the graduate training of school counselors. However, research has provided limited results of school counselors’ ability to incorporate a CSCP
within their practice (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Studer and Oberman sought to understand whether the implementation of the ASCA National Model, a CSCP, had an impact on several variables related to school counseling supervisory practice. The researchers studied 73 school counselors who were currently supervising graduate students with a chi-squared analysis of the variables. Twenty six percent (26%) of participants reported having a CSCP and 23% were in the process of developing a CSCP. However, over 50% of the participants did not engage in a CSCP (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Results concluded (a) there were no differences in years of experience as a school counselor and their ability to implement a CSCP, (b) their supervisory practice was not impacted by implementing a CSCP, and (c) principal support for engagement in the recommended counseling duties by the ASCA National Model was limited even when a CSCP was implemented (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Principals often have the understanding of school counselor roles through vocational, guidance, and educational services, which were common practice before the inception of CSCPs and the ASCA National Model in 2003 (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Therefore, principal support may have a limited to negative impact on school counselors’ ability to engage in counseling related roles within the school setting.

Implementation practices of CSCPs aligning with the ASCA National Model have been described in the school counseling literature. Dixon Rayle and Adams (2007) studied 388 school counselors and their implementation practices of CSCPs. The authors concluded that elementary school counselors reported implementing higher levels of CSCPs, followed by middle school counselors, and lastly, high school counselors. All
participants reported engaging in non-counseling duties and not able to fully implement a CSCP despite their desire to engage in counseling duties. Dixon Rayle and Adams suggested the implementation of CSCPs may free up school counselors’ time to engage in counseling duties and lead to greater job satisfaction based on their results. They suggested that school counselors’ roles need to be considered within a historical context of educational trends. For example, national educational trends often impact local and district educational trends. The trends have resulted in state-wide high stakes testing providing accountability of each school district’s student academic achievement. This educational trend has shifted school counselors’ roles to primarily testing coordinators. Additionally, Dixon Rayle and Adams reported higher student-to-school counselor ratios posed a barrier for their participants to implement CSCPs. In order to meet the needs of all students and to maintain adequate ratios, the authors highlighted the need to advocate for the school counseling profession to key stakeholders (i.e., principals; ASCA, 2012; Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007).

The impact of the relationship between principals and school counselors has been discussed in the school counseling literature. Walsh, Barrett, and DePaul (2007) offered insight into the impact of principal support and the timeframe school counselors may need to implement a CSCP aligned with the ASCA National Model. Walsh et al. described the ability for urban elementary school counselors within their first three years of practice of the Boston Connects public schools to implement a CSCP that aligned with the Delivery System of the ASCA National Model. Of the four school counselors surveyed, the participants were completing guidance curriculum 32% of their time (i.e.,
group services, school climate activities, and family support and outreach), individual planning involved 17% of their time (i.e., individual student appraisal, school screening), responsive services encompassed 34% of their time (i.e., individual student services and service connections), and system support encompassed 17% of their time (i.e., staff and agency support; Walsh et al., 2007). This makeup aligned with the direct and indirect student services of the Delivery System of the ASCA National Model (2012) and provided a framework for practice in the sample of Boston elementary school counselors.

No comparison to non-counseling duties was reported in the sample. Principal support positively contributed to the ability for the participants to implement the program within a two year time period, engage in systemic support, and collaborate with community agencies, other school professionals, and families (Walsh et al., 2007).

Janson et al. (2008) completed a Q-Methodology on how school counselors and principals perceive their professional relationships. Thirty-nine participants (22 school counselors and 17 principals) sorted 45 opinion statements. The results of each participant opinion statement distributions ranging from least characteristic of your relationship to most characteristic of your relationship, or Qsorts, were factor analyzed. The analysis yielded factors in four opinion groupings that represented four viewpoints of the school counselor-principal relationships (Janson et al., 2008). The first viewpoint titled, Working Alliance, encompassed the school counselors’ and principals’ positive perceptions of acknowledgment, trust, and open communication. The second viewpoint titled, Impediments to Alliance, encompassed lack of communication, limited involvement and understanding of professional goals of each profession, and an absence
of engagement between the professionals. All participants aligning with this viewpoint were school counselors. The third viewpoint titled, Shared Leadership, encompassed a belief that both principals and school counselors were leaders within the school setting. All participants in this viewpoint were principals. The fourth viewpoint titled, Purposeful Collaboration, encompassed focused and ongoing collaboration between professionals and centering leadership activities to improve specific school tasks and struggling students (Janson et al., 2008). This fourth viewpoint aligned with the vision of the Education Trust’s Transforming School Counseling Initiative (2009a) and the ASCA National Model (2012). The ability for school counselors to purposefully collaborate with their principals may also have positive implications for their practice. Janson et al. discussed school counselors having the potential to shape principals’ perceptions of their roles in the school setting. Utilizing collaborative practice between principals and school counselors allows for advocacy and engagement in appropriate roles and functions as described in the ASCA National Model and will advocate for students’ success as well (Janson et al., 2008).

The impact of the ASCA National Model on job satisfaction of school counselors has recently been discussed in the school counseling literature. Pyne (2011) surveyed 103 secondary school counselors in Michigan public school districts. The goal of the study was to understand the impact of implementing the ASCA National Model on school counselors’ levels of job satisfaction, whether demographic variables correlated with increased job satisfaction, and whether demographic variables effected level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. Pyne measured levels of implementation
of the ASCA National Model with a self-developed 20 item instrument, the Comprehensive School Counseling Implementation Measure (CSCIM). Pyne noted in the further research section that he recommended using the School Counselor Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens, Carey, & Harrington, 2010), the instrument used in the current study, not the CSCIM, since the SCPIS was shown to have validity and reliability but constructed and published after the completion of his study.

Pyne (2011) reported positive results between job satisfaction and implementing the ASCA National Model. Correlations were presented between job satisfaction, total scores of the CSCIM, and the individual scores on the CSCIM. The findings of a multiple regression analysis with the items of the CSCIM and job satisfaction, along with a factor analysis of the CSCIM were presented (Pyne, 2011). A moderate-to-strong correlation \( r = 0.56 \) was found between levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model and job satisfaction in school counselors. The strongest positive correlation \( r = 0.68 \) was found between administrative support and job satisfaction. Administrative support was measured by the question, “Administrative procedures encourage appropriate use of my special skills as school counselor” (Pyne, 2011, p. 94). Additionally, administrative support was the variable reported statistically significant in the multiple regression model. A written philosophy statement within the Foundation section, defining the roles of a school counselor, also showed moderate correlations with job satisfaction \( r = 0.51; \) Pyne, 2011). Pyne inferred the lack of incorporating the Foundation Section of the ASCA National Model into practice contributed to greater role ambiguity experienced by school counselors from his findings (Pyne, 2011). No
significant correlations were found between age of school counselors and CSCIM scores, years of experience and CSCIM scores, and student-to-school counselor ratio and CSCIM scores. Overall, Pyne discovered that school counselors who had higher levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model reported higher job satisfaction than those who had not implemented the program. This finding is significant in relation to the current study, describing the potentially positive benefits for school counselor practice and wellbeing when incorporating the ASCA National Model into practice.

Understanding the roles of school counselors is a complex process and has evolved throughout several decades. Their roles have shifted with educational reform and other historical events. Despite the adoption of the ASCA National Model as a framework of practice, school counselors continue to be assigned and perform additional tasks outside of their practice, which may lead to role ambiguity and role conflict (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Therefore, this study seeks to understand the impact demographic and related variables may have on school counselors’ ability to implement the ASCA National Model into practice.

This section highlighted a historical overview of the school counseling profession. The ASCA National Model was described in detail, followed by a review of the research on CSCPs and the ASCA National Model. The next section includes a review of the literature on burnout of school counselors. Variables discussed as having an influence on burnout in the literature are described in detail throughout the next section.
**Burnout**

Burnout is described by the Merriam-Webster definition as an “exhaustion of physical or emotional strength or motivation usually as a result of prolonged stress or frustration” (2014, paragraph 1). Individuals who work in the human service professions are at the greatest risk for experiencing burnout (i.e., mental health, education, and health careers; Newell & MacNeil, 2010). Burnout has been described as manifesting in stages (Lawson, 2007; Lawson, Venart, Hazler, & Kottler, 2007), as a developmental model (Maslach et al., 2001), and as a result of individual, organizational (i.e., external), client, and situational factors (S. M. Lee et al., 2007; Maslach, 2003; Maslach et al., 2001). Overall, a general consensus has been reached that burnout can happen progressively over time (Morrissette, 2000; Wilkerson, 2009). These characteristics are universal despite the way in which burnout unfolds. Individuals’ burnout symptoms may include physical symptoms (e.g., low energy, chronic fatigue), cognitive symptoms (e.g., depersonalization, cynicism towards self, others, and clients), emotional symptoms (e.g., feelings of helplessness), and behavioral symptoms (e.g., absenteeism, changing jobs; Lambie, 2006).

Burnout was first described in the 1970s concerning people within the human services workforce. Freudenberger (1974) identified and conceptualized burnout while interacting with his staff of volunteer workers at a free medical clinic in New York City. He reported those who experienced burnout were “the dedicated and committed” (Freudenberger, 1974, p. 161) and physical and behavioral indicators of burnout manifested as early as one year after beginning employment.
Shortly after Freudenberger (1974) described burnout in the literature, Maslach and colleagues began researching the construct. The research on burnout by Maslach and colleagues resulted in the development of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1981) to measure levels of burnout in human services professionals. The MBI contained three factors of burnout: (a) emotional exhaustion, (b) depersonalization, and (c) decrease in personal accomplishment. Exhaustion refers to the stress dimension of burnout, depersonalization is the attempt to distance the relationship between the provider and recipient, and reduced personal accomplishment is inefficacy and cynicism about the work environment (Maslach, 2001).

The MBI primarily focuses on understanding the individual’s syndrome of burnout. However, S. M. Lee et al. (2007) and Maslach (2001) reported that environmental or organizational factors within the workplace may also contribute to burnout symptoms. Top contributors of environmental factors of burnout include apathy towards system stress (S. M. Lee et al., 2007), work overload and time pressures, role conflict, role ambiguity, and lack of administrative support leading to exhaustion (Maslach et al., 2001).

Environmental factors have been reported as contributors of counselor burnout in the literature. Counselors working full-time in agencies reported to “burn out” (Warnath & Shelton, 1976, p. 172) due to high levels of work-related stressors and demands. Therefore, burnout is defined for this study as the physical or emotional exhaustion due to work overload leading to difficulty with competently performing clinical tasks on the job and devaluing clients due to a combination of individual and environmental factors
(S. M. Lee et al., 2007; Maslach et al., 2001). To emphasize the significance of internally and externally related burnout factors within the counseling profession, the Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007) was developed and is utilized to measure level of burnout for participants in the current study. For a full description of the CBI, please view the Instrument section of Chapter 2. The following section describes burnout in school counselors.

Professionals working in the school setting (i.e., teachers, administrators), especially school counselors, are susceptible to experiencing symptoms of burnout (Moyer, 2011; Wilkerson, 2009). This section reviews the literature on the impact of several demographic factors (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, and perceived principal support) and related variables (i.e., perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict) on burnout of school counselors. A discussion of the relative contribution to each variable to burnout among school counselors is included.

**Age.** Several decades of research support the impact of age on burnout within the human service professions. Maslach and Jackson (1981) considered the influence of age on burnout among human service workers (e.g., nurses, social workers, counselors, psychiatrists, physicians) across their respective work environments when developing the
MBI. They concluded burnout was most likely to occur within the first few years of someone’s career. Maslach et al. (2001) found that human service workers were more susceptible to burnout within their first few years of employment than senior level practitioners. These authors also found that individuals under age 30 were more susceptible to burnout than their older counterparts; a finding supported by Iacovides, Fountoulakis, Kaprinis, and Kaprinis (2003). Overall, the findings of Maslach et al. (2001) and Iacovides et al. (2003) suggest that vulnerability to job burnout occurs due to younger workers’ lack of work experience and knowledge of the actual job duties (Warnath & Shelton, 1976).

The impact of age on burnout is noted in the counseling literature. Lim, Kim, Kim, Yang, and Lee (2010) conducted a meta-analysis of the factors influencing burnout in counselors as measured by the MBI (originally developed by Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Their meta-analysis included 15 studies and 3,613 participants, one of which pertained to school counselors (i.e., Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Overall, Lim et al. (2010) found that age was the most significant predictor of burnout in the participants, with younger participants indicating higher levels of burnout. The findings by Lim et al. (2010) were consistent with the broader literature (i.e., Maslach & Jackson, 1985; Maslach et al., 2001) that younger workers may experience higher levels of burnout.

In the school counseling literature results have been mixed and at times contrary to the findings from studies of human service professionals. Additionally, studies investigating the impact of age on school counselors experiencing burnout are limited. Existing studies (e.g., Bryant & Constantine, 2006; Wachter, Clemens, & Lewis, 2008)
did not find a significant relationship between school counselor’s age and their reports of increased levels of burnout. In contrast, Wilkerson and Bellini (2006) sampled 78 school counselors in the Northeastern United States and concluded age to be a significant variable for school counselors who experienced burnout. They completed a multiple regression analysis of several demographic, intrapersonal, organizational, and outcome variables on burnout. When age was taken into consideration with student-to-school counselor ratio, years of experience, and engagement in clinical supervision, the variables accounted for 7% of the variance in the hierarchical regression model to predict burnout (Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Overall, the literature investigating the impact of age on school counselors’ levels of burnout is limited and contains mixed results. Further investigation of the impact of age on school counselors’ experience of burnout is warranted. In addition to age, sex is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of sex on burnout in school counselors.

**Sex.** Several decades of research yielded mixed results related to the impact of sex on burnout within human service professions. Generally, Maslach and colleagues found that sex was only a minimally contributing predictor of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1985; Maslach et al., 2001). A confounding issue impacting the study of sex on burnout may be the disproportionate amount of females working in the human service professions (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Despite this issue, males have scored slightly higher on the MBI subscales related to depersonalization and cynicism and females have scored higher on the MBI subscale for emotional exhaustion (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, 1985; Maslach et al., 2001). Additionally, Purvanova and Muros (2010) conducted a
meta-analysis of 183 studies and 409 effect sizes using the MBI with sex as a predictor variable of burnout. The results were consistent with Maslach and colleagues’ general findings—the effects were small but females were slightly more emotionally exhausted and males scored slightly higher on the depersonalization scale (Maslach et al., 2001; Purvanova & Muros, 2010).

The school counseling literature describes scant results regarding the impact of sex on burnout levels. Butler and Constantine (2005) conducted a study with 533 school counselors and did not find a significant difference between sexes and their levels of burnout. The study contained 533 participants with 415 (77.9%) identifying as female and 118 (22.1%) identifying as male. The researchers noted the disproportionate number of female school counselors in the profession (Butler & Constantine, 2005). Considering the disproportionate number of females in the school counseling profession, Bryant and Constantine (2006) completed a study with only female school counselor participants. The researchers sought to understand the impact of female identity and life satisfaction for female school counselors. Bryant and Constantine’s reported engagement in role balance and experiencing job satisfaction were significant predictors for positive life satisfaction for women school counselors.

Additional school counseling research found sex to be an insignificant predictor (e.g., McCarthy, Van Horn Kerne, Calfa, Lambert, & Guzman, 2010) or did not report its results (e.g., Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Overall, the impact of sex on burnout is small for the human services professions and the literature is outdated. Investigation is warranted in this study to determine the impact sex may have on school counselors’
levels of burnout. In addition to sex, race and ethnicity is believed to impact burnout.
The next section highlights the influence of race and ethnicity on burnout in school counselors.

**Race and ethnicity.** Understanding the relationship between an individual’s race and ethnicity and their levels of burnout may yield several confounding factors. Generally, individuals of color may experience higher levels of stress than White counselors when working in the human services professions (A. P. Jackson & Sears, 1992). Bell (1987) found higher levels of stress in African American helping professionals due to alienation of support systems, racist behavior of individuals they work with and for, and limited number of colleagues with similar racial backgrounds.

Individuals of color are often underrepresented in research. Studies often found insignificant results due to low number of ethnic participants (e.g., Maslach & Jackson, 1985). Maslach et al. (2001) concluded a negligible amount of studies included ethnicity as a demographic variable effecting burnout. As a result, they reported an inability to summarize the research results for race and ethnicity and burnout. In the school counseling literature, Bryant and Constantine (2006) also reported they did not have enough participants of color for their sample and were unable to assess for possible differences among races and ethnicities and burnout.

There is limited research in the counseling profession including the impact of race and ethnicity on individuals’ stress and burnout. The counseling literature (i.e., Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007) that did include the impact of race and ethnicity justified Bell’s (1987) racial discrimination findings. Day-Vines and Holcomb-McCoy
(2007) reported racism and discrimination negatively affected psychological stress, decreased their well-being, and increased income disparities for African American counseling professionals when compared to European American counseling professionals. The effect of stress on people of color in the human services and counseling professions has been a factor of concern (Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; A. P. Jackson & Sears, 1992).

The school counseling literature yielded findings of increased stress and burnout experienced by school counselors of color. Evans (1997) studied 91 African American counselors from several counseling subspecialties (i.e., school, community agency, private practice, counselor education, etc.). The participants completed a wellness questionnaire and open ended questions to determine their levels of stress, wellness, and coping. The school counselor participants were the only counseling specialty that reported high levels of occupational stress. The school counseling participants cited role ambiguity and limited availability of wellness opportunities were contributing factors for increased stress (Evans, 1997).

School counselors of color may be in a position for increased levels of stress and burnout on the job (Dollarhide et al., 2013; Evans, 1997; McCarthy et al., 2010). McCarthy et al. (2010) studied 227 school counselors in Texas. There were two groups of school counselors that emerged after data collection and analysis in McCarthy et al.’s study including resource rich schools (e.g., access to other professionals providing support to students, administrative and parent support, and counselor mentors) and high demand schools (e.g., high amounts of paperwork, high number of student-to-school
counselor ratios, administrative disruptions, etc.). In general, school counselors with increased demands reported higher levels of stress. Furthermore, school counselors of color were most often positioned in schools with increased demands and subsequent higher levels of stress (McCarthy et al., 2010).

Dollarhide et al. (2013) completed a qualitative study that sought to understand the impact of occupational stress on school counselors of color. The school counselor participants reported both positive and negative racial events were experienced at work. Oftentimes negative events cancelled out the positive engagements and contributed to participants experiencing feelings of frustration, disempowerment, stress, burnout, and a desire to leave the job (Dollarhide et al., 2013). The research findings warrant a greater understanding of how race and ethnicity may impact school counselors’ level of burnout. Therefore, race and ethnicity was studied in relation to burnout for school counselors in the present study. In addition to race and ethnicity, the type of degree is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of type of degree on burnout in school counselors.

**Type of degree.** The human services literature on the type of degree (i.e., educational level) and impact on burnout has limited results across decades of research. The educational status or type of degree is often confounded with other variables, including occupation, responsibility, and status (Maslach et al., 2001). Generally, a higher degree equates to an increased likelihood for professionals to experience burnout (Maslach et al., 2001).
The research on burnout and type of degree for the counseling profession has yielded consistent findings with Maslach et al. (2001). A meta-analysis completed by Lim et al. (2010) of counseling professionals reported individuals with the highest degree (i.e., Ph.D.) experienced the greatest amount of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization of burnout but felt most accomplished. These factors may be due to counselors with higher degrees treating more complex clients and having higher expectations at work. Overall, higher levels of education may impact burnout in counseling professionals (Lim et al., 2010).

There is scarce school counseling literature on the relationship between type of degree and burnout. Stickel (1991) surveyed 147 school counselors from a rural area. A multiple regression used to analyze data for several demographic variables as predictor variables and burnout as the outcome variable. For the sample, 76 had a master’s degree, 46 had a master’s degree +30, and four held a bachelor’s degree. In contrast to the counseling and human services professions findings, school counselors with lower level degrees (i.e., master’s only and bachelor’s degrees) had significantly higher levels of depersonalization on the MBI than participants with a master’s +30 degree (Stickel, 1991).

Due to the outdated and limited number of studies in the school counseling literature studying the effects of educational status or type of degree on levels of burnout, it may merit further exploration in this study. In addition to type of degree, the number of years of experience as a school counselor is believed to impact burnout. The next
section discusses the influence of number of years of experience as a school counselor on burnout.

**Years of experience as a school counselor.** Years of experience in the school counseling profession has yielded mixed results throughout decades of research. Cummings and Nall (1982) sampled 31 school counselors with work experiences ranging from 1 to 19 years and their perceived levels of burnout. Their findings for years of experience revealed that the longer a school counselor worked, the less likely they reported feeling burnt out (Cummings & Nall, 1982).

In contrast, other studies reporting ranges of school counselors’ years of experiences have reported those with more years of experience have higher levels of burnout (Butler & Constantine, 2005; Wilkerson, 2009). Butler and Constantine (2005) studied 533 school counselors and the impact of collective self-esteem and demographic variables on their levels of burnout. Results of the multiple regression analysis described school counselors who were working 20 or more years experienced higher levels of burnout than their colleagues working fewer than 10 years (Butler & Constantine, 2005). Wilkerson (2009) found similar results in his sample of 482 school counselors; there was a significant positive relationship between increased years’ experience as a school counselor and increased levels of burnout. Wilkerson concluded that burnout may be a chronic syndrome in the participants, a finding echoed by Lim et al. (2010), reporting higher burnout levels experienced by school counselors with longer years of experience.

Additionally, no relationship between length of employment and burnout has been reported in the school counseling literature. Bryant and Constantine (2006) studied 133
women school counselors at all grade levels and found no relationship between increased years of work experience and higher levels of burnout. Similarly, Wachter et al. (2008) studied 249 school counselors with approximately 65% of their participants meeting criteria for being in danger of or currently experiencing burnout, 20% currently experiencing burnout, and 2.9% ($n = 7$) meeting criteria for serious burnout. However, in their sample, years of experience was not found to be a significant predictor of burnout.

Due to conflicting results for the impact of years of experience on school counselors’ levels of burnout, it may merit further investigation for this study. In addition to years of experience as a school counselor, the type of school district a school counselor is employed within may impact burnout. The next section highlights the impact of type of school district on burnout in school counselors.

**Type of school district.** The type of area (i.e., rural, suburban, and urban) a school district is located within may contribute to unique factors experienced by school counselors. Despite this knowledge, studies related to the effects of geographic location have been scant in the school counseling literature (Morrissette, 2000). The few school counseling studies including the type of geographic setting reported mixed outcomes on burnout levels. One study (i.e., Butler & Constantine, 2005) reported burnout levels highest in urban school counselors, whereas other researchers (i.e., Grimes, Haskins, & Paisley, 2013; Morrissette, 2000; Stickel, 1991) reported rural environments having a significant negative impact on school counselors; one study reported no difference between settings (i.e., Bryant & Constantine, 2006), and others did not include
geographic setting in their predictor variables or as a factor in their results (e.g., Moyer, 2011; Wilkerson, 2009).

The literature reports rural school environments may have limited resources contributing to increased burnout levels in school counselors. The limited resources included: (a) a lack of peer and administrative support due to misunderstanding of appropriate roles of school counselors (Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, Milde, Leitner, & Skelton, 2006), (b) limited training opportunities, (c) lack of privacy for the school counselor within the community, and (d) professional isolation (Morrissette, 2000). Personal and professional integration due to geographic isolation of a community contributed to the potential for role conflict experienced by school counselors (Grimes et al., 2013). Weak community infrastructure and economics (Grimes et al., 2013) and rural family and religious culture (Stickel, 1991) were reported as secondary factors impacting educational practice within the rural school environment. Stickel recognized the rural environment as a potential predictor variable for increased burnout and sampled school counselors only from rural areas. The school counselor participants were experiencing moderate levels of burnout and frustration but reported feeling accomplished in their work (Stickel, 1991). Similarly, a phenomenological qualitative study sought to understand the experience of rural school counselors engaging in social justice advocacy (Grimes et al., 2013). Seven school counselor participants completed the study and several themes emerged that related to limited resources and contributed to burnout in the rural school settings. All participants discussed the importance of slowly building relationships with members of the community, generational cycles of stability (i.e., “I’ve
always lived like this;” Grimes et al., 2013, p. 44), the reliance on local faith-based organizations, and community integration of the school counselors’ personal and professional selves. Understanding rural culture and the interrelatedness of the community (i.e., oftentimes the church) may lead to increased advocacy and success of school counselors’ service delivery (Grimes et al., 2013).

Service delivery practices may be influenced by the rural school setting. Monteiro-Leitner et al. (2006) described school counselors who worked in rural areas may experience increased engagement in non-counseling duties and responsive services, as outlined by the ASCA National Model (i.e., supervising hall duty, bus duty, restrooms, and lunchrooms). School counselors working in the rural setting may have greater difficulty executing a CSCP due to limited resources (Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006). Overall, the rural environment may impact service delivery and subsequent burnout experienced by school counselors.

Similar challenges may be found within the urban setting, including the limited availability of resources, high levels of achievement gaps with students, and high poverty (C. C. Lee, 2005). Mismanagement of funds and politics may provide additional challenges to school counselors working in the urban setting. The issues described may contribute to barriers of effectively implementing a CSCP in the urban setting (C. C. Lee, 2005).

Specific issues of urban school environments have been suggested to contribute to increased school counselor burnout including: (a) growing cultural diversity in the schools, (b) varied complex needs of students, (c) student makeup of differing
backgrounds and experiences from the school counselors, (d) students’ differing thoughts on how school counselors can meet their needs, (e) increased stress felt by the school counselors due to poverty, (f) high crime levels for students in the areas (Butler & Constantine, 2005), (g) the impact of lower family functioning and decreased academic achievement of the students (Holcomb-McCoy & Mitchell, 2005; C. C. Lee, 2005), and (h) limited access to resources (C. C. Lee, 2005). The only known study found by this author that researched and disseminated the impact of the urban school setting on burnout was by Butler and Constantine (2005). Butler and Constantine compared urban school counselor burnout levels to those working in the suburban and rural settings. The authors reported the highest burnout levels were experienced by school counselors working in the urban setting.

Due to the limited consensus of the impact of the geographic location on levels of school counselor burnout, further examination is necessary for this study. In addition to type of school district, level of practice is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of level of practice on burnout in school counselors.

**Level of practice.** The school counseling literature reported an insignificant relationship between level of practice (i.e., Grades K through 12) and burnout. Level of practice was not found to be a statistically significant predictor variable for burnout experienced by school counselors in several studies (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Wachter et al., 2008). However, the level of practice of school counselors may impact the roles they engage in, which may subsequently impact burnout levels (Coll & Freeman, 1997).
Generally, the school counseling literature has included that elementary school counselors prefer to engage in roles most often aligned with CSCPs including the programmatic delivery of classroom guidance lessons and group counseling services within the personal and social domain of the National Standards for School Counseling (Dahir et al., 2009; Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007; Perkins, Oescher, & Ballard, 2010). A study completed approximately 10 years before the inception of the ASCA National Model revealed elementary school counselors believed their roles aligned with consultant, coordinator, and counselor (Carroll, 1993). Additional roles of teacher and management emerged in the study, highlighting the multifaceted roles engaged by school counselors (ASCA, 2012; Carroll, 1993). Coll and Freeman (1997) outlined the susceptibility of elementary school counselors to experience role conflict due to the various roles. To understand elementary school counselors’ experience of role conflict compared to their middle and high school counselor counterparts, a quantitative analysis was completed. Included in the sample was 525 elementary school counselors, 468 middle school counselors, and 417 high school counselors (Coll & Freeman, 1997). Elementary school counselors experienced the highest levels of role conflict \( F = 7.93, p < 0.001 \). Reasons for increased role conflict included engaging in non-counseling duties and conflict with administrators (Coll & Freeman, 1997). The authors concluded that decreasing role conflict experienced by school counselors may be accomplished by understanding preventative strategies for decreasing burnout (Coll & Freeman, 1997).

The opposite of Coll and Freeman (1997) findings were reported by Culbreth et al. (2005) in which elementary school counselors reported experiencing less role conflict
than high school counselors. Culbreth et al. (2005) contributed their findings to elementary school counselor participants being most appropriately trained during graduate school for the realities of the profession (i.e., decreased role ambiguity). In turn, the elementary school counselors reported lowest levels of perceived job stress (Culbreth et al., 2005). In addition, Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) reported their sample of 475 high school counselors were experiencing role ambiguity and role conflict because they had a preference for engaging in counseling duties but often engaged in non-counseling duties. The varied results of the studies (i.e., Coll & Freeman, 1997; Culbreth et al., 2005; Nelson et al., 2008) may highlight a shift in professional role alignment due to the inception of the ASCA National Model in 2003. The ASCA National Model implementation may have contributed to increased knowledge and advocacy for decreasing role ambiguity and role conflict experienced by school counselors.

Due to the limited understanding and outdated studies on levels of practice on school counselor burnout, it may merit further exploration with this sample. In addition to level of practice, number of buildings served is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of number of buildings served on burnout in school counselors.

**Number of buildings served.** School counselors may be required to work in two or more buildings leading to increased duties and increased student-to-school counselor ratios (Wilkerson, 2009). Despite the experience of school counselors working in two or more buildings to serve students, limited discussion has been found regarding this variable in the literature. The only known study to this author’s knowledge that reported
the number of buildings served by school counselors was by Wilkerson. The investigator sampled 198 school counselors with 58 (29.3%) reporting working at two or more schools and 139 (70.2%) working at one school. Wilkerson (2009) did not report any outcome results of number of buildings served in relation to burnout. Therefore, the number of building served was investigated to explore the potential impact on burnout for school counselors. In addition to number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio is believed to impact burnout. The concepts may be related in that when school counselors serve at more than one building, the amount of students they are responsible for may increase (i.e., student-to-school counselor ratio). The next section highlights the influence of student-to-school counselor ratio on burnout in school counselors.

**Student-to-school counselor ratio.** A significant contributing factor of burnout in the human services and counseling professions has been work overload (Angerer, 2003; Maslach et al., 2001). A meta-analysis of 231 studies researching burnout from 1981 to 2010 in the helping professions revealed work overload to significantly impact burnout (Alarcon, 2011). The student-to-school counselor ratio (i.e., caseload) is an example of the potential for work overload in the school counseling profession. The ASCA National Model recommends the ratio to be 250 students to one school counselor (ASCA, 2012). However, only four states have actual student-to-school counselor ratios within the recommended 250:1. The current data on ratios range from 200:1 in Wyoming to 1016:1 in Arkansas with an average of 471:1 in the United States. For a full list of current student-to-school counselor ratios, please visit: www.schoolcounselor.org.
The significance of student-to-school counselor ratios and school counselors’ levels of burnout have been reported in the literature with varying results. In a study by McCarthy et al. (2010), school counselors rated student-to-school counselor ratios as a contributor to stress. Bardhoshi, Schweinle, and Duncan (2014), Wilkerson (2009), and Stickel (1991) found statistical significance between the relationship of higher student-to-school counselor ratios with increased burnout whereas Moyer’s (2011) and Wilkerson and Bellini’s (2006) results indicated ratios as not being a significant contributor of burnout.

Wilkerson (2009) reported that high student-to-school counselor ratios were associated with increased stress and subsequent increased levels of burnout. The participants in Wilkerson’s study reported a mean student-to-school counselor ratio of 369.60:1 and standard deviation of 194.60, which were 100 more students per school counselor than the ASCA recommended ratio. Stickel (1991) also reported a linkage between increased caseloads and higher levels of burnout in the sample of 147 school counselors with average caseloads of 280:1. School counselor participants, across decades (i.e., Stickel, 1991; Wilkerson, 2009), similarly experiencing high levels of burnout with caseloads higher than the ASCA recommended ratio of 250:1.

Moyer (2011) surveyed 382 school counselors from several states in a quantitative study and found contrary results to Wilkerson (2009). A hierarchical regression analysis was completed to determine whether student-to-school counselor ratios, supervision, and amount of non-counseling duties contributed to burnout as measured by the CBI. The student-to-school counselor ratios were entered as the third
step of the regression analysis. The average student-to-school counselor ratio for the sample was 348:1 with a standard deviation of 146.54 (Moyer, 2011), similar to the sample by Wilkerson (2009). However, the student-to-school counselor ratios did not account for a significant amount of the variance in any of the models and did not have an impact on school counselor burnout (Moyer, 2011).

The ASCA recommends ratios of 250 students to one school counselor. The potential impact of implementing the ASCA National Model and decreasing student-to-school counselor ratios is unknown in the literature. Due to the high student-to-school counselor ratios experienced by school counselors and its potential impact on burnout, this variable was researched in the present study. In addition to student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision may impact burnout. Increased student ratios may impact the ability for school counselors to engage in supervision. The next section highlights the influence of amount of time engaged in supervision on burnout in school counselors.

**Amount of time engaged in supervision.** Supervision between a senior level clinician and junior level professional has many benefits including helping junior-level professionals with developing skills not mastered during graduate training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Page, Pietrzak, & Sutton, 2001). For example, school violence and crisis situations are on the rise in the school setting, which require a unique skill set of school counselors who are called upon to assist in times of need (Paine, 2009). School counselors may have limited experience in delivering crisis skills upon graduating from
their training programs. Supervision can bridge the gap to meet the advanced training needs of school counselors (Page et al., 2001).

Supervision for school counselors is not mandated by state or school district standards, or professional associations (i.e., ASCA, American Counseling Association [ACA], Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES]; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Supervision of school counselors may consist of several forms: (a) administrative supervision provided primarily by principals, (b) developmental or program supervision primarily conducted by district coordinators, and (c) clinical supervision conducted by trained counseling supervisors (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

A lack of supervision and support from supervisors has been consistently described as a link to burnout in the human services literature (Freudenberger, 1974; Maslach et al., 2001). The support for supervision to buffer burnout continues in the general counseling (i.e., Venart, Vassos, & Pitcher-Heft, 2007) and school counseling (i.e., Wachter et al., 2008) literature. Savicki and Cooley (1982) were some of the first authors in the counseling profession to identify the need for feedback from fellow colleagues as a safeguard against professional burnout. Everall and Paulson (2004) called for counselors to obtain supervision to ensure standards of ethical practice.

Despite the need for supervision, school counselors receive less post-degree supervision than other mental health professionals and the supervision of school counselors is most often conducted by administrators (Borders & Usher, 1992). Borders and Usher reported most of their school counselor participants were supervised by school administrators (i.e., principals). Since principals and other school administrators have
minimal to no graduate training related to school counseling, they are less likely to understand school counselors’ roles, often leading school counselors to engage in varied roles and duties within the school environment that are not aligned with the ASCA National Model (Janson et al., 2008; Studer & Oberman, 2006). Additionally, training and supervision models related to school counseling are lacking in the professional literature (Page et al., 2001).

Several studies have sought to understand the supervision trends of the school counseling profession (Borders & Usher, 1992; Page et al., 2001; Sutton & Page, 1994). Borders and Usher (1992) studied 357 Nationally Certified Counselors supervision practices. Ninety-two participants were school counselors. Of the school counselor sample, 41 were not receiving clinical supervision; they wanted supervision less frequently than the other nationally certified counselors in the study, and were most likely supervised by school administrators (Borders & Usher, 1992). Sutton and Page (1994) studied 493 school counselors in Maine to further understand the supervision practices of the profession in relation to Borders and Usher’s (1992) findings. In Sutton and Page’s (1994) participants, 20% were receiving clinical supervision and 37% reported no need for clinical supervision, which mirrored Borders and Usher’s (1992) findings. For Borders and Usher, supervision was credited for increasing professional support and improving clinical skills for their sample of participants. For school counselors not receiving supervision, 37% reported not knowing how to obtain it (Sutton & Page, 1994).

As a follow up to Sutton and Page (1994), Page et al. (2001) sampled 267 school counselors across the United States to compare supervision from the previous decade. In
their sample, clinical supervision was received by only 35 participants but 146 reported wanting to receive it in the future. The main goals of supervision were to improve clinical skills and contribute to the development of counselors’ professional identities (Page et al., 2001). Two hundred forty-three \( n = 267 \) school counselors reported administrators as their primary supervisor (i.e., principal, guidance director, or assistant principal) reporting their supervision was adequate—that is, a mean score of 3.21, on a 5 point Likert scale (Page et al., 2001).

A. H. Davis, Savicki, Cooley, and Firth (1989) studied the extent to which engagement and satisfaction in supervision may impact counselor burnout. Davis et al. measured supervision with the Counselor Supervision Inventory and measured burnout with the MBI. Their sample consisted of 120 counselors, with 41% identifying as school counselors. Statistically significant correlations were found between supervision and burnout scores. Specifically, higher counselor dissatisfaction correlated with increased levels of burnout. These findings may describe a linkage between supervision being a protective factor in decreasing counselor burnout.

Following A. H. Davis et al. (1989), a link continued in the literature between increased supervision and decreased levels of stress and burnout for school counselors (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Moyer, 2011). Baggerly and Osborn (2006) completed a regression analysis with 1,280 of school counselors of all grade levels in Florida, which yielded results that career satisfaction was positively predicted by peer supervision by a fellow school counselor within the school district. Supervision was found to contribute to decreased burnout in the sample, even when the school counselors reported receiving a
limited amount of supervision over the course of the school year. Several years after Baggerly and Osborn’s (2006) findings, Moyer (2011) reported a negative relationship between the lack of supervision and increased levels of burnout in his sample of 382 school counselors. Seventy-seven percent (or 292) of the participants received one hour or less of clinical supervision each month whereas the remaining 23% (or 87) of participants received two to five or more hours of supervision. Supervision accounted for a significant amount of variance of the CBI subscales including negative work environment, incompetence, and devaluing clients. Supervision was also significant for the overall burnout scores; again, suggesting supervision may be a safeguard against burnout among school counselors.

A criticism of supervision within the school counseling profession has been that it is limited, out of date, and primarily expanded from clinical mental health counseling practice (Page et al., 2001; Wood & Dixon Rayle, 2006). Yet, the practice of school counselors does not fully parallel their clinical mental health counseling colleagues (Lawson, 2007). This calls for an increased need to understand what is important for supervising school counselors and the linkage between supervision and burnout in school counselors. Supervision may be important to help counselors identify burnout and provide for self-care needs (Cummings & Nall, 1983).

Due to generally consistent findings on the connection between the lack of supervision and increased levels of burnout, the estimated amount of time school counselors engage in supervision was included in the current study. Much of the school counseling supervision literature is dated and thus meritng further study. In addition to
amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of amount of time engaged in consultation on burnout in school counselors.

**Amount of time engaged in consultation.** The amount of time engaged in consultation has been described as an influential variable of burnout in the literature. Across human service professions, burnout levels were found to be lower when colleagues actively shared their reflections about their job experiences (i.e., consulted) with one another (Maslach, 1979). Consultation has been described as essential for processing experiences and maintaining a personal sense of wellbeing in the school counseling literature (Morrissette, 2000). For school counselors, consulting with peers or colleagues may be a viable alternative to the barriers of receiving supervision (Moyer, 2011). In addition to peer consultation, school counselors often engage in consultation with community agency staff, other school and community stakeholders, and the families of students (Walsh et al., 2007).

The support school counselors receive from others (i.e., counselors, administrators, etc.) has been researched and shown to impact burnout (McCarthy et al., 2010). The general trend of school counselors engaging in consultation with their peers in 1994 was received by approximately 200 of their 493 participants (Sutton & Page, 1994). In 2001, 27 of the 251 school counselors reported engaging in peer consultation (Page et al., 2001). School counselors and clinical mental health counselors who reported the highest burnout scores also recognized the importance of using consultation, especially when supervision was unavailable, as a safeguard against burnout (Lawson,
The counselors who incorporated consultation into their practice discussed an increased sense of wellness in their professional lives (Lawson, 2007). This finding by Lawson was supported by Venart et al. (2007), who described colleague consultation and peer support groups led to increased wellness practices of counselors. The findings by Lawson (2007) and Venart et al. (2007) have been echoed in the school counseling literature. School counselors who viewed themselves favorably by their peers (i.e., collective self-esteem) reported lower burnout scores (Butler & Constantine, 2005). In addition to peer consultation’s impact on burnout, Wilkerson and Bellini (2006) discovered that a school counselor-teacher professional relationship or engagement in consultation had a positive impact and decreased the school counselors’ burnout scores. Similarly, Cummings and Nall (1982) reported the positive influence of school counselor-administrator relationship and reduced burnout scores. Overall, these findings highlight the positive impact of consultation on the vitality of the school counseling profession.

In 2000, school counselors in Alabama reported spending approximately 20% of their time in consultation services (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). Due to the amount of time spent on consultation services and the impact it may have on school counselors’ levels of burnout, the variable is included in this current study. Additionally, consultation with other school administrative personnel may influence the amount of time school counselors may spend on counseling and non-counseling duties. Therefore, in addition to amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the
influence of percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties on burnout in school counselors.

**Percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties.** The ASCA National Model suggests that school counselors spend at least 80% of their time in counseling duties (e.g., small group counseling, large group guidance lessons; ASCA, 2012). The remaining 20% may be spent on non-counseling duties (e.g., fair share duties including class coverage, testing coordinator; ASCA, 2012). The impact of engaging in non-counseling duties as part of a school counselor’s job has been a professional concern. Several CSCP models (i.e., Gysbers, Myrnick), and most recently, the ASCA National Model (2012) have attempted to align the school counselor’s role with counseling duties. However, school counselors continue to engage in larger than recommended amounts of non-counseling duties. The most frequent non-counseling duties reported in a recent survey included testing, lunch duty, substitute teaching, disciplining, scheduling, special education services, and bus duty (Bardhoshi et al., 2014).

The grade level may shape the activities school counselors are involved in (Hardesty & Dillard, 1994). Elementary school counselors often spend most of their time counseling children and their families, consulting with community agencies, and serving as the testing coordinator. Middle school counselors often spend most of their time engaging in suicide prevention and relationship counseling. High school counselors often spend most of their time engaging in college or career related activities with students, scheduling, testing services, and paperwork (Chandler, Burnham, & Dahir, 2008; Hardesty & Dillard, 1994). A trend across all grade levels since the accountability era of
education is the increase in testing and administrative duties performed by school counselors (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Hardesty & Dillard, 1994). Administrators’ understanding of school counselor roles may have an additional impact on the amount of time they can spend on counseling duties (Chata & Loesch, 2007).

The school counseling literature provided a descriptive understanding of the amount of time school counselors spent on counseling and non-counseling related duties during the previous decade. Vaughn, Bynum and Hooten (2007) surveyed 31 school counselors who reported having preferences to engage in individual and small group counseling (i.e., counseling related duties). However, 19 of the 31 participants engaged in non-counseling duties routinely (i.e., test scores, attendance reports) which took away from their ability to engage in counseling related duties. Burnham and Jackson (2000) reported 70 of their 80 school counselor participants were the testing coordinators and non-counseling duties occupied an average time of 25.04% of the school counselor participants’ week, with an average ranging from 13 to 40%. An additional eight participants reported engaging in 50 to 88% of their time in non-counseling duties (i.e., maintaining records/paperwork, scheduling; Burnham & Jackson, 2000). This exceeds the 20% or less engagement in non-counseling duties recommended by the ASCA National Model (2012).

Non-counseling duties may be a reality of school counselors’ jobs (Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007; Moyer, 2011). A high level of non-counseling duties performed by school counselors may have a negative impact on their professional practice. The impacts on practice were described by Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011). The
researchers surveyed 175 high school counselors to determine the association between role conflict, role ambiguity, percentage of time spent on ASCA duties (i.e., counseling, consultation, large group guidance, and coordination), non-counseling duties, and job satisfaction. Non-counseling and counseling duties, along with role ambiguity significantly predicted 23.2% of variance for job satisfaction—increased time spent in counseling duties contributed to decreased time spent on non-counseling duties, decreased role ambiguity, and increased job satisfaction. Additionally, school counselors experienced higher levels of role ambiguity when expected to engage in non-counseling duties with limited administrator support (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Falls & Nichter, 2007).

Engagement in higher amounts of non-counseling duties may have a negative impact on school counselors’ levels of burnout (Moyer, 2011). Spanning decades, paperwork has been rated as the first or second most demanding duty of school counselors (McCarthy et al., 2010; Sears & Navin, 1983). Administrative disruptions and state-wide testing have become the most demanding aspects of school counselors’ jobs (T. E. Davis, 2006; McCarthy et al., 2010). To understand recent trends of school counselors’ usage of time, Moyer (2011) surveyed 382 school counselors across the United States and over 50% of the sample reported engaging in 10 or more hours of non-counseling duties each week. Next, Moyer (2011) researched the effects of engaging in non-counseling duties on school counselor burnout levels, as reported by the CBI (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). Non-counseling duties was incorporated as a predictor variable into the first step of the hierarchical regression analysis and accounted for a significant
portion of the variance in burnout overall and for all of the CBI subscales (Moyer, 2011). Moyer concluded in the sample that as non-counseling duties increased, feelings of exhaustion and incompetence increased and empathy towards students decreased. Similar results were reported by Bardhoshi et al. (2014) in their sample of 212 school counselors. The authors completed a regression analysis to determine the effects of non-counseling duties on burnout in school counselors and followed up with a qualitative inquiry of burnout. Non-counseling duties significantly contributed to burnout in the CBI subscales of exhaustion, negative work environment, and deterioration in personal life. Thirteen participants discussed non-counseling duties resulting from role ambiguity within the profession (Bardhoshi et al., 2014). These results may infer a potential interconnectedness between role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout in school counselors.

The findings concurred by Bardhoshi et al. (2014), Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011), and Moyer (2011), among others researchers, that non-counseling duties may be an important variable to consider its impact on school counselor burnout levels. Therefore, estimated amounts of time school counselors spend on counseling and non-counseling duties are included in this study. In addition to estimated percentage of time spent on counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support is believed to impact burnout. Principal support may have an influence on school counselors’ abilities to engage in counseling related duties. The next section highlights the influence of perceived principal support on burnout in school counselors.
**Perceived principal support.** The negative relationship between workers’ lack of support from their supervisors and increased burnout is a contributing organizational factor in the human service professions (Maslach et al., 2001). Organizational support may often be lacking in the counseling profession (Savicki & Cooley, 1982). Therefore, developing professional relationships with supervisors, receiving constructive feedback from supervisors, and a participatory leadership style may contribute to lower burnout experienced by counselors (Cummings & Nall, 1982; Maslach, 1979). In a meta-analysis of 17 studies completed of counseling professionals in the United States, J. Lee, Lim, Yang, and Lee (2011) found a significant antecedent to burnout was a decrease in support from supervisors.

Principals are in a position to hire and determine the roles school counselors will perform (Chata & Loesch, 2007; Janson et al., 2008). Additionally, principals are often the individuals who supervise and evaluate school counselors. These practices necessitate a greater understanding on principals’ knowledge of the school counseling profession according to the ASCA National Model (2012) and the level of support they may be able to provide their school counseling staff (Fitch, Newby, Ballestero, & Marshall, 2001).

Supportive and positive relationships between principals and school counselors have shown to decrease burnout in school counselors (Bardhoshi et al., 2014; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Wilkerson and Bellini (2006) studied the effects of school counselor-principal relationships on school counselors’ levels of burnout in a sample of 78 school counselors. Wilkerson (2009) studied their relationships again with
198 school counselors. In both studies, the school counselors who perceived their relationships with their principals as positive reported lower burnout scores than school counselors who perceived their relationships as negative. The findings may have contributed to Wilkerson (2010) emphasizing areas for collaboration between principals and school counselors that included utilizing the ASCA National Model in educating principals about the appropriate roles of school counselors and for demonstrating practices leading to accountability and academic achievement of all students.

Principals’ understanding of the ASCA National Model has been called into question in the literature despite the recommendations by Wilkerson (2010). Where there was a state-specified model based on the ASCA National Model, Graham et al. (2011) reported 21.4% out of 56 participants knew of the ASCA National Model due to professional principal associations, colleagues, but, mostly from their school counselor. Graham et al. (2011) included a qualitative component to their study. Several principal participants reported a viewpoint of the ASCA National Model that lacked value to its inception to practice. For example, many principals believed non-counseling and counseling duties were both important for school counselors’ practice (Graham et al., 2011). Zalaquett and Chatters (2012) described a similar result of Florida principals’ knowledge of the ASCA National Model. In their sample, of the 160 participants, 47 or 26.4% were not familiar with the ASCA National Model. Generally, due to principals having minimal to no school counseling training, they may have less knowledge of school counselors’ appropriate roles, leading to school counselors engaging in varied
roles and duties within the school environment not aligned with the ASCA National Model (Studer & Oberman, 2006).

Principals’ increased knowledge of the ASCA National Model may positively impact school counselors’ practice. Leuwerke, Walker, and Qi (2009) interviewed 337 principals and reported when they were informed of the ASCA National Model, their perceptions were more in favor of advocating for school counselors to engage in counseling roles to meet the academic mission of the school. Lieberman (2004) described the potential for decreased role ambiguity and burnout when school principals had an understanding of the ASCA National Model and utilized their knowledge when supervising school counselors. These authors highlighted the potential positive results of school counseling practice when principals had an understanding of the ASCA National Model and a supportive relationship with their school counselors.

Due to the potential for impact of perceived principal support on school counselor burnout levels, the variable was researched in this study. In addition to perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction is believed to impact burnout. Perceived principal support and perceived job satisfaction may be linked in school counselors. The next section highlights the influence of perceived job satisfaction on burnout in school counselors.

Perceived job satisfaction. Human service professionals who experience burnout often report feeling unsatisfied with their job (Maslach et al., 2001). A meta-analysis of 231 studies researching burnout from 1981 to 2010 in the helping professions revealed job satisfaction had a statistically significantly negative effect on
burnout (Alarcon, 2011). In a meta-analysis of 17 studies completed of counseling professionals in the United States, J. Lee et al. (2011) reported similar findings to Alarcon (2011)—a significant consequence to burnout was a decrease in counselors’ job satisfaction. Concurrent findings across human service professions and decades of research reveal job satisfaction is a variable that may affect burnout.

Factors related to job satisfaction of school counselors has been discussed in the literature. DeMato and Curcio (2004) reported a longitudinal analysis of job satisfaction in 301 elementary school counselors in Virginia in 2001 and compared their results to studies completed in 1988 and 1995. Job satisfaction was rated at 93.4% in the 1988 sample, 96.3% in the 1995 sample, and 90.9% in the 2001 sample. The main contribution to job dissatisfaction in 2001 included a change of roles within the school system, including the increase in non-counseling duties due to testing and discipline referrals (DeMato & Curcio, 2004). This study discussed significant correlations between the linkage of engagement in non-counseling duties and job dissatisfaction to others who discussed its impact in the school counseling literature (Moyer, 2011).

It has been suggested that school counselor job satisfaction may be positively impacted by an increase in engagement in counseling duties (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Wachter et al., 2008). Baggerly and Osborn (2006) studied job satisfaction in a sample of 1,280 school counselors from Florida. Their results suggested that school counselors who engaged in higher amounts of counseling duties and received supervision reported higher levels of job satisfaction. The participants who engaged in higher amounts of non-counseling duties and experienced job stress reported significantly lower levels of
job satisfaction (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006). Overall, 84.5% of their participants reported feeling satisfied or very satisfied with their job (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006), which was slightly lower than DeMato and Curcio’s (2004) findings. Dixon Rayle (2006) discussed similar results for school counselor job satisfaction. The participants, who had higher levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model, or CSCPs, reported statistically significant increased job satisfaction than the school counselors who were not implementing a program (Dixon Rayle, 2006). Dixon Rayle also reported a significant relationship between job satisfaction and stress—those experiencing greater stress had decreased job satisfaction. Therefore, those who may be able to implement a CSCP, or the ASCA National Model, may have higher levels of job satisfaction, which may assist them in an increased engagement of counseling related duties leading to decreased role conflict (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Dixon Rayle, 2006; Foster, Young, & Hermann, 2005).

Job satisfaction may be interconnected with counseling related duties and principal support in school counselors. The findings by Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell (2009) highlight the interconnections between job satisfaction, relationship with the principal, and alignment of counseling related duties for school counselors with the ASCA National Model. The authors discovered in a sample of 188 school counselors through a path analysis that 15% of variance in counseling and non-counseling duties were due to the ASCA National Model implementation and 49% of variance was due to school counselors’ job satisfaction. Therefore, implementing the ASCA National Model impacted the type of counseling roles school counselor engaged in and these roles
influenced their job satisfaction. The findings by Clemens et al. (2009) highlighted the importance of school counselors engaging in appropriate roles and positive relationships with their principals to increase their job satisfaction.

The relationships between job satisfaction and burnout have been documented in the school counseling literature (i.e., Bryant & Constantine, 2006; Stickel, 1991). Approximately 85% to 90% of school counselors reported satisfaction with their job (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; DeMato & Curcio, 2004). However, the remaining percentages (i.e., 10% to 15%) are a population at risk due to stress, lack of satisfaction, and burnout (Wachter et al., 2008). Stickel (1991) noted job satisfaction in a sample of school counselors as “relatively low” (p. 8) but did not report participants’ job satisfaction scores. Bryant and Constantine (2006) emphasized the potential importance of life satisfaction and balancing multiple roles to safeguard against professional burnout and increase job satisfaction in women school counselors. Understanding the impact of job satisfaction in the current study is important to understand its relationship to burnout in school counselors. Burnout and job satisfaction found to be negatively correlated but are not the same constructs. However, the two constructs may be connected with another factor, such as working environment (i.e., student-to-school counselor ratios, non-counseling duties, principal relationship; Maslach et al., 2001).

Therefore, the current study sought to understand the influence of perceived job satisfaction on school counselors’ levels of burnout. In addition to perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress is believed to impact burnout. Job satisfaction and job
stress may be negatively correlated with each other in school counselors. The next section highlights the influence of perceived job stress on burnout in school counselors.

**Perceived job stress.** Stress is often experienced by human service workers and has been linked to subsequent burnout throughout several decades of research (Maslach, 1979; Maslach et al., 2001). Despite their relationship, stress has not been shown to be a direct cause of burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). There are several predictors of job stress (i.e., work overload, role conflict) and protective variables (i.e., job satisfaction, support from others; Iacovides et al., 2003) that may mediate burnout.

Excessive stress may result in burnout and subsequent deterioration in quality of care with clients (Maslach, 2003). P. L. Smith and Burton Moss (2009) reported distress symptoms (i.e., depression, substance use, burnout, vicarious traumatization) from high occupational demands developing into personal exhaustion and impairment to provide adequate care to clients. Stress is often an unavoidable phenomenon in the counseling profession (J. Lee et al., 2011). Negative work environments, unwilling clients, and difficult situations (i.e., physical and sexual abuse of children) are all potential contributors of stress for counselors (Savicki & Cooley, 1982). Overall, stress affects all human service professions, including the counseling profession.

A linkage between job stress and satisfaction has been supported in the school counseling literature (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Dixon Rayle, 2006). Baggerly and Osborn (2006) investigated school counselor stress and satisfaction with school counselors of all grade levels in Florida. Results of the regression analysis yielded stress as a negative predictor of job satisfaction ($F = 54.08, p < 0.001$). In their sample, the
mean stress score was 3.34 out of 4, indicating the school counselors were experiencing stress on the job.

Excessive job stress may increase the potential for school counselors to experience burnout (Kesler, 1990; Wilkerson, 2009). Therefore, understanding factors related to stress experienced by school counselors may be important to understanding burnout. A seminal study on school counselor stress was completed by Sears and Navin (1983). The researchers studied 240 school counselors in Ohio. Approximately 65% of the sample reported feeling stressed or very stressed. There were five consistently reported highest sources of stress in their sample: (a) not enough time to see students, (b) too much paperwork, (c) not enough time to do their job, (d) too large of a caseload, and (e) too many non-counseling duties. The sources of stress may directly link to role conflict when school counselors are required to engage in the roles but in conflict due to wanting to engage in others (i.e., counseling; Sears & Navin, 1983). Although coping was not a variable studied by Sears and Navin, they questioned the potential influence coping strategies may have had on their sample who were experiencing job stress.

Comparable results were found by Falls and Nichter (2007) several decades later. The researchers completed a qualitative study with four participants from suburban high schools with high student-to-school counselor ratios to investigate the influence of job stress on role ambiguity. The theme of constant organizational changes without the ability for the participants to enact change was the highest contributor to stress. Non-counseling duties without support was described as leading towards role ambiguity (Falls & Nichter, 2007). A major stressor for school counselors may be due to high job
demands and a lack of clearly defined roles or role ambiguity leading to burnout (Kendrick, 1994; McCarthy et al., 2010; Sears & Navin, 1983).

Wilkerson (2009) studied the effects of the stress-strain-coping theory on school counselors’ levels of burnout. He completed a multiple regression analysis with 198 school counselors and reported stress was first experienced and perceived by the participants, followed by a resultant coping or reaction response. Increased emotionally focused coping (i.e., the focus on the emotional outcome of a stressful situation) most significantly contributed to higher levels of burnout. Task oriented coping (i.e., the focus on dealing with the problem directly) contributed to lower levels of burnout. He suggested stress and burnout may be moderated by a school counselor’s coping strategies (Wilkerson, 2009).

To understand the potential relationship between stress and burnout, perceived stress was researched in this current study. Coping responses and styles are often a result of perceived stress of an individual and also believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of coping responses and styles on burnout in school counselors.

**Coping responses and styles.** In the human services professions, individuals’ coping styles have an impact on their experiences of subsequent stress and burnout (Maslach, 1979). Maslach discussed an inability to cope with continued emotional stress, leading to burnout as an overall theme within human services professions. Individuals who experience higher levels of burnout generally coped with stressful events in a passive and defensive manner and had a lack of concern for clients (Maslach, 1979; Maslach et al., 2001). The resultant burnout manifested as poor service delivery and a
detachment from clients or patients. Coping with stress may be crucial but difficult because there are contributing factors beyond one’s control (i.e., job environment; Iacovides et al., 2003).

Understanding the impact coping may have on individuals’ stress and burnout is important for professionals and the clients with whom they work. Maladaptive and emotionally focused coping responses and styles have shown to intensify stress and burnout experienced by counselors (Thompson, Amatea, & Thompson, 2014) and school counselors (Wilkerson, 2009). Increasing positive and proactive coping responses and styles may decrease perceived stress. Therefore, the types of coping responses and styles in which individuals engage may be a factor in determining individuals’ perceived stress and burnout (Savicki & Cooley, 1982).

The manner in which school counselors cope have connections to the levels of stress and burnout in the school counseling literature (Lambie, 2007; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Wilkerson and Bellini (2006) and Wilkerson (2009) reported the impact on coping styles and burnout in school counselors. Types of coping styles, specifically emotionally oriented coping, accounted for the largest levels of burnout experienced by the school counselors in both samples. Lambie (2007) discovered when school counselors coped with stress in an effective manner it resulted in a positive attitude towards the profession, their burnout decreased, ego maturity increased, and they had increased positive feelings at work. These findings may highlight the potential relationship of Savicki and Cooley’s (1982) discussion on the impact of coping on stress and burnout in counseling professionals.
A national survey of counselor wellness and impairment completed by Lawson (2007) found that school counselors and community mental health counselors scored highest on burnout due to high caseloads. Lawson described several coping strategies that highly satisfied counselor participants utilized, which included several characteristics consistent with the Brief COPE (Carver, 1997), an instrument used in the current study. The importance of understanding both stressors and resultant coping strategies is justified in understanding their relationships to successive burnout in school counselors for the current study. In addition to coping responses and styles, role ambiguity is believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of role ambiguity on burnout in school counselors.

**Role ambiguity.** Role ambiguity has been described as a contributor to burnout in human service professions (Alarcon, 2011; Maslach et al., 2001). Specifically, experiencing role ambiguity has been linked to an increase in emotional exhaustion experienced by counselors (Kirk-Brown & Wallace, 2004), which is a factor of burnout on the CBI (S. M. Lee et al., 2007) and the MBI (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Role ambiguity has been described in the school counseling literature as a discrepancy between actual and preferred counseling duties (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008).

Much of the general research on role ambiguity is dated (e.g., S. E. Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Additionally, limited research has been uncovered related to role ambiguity and the school counseling profession (e.g., Warnath & Shelton, 1976). Warnath and Shelton identified burnout as a result of excessive stress partially due to counselors lacking understanding of their professional roles. They contributed the
discrepancy of roles beginning during graduate training when counselors learned ideal roles of counselors. New counseling professionals were often misinformed of the realities of the job, which may contribute to role ambiguity and fatigue (Olk & Friedlander, 1992; Warnath & Shelton, 1976).

Savicki and Cooley (1982) delved into understanding burnout in greater detail and highlighted organizational and individual contributors of burnout for counselors. The authors identified organizational contributors, which included: (a) job intensity, (b) high client caseloads, (c) increased stress, (d) and decreased social support. The authors identified individual contributors, which included: (a) over identifying with the client, (b) internal locus of control, and (c) coping styles and ability to resist stress (Savicki & Cooley, 1982). The theme of role ambiguity emerged in Warnath and Shelton’s (1976) and Savicki and Cooley’s (1982) discussions and the authors advocated for realistic conversations of the actual roles of counselors beginning at the outset of graduate school.

Specific to school counselor graduate training, Butler and Constantine (2005) reported school counselors-in-training may be exposed to unrealistic positive views of the job while in graduate school. The authors concluded graduate training may contribute to placing students at risk for role ambiguity, stress, and burnout to be experienced once they assume professional roles. When school counseling graduate students are aware of the competing roles in the school setting (i.e., role conflict), they may be more adequately prepared for the realities on the job, leading to increased positive job experiences (Butler & Constantine, 2005). Core classes (e.g., theories/helping relationship, assessment, and introductory courses in school counseling) and field experience courses (e.g., practicum
and internship) were critical influences for students to begin developing a professional
identity and understand actual school counselor practice (Gibson, Dooley, Kelchner,
Moss, & Vacchio, 2012).

The school counseling literature suggests that the effect of role ambiguity on
school counselors is the result of various factors (i.e., assigned non-counseling duties and
lack of administrative understanding of the roles of a school counselor; Lawson, 2007).
For school counselors, advocating for engaging in roles aligned with meeting the
educational needs of all students have been shown to decrease role ambiguity (Dixon
Rayle & Adams, 2007). Burnham and Jackson (2000) discussed the importance for the
school counseling profession to transform roles that align with evolving educational
models and trends, which currently includes the ASCA National Model (2012). Culbreth
et al. (2005) discussed general linkage between expectations, training, and actual
experiences contributed to less role ambiguity in school counselors. They studied
elementary school counselors and concluded at the elementary level of practice they were
appropriately trained during graduate school to enter the profession and were having
lower levels of on the job stress and role ambiguity compared to the middle and high
school counselor participants (Culbreth et al., 2005). To investigate role ambiguity
further, Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) completed a regression analysis of actual and
preferred practice of school counselors at all grade levels. It was reported that school
counselors preferred to spend their time in best practices (i.e., counseling duties
according to the ASCA National Model). Specifically, high school counselors were
found to have a higher discrepancy between actual and preferred practices than middle
and elementary school counselors. All counselors wanted to spend more time in counseling related duties and school counselors with more years of experience were more likely doing so which would decrease role ambiguity.

Variation in training and actual experience on the job led to role ambiguity and stress for school counselors (Falls & Nichter, 2007). A qualitative study was completed with four participants from suburban high school with high student-to-school counselor ratios to investigate the influence of role ambiguity on job stress. The theme of constant organizational changes without the ability to enact change was the highest contributor to stress in the sample. Non-counseling duties without support was described as leading towards role ambiguity (Falls & Nichter, 2007).

The research on the impact of role ambiguity on burnout among school counselors is limited. Wilkerson (2009) studied 198 school counselors and several organizational factors that may be related to burnout. Role ambiguity was included with stress as a factor in the second step of the hierarchical regression analysis. Role ambiguity significantly correlated with all MBI subscales. Role ambiguity and stress may be connected and are both statistically significant factors that impacted burnout. Increased stress and increased role ambiguity may lead to increased burnout experienced by school counselors (Wilkerson, 2009).

Overall, limited amount of studies have researched the impact of role ambiguity on burnout in school counselors. The importance of understanding role ambiguity is justified in understanding its relationship to burnout in school counselors for the current study. Role ambiguity may be linked to role conflict experienced by individuals (Rizzo
et al., 1970). Role conflict is also believed to impact burnout. The next section highlights the influence of role conflict on burnout in school counselors.

**Role conflict.** Role conflict may result from incongruent work demands (Rizzo et al., 1970) in the human services (Alarcon, 2011; Maslach et al., 2001) and counseling professions (Savicki & Cooley, 1982; Warnath & Shelton, 1976). Role conflict is an organizational concern, contributing to burnout in human services professionals (Maslach et al., 2001). Role conflict can be experienced in school counselors when two or more roles are not in agreement with one another (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011). Examples of role conflict in the school counseling profession is whether school counselors should focus primarily on the education goals or mental health needs of the students (Paisley & Borders, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001) and when organizational variables, including relationships, lack of decision making, and engagement in large amounts of non-counseling duties (Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). When the focus required of the school counselor does not align with their practice, role conflict may be experienced (Coll & Freeman, 1997). Additionally, when a supervisor is unaware of the appropriate counseling duties of school counselors and assigns excessive non-counseling duties, this may lead to role conflict (Clemens et al., 2009).

Role conflict is often linked to burnout in school counselors (Bryant & Constantine, 2006; Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011). Maslach et al. (2001) found negative correlations between job satisfaction and burnout (range from 0.40 to 0.52) but only large enough to provide linkage between the two constructs. Maslach et al. reported another factor, poor working conditions, may contribute to both burnout and job
satisfaction in professionals. Increased amounts of inappropriate related duties (i.e., paperwork, administrative duties, state testing) as outlined by the ASCA National Model, along with increased caseloads of students with poor attendance, grade averages, and physical and learning disabilities, were found to increase stress and lower job satisfaction, leading to role conflict and burnout (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; McCarthy et al., 2010). Role conflict arose as a significant factor when investigating the meaning of school counselor burnout in a study by Sheffield and Baker (2005). The researchers conducted a phenomenological qualitative study of school counselors’ subjective meaning of their experiences of burnout. Their sample consisted of three currently practicing full-time school counselors who self-described feelings of burnout. Among the significant findings included job dissatisfaction, exhaustion, incompetence, coping through the use of support from peers, and lack of other counseling colleagues in the building. The most significant result described by Sheffield and Baker’s participants was role conflict experienced due to unrealistic expectations of profession (i.e., ideal if school counselor could make contact with every student) and non-counseling duties that significantly contributed to their feelings of burnout, results echoed by Bardhoshi et al. (2014).

School counselors, who were able to clarify their roles with teachers and administrators, reported less experience of role conflict and burnout (Wachter et al., 2008). The ability for school counselors to clearly define their roles and make decisions within the school environment significantly decreases their potential for burnout (Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Despite these recommendations, many
researchers have reported the continued practices of school counselors that contributed to role conflict and subsequent burnout. A recent study by Bardhoshi et al. (2014) highlighted the continued difficulty of school counselors to decrease role conflict. In their sample of 252 school counselors who were members of the ASCA, several variables related to role conflict were identified as contributing to burnout. Budgetary complaints, lack of resources, lack of organization support, lack of authority, negative school environment, non-counseling duties, and large caseloads contributed to increased burnout in their sample (Bardhoshi et al., 2014). In another study, several organizational factors were reported to contribute to increased burnout in a sample of 198 school counselors (Wilkerson, 2009). Role conflict was included in the organizational factors of the hierarchical regression analysis. Role conflict negatively correlated with all MBI subscales and was a statistically significant factor that impacted an increased level of the emotional exhaustion factor of burnout (Wilkerson, 2009).

The connection between role conflict and burnout has been documented in the literature and important to consider its effects in the current study. In addition to role conflict, implementing the ASCA National Model is believed to impact burnout. The ASCA National Model may lessen school counselors’ experiences of role conflict and role ambiguity when incorporated into practice. The next section highlights the influence of implementing the ASCA National Model on burnout in school counselors.

**The ASCA National Model, role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout.** The ASCA developed and disseminated the ASCA National Model as a framework for school counselor practice. However, there has not always been a clear linkage between the roles
defined by the ASCA, the actual practices of school counselors, and the expectations of school administrators (Zalaquett & Chatters, 2012). Additionally, principals, teachers, and parents may not be aware of the ASCA National Model (2012). These stakeholders may have a historically influenced (i.e., guidance counseling) view of school counselors’ roles. School counselors may experience role ambiguity as a result of a desire to engage in counseling related duties but expected to engage in several other non-counseling duties (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). When school counselors actually engage in the roles or duties that are inconsistent to their expectations or training and the ASCA National Model (2012), they may experience role conflict (Coll & Freeman, 1997).

School counseling research has primarily focused on the impact that counseling duties, as described by the ASCA National Model, have on job satisfaction (Pyne, 2011). Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) reported engagement in non-counseling duties was a predictor of decreased job satisfaction. As time spent on non-counseling duties increased, counseling duties decreased, resulting in lower job satisfaction (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011). Bardhoshi et al. (2014) reported budgetary complaints and a lack of resources and support led school counselors to engage in high amounts of non-counseling duties and experience higher levels of burnout. Additionally, the school counselor participants who were primarily able to engage in counseling duties, as outlined in CSCPs and the ASCA National Model (2012), reported statistically significant decreased levels of burnout when compared to participants who engaged in higher amounts of non-counseling duties.
The school counseling literature describes the positive impact of school counselors aligning their practices within the ASCA National Model framework, or CSCPs, and may decrease role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout (Falls & Nichter, 2007; Moyer, 2011; Nelson et al., 2008; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Role conflict and role ambiguity occur when school counselors engage in non-counseling duties, which are outlined by the ASCA National Model. Moyer (2011) suggested that the “greater amount of time school counselors spent in non-counseling activities increased the likelihood of burnout” (p. 19). Overall, the review of relevant literature suggests that many factors have been identified that contribute to burnout in school counselors. Burnout and the variables contributing to its manifestation are complex, often with multidimensional factors influencing the overall construct (e.g., types of coping strategies; Wilkerson, 2009).

Young and Lambie (2007) described the intersection of increased role conflict and role ambiguity, leading to a decrease in school counselors’ wellness and the potential to increase burnout. Several suggestions were made for decreasing role conflict and role ambiguity in school counselors which included: (a) educating administrators of the unique professional roles and abilities (i.e., aligning with the ASCA National Model), (b) establishing a model of practice to educate stakeholders, (c) supporting school counselors’ professional development endeavors to protect from stress and role ambiguity, (d) collaborating with the hierarchy within the school system, (e) and engaging in supervision with peer supervision as an appropriate alternative (Young &
Lambie, 2007). Many of the proposed ideas by Young and Lambie align with practices of CSCPs and the ASCA National Model (2012).

Despite these findings, a review of the literature by this author yielded no studies that researched the impact of implementing the ASCA National Model on school counselors’ levels of burnout. The ASCA National Model has been shown to increase job satisfaction and perceived relationships with their principals in school counselors, which are factors related to impacting burnout (Pyne, 2011). Therefore, this study seeks to determine the potential effects implementing the ASCA National Model may have on burnout for school counselors.

Overall, the literature suggests interrelationships between several demographic variables, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, levels of role ambiguity, levels of role conflict, and levels of burnout within school counselors. Furthermore, the variables listed may impact the levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model (2012) for school counselors. Despite these findings, much of the school counseling literature on burnout was completed before the inception of the ASCA National Model. Therefore, this study seeks to determine the potential effects implementing the ASCA National Model into practice, demographic variables, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, levels of role ambiguity, and levels of role conflict may have on level of burnout in school counselors. To investigate the research questions, a multiple linear regression research design was employed and is illustrated in Chapter 2.
Summary of Chapter 1

This chapter outlined the study and its significance being addressed. An introduction was first provided, followed by the purpose and rationale of the study. The research question along with the research hypotheses and a statement of the problem were outlined. A definition of terms relevant to the research question was included. Finally, a review of the literature discussed the significance of the topic. It contained first, a history of the school counseling profession, followed by a description of the ASCA National Model, then research of the ASCA National Model, and concluded with a discussion on burnout in relation to the variables of the study. The next chapter contains the methodology of the study.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Chapter 2 begins with a discussion of the purpose and rationale of the study. The research questions, including the null and alternative hypotheses are identified. Methods of the study including the instruments, participants and inclusion criteria, data collection procedures, sampling, data analysis, and justification for the statistical analysis are included. Delimitations of the study follow and a chapter summary is provided at the conclusion of the chapter.

Purpose of the Study and Rationale

Burnout has been documented as a statistically significant concern for the school counseling profession throughout several decades (e.g., Moyer, 2011; Stickel, 1991, Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Burnout has been described as a combination of negative individual and environmental work factors that contribute to feelings of exhaustion and incompetence, devaluing clients, and deterioration in one’s personal life (S. M. Lee et al., 2007; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). School counselors may be adversely affected by burnout within their personal, ethical, and professional domains, having the potential to negatively impair client or student care and their personal life (Lee, Cho, et al., 2010). The American Counseling Association’s (ACA) Code of Ethics (2014) calls for counselors to be alert for signs of impairment and engage in preventative measure so it does not negatively affect client care. Similarly, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2010) identifies the importance of school counselors to practice wellness and ensure optimal effectiveness.
and competence within their practice. Therefore, identifying burnout and engaging in preventative measures with school counselors may have positive personal and professional implications.

Roles of school counselors have often become conflicted and ambiguous due to the changing educational system (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The difference between ideal roles learned in graduate school and actual roles on the job may lead to role ambiguity (Warnath & Shelton, 1976). Receiving conflicting messages on the role of the school counselor (i.e., counselor or educator first; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001) may lead to role conflict (Coll & Freeman, 1997). The ASCA first developed the ASCA National Model in 2003 for school counselors to integrate the framework into their comprehensive school counseling programs (ASCA, 2012). Main components of the ASCA National Model were to educate stakeholders (i.e., other school personnel, parents/guardians, community members, etc.) on the appropriate roles and duties of school counselors, provide a framework for practice, which included performing appropriate roles related to advocating for the needs of every student through a program-centered, comprehensive school counseling program, incorporating the National Standards for school counseling programs, and align the professional practice of school counselors with the educational standards of the school’s academic mission (ASCA, 2012). In spite of the ASCA National Model, school administrators and other personnel who are directly supervising school counselors (i.e., principals) often do not understand the appropriate roles of school counselors (e.g., Graham et al., 2011; Janson et al., 2008; Zalaquett, 2005). Therefore, misinformed understandings of school counselor roles can
steer school counselors to engage in inappropriate roles (e.g., administrative duties, clerical work, state testing coordination, etc.) on a daily basis, which can contribute to burnout (e.g., Moyer, 2011; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006).

The literature supports the linkage between role ambiguity and role conflict, and higher burnout levels in school counselors (e.g., Coll & Freeman, 1997; Lambie, 2006; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Review of the school counseling literature yielded a lack of discussion of the impact the ASCA National Model implementation may have on school counselors’ roles and susceptibility to burnout. This study seeks to determine the impact of the ASCA National Model implementation, demographic factors (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, estimated student-to-school counselor ratio, estimated amount of time engaged in supervision, estimated amount of time engaged in consultation, estimated percentage of time spend in counseling and non-counseling duties, and perceived principal support), perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict may have on the level of burnout for school counselors. Additionally, this study seeks to determine the extent to which demographic factors will predict the level of the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings for school counselors.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions, null hypotheses, and alternative hypotheses for this study are as follows:
Research Question One: Which of the following variables are significant predictors of the level of burnout in school counselors: level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict?

Null Hypothesis One: Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict will not predict the level of burnout in school counselors.

Alternative Hypothesis One: Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict.
level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predict the level of burnout in school counselors.

*Research Question Two:* What demographic and environmental factors can be used to explain the variance in the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings?

*Null Hypothesis Two:* Age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict will not predict the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model by school counselors in different school settings.

*Alternative Hypothesis Two:* Age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predict the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model by school counselors in different school settings.
Instruments

Instrumentation was chosen to gather data of implementation of the ASCA National Model, demographic variables, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, level of role conflict, and level of burnout in school counselors. Several instruments were included in the study. The School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens et al.; Appendix A) was included to measure implementation of the ASCA National Model. I obtained permission for the usage and reprinting of the SCPIS by the test creator and publisher for the Professional School Counseling journal under my former name of Heather Smith (Appendix B). The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1985; Appendix C) was included to measure perceived job satisfaction. Permission for the usage of the JSS was obtained through a blanket online permission and in exchange for sharing the results of the current study with the instrument developer under my former name of Heather Smith (Appendix D). The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4; S. Cohen et al., 1983; Appendix E) was included to measure perceived job stress. Permission for the usage of the PSS was granted through a blanket online permission under my former name of Heather Smith (Appendix F). The Brief COPE (Carver, 1997; Appendix G) was included to measure coping responses and styles. Permission for the usage of the Brief COPE was granted through a blanket online permission under my former name of Heather Smith (Appendix H). The Role Questionnaire (RQ; Rizzo et al., 1970; Appendix I) was included to measure levels of role ambiguity and role conflict. Permission for the usage and reprinting of the RQ was granted by the current editor of the Administrative Sciences
Quarterly journal under my former name of Heather Smith (Appendix J). The Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007; Appendix K) was included to measure levels of burnout. Permission for the usage and reprinting of the CBI was granted by the test creator under my former name of Heather Smith (Appendix L). In the subsequent sections, detailed descriptions of the instrumentations are provided.

Demographics Questionnaire (Appendix M)

A demographic questionnaire was created and used to gather information about participants in this study. Questions on the demographics portion included: (a) age, (b) sex, (c) race and ethnicity, (d) type of degree, (e) years of experience as a school counselor, (f) type of school district, (g) level of practice (i.e., grades you are responsible for, the total grades in your school setting, and the number of school counselors in your building(s)), (h) number of buildings responsible for, (i) approximate student-to-school counselor ratio, (j) estimated amount of time engaged in supervision, (k) estimated amount of time engaged in consultation, (l) estimated percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling related duties, and (m) perceived principal support.

School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010)

The SCPIS is a 20-item measurement inventory designed to measure the extent to which a school counseling program has implemented the ASCA National Model. Participants respond to the items of three subscales using a 4-point Likert scale to the degree to which it is currently implemented in the school’s counseling program (i.e., 1 = not present, 2 = development in progress, 3 = partly implemented, 4 = fully implemented). The SCPIS was normed on two samples of school counselors during data
collection. The first sample included 201 school counselors and the second sample included 136 school counselors (Clemens et al., 2010).

An exploratory factor analysis was completed with the two samples. A four factor model emerged with the 20 items. After deleting three items (Questions 6, 7, and 8), a two and three factor model was compared and found the three factor model allowed researchers to capture more precise aspects of the ASCA National Model program implementation and explained more variance of the intercorrelation matrix. The three factor model accounted for 54% of the variance of the intercorrelation matrix (Clemens et al., 2010). The first factor is the programmatic orientation aspect of implementing a program. A sample question on the SCPIS to measure subscale one, programmatic orientation, is “A written mission statement exists and is used as a foundation by all counselors.” Factor one is determined by summing items 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, and 14. Factor two comprises of items that are focused on school counselors’ use of software to manage student data and the use of data for school improvement. A sample question on the SCPIS to measure subscale two is “School counselors use computer software to analyze student data.” Factor two is determined by summing items 15, 16, and 17. Factor three is school counseling services delivery. A sample question on the SCPIS to measure subscale three is “Services are organized so that all students are well served and have access to them.” Factor three is determined by summing items 2, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, and 20 (Clemens et al., 2010). Cronbach’s alpha reliability estimates for factor one was $\alpha = 0.79$ (Clemens et al., 2010), factor two was $\alpha = 0.83$ (Clemens et al., 2010), and factor three was $\alpha = 0.81$ (Clemens et al., 2010).
Validity of the SCPIS was established by correlating participant scores with the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS) scores, a 40 item instrument developed by Scarborough (2005). The SCARS yielded four factors and the amount of variance of the factors were 47%; therefore, Clemens et al. (2010) determined that the initial steps in SCPIS development indicated preliminary evidence of psychometric suitability. The SCPIS and SCARS both measure school counselors’ activities but the SCPIS additionally allows researchers a way to measure characteristics of school counseling programs according to the ASCA National Model (Clemens et al., 2010). The SCPIS has limited test-retest reliability and further investigation is warranted for content, construct, and criterion-related validity. Due to the limited psychometric properties for the instrument and being a seminal instrument to measure the ASCA National Model implementation into practice, reliability and validity was completed with the SCPIS as part of this research study.

**Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1985)**

The JSS is a 36 item inventory designed to measure an individual’s perceived job satisfaction. Participants respond to the items on a six point Likert Scale ranging from 1 = disagree very much to 6 = agree very much (Spector, 1985). The total score for job satisfaction ranges from 36 to 216 with the higher the score, the higher job satisfaction experienced (Spector, 1994). Generally, total score ranges of 36 to 108 encompass dissatisfied workers, total score ranges of 108 and 144 encompass ambivalent workers, and total score ranges of 144 and 216 encompass satisfied workers (Spector, 1994).
The JSS consists of nine subscales and their internal consistency reliabilities are as follows on a sample of 2870: pay ($\alpha = 0.75$; Spector, 1985), promotion ($\alpha = 0.73$; Spector, 1985), supervision ($\alpha = 0.82$; Spector, 1985), fringe benefits ($\alpha = 0.73$; Spector, 1985), contingent rewards ($\alpha = 0.76$; Spector, 1985), operating procedures ($\alpha = 0.62$; Spector, 1985), coworkers ($\alpha = 0.60$; Spector, 1985), nature of work ($\alpha = 0.78$; Spector, 1985), and communication ($\alpha = 0.71$; Spector, 1985) with a total for all facets ($\alpha = 0.91$; Spector, 1985). An example question on the JSS is, “My job is enjoyable.” The JSS was originally constructed for and normed on the social services profession and later with 9,507 participants within the educational setting (job satisfaction score of $M = 135$, $SD = 7.3$; Spector, 2011) and 2,179 participants within the mental health profession (job satisfaction score of $M = 136.2$, $SD = 8.4$; Spector, 2011).

Reliability and validity has been established for the JSS. The test-retest reliability at an 18 month interval was 0.71 (Spector, 1985). Construct validity was established in the sample of human services professionals in the United States. Discriminant validity was relatively low at 0.19 to 0.59 (Spector, 1985). Convergent validity was established with the multi-trait method and estimated scores to range from 0.61 to 0.80 (Spector, 1985) and correlated with another well-recognized job satisfaction scale, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; P. C. Smith, Kendall, & Hulin 1969). The JDI was not constructed specifically for the human services professions and researchers have found it yielded lower scores with human service professionals than its norming sample (Frontz, 1978). The JSS has been utilized in research with the general workforce population, human services workers, child welfare workers, mental health workers, principals, and
others in the academic setting. A review of quality instruments measuring job satisfaction when considering their established reliability and validity revealed the JSS as a top measure (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003). Since the JSS was constructed specifically for the human services professions and it is a quality measure of job satisfaction, it was included in this study.

**Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4; S. Cohen et al., 1983)**

The PSS is a 4 item inventory designed to measure an individual’s perceived stress within the past one month. It was derived from the PSS scale originally consisting of 14 items and shortened to provide robust answers (i.e., items 2, 6, 7, 14 from the original PSS) in a community sample of individuals with a junior high school education or higher (S. Cohen et al., 1983). Participants respond to the items on a five point Likert Scale ranging from 0 = Never to 4 = Very Often. PSS-4 scores range from 0 to 20 (S. Cohen & Williamson, 1988). An example question of the PSS-4 is, “In the past month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?” The PSS-4 was determined to have adequate validity and be a better predictor of health-related outcomes in comparison to life-scale events used in the original norming sample (S. Cohen et al., 1983). However, the predictive validity of the PSS falls rapidly after four weeks due to it measuring stress of an individual within the past month (S. Cohen et al., 1983). S. Cohen and Williamson (1988) reported factorial validity with an exploratory factor analysis to account for 45.6% of the variance and criterion validity to be moderately related to other appraisals of stress (i.e., physical illness and other health behaviors). Similarly, an exploratory factor analysis reported the one factor structure.
accounted for 65.2% of the variance in a study by Mitchell, Crane, and Kim (2008). For criterion validity, the PSS-4 correlated with mental components ($r = -0.65$; Mitchell et al., 2008), and with physical components ($r = -0.27$; Mitchell et al., 2008) and with the PSS-10 ($r = 0.63$; Karam et al., 2012). Construct validity was upheld and frequency of physical illness, symptoms of physical illness, and high life dissatisfaction were positively reported to self-reported symptoms of stress on the PSS-4 (S. Cohen & Williamson, 1988). Validity of the PSS-4 has been upheld across several studies.

Reliability of the PSS-4 has been reported in several samples. Cronbach’s alpha, or internal consistency, was upheld in several studies: 0.60 (S. Cohen & Williamson, 1988), 0.89 (Mitchell et al., 2008), 0.79 (Karam et al., 2012), and 0.77 (Warttig, Forshaw, South, & White, 2013). Test-retest reliability for the PSS-4 was 0.85 after two days but 0.55 after six weeks (S. Cohen et al., 1983). Due to its goal of measuring stress within the previous month or less, the lower test-retest reliability is not an issue for the PSS-4. Overall, the PSS-4 has upheld both validity and reliability across several studies and an adequate measure to use for this study.

**Brief COPE (Carver, 1997)**

The Brief COPE is a 28-item inventory designed to measure coping responses or styles through a nine factor structure. It was derived from the original COPE scale (Carver et al., 1989) and shortened to provide robust answers with participants (Carver, 1997). It consists of 14 subscales and their internal reliabilities are as follows: active coping ($\alpha = 0.68$; Carver, 1997), planning ($\alpha = 0.73$; Carver, 1997), positive reframing ($\alpha = 0.64$; Carver, 1997), acceptance ($\alpha = 0.57$; Carver, 1997), humor ($\alpha = 0.73$; Carver,
1997), religion ($\alpha = 0.82; \text{Carver, 1997}$), using emotional support ($\alpha = 0.71; \text{Carver, 1997}$), using instrumental support ($\alpha = 0.64; \text{Carver, 1997}$), self-distractions ($\alpha = 0.71; \text{Carver, 1997}$), denial ($\alpha = 0.54; \text{Carver, 1997}$), venting ($\alpha = 0.50; \text{Carver, 1997}$), substance use ($\alpha = 0.90; \text{Carver, 1997}$), behavioral disengagement ($\alpha = 0.65; \text{Carver, 1997}$), and self-blame ($\alpha = 0.69; \text{Carver, 1997}$). For the present study, the subscale, Substance Use (e.g., Questions 4 and 11), was omitted because it inquired about participants’ alcohol and illegal drug use as coping responses or styles. It was determined that the questions were considered sensitive in nature and a high risk because they were requesting information that may put the participant’s job in question and not significantly related to the purpose of this study. The scale developer reported in a blanket online permission that researchers are able to use all of the scales of the Brief COPE or choose selected scales for use. Therefore, the Substance Use subscale was omitted and 26 questions of the Brief COPE were used for this study.

Participants respond to the items of these subscales using a 4-point Likert scale from 0 = I haven’t been doing this at all to 3 = I’ve been doing this a lot. A sample question on the Brief COPE includes, “I’ve been learning to live with it.” A pilot test was completed with a sample of community residents ($n = 168$) who were recovering after Hurricane Andrew and again completed at three and six month intervals ($n = 124$) and a third assessment one year later ($n = 126; \text{Carver, 1997}$). Nine of the factors accounted for 72.4% of the variance and all primary loadings were at least 0.40 (Carver, 1997). The factor structure shared many similarities to the original COPE measure. Due to the Brief COPE describing participants’ coping responses and styles after an operation,
this study describes the Brief COPE according to the original COPE (Carver et al., 1989) description at the outset of the scale within the survey:

We are interested in how people respond when they confront difficult or stressful events in their lives. There are lots of ways to try to deal with stress. This questionnaire asks you to indicate what you generally do and feel, when you experience stressful events. Obviously, different events bring out somewhat different responses, but think about what you usually do when you are under a lot of stress. (p. 271)

Validity of the Brief COPE has been upheld in several studies. Content validity of the Brief COPE was found by Cooper, Katona, and Livingston (2008) in carers of people with dementia with three subscales: emotion-focused (α = 0.72), problem-focused (α = 0.84), and dysfunctional coping (α = 0.75). Test-retest reliability for the three subscales over a year time span was demonstrated and did not change significantly (r = 0.58, r = 0.72, and r = 0.68). Construct validity was upheld when correlating with attachment scores, social support, and the coping subscales (i.e., emotion-focused coping correlated with problem-focused coping correlated with dysfunctional coping, avoidant attachment, and higher burden; Cooper et al., 2008).

A three factor model of coping styles was also reported in people with a mild traumatic brain injury (Snell, Siegert, Hay-Smith, and Surgenor, 2011). The Brief COPE has upheld construct validity in a sample of Greek-speaking adults (Kapsou, Panayiotou, Kokkinos, & Demetriou, 2010) and women with breast cancer (Yusoff, Low, & Yip, 2010). Overall, the Brief COPE has upheld validity and reliability across studies and was
included as a psychometric instrument in this study to measure coping responses and styles in the sample of school counselors.

**Role Questionnaire (RQ; Rizzo et al., 1970)**

The RQ is a 14-item inventory designed to measure the degree of role conflict and role ambiguity a person has about his or her job. There are two subscales of one which measures role conflict and one which measures role ambiguity. The two factors accounted for 56% of the common variance of the original 30 items (Rizzo et al., 1970). Participants respond to the 14 items of these subscales using a 7-point Likert scale from 1=Very False to 7=Very True.

Role conflict is defined as the “dimensions of congruency-incongruency or compatibility-incompatibility in the requirements of the role, where congruency or compatibility is judged relative to a set of standards or conditions which impinge upon role performance” (Rizzo et al., 1970, p.155). A sample question on the RQ to measure role conflict is “I have to do things that should be done differently.” Items one through eight comprise the role conflict subscale of the RQ. Role ambiguity is defined as:

The predictability of the outcome or responses to one’s behavior and the existence or clarity of behavioral requirements, often in terms of inputs from the environment, which would serve to guide behavior and provide knowledge that the behavior is appropriate. (Rizzo et al., 1970, pp. 155-156)

A sample question on the RQ to measure role ambiguity is “I feel certain about how much authority I have.” Items nine through 14 comprise the role ambiguity subscale of the RQ.
The RQ has upheld construct validity and reliability throughout several studies. Coefficient alpha was estimated at 0.82 for the role conflict subscale and ranged from 0.78 to 0.81 for the role ambiguity subscale in the original study (Rizzo et al., 1970). Schuler, Aldag, and Brief (1977) found an internal reliability average of 0.75 (range of 0.40 to 0.96) for six occupational groups (nursing, manufacturing, public utility, public utility communications, hospital service workers, and nursing aids) and reasonable stability in test-retest reliability after seven months. Schuler et al. (1977) reported all factor congruencies of samples exceeded 0.8 for both role conflict and role ambiguity. In a study by Schwab, Iwanicki, and Pierson (1983) of the RQ with teachers, further validation was provided by a principal component analysis of the RQ. Cronbach coefficient alpha internal consistency reliability were satisfactory at 0.85 for the role conflict scale and 0.86 for role ambiguity scale and factorial validity was synonymous with the structure of the RQ (Schwab et al., 1983).

The Role Questionnaire has been used in studies and factor analyzed across disciplines for several decades and consistently found the two distinct factors or concepts of Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity (Schuler et al., 1977). Additionally, Freeman and Coll (1997) completed a confirmatory factor analysis of the RQ with a sample of high school counselors and found a third factor in their sample, Role Incongruence, or the actual roles performed and the roles believed should be performed (factor loadings between 0.69 and 0.78), in addition to role conflict (factor loadings between 0.61 and 0.80), and role ambiguity (factor loadings between 0.63 and 0.86) subscales. The
findings by Freeman and Coll (1997) maintained construct validity of the RQ in a sample of school counselors.

A review of the school counseling literature by this author yielded the RQ as a frequently utilized instrument measuring role conflict and role ambiguity. Wilkerson (2009) reported satisfactory Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for his study with school counselors ($\alpha = 0.83$ for Role Conflict, $\alpha = 0.90$ for Role Ambiguity, and $\alpha = 0.78$ for Role Incongruence). Additionally, Wilkerson and Bellini (2006) reported satisfactory Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for their study with school counselors ($\alpha = 0.75$ for Role Conflict, $\alpha = 0.90$ for Role Ambiguity, and $\alpha = 0.85$ for Role Incongruence). Lastly, the RQ was used with school counselor participants by Culbreth et al. (2005) but no psychometric properties were reported in their study. The psychometrics of the RQ have been supported but outdated. Therefore, reliability and validity analyses were completed in this study with the sample of school counselors.

**Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007)**

The CBI is a 20-item inventory designed to measure counselor burnout through a five factor structure. The subscales are negative work environment, devaluing clients, deterioration in personal life, exhaustion, and incompetence. The five factors accounted for 66.97% of the total variance with all factors strongly associated with one another. Participants respond to the items of these subscales using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 = never true to 5 = always true. Two pilot tests with exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis were conducted that supported the factors. Across samples, factor ratings for the items ranged from 0.24 to 0.69. Additionally, Rasch analysis was
conducted and found the five category scoring was appropriate for the CBI (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). The CBI subscales were correlated with the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS) subscales assessing burnout. Concurrent, convergent, and criterion-related validity were found with the CBI. For convergent validity, the correlation for emotional exhaustion between the MBI-HSS and CBI was \( r = .73, p < .01 \), negative work environment was \( r = .62, p < .01 \), deterioration in personal life was \( r = .62, p < .01 \), devaluing client was \( r = .31, p < .01 \), and incompetence was \( r = .30, p < .01 \) (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). To determine criterion-related validity, the CBI subscales were correlated with job satisfaction and self-esteem scales. Job satisfaction on the MBI-HSS was negatively correlated with negative work environment, \( r = -.53, p < .01 \), exhaustion, \( r = -.46, p < .01 \), deterioration in personal life, \( r = -.33, p < .01 \), and devaluing client, \( r = -.31, p < .01 \) (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). The incompetence subscale on the CBI negatively correlated with the self-esteem subscale on the MBI-HSS, \( r = -.31, p < .01 \) (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). The five factor structure of the CBI has been upheld with a confirmatory factor analysis in samples of Sexual Offender and Sexual Abuse Therapists (J. Lee, Wallace, et al., 2010) and school counselors (Gnilka, Karpinski, & Smith, 2015).

For reliability, Cronbach’s alpha was 0.88 and ranged from 0.73 to 0.85 on the subscales in the second pilot test. Test-retest reliability completed again after six weeks for sample two found a Pearson product moment correlation ranging from 0.72 to 0.85 for the subscales (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). Overall, validity and reliability has been upheld for the CBI and appropriate to measure burnout in school counselors. This
section described the instrumentations utilized in the present study. The next section describes the participants for the present study.

**Participants**

Participation in this study was voluntary. Participants included currently practicing school counselors in schools with grades kindergarten through 12th within the United States. Participants held a master’s degree or higher in school counseling with at least one year of working as a full-time school counselor. A full-time worker was defined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics (2015) as persons who work 35 or more hours per week. All participants were current members of the ASCA, the national organization for school counselors. Exclusion criteria included school counselors who were not employed full-time, long term school counselor subs, school counselors-in-training, school counselor educators, and those who were retired from the profession. Detailed descriptions of the participants’ demographic data are outlined in the next paragraph.

**Sampling**

A convenience sample based on who voluntarily responded was completed and stratified by each state to distribute the instruments (Dimitrov, 2009). Based on this sampling, emails were sent to approximately 20% of currently practicing school counselors in each of the 50 United States and the District of Columbia. Therefore, a total of 4,000 school counselors were contacted across the United States. All of the individuals were members of the ASCA and their contact information was obtained from the ASCA online membership directory.
An alpha of 0.05 and a moderate effect size (J. Cohen, 1992) was maintained for all statistical procedures in this study. A power analysis was completed in G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009) to determine the minimum sample size and ensure an adequate sampling for results. To determine the necessary sample size for the analysis with a power of 0.80 and assuming a moderate effect size of 0.15 in the multiple regression analysis and an error probability (alpha) of .05, the minimum sample was determined to include at least 200 participants for the current study (J. Cohen, 1992).

The research variables included in the present study were: (a) age as a continuous variable, (b) sex as a categorical variable, (c) race and ethnicity as a categorical variable, (d) type of degree as a categorical variable, (e) years of experience as a school counselor as a continuous variable, (f) type of school district as a categorical variable, (g) level of practice as a categorical variable, (h) number of buildings served as a continuous variable, (i) student-to-school counselor ratio as a continuous variable, (j) estimated amount of time engaged in supervision as a continuous variable, (k) estimated amount of time engaged in consultation as a categorical variable, (l) estimated percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling related duties as a continuous variable, (m) perceived principal support as a continuous variable, (n) perceived job satisfaction as measure by the JSS, (o) perceived job stress as measured by the PSS-4, (p) coping responses and styles as measured by the Brief COPE, (q) level of role ambiguity as measured by the RQ, (r) level of role conflict as measured by the RQ, (s) level of the ASCA National Model implementation as measured by the SCPIS, and (t) level of burnout as measured by the CBI.
Procedures

Approval was secured for this study by Kent State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB; Appendix N). This researcher contacted the national organization, the ASCA, to obtain email addresses from their online membership directory to recruit participants. This researcher is a member of the ASCA and the email addresses were obtained as a membership benefit. The online directory of membership information enabled me to obtain school counselors’ email addresses by state and current practice (i.e., Grades K-12 school counselors and exclude counselor educators, students, and retired members). The ASCA Member Directory contained 19,510 currently practicing school counselors within the 50 United States and the District of Columbia.

The instruments were constructed in Qualtrics (2013), an online portal endorsed for use by Kent State University. A voluntary invitation (Appendix O) was emailed to participants who were members of the ASCA. The email invitation (Appendix O) provided a basic description of the purpose of the study, explained the requirements of the study, described an incentive to participate in the study, and included a link to the website where the instruments were located. A second email reminder was sent to participants who had not yet completed the instruments two weeks later (Appendix P). A third email reminder was sent two weeks after the second email reminder to participants who had not yet completed the instruments (Appendix Q). Reminder emails were sent from Qualtrics (2013) only to participants who had not yet completed the instruments. Qualtrics allowed this researcher to track the number of participants emailed ($N = 4,000$) and the response rate ($N = 208$) for the study.
Participants were prompted in the emails to click on the link to the instruments in Qualtrics (2013) if interested in completing the instruments. Clicking the link took participants to the informed consent page (see Appendix R). The informed consent (Appendix R) included a detailed description of the study and the approximate time it would take to complete the instruments (i.e., approximately 20 minutes). This allowed the participants to decide whether or not they were interested in completing the instruments. The participants were given the opportunity to print the informed consent for their records before completing the instruments. Once participants agreed to the informed consent by clicking on “I agree/Next,” they were directed to the study instruments. The instruments included the demographics questionnaire, the SCPIIS, the JSS, the PSS-4, the Brief COPE, the RQ, and the CBI. If participants clicked on “I don’t agree” to the informed consent, they were directed to the end of the study and no data were collected on those individual participants.

There were no anticipated risks to participants who completed the instruments beyond those encountered in a normal day of life. However, a statement in the informed consent was included to address any potential risks. If at any point a participant experienced psychological discomfort during or after the completion of the instruments, they were urged to seek psychological services in their area (e.g., counseling) from someone they trust. If they are unfamiliar with the psychological resources in their area, they were prompted to contact this author to direct them to services in their geographic area. Additionally, this researcher did not ask sensitive information that may damage their reputation nor would the data be linked to any of the participants’ work settings.
Once the participants had the opportunity to review and respond to all of the instruments’ questions, their participation was considered complete. After participants reviewed and responded to the instruments, they were thanked for their participation and prompted to follow a separate link in Qualtrics (2013) to provide their email addresses if they wanted to be included in a lottery drawing for a chance to win one of two $50 Amazon gift cards. A description of the lottery drawing was described in the recruitment emails, informed consent, and at the conclusion of the instruments. All participants who completed the instruments and entered the drawing were eligible to win the gift cards. The link to the lottery drawing was separate from the Qualtrics (2013) instruments so no connection between participants’ responses and their emails for the incentive could be made. Two participants were randomly selected in a lottery drawing to receive a $50 Amazon gift card. Each randomly selected participant was notified via email of being the receiver of a $50 Amazon gift card. The randomly selected participants were required to fill out and return a Research Participants Receipts (i.e., RPR-1) form to this researcher. Upon completing and returning the RPR-1 form, the gift cards were distributed to the participants. This researcher collected the RPR-1 forms from the participants and they were kept in a separate locked safe from the participants’ data. Participants who were chosen as winners of the incentive (e.g., $50 Amazon gift card) were notified once data analyses were completed. There were no linkages to the lottery drawing winners and participants’ data. Once the prizes were awarded, all email addresses were discarded.

The completed information from each participant was downloaded from the Qualtrics (2013) website and into the software, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
(SPSS; IBM Corp., 2015) version 23 on a secure computer. The information transferred to SPSS included the demographic questionnaire information, responses to the SPIS, JSS, PSS-4, Brief COPE, RQ, and CBI. Instrument responses and email information was kept on a password-protected computer to ensure confidentiality was maintained for all participants. Minimal risk to anonymity existed to the same extent as any transactions on a secure server. The email addresses for the $50 visa gift cards incentive were downloaded in a separate location and kept on a password-protected computer to ensure confidentiality for all participants and that the information was not connected to any information from the original research instruments.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis began once data collection was completed. The data were downloaded, coded, and analyzed using SPSS version 23 (IBM Corp., 2015). Confirmatory analyses were completed for the SCPIS and RQ with LISREL version 9.1 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2015). First, descriptive statistics were completed to summarize the predictor and criterion variables. Next, correlational analyses were completed to determine the strength and relationship between each variable. Additionally, psychometric analyses were completed with two of the instruments (i.e., SCPIS and RQ). Finally, multiple linear regression analyses were completed to test the research questions in the current study.

Descriptive statistics were completed for each of the variables in the present study. Mean scores and standard deviations were reported for all predictor variables (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district,
level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role conflict, and level of role ambiguity) and criterion variables (i.e., the CBI for research question one and the SCPIS for research question two). See Table 1 (in Chapter 3) for the descriptive statistics of the continuous variables for the present study. Frequency counts were reported for all categorical data (i.e., sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, and amount of time engaged in consultation; Dimitrov, 2009). See Table 2 (in Chapter 3) for the descriptive statistics of the categorical variables for the present study.

In addition to descriptive statistics, correlational analyses were completed to determine the relationships between all pairs of data in this study including the predictor and criterion variables (Dimitrov, 2009). Multicollinearity was checked to determine if there were high levels of correlations between any of the predictor variables (Dimitrov, 2009). This step also allowed the researcher to determine whether any variables (i.e., perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, and coping responses and styles) affected the strength or direction of the relationship (or interaction) between the other variables in the study.

Psychometric analyses were completed for two of the instruments (e.g., SCPIS and RQ). Assumptions of linearity, independence, normality, and homoscedasticity were tested for the SCPIS, JSS, PSS-4, Brief COPE, RQ, and CBI (Dimitrov, 2009). To test
for internal consistency reliability of the instruments, coefficient alphas (Cronbach, 1951) were tested and reported for the SCPIS, JSS, PSS-4, Brief COPE, and CBI.

To test the construct validity of the SCPIS and RQ, confirmatory analyses were completed using LISREL 9.1 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2015). Confirmatory analyses were appropriate for the SCPIS and RQ to confirm the factor structure and model fit of the instruments based upon the theoretical and empirical research of the instruments (Dimitrov, 2009). Evaluating the confirmatory analysis model accuracy of each instrument was evaluated within the criteria specified by Dimitrov. Finally, testing of model parameters for statistical significance was completed to determine the model fit for the SCPIS and RQ. Results of the CFAs were reported for the current study.

Multiple linear regression analyses were completed to test the research questions. An alpha level of 0.05 was specified to achieve statistical significance and maintained to limit the potential of a Type I error. A multiple linear regression analysis was selected in order to explain the extent of impact the ASCA National Model and the additional independent variables had on predicting the levels of burnout in school counselors. A multiple linear regression analysis was also utilized to explain the extent of impact the independent variables predicted the levels of implementing the ASCA National Model for school counselors. A multiple linear regression analysis was an appropriate procedure to analyze the data because it is a statistical procedure that explores individual and collective predictive or explanatory contributions of more than one independent variable to the dependent variable (Dimitrov, 2009).
Delimitations

Due to the research question, there were limitations for participation in this study. The study was limited to currently practicing full-time school counselors with at least one year of professional experience. The study did not include students currently training for a school counselor licensure or certification (i.e., practicum or internship). The participants excluded school counselor educators and counselor educators, school counselors who have retired, other mental health professionals working within the school (i.e., school social workers, school psychologists, school based mental health workers, etc.), and other mental health professionals. Participation was limited to current members of the ASCA who were currently working full-time in a school setting within the United States. Additionally, the study was sent out during the summer months, after the conclusion of the school year (i.e., mid-July and August) when responsibilities (i.e., high stakes testing, end of the year activities, etc.) and fatigue may not have been recently high for school counselors.

To address the research questions in the current study, quantitative research procedure (i.e., multiple linear regression analysis) was completed and the most suitable approach to answer the research questions. Qualitative research methods were not selected because the research questions were not suited for qualitative inquiry. For example, one type of qualitative research methodology (i.e., phenomenology) focuses on gaining insights into the lived experiences of the participants. This may provide in depth information on the topics of the ASCA National Model implementation and level of burnout of school counselors but does not allow for explanation or prediction of the
independent variables on the dependent variables in the current research questions. The delimitations outline the focus of the study and participants as well as who was included and excluded throughout the study.

**Summary of Chapter 2**

Chapter 2 focused on the methodology of the research study. The purpose and rationale, along with the research hypotheses were described. Procedures for sampling participants and completing the study were detailed. The statistical procedures for data analysis were presented. The chapter concluded with a description of the delimitations of the study.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The following chapter provides a detailed description of the results from the present study. First, a summary of sampling procedures is described. Next, descriptive statistics of all the continuous variables and frequency of categorical variables are reported, followed by results for correlational coefficients of continuous variables for the research questions. Confirmatory analyses results are described for the School Counselor Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010) and the Role Questionnaire (RQ; Rizzo et al., 1970). Finally, multiple linear regression analyses results are reported, identifying the multivariate contributions of variables that predict or explain the level of burnout (e.g., research question one) and level of implementation of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model (2012; e.g., research question two) for the school counselor participants in the present study. The chapter concludes with a summary of significant findings for this study.

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the ASCA National Model implementation, demographic factors (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, estimated student-to-school counselor ratio, estimated amount of time engaged in supervision, estimated amount of time engaged in consultation, estimated percentage of time spend in counseling and non-counseling duties, and perceived principal support), perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict may have
on the level of burnout in school counselors. Additionally, this study sought to determine
the extent to which demographic and environmental factors predicted the level of the
ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings for school counselors.
Hypotheses were generated based upon the research questions.

*Research Question One*: Which of the following variables are significant
predictors of the level of burnout in school counselors: level of implementation of the
ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience,
type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school
counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in
consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived
principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and
styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict?

*Null Hypothesis One*: Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age,
sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level
of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time
engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent
in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job
satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity,
and level of role conflict will not predict the level of burnout in school counselors.

*Alternative Hypothesis One*: Level of implementation of the ASCA National
Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school
district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio,
amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predict the level of burnout in school counselors.

*Research Question Two:* What demographic and environmental factors can be used to explain the variance in the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings?

*Null Hypothesis Two:* Age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict will not predict the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model by school counselors in different school settings.

*Alternative Hypothesis Two:* Age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predict the
level of implementation of the ASCA National Model by school counselors in different school settings.

**Sampling**

Four thousand school counselors who were members of the ASCA received an initial email (Appendix O) requesting their participation in this study. A reminder email (Appendix P) was sent out to potential participants who had not completed the survey two weeks after the original recruitment email. Finally, a second reminder email (Appendix Q) was sent out two weeks after the reminder email to participants who had not yet participated in the study. Overall, the data collection process took place over 41 days, and 208 participants, a response rate of 5.2%, fully completed the study.

**Descriptive Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics were collected for this study. These results included all of the predictor (e.g., independent) and criterion (e.g., dependent) variables. Descriptive statistics were reported for the demographic data (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, and perceived principal support). Means and standard deviations were calculated for all continuous variables and reported in Table 1. Frequencies were calculated for all categorical variables and reported in Table 2.
Table 1

*Demographic Data of Continuous Predictor Variables (N = 208)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience as a school counselor</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buildings served</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-to-school counselor ratio</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time engaged in supervision in minutes per month</td>
<td>62.43</td>
<td>129.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time spent in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling duties per week</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>19.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-counseling duties per week</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived principal support</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Demographic Data of Categorical Predictor Variables (N = 208)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi Racial/Multi Racial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not of Hispanic Origin)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S./M.Ed./MA.Ed. in School Counseling</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A./M.S./M.Ed./MA.Ed. in Clinical Mental Health Counseling, or mental health degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or Ed.D.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten-6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple grades</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buildings served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time engaged in consultation in hours per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Data

Age. Demographic data were collected regarding the age of each participant for this study. As outlined in Table 1, the average age was 45.77 years old with a standard deviation of 10.18. The ranges of ages were from 25 to 67 years old. The majority of participants in this study identified as being in their 40s.

Sex. Demographic data were collected regarding the sex of each participant for this study. As outlined in Table 2, there were more females \((n = 151, 72.6\%)\) who participated in the study than males \((n = 57, 27.4\%)\). No participants identified as other. Therefore, the majority of participants in this study identified as female.

Race and ethnicity. Demographic data were collected regarding the race and ethnicity of each participant for this study. As outlined in Table 2, the highest representation were White (not of Hispanic Origin) participants \((n = 178, 85.6\%)\). The next highest frequency were African American/Black (not of Hispanic Origin) participants \((n = 18, 8.7\%)\). The third highest frequency were Hispanic participants \((n = 7, 3.4\%)\) followed by Asian/Pacific Islander participants \((n = 4, 1.9\%)\). The fifth highest frequency were American Indian/Alaskan Native participants \((n = 3, 1.4\%)\). Lastly, there were \((n = 4, 1.9\%)\) participants who identified as Bi Racial/Multi Racial. Therefore, the majority of participants identified as White (not of Hispanic Origin) for this study.

Type of degree. Demographic data were collected regarding the type of degree for each participant in the study. The demographic questionnaire requested participants check the type of degree he or she held and included the following degrees: M.A., M.S., M.Ed., or MA.Ed. in School Counseling, M.A., M.S., M.Ed., or MA.Ed. in Clinical
Mental Health Counseling or Community Counseling, Master’s Degree in Social Work, Ph.D., Ed.D., and a text box to specify “other” degree. The data regarding participants’ type of degree were reviewed. No participants reported holding a Master’s Degree in Social Work. The “other” specified degrees participants reported were variations of a M.A., M.S., M.Ed., or MA.Ed. in Clinical Mental Health Counseling or Community Counseling degree. Therefore, the “other” specified degrees were included or blocked with the M.A., M.S., M.Ed., or MA.Ed. in Clinical Mental Health Counseling or Community Counseling degree participants. Additionally, the Ph.D. and Ed.D. participants were coded into one category. As outlined in Table 2, the highest representation of participants reported holding an M.A., M.S., M.Ed., or MA.Ed. in School Counseling ($n = 162, 77.9\%$). The second highest frequency were participants who reported holding a Ph.D. or Ed. D ($n = 29, 13.9\%$). The third highest frequency were participants who reported holding an M.A., M.S., M.Ed., or MA.Ed. in Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Community Counseling, or another mental health degree ($n = 17, 8.2\%$). Therefore, the majority of participants held a master’s degree or higher in School Counseling.

**Years of experience as a school counselor.** Demographic data were collected regarding the years of experience as a school counselor of each participant for this study. As outlined in Table 1, the average years of experience was $13.62$ years of experience as a school counselor with a standard deviation of $7.56$. The years of experience as a school counselor ranged from $2$ to $40$ or more years.
Type of school district. Demographic data were collected regarding the type of school district each participant worked within for this study. As outlined in Table 2, the highest representation of participants reported working in the suburban setting ($n = 89, 42.8\%$). The second highest frequency were participants working in the rural setting ($n = 68, 32.7\%$). The third highest frequency were participants working in the urban setting ($n = 51, 24.5\%$). Therefore, the majority of participants worked in the suburban school setting for this study.

Level of practice. Demographic data were collected regarding level of practice of each participant for this study. Level of practice was categorized similarly to Wilkerson’s (2009) classification of school counselors with elementary school setting encompassing grades K–6, middle school setting encompassing grades 7–8, and the high school setting encompassing grades 9–12. As outlined in Table 2, the highest frequency of participants who worked in the elementary setting (i.e., grades K–6; $n = 71, 34.1\%$). The second highest frequency were participants who reported their level of practice to be within the high school setting (i.e., grades 9–12; $n = 52, 25.0\%$). The third highest frequency were participants who reported their level of practice to be within the middle school setting (i.e., grades 7–8; $n = 14, 6.7\%$). Additionally, 71 participants (34.1%) reported working in multiple grade levels (e.g., K–8; K–12, etc.). Therefore, the majority of participants worked in the elementary school setting or multiple grade levels for this study.

Number of buildings served. Demographic data were collected regarding number of buildings served of each participant for this study. As outlined in Table 2, 186
participants (89.4%) reported working and being responsible for one building, 12 participants (5.8%) reported working and being responsible for two buildings, five participants (2.4%) reported working and being responsible for three buildings, two participants (1.0%) reported working and being responsible for four buildings, and three participants (1.4%) reported working and being responsible for five or more buildings. As outlined in Table 1, participants reported a mean score of 1.19 buildings served with a standard deviation of 0.66. Therefore, the majority of participants for this study worked in one building.

**Student-to-school counselor ratio.** Demographic data were collected regarding the student-to-school counselor ratio of each participant for this study. Participants were asked to choose the average of student-to-school counselor ratio by 100 person increments (i.e., less than 100 students, 101 to 200 students, etc.). The student-to-school counselor ratio ranged from less than 100 to 1,400 students on a caseload. As outlined in Table 1, participants reported a mean score of 459 students-to-school counselors and standard deviation of 201. In addition to the student-to-school counselor ratio, participants reported a mean score of 2.23 school counselors, including themselves, in their building with a standard deviation of 1.59. Therefore, the majority of participants had a mean student-to-school counselor ratio of 459:1 for this study and worked with at least one additional school counselor in their building.

**Amount of time engaged in supervision.** Demographic data were collected regarding the amount of time each participant engaged in supervision in minutes on a monthly basis for this study. As outlined in Table 1, participants reported a range of not
engaging in supervision to 1,025 minutes of supervision on a monthly basis. Eighty four (40.4%) participants reported engaging in no supervision on a monthly basis. The overall mean score and standard deviation for supervision time was skewed because 207 participants reported engaging in none to 600 hours of supervision in minutes on a monthly basis and one participant reported engaging in 1,025 minutes of supervision in a month. However, when the participant’s skewed data were removed from the data analysis, it did not significantly impact the results. Therefore, all of the participants’ data for the amount of time engaged in supervision remain in the data analysis. Therefore, participants reported a mean monthly supervision score of 62.43 minutes with a standard deviation of 129.19. Immediate supervisors included 115 (66.1%) principals, 30 (17.2%) senior level school counselors, 16 (9.2%) other mental health professionals, and 12 (6.9%) other professionals serving as supervisors to the school counselor participants. Therefore, the majority of participants had an average amount of 62 minutes of supervision monthly with principals primarily serving in the role of supervisors.

**Amount of time engaged in consultation.** Demographic data were collected regarding the amount of time each participant engaged in consultation on a monthly basis for this study. The wording of this question was constructed based on previous research (i.e., Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Moyer, 2011). The variable, amount of time engaged in consultation, was constructed and reported in a manner in which it can be interpreted as a continuous and categorical variable. Regarding categorical analysis, as outlined in Table 2, 26 (26; 12.5%) participants reported they engaged in none to five hours of consultation monthly, 48 (23.1%) participants reported they engaged in six to 10 hours of consultation
monthly, 45 (21.6%) participants reported they engaged in 11 to 15 hours of consultation monthly, 45 (21.6%) participants reported they engaged in 16 to 20 hours of consultation monthly, and 44 (21.2%) participants reported they engaged in 21 hours or more of consultation monthly. Consultation hours were then converted into a continuous variable for data analysis (i.e., 1 = participants reported they engaged in none to five hours of consultation monthly, 2 = participants reported they engaged in six to 10 hours of consultation monthly, 3 = participants reported they engaged in 11 to 15 hours of consultation monthly, 4 = participants reported they engaged in 16 to 20 hours or more of consultation monthly). Participants reported a mean of 3.16 (e.g., category of 11 to 15 hours) of consultation monthly with a standard deviation of 1.33. Participants were asked to reported various professionals in which they engaged in consultation on a monthly basis with 201 participants engaged in consultation with teachers, 197 participants engaged in consultation with parents, 200 participants engaged in consultation with principals or administrators, 160 engaged in consultation with other mental health professions, and 185 engaged in consultation with other school counselors on a monthly basis. Therefore, participants had a varying range of engaging in none to 21 or more hours with an average of 11 to 15 hours of consultation on a monthly basis, with teachers, parents, and other school and mental health professionals.

**Percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties.**

Demographic data were collected regarding the percentage of time each participant spent in counseling and non-counseling duties each week for this study. As outlined in Table 1, participants reported spending an average amount of 72.22% of their time in
counseling related duties each week ($M = 72.22, SD = 19.46$). Participants spent from 20% to 100% of their time in counseling duties each week. Participants reported spending an average amount of 25.80% of their time in non-counseling duties each week ($M = 25.80; SD = 17.80$). Participants ranged from none to 80% of their time spent in non-counseling duties each week. Therefore, the majority of participants spent an average amount of 72.22% of their time in counseling duties and 25.80% of their time in non-counseling duties each week.

**Perceived principal support.** Demographic data were collected regarding the amount of perceived principal support for each participant in this study. The range of support was based on a Likert scale of one to five with a score of one feeling completely unsupported and a score of five representing feeling completely supported. As outlined in Table 1, participants reported a mean score of 4.04 perceived principal support with a standard deviation of 0.98. No participants reported feeling completely unsupported by their principals. Additionally, 105 (50.5%) school counselors reported their principal had appropriate knowledge of their job duties according to the ASCA National Model whereas 103 (49.5%) principals did not have knowledge of the ASCA National Model. Therefore, participants reported, on average, feeling supported by their principals and approximately half of the principals knew of their appropriate job roles according to the ASCA National Model.

**Instrumentation**

Descriptive statistics were reported for the instruments used in this study to test the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model (SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010),
perceived job satisfaction (JSS; Spector, 1985), perceived job stress (PSS-4; S. Cohen et al., 1983), coping responses and styles (Brief COPE; Carver, 1997), level of role ambiguity (items 9-12 of the RQ; Rizzo et al., 1970), level of role conflict (items 1-8 of the RQ; Rizzo et al., 1970), and level of burnout (CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007) in school counselors. Total scores were reported for all instruments. Assumptions of linearity, independence, normality, and homoscedasticity were tested for the SCPIS, JSS, PSS-4, Brief COPE, RQ, and CBI (Dimitrov, 2009). Assumptions were met for all instrumentations used in this study. To test for internal consistency reliability of the instruments, coefficient alphas (Cronbach, 1951) were tested and reported for the SCPIS, JSS, PSS-4, Brief COPE, RQ and its subscales (i.e., role ambiguity and role conflict), and CBI. Results of the instrumentations are outlined in Table 3.

Table 3

*Qualities of Instrumentations (N = 208)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCPIS</td>
<td>25-80</td>
<td>59.43</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>82-204</td>
<td>143.40</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS-4</td>
<td>4-19</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief COPE</td>
<td>26-87</td>
<td>60.61</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA subscale</td>
<td>9-42</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC subscale</td>
<td>7-50</td>
<td>30.59</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI</td>
<td>20-74</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SCPIS.** The coefficient alpha and scores were calculated for the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model using the SCPIS (Clemens et al., 2010). The original analysis of the 20 items for the SCPIS completed by Clemens et al. yielded a coefficient alpha of .81. The internal consistency reliability of the SCPIS was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .92. Scores on the SCPIS ranged from 25 to 80 with a mean score of 59.43 and standard deviation of 11.78 for the current sample of participants. The majority of participants reported having partly implemented the majority of the ASCA National Model into their practices.

**JSS.** The coefficient alpha and scores were calculated for perceived job satisfaction of school counselors using the JSS (Spector, 1985). The original analysis of the 36 items for the JSS completed by Spector yielded a coefficient alpha of .91. The internal consistency reliability of the JSS was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .92. Scores on the JSS for the current sample ranged from 82 to 204 with a mean score of 143.40 and standard deviation of 25.42. The mean score of 143.40 describes participants at the cutoff between ambivalent (i.e., scores of 108 to 144) and satisfied (i.e., scores of 144 or higher) with their jobs.

**PSS-4.** The coefficient alpha and scores were calculated for perceived job stress of school counselors using the PSS-4 (S. Cohen et al., 1983). The original analysis of the four items for the PSS-4 completed by S. Cohen et al. yielded a coefficient alpha of .72. The internal consistency reliability of the PSS-4 was tested with the current sample of participants and a value of .77 was obtained. Scores of the PSS-4 for the current sample
ranged from 4 to 19 with a mean score of 8.22 and standard deviation of 2.93. Overall, the participants reported a moderate level of perceived job stress.

**Brief COPE.** The coefficient alpha and scores were calculated for coping responses and styles using the Brief COPE (Carver, 1997). The original analysis of the 28 items for the Brief COPE completed by Carver reported coefficient alphas for each of the 14 subscales, yielding results between .90 and .50. The internal consistency reliability of the JSS was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .86. Scores of the Brief COPE for the current sample ranged from 26 to 87 with a mean score of 60.61 and a standard deviation of 11.22. Overall, participants reported utilizing various coping responses and styles as a school counselor.

**RQ.** The coefficient alpha and scores were calculated for levels of role ambiguity and role conflict using the RQ (Rizzo et al., 1970). The original analysis by Rizzo et al. (1970) of the 14 items for the RQ did not report an overall internal consistency reliability score because the two subscales or factors (i.e., level of role ambiguity and level of role conflict) were deemed independent constructs based on their intercorrelations. The Cronbach’s (1951) alpha is an index of internal consistency of the items of the instrument. The internal consistency reliability of the overall RQ (i.e., 14 items) was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .55. Therefore, the overall RQ scale had low reliability due to it measuring two distinct constructs. Therefore, the coefficient alphas were calculated separately for role ambiguity (i.e., items 9-14) and role conflict (i.e., items 1-8) of the RQ for the present study.
**Role ambiguity.** The seminal validation study by Rizzo et al. (1970) of the RQ included and compared two samples of participants (i.e., sample A and sample B) for data analysis. The original analysis of the six items for the Role Ambiguity subscale completed by Rizzo et al. yielded a coefficient alpha of .78 for sample A and .81 for sample B. The internal consistency reliability of the Role Ambiguity subscale was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .89. Scores of the role ambiguity subscale with the current sample of participants ranged from nine to 42 with a mean score of 29.70 and standard deviation of 7.28. The role ambiguity subscale was negatively worded; therefore, the interpretation of the scores means the lower the score, the increased level of role ambiguity experienced. Overall, the participants were experiencing moderate levels of role ambiguity as a school counselor.

**Role conflict.** The seminal validation study by Rizzo et al. (1970) of the RQ included and compared two samples of participants (i.e., sample A and sample B) for data analysis. The original analysis of the eight items for the Role Conflict subscale completed by Rizzo et al. yielded a coefficient alpha of .82 for sample A and .82 for sample B. The internal consistency reliability of the Role Conflict subscale was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .86. Scores of the role conflict subscale with the current sample of participants ranged from seven to 50 on the role conflict subscale with a mean score of 30.59 and standard deviation of 10.12. Overall, the participants were experiencing moderate to high levels of role conflict as a school counselor.
**CBI.** The coefficient alpha and scores were calculated for the level of burnout of school counselors using the CBI (S. M. Lee et al., 2007). The original analysis of the 20 items for the CBI completed by Lee et al. yielded a coefficient alpha of .88. The internal consistency reliability of the CBI was tested with the current sample of participants and obtained a value of .89. Scores on the CBI with the current sample of participants ranged from 20 to 74 with a mean score of 44.33 and standard deviation of 11.64. Overall, participants were experiencing moderate to high levels of burnout as a school counselor.

**Correlational Data Analyses**

A correlational analysis was conducted with the continuous criterion variables and predictor variables. This step was completed to determine the relationship between pairs of data and allowed the researcher to test for any interactions between variables (i.e., perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, and coping responses and styles with levels of burnout) in this study. Non-significant correlation results are described followed by statistically significant correlation results. Statistical significance for this study was determined by setting alpha at 0.05, power at 0.80, and maintaining a medium effect size of 0.15 (J. Cohen, 1992). The results of the correlational analyses are separated into three categorical findings (e.g., low, moderate, and high correlations) and reported in Table 4.
Table 4

Statistically Significant Correlations ($p < .05$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
<th>Correlation (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time spent in counseling duties</td>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties</td>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived principal support</td>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>0.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job satisfaction</td>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role ambiguity</td>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role conflict</td>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience as a school counselor</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time engaged in consultation in hours per month</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time spent in counseling duties</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived principal support</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job satisfaction</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job stress</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping responses and styles</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role ambiguity</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role conflict</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model</td>
<td>Level of burnout</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Significant Correlations

Nineteen variables were included overall in this study to understand the relationship between various demographic and environmental variables and levels of burnout and levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model. Correlation analyses were completed with several variables (i.e., age, type of degree, type of school district, level of practice, years of experience as a school counselor, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling duties, percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, level of role conflict, level of burnout, and level of implementation of the ASCA National Model). The following variables did not produce statistical significance with each other.

Level of burnout did not correlate with type of degree, type of school district, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, and amount of time engaged in supervision. The level of implementation of the ASCA National Model did not correlate with age, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, and perceived job stress. Overall, several demographic variables did not correlate with the criterion variables.
Statistically Significant Correlations

Several pairs of variables reported statistical significant correlations in this study. To understand the results, correlations of 0.5 or more were considered high, 0.3 was considered moderate, and 0.1 were considered low with anything below a 0.1 to not be statistically significant and described in the previous section (J. Cohen, 1988). Based on the results, Table 4 outlines all of the statistically significant variables for this study.

**Low correlations.** Small correlations were the variables that fell between 0.1 and 0.3 in this study (J. Cohen, 1988). Burnout was negatively correlated with age ($r = -0.137$), years of experience ($r = -0.145$), percentage of time spent in counseling duties ($r = -0.174$), level of implementation of the ASCA National Model ($r = -0.230$). Therefore, as the participants' age and years of experience increased, their levels of burnout decreased. Additionally, as level of burnout increased for participants, their percentage of time spent in counseling duties and their level of implementation of the ASCA National Model decreased. Burnout was positively correlated with amount of time engaged in consultation ($r = 0.169$), percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties ($r = 0.204$), and coping responses and styles ($r = 0.253$). As levels of burnout increased, the amount of time participants engaged in consultation hours per month increased, their percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties increased, and their coping styles and responses increased. Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model was positively correlated with percentage of time spent in counseling duties ($r = 0.270$) and negatively correlated with level of role conflict ($r = -0.267$). Therefore, as participants engaged in increased levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model, their
percentage of time spent in counseling duties increased and their level of role conflict experienced decreased. Overall, level of burnout and level of implementation of the ASCA National Model had low statistically significant correlations with several demographic and environmental variables.

**Moderate correlations.** Moderate correlations were the variables that fell between 0.3 and 0.5 in this study (J. Cohen, 1988). The level of implementation of the ASCA National Model and percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties were negatively correlated \((r = -0.350)\). Therefore, as participants had higher levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model, their percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties decreased. The level of implementation of the ASCA National Model positively correlated with perceived principal support \((r = 0.324)\), perceived job satisfaction \((r = 0.324)\), and level of role ambiguity \((r = 0.482)\). As participants had increased levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model into their practice, they experienced high amounts of perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, and lower levels of role ambiguity. The level of burnout negatively correlated with perceived principal support \((r = -0.321)\) and level of role ambiguity \((r = -0.457)\). As participants’ levels of burnout increased, their perceived principal support decreased and level of role ambiguity increased. Overall, the variables, level of burnout had statistically significant moderate correlations with perceived principal support and level of role ambiguity. Additionally, level of implementation of the ASCA National Model had statistically significant moderate correlations with perceived principal support, level of role ambiguity and level of role conflict.
**High correlations.** Large correlations were the variables that fell above 0.5 for this study (J. Cohen, 1988). Level of burnout ($r = -0.530$) was negatively correlated with perceived job satisfaction. As participants’ levels of burnout increased, their perceived job satisfaction decreased. Level of burnout was positively correlated with perceived job stress ($r = 0.562$) and level of role conflict ($r = 0.561$). As participants’ levels of burnout increased, their perceived job stress and levels of role conflict increased. Overall, there were high statistically significant correlations between levels of burnout, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, and level of role conflict.

**Psychometrics of Instrumentations**

To test the construct validity of the SCPIS and RQ with the data collected in this study, a confirmatory analysis was completed using LISREL 9.1 (Jöreskog, & Sörbom, 2015). A confirmatory analysis was appropriate for the SCPIS and RQ to confirm the factor structure and model fit of the instruments based upon the theoretical and empirical research of the instruments (Dimitrov, 2009). Additionally, the confirmatory analysis was completed for the SCPIS and RQ with the data gathered from the participants in this study to show they produced reliable measurements for the variables in the present study, level of implementation of the ASCA National Model (i.e., SCPIS), and levels of role ambiguity and role conflict (i.e., RQ).

**SCPIS.** An original validation study, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA), was conducted for 20 items of the SCPIS by Clemens et al. (2010). The EFA results indicated a four factor structure with the 20 items of the SCPIS. These researchers chose to delete three items based on the EFA results and to obtain a more parsimonious model. After
deleting the three items, a three factor structure emerged that measured various aspects of the ASCA National Model program implementation for school counselors. The three factors were labeled: (a) programmatic orientation (i.e., Factor 1), (b) use of software to manage student data and the use of data for school improvement (i.e., Factor 2), and (c) school counseling services delivery (i.e., Factor 3). The researchers additionally included the three unlabeled items in the publication of the SCPIS (Clemens et al., 2010).

To this researcher’s knowledge, a confirmatory analysis has not yet been completed to establish the construct validity of the SCPIS. Therefore, this researcher chose to include the 20 items and a four factor structure for a confirmatory analysis because the three additional items included levels of implementation of direct student service, within the Delivery section, based on the ASCA National Model. This fourth factor was labeled, direct student services, by this researcher. There were 268 (df = 164) participants who completed the SCPIS in its entirety and those results were included in the confirmatory analysis. A confirmatory analysis using LISREL 9.1 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2015) was performed to test the fitness of the SCPIS four factor model. The results indicated an overall model fit with the four factors and each factor measured a distinct construct, consistent with the theoretical constructs of the SCPIS (Clemens et al., 2010). Factor 1 (i.e., SCPIS_F1 or programmatic orientation) measured a distinct construct and had the strongest correlation with Factor 3 (i.e., SCPIS_F3 or school counseling services delivery). Factor 2 (i.e., SCPIS_F2 or use of software to manage student data and the use of data for school improvement) measured a distinct construct.
Factor 4 measured a distinct construct and this researcher labeled it SCPIIS F4 or direct student services.

The following conclusions are discussed based upon the confirmatory analysis completed of the SCPIS. See Figure 1 for the confirmatory analysis results of the SCIPS in the present study. The confirmatory analysis results report the SCPIS may be approaching significance but the Likert scale of 1 to 4 has an overall limited structure to assume normality. The SCPIS is a type of scale based upon the purpose of describing a model versus measuring a construct (i.e., burnout). A confirmatory analysis is most appropriately used to measuring a construct (Dimitrov, 2009). Therefore, caution should be taken in interpreting the confirmatory analysis results of the SCPIS as a measure of validity. Despite the limitation, the confirmatory analysis provided evidence to confirm the factor structure and correlation of factors. Finally, SCPIIS F4, or direct student services, does not capture all of the methods described within the ASCA National Model (2012) for direct interactions with students (i.e., large group, classroom, small group, and individual) and this may have led to its problematic loadings in the original EFA (Clemens et al., 2010).
Figure 1. Confirmatory Analysis of the SCPI S

RQ. A confirmatory analysis of the RQ was completed for the present study. There were 215 participants who completed the RQ in its entirety and those results were included in the confirmatory analysis. See Figure 2 for the confirmatory analysis results of the RQ in the present study. An original EFA of the 14 item RQ was conducted by Rizzo et al. (1970). Confirmatory analysis results of the RQ were reported by Gonzalez-Roma and Lloret (1998) and yielded similar findings to this researcher’s CFA
results. Therefore, the confirmatory analysis of the RQ completed for the present study shows an overall good model fit. The confirmatory analysis verified the RQ may be an appropriate instrument to measure the distinct constructs of levels of role ambiguity and role conflict in the present sample of school counselors. The RQ was originally constructed to measure general role ambiguity and role conflict in various professions. A limitation of the RQ may be the varied meaning of role ambiguity and role conflict between school counselors and other professions. In the present study, IV18_RQ is the variable, level of role conflict and IV19_RQ is the variable, level of role ambiguity.

Figure 2. Confirmatory Analysis of the RQ
Multiple Linear Regression Analyses

Multiple linear regression analyses were completed to test the research questions. An alpha level of 0.05 was specified to achieve statistical significance and maintained to limit the potential of a Type I error. A multiple linear regression analysis was selected in order to examine the extent to which the ASCA National Model and additional independent variables can explain the level of burnout in school counselors. A multiple linear regression analysis was additionally utilized to explain the extent of impact the independent variables predicted the levels of implementing the ASCA National Model for school counselors. A multiple linear regression analysis was an appropriate procedure to analyze the data because it is a statistical procedure that explores individual and collective predictive or explanatory contributions of more than one independent variable to the dependent variable (Dimitrov, 2009).

Research Question One

The predictor variables (i.e., level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision in minutes each month, amount of time engaged in consultation in hours each month, percentage of time engaged in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, level of role conflict) and criterion variable (i.e., level of burnout) were included in data analysis for research question one. Assumption checks were completed for the multiple
regression equation of research question one. There were no outliers or influential data points, as concluded by the data analysis and a visual inspection of the data and Residual Plots. Multicollinearity was checked to determine if there were high levels of correlations between any of the predictor variables. Multicollinearity was determined to be an issue if the VIF was higher than five or the tolerance was less than 0.01 (Dimitrov, 2009). Multicollinearity was determined to be an issue for one variable, race and ethnicity. The White participants’ VIF was 6.595 and the tolerance was reported as 0.152. The majority of participants identified as White for this study. With the high VIF and disproportionate number of White participants, the race and ethnicity variable was excluded in the analysis of research question two. Additionally, the participants who worked in multiple grade settings were excluded from the analysis due to having little to no predictive or explanatory value to their levels of burnout. Therefore, the remaining variables were determined to provide unique contributions to the multiple regression equation and not have significant interactions between each other.

The results for the multiple regression equation for level of implementation of the ASCA National Model are displayed in Table 5. The results indicated the linear regression equation was significant at $F(27, 180) = 11.07, p < 0.001$. The independent variables were entered into the regression equation. The combination of amount of time engaged in consultation, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict predicted a significant proportion of variance in the level of burnout. That is, $R = 0.79$, $R^2 = 0.62$, which indicated that approximately 62.0% of the variance in level of burnout is explained by the amount of time engaged in
consultation, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict. Amongst the predictor variables, perceived job stress was the strongest predictor and explained the highest amount of variance ($\beta = 0.346$) followed by level of role conflict ($\beta = 0.231$), perceived job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.215$), level of role ambiguity ($\beta = -0.161$), and lastly, amount of time engaged in consultation ($\beta = 0.121$).

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the variables, amount of time engaged in consultation, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict, are significantly capable of predicting the level of burnout in school counselors. In conclusion, the predictor variables, perceived job stress, levels of role conflict and role ambiguity, amount of time spent in consultation, and perceived job satisfaction, significantly predicted the level of burnout experienced by the school counselors in the present study.

Table 5

*Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Research Question One*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig. ($p$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time engaged in consultation</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>2.502</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>-3.056</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived job stress</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>6.704</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role ambiguity</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-2.366</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role conflict</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>3.466</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 208$. $R^2 = 0.62$, $F = 11.07$*
Research Question Two

The predictor variables (i.e., age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience as a school counselor, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision in minutes each month, amount of time engaged in consultation in hours each month, percentage of time engaged in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity, and level of role conflict) and criterion variable (i.e., level of implementation of the ASCA National Model) were included in data analysis for research question two. Assumption checks were completed for the multiple regression equation of research question two. Similarly to research question one, there were no outliers or influential data points, as concluded by data analysis and a visual inspection of the data and Residual Plots. Multicollinearity was checked to determine if there were high levels of correlations between any of the predictor variables. Multicollinearity was determined to be an issue if the VIF was higher than five or the tolerance was less than 0.01 (Dimitrov, 2009). Multicollinearity was determined to be an issue for the variable, race and ethnicity. The White (not of Hispanic Origin) participants VIF was 6.569 and the tolerance was 0.152. The majority of participants identified as White (not of Hispanic Origin) for this study. With the high VIF and disproportionate number of White participants, the race and ethnicity variable was excluded in the analysis. Additionally, the participants who worked in the elementary school were excluded from the multiple regression analysis due to having little predictive or explanatory contributing value to the
level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. Therefore, the remaining variables were determined to provide unique contributions to the linear regression equation and not having significant interactions between each other.

The results for the multiple regression equation for level of implementation of the ASCA National Model are displayed in Table 6. The results indicated the linear regression equation was significant at $F(26, 181) = 3.793$, $p < 0.001$. The independent variables were entered into the regression equation. The combination of percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity predicted a significant proportion of variance in the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. That is, $R = 0.594$, $R^2 = 0.353$, which indicated that approximately 35.3% of the variance in the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model is explained by percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity. Between the two predictors, percentage of time spent on non-counseling duties was the stronger predictor (i.e., explained more of the variance; $\beta = -0.414$) than level of role ambiguity ($\beta = 0.383$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the variables, percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity, are significantly capable of predicting the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. In conclusion, the predictor variables, percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity, significantly predicted the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model for the school counselors in the present study.
Table 6

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis for Research Question Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.414</td>
<td>-3.541</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of role ambiguity</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>4.529</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 208. $R^2 = 0.353$, $F = 3.793$

Summary of Chapter 3

This chapter summarized the results of this study. Sampling procedures were discussed, followed by results of descriptive data analyses, correlational analyses, confirmatory analyses, and multiple linear regression analyses in relation to the criterion and predictor variables. The following paragraph summarizes the major findings for the study.

There were several significant findings for this study. The level of burnout school counselors experience on the job is predictive based upon their perceived job stress, level of role conflict, perceived job satisfaction, level of role ambiguity, and amount of time engaged in consultation. Therefore, as school counselors experience higher levels of burnout, they are more likely to be experiencing higher levels of perceived job stress, role ambiguity, and role conflict, engage in higher amounts of consultation, and experience lower perceived job satisfaction. Additionally, the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model school counselors may be able to incorporate into practice is explained
by the amount of time spent in non-counseling duties and the level of role ambiguity experienced. Therefore, as school counselors have higher amounts of time spent in non-counseling duties and experience increased levels of role ambiguity on the job, they are less likely implementing higher levels of the ASCA National Model into their practice. Chapter 4 outlines a discussion of the findings of the study and subsequent limitations and future research related to the current study.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The following chapter provides a detailed discussion of the findings related to this study. First, the findings of the research questions are discussed. Next, implications of the findings are described in relation to the school counseling profession and the graduate training of school counselors (i.e., the counselor education and supervision profession). Limitations of the study are discussed, followed by recommendations for future research. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings for this study.

Discussion of Findings

Results were obtained for this study that supported the alternative research hypotheses of research questions one and two. Results showed several statistically significant correlations between the predictor and criterion variables for research questions one and two. Several statistically significant predictor variables explained the variance for the criterion variable of research question one (i.e., level of burnout) and research question two (i.e., level of implementation of the American School Counselor Association [ASCA] National Model). For research question one, results confirmed the alternative hypothesis that perceived job stress, level of role conflict, perceived job satisfaction, level of role ambiguity, and amount of time engaged in consultation were significant predictors of the level of burnout in school counselors. For research question two, results confirmed the alternative hypothesis that percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity explained the variance in level of implementation of the ASCA National Model in different school settings. Therefore, the
null hypotheses were rejected. The significant results of this study are important to discuss in order to recognize the importance of the level of burnout and level of implementation of the ASCA National Model for the school counseling profession. The next section reviews the sample characteristics of the present study.

Sample Characteristics of the Study

Results of the study detailed several characteristics of the participants. The majority of participants were female, White, in their mid-40s, held a master’s degree in school counseling, and had an average of 14 years of experience as a school counselor. Participants reported working in either a suburban, rural, or urban school district and in the elementary, middle, high school settings. The majority of participants worked in one building, had one additional school counselor at their school, and reported an average student-to-school counselor ratio of 459:1. The majority of participants received none to 60 minutes of supervision monthly. Participants reported on average engaging in 11 to 15 hours of consultation monthly with a variety of stakeholders (i.e., teachers, parents, principals or administrators, and other mental health and school counseling professionals). Participants reported, on average, spending 72% of their time in counseling duties and 26% of their time in non-counseling duties each week. Generally, the participants reported feeling supported by their principals and half of the participants believed their principal had appropriate knowledge of their job duties according to the ASCA National Model. On average, participants reported partly implementing the ASCA National Model into practice. Participants expressed their perceived job satisfaction from feeling ambivalent to satisfied with their jobs. Participants described
moderate to high amounts of perceived job stress while implementing various coping styles and responses. Participants reported moderate to high levels of role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout. Overall, several characteristics related to the participants were described. The next section describes results related to the research question one.

**Research Question One: Level of Burnout**

The predictive value of several variables and level of burnout experienced by school counselors were investigated in research question one. First, this section includes the instrumentation of measurement for level of burnout (i.e., CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007). Next, the variables that had statistically significant correlations with burnout (i.e., age, years of experience, percentage of time spent in counseling duties, percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, coping styles and responses, and level of implementation of the ASCA National Model) are briefly examined. Finally, the multivariate contributions of the statistically significant predictor variables for level of burnout: (a) perceived job stress, (b) level of role conflict, (c) perceived job satisfaction, (d) level of role ambiguity, (e) and amount of time engaged in consultation, are discussed.

**CBI.** The level of burnout was measured by the Counseling Burnout Inventory (CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007) for research question two. The CBI measured an overall score of burnout for five factors: (a) level of negative work environment, (b) devaluing clients, (c) deterioration in personal life, (d) exhaustion, and (e) incompetence. The construct validity of the CBI has been upheld for school counselors (Gnilka et al., 2015). Therefore, it appears to be a valid measurement for level of burnout for school counselors.
in the present study. The next section discusses the statistically significant predictor variables for research question one.

**Statistically significant correlations.** Previous researchers described the potential for positive impacts when aligning school counselors’ practice within the ASCA National Model framework to decrease role conflict, role ambiguity, and burnout (e.g., Moyer, 2011; Wilkerson, 2009). However, results of the present study only determined a statistically significant negative correlation between the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model and level of burnout. The results of the present study contribute to the previous literature that supports the ASCA National Model as a framework to align and support school counselor practice. However, the results of the present study do not support the ASCA National Model as being a statistically significant predictive factor of burnout for school counselors. Additionally, there was a statistically significant negative correlation between amount of time engaged in counseling duties and level of burnout. There were statistically significant positive correlations between amount of time engaged in non-counseling duties and level of burnout, along with coping responses and styles with level of burnout. As school counselors engaged in increased amounts of counseling duties, according to the ASCA National Model, their level of burnout decreased. As school counselors engaged in increased amounts of non-counseling duties, according to the ASCA National Model, their level of burnout increased. These results highlight the significant correlations between duties discussed in the ASCA National Model and their correlations with level of burnout in the present sample of school counselors.
The results of the present study revealed negative statistically significant correlations between age and level of burnout and years of experience and level of burnout. Older school counselors and those with more experience had lower burnout scores. The results may highlight a limitation in current practices for meeting the needs of school counselors earlier in their careers. Several school counseling professionals and educators (e.g., Borders & Usher, 1992; Savicki & Cooley, 1982; Wachter et al., 2008) have discussed the importance of feedback, support, and supervision for school counselors to safeguard against professional burnout and to ensure ethical practice. Cummings and Nall (1982) also reported a negative relationship between years of experience as a school counselor and burnout and Christina Maslach and colleagues (Maslach, 2001; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 2001) reported susceptibility for burnout to occur with younger workers due to a lack of work experience. The results of the present study support the vulnerability of school counselors earlier in their career.

A statistically significant negative correlation was shown between perceived principal support and level of burnout. Results suggested participants were more likely experiencing lower levels of burnout when they perceived higher principal support. The correlation between perceived principal support and level of burnout is important to discuss because principals are typically responsible for providing supervision of school counselors (Janson et al., 2008) and participants in the present study reported principals being the most frequent immediate supervisors ($n = 115; 66.1\%$). Despite these findings, only half of the participants ($n = 105$) reported their principals had appropriate knowledge of their job duties according to the ASCA National Model.
The results reported a statistically significant positive correlation between coping responses and styles with level of burnout. Results showed participants in the current study were more likely to experience burnout symptoms despite engaging in higher amounts of coping responses and styles. These results may imply that participants were attempting to cope with stressors of their jobs but their coping responses and styles may be ineffective in safeguarding against burnout. The results of coping styles and responses in this study were similar to findings by Maslach et al. (2001), who describe professionals generally engaged in ineffective coping strategies. Additionally, Wilkerson (2009) reported maladaptive and emotionally focused coping responses and styles intensified stress and burnout for school counselors. Therefore, participants were engaging in coping responses and styles but their efforts did not safeguard them against burnout. More research is warranted on the impact of positive and negative coping responses and styles on level of burnout for school counselors. Overall, this section described the statistically significant correlations between predictor variables and level of burnout for research question two. The next section describes the statistically significant predictor variables for level of burnout in the present study.

**Statistically significant predictor variables.** Five statistically significant predictor variables (i.e., perceived job stress, level of role conflict, perceived job satisfaction, level of role ambiguity, and amount of time engaged in consultation monthly) predicted the level of burnout for the sample of school counselors. Perceived job stress was the highest predictor variable for level of burnout in the present sample of school counselors. Results showed a positive relationship between perceived job stress
and level of burnout. As perceived job stress is experienced by school counselors, their level of burnout increased. Furthermore, 9.3% of the variance in level of burnout was uniquely explained by the variance in perceived job stress.

The findings related to the statistically significant positive relationship between perceived job stress and level of burnout in the present study were supported by previous school counseling literature (e.g., McCarthy et al., 2010; Sears & Navin, 1983; Wilkerson, 2009). School counselors are in a position to meet the complex needs of many students and work demands within the school setting on a daily basis (ASCA, 2012; Gysbers, 2001). In addition to diverse student needs, school counselors experience several demands and pressures from administrators and other stakeholders in the school (Wilkerson, 2009). Overall, school counselors are expected to perform a variety of duties throughout the work day when operating within the ASCA National Model (2012) framework.

Previous researchers reported the negative impact daily demands and disruptions had on the job stress of school counselors (McCarthy et al., 2010). Sears and Navin (1983) identified the top stressors of school counselors, which included not enough time to see students, too much paperwork, not enough time to do the job, too large a caseload, too many non-counseling duties, and teachers’ misunderstanding of school counselor roles. Sears and Navin reported the stressors reported in their study quantified the concept of role conflict and role ambiguity, also significant predictors of level of burnout in the current sample of school counselors.
A positive relationship between level of role conflict and level of burnout was also shown for the present study. Therefore, level of role conflict and perceived job stress predicted the level of burnout participants experienced in the present study, results previously reported in the school counseling literature (i.e., Culbreth et al., 2005). When school counselors engage in roles (i.e., non-counseling duties such as testing coordinator) that are in conflict with the appropriate roles (e.g., individual or small group counseling) outlined by the ASCA National Model (2012), school counselors experience perceived job stress and burnout. It was reported by the school counselor participants in the present study reported moderate amounts of perceived job stress on a daily basis due to several factors including the large amount of work demands and pressures, along with conflicting roles within the school setting. The results of the present study provides support that school counselors often engage in several varying roles, demands, and responsibilities on a daily basis, which increased perceived job stress.

Role conflict was the second highest statistically significant predictor variable for explaining the variance of level of burnout in the present sample of school counselors. Results from the study indicated a positive relationship between level of role conflict and burnout—as scores of role conflict increased, scores for level of burnout increased. Furthermore, 2.5% of the variance in level of burnout was uniquely accounted for by the variance in level of role conflict.

The findings related to the level of role conflict as a statistically significant predictor variable for level of burnout in the present study confirm previous school counseling literature (Bardhoshi et al., 2014; Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011).
Previous researchers reported role conflict experienced by school counselors resulted from excessive time spent on non-counseling duties, experiencing role ambiguity, and a lack of understanding of roles from administrators, which negatively impacted job satisfaction (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011). Qualitative results from Bardhoshi et al. (2014) revealed role conflict as the outcome of engagement in duties that are in conflict to preferred practice. Several decades prior, Coll and Freeman (1997) called for school counselors to be aware of the impact of role conflict and role ambiguity to prevent burnout. The results of this study and others suggest, role conflict continues to impact school counselors’ level of burnout.

The ASCA (2012) recommends school counselors spend 20% or less of their time in non-counseling duties or inappropriate roles. The participants in this study reported, on average, spending at least 26% of their time in non-counseling duties on a weekly basis. Participants in the present study appear to be engaging in several activities that are in conflict with appropriate roles described during graduate training and the ASCA National Model (2012). The results of the present study support previous literature that described school counselors engaging in a variety of roles that often changes throughout the work day, which result in experiencing role conflict (Chandler et al., 2008). In many situations, students, teachers, parents, administrators and principals, and other stakeholders may request the assistance of school counselors throughout the work day. Therefore, school counselors may have to put aside assigned or planned counseling duties to meet the current needs of students or school setting. Additionally, school counselors’ roles may change with the expectations of the school year. For example, during state
mandated testing times in the school calendar year, school counselors may engage in increased amounts of time spent in testing duties and less time in counseling-related duties.

For the present study, only approximately 50% of the participants reported their principals knew the appropriate roles of the school counselor according to the ASCA National Model. This lack of knowledge by principals may leave school counselors vulnerable to being assigned additional non-counseling duties, which may have led to experiencing role conflict at work. Overall, the role conflicts experienced by participants contributed to their perceived job stress. The statistically significant results of level of role conflict and perceived job stress were also shown to have a statistically significant relationship with perceived job satisfaction and level of burnout in the present study.

Perceived job satisfaction was the third highest statistically significant predictor variable for level of burnout in the present sample of school counselors. Results revealed a negative relationship between perceived job satisfaction and level of burnout—as school counselors’ perceived job satisfaction scores increased, their level of burnout decreased. Furthermore, 1.9% of the variance in level of burnout is uniquely accounted for by the variance in perceived job satisfaction.

Perceived job satisfaction was measured by the following outcomes of the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1985) in the present study: (a) pay, (b) promotion, (c) supervision, (d) fringe benefits, (e) contingent rewards, (f) operating procedures, (g) coworkers, (h) nature of work, and (i) communication. Findings of the present study confirmed the importance of the school counseling profession and individuals in the
school setting (i.e., principals and administrators) to understand factors that compose perceived job satisfaction. Having an increased understanding of perceived job satisfaction of school counselors may lessen its negative relationship with level of burnout. For example, fringe benefits for school counselors may include taking time off work for vacation and personal days. Additionally, there may be limits to implementing some of the factors comprising perceived job satisfaction according to the JSS with school counselors (Spector, 1985). For example, promotional opportunities may be limited due to school counseling being a terminal degree with minimal upwards mobility for promotions. Supervision may be happening minimally since 168 participants reported receiving 60 minutes or less of supervision monthly in the present study. Additionally, communication may primarily be with teachers, administrators and principals, and parents, not other school counselors. Results of the current study showed 92 participants (46.2%) were most often the only school counselor in the building and 42 participants (20.2%) had one other school counselor in the building. Therefore, school counselors may not have many opportunities to communicate with school counseling colleagues.

The results of the present study related to perceived job satisfaction having a statistically significant negative relationship with level of burnout has been supported in the school counseling literature (e.g., Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; DeMato & Curcio, 2004). According to Baggerly and Osborn (2006), inappropriate duties and stress negatively affected job satisfaction and engagement in counseling duties positively affected perceived job satisfaction. Additional variables identified in the school counseling literature that contributed to job satisfaction and burnout included identified
conflict and ambiguous roles of the job, desire to engage in preferred roles, job stress, feelings of being not valued, not enough time to do counseling, role conflicts with assigned teaching duties contributed to decreased job satisfaction (DeMato & Curcio, 2004).

Results of the present study provided evidence to the significant impact of the negative relationship between perceived job satisfaction and level of burnout for school counselors. Finding ways to increase perceived job satisfaction for school counselors may have positive outcomes including decreasing perceived job stress, level of role conflict, and level of burnout. Bryant and Constantine (2006) emphasized the importance of life satisfaction to safeguard against burnout for school counselors. The present study highlighted the importance of increasing perceived job satisfaction and decreasing perceived job stress and role conflict to safeguard against burnout. Perceived job satisfaction was shown to also have a statistically significant relationship with level of role ambiguity and level of burnout in the present sample of school counselors.

Results of the present study showed role ambiguity as the fourth highest statistically significant predictor variable for explaining the level of burnout. Results reported a negative relationship between role ambiguity and burnout—as role ambiguity increased (i.e., role ambiguity was negatively scored), participants’ level of burnout increased. Furthermore, 1.2% of the variance in level of burnout is uniquely accounted for by the variance in level of role ambiguity.

In the school counseling literature, there is an ongoing debate of whether school counselors are educators with mental health knowledge or counselors working in the
It was confirmed that role ambiguity continues to impact school counselors and their level of burnout in the present study. Findings of the present study associated with level of role ambiguity and level of burnout resonate with previous research in the school counseling literature (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Scarborough and Culbreth described school counselors desiring to engage in counseling duties that contributed to positive student outcomes and less time in non-counseling duties. The results of Scarborough and Culbreth may provide support for role ambiguity being additionally described as a contributing factor for increased job stress in school counselors (Wilkerson, 2009) and due to a lack of administrators understanding roles of school counselors (Lawson, 2007). Despite role ambiguity being discussed as a topic of concern since the 1970s, limited research has measured role ambiguity as a variable in the school counseling profession. Researchers have discussed role ambiguity as an explanation of their findings (e.g., Bardhoshi et al., 2014) but have not included an operational definition in the research to understand its potential effect on burnout. Additionally, there are various definitions and discussions related to the meaning of role ambiguity in the school counseling literature.

The level of role ambiguity experienced by participants in the current study negatively impacted them, who were alongside, experiencing increased levels of burnout. The findings of the present study may provide increased understanding the impact role ambiguity may have on school counselors’ levels of burnout. The significant findings related to role ambiguity in the present study provide evidence for the need to define the
roles, educate key stakeholders (i.e., administrators and principals) of those roles, and advocate for increased engagement in appropriate roles for school counselors.

Additionally, since the ASCA National Model calls for school counselors to spend 80% of the time in delivery of appropriate roles, it may be important to acknowledge that school counselors may be assigned non-counseling duties during other times. However, the non-counseling duties should not exceed the recommended time according to the ASCA National Model (2012). Finally, school counselors-in-training may focus on increasing their counseling skills during graduate training, but according to the ASCA National Model (2012), counseling services is only one portion of direct student services school counselors engage in to meet the needs of students. It is important for school counselors to understand potential limitations to engaging in counseling-related roles at times, yet continue to advocate for and educate others of appropriate role definitions to meet the needs of students in the school setting.

The results of the present study suggest participants are often engaging in non-counseling and consultations duties, along with experiencing role ambiguity. The results of the present study showed amount of time engaged in consultation was the fifth highest statistically significant predictor variable for explaining the level of burnout in the sample of school counselors. The results showed a positive relationship between amount of time engaged in consultation and burnout—as amount of time engaged in consultation increased, their level of burnout increased. Furthermore, 1.3% of the variance in level of burnout is uniquely accounted for by the variance in percentage of time spent in consultation.
The findings of the present study associated with a positive relationship between amount of time engaged in consultation and level of burnout are in contrast with the previous school counseling literature (i.e., Morrissette, 2000; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). The school counseling literature also identified consultation as a practical alternative to receiving supervision (Moyer, 2011). Morrissette (2000) and Wilkerson and Bellini (2006) described consultation as a protective factor to incorporate into school counselor practice to safeguard against burnout. The discrepancy in findings between this study and previous researchers may be the result of several factors. In the present study, the participants were asked about how often they engaged in consultation services monthly. However, no further information regarding consultation was requested by participants, which may have included descriptors of the types of consultation participants were engaging in with others. Additionally, the consultation definition provided in the current study to participants encompassed meeting students’ needs only. The consultation definition did not include times in which school counselors were using consultation to assist their professional development. The participants may have only considered their amount of consultation when they were providing responsive or reactive services for students (i.e., crisis and counseling services), which are in contrast to the ASCA National Model (2012) being a comprehensive and developmental model incorporating mainly preventative or proactive services for students.

Due to the statistically significant negative relationship between amount of time engaged in consultation and level of burnout, several findings are concluded. Consultation may be an activity that is readily needed in the school setting due to
complex student needs but difficult to engage in due to various additional duties of school counselors. School counselors may have difficulty engaging in proactive consultation due to the lack of time available throughout the day. They may be experiencing additional perceived work stressors and role conflicts that are impacting their ability to engage in consultation. School counselors may be engaging in consultation with many other professional due to complex student cases and needs (e.g., individual long-term counseling due to trauma). Additionally, school counselors earlier in their career may have more need to engage in consultation with other professionals. Therefore, increased in perceived job stress, role conflict, role ambiguity, and amount of time engaged in consultation, along with decreased perceived job satisfaction were multivariate factors which contributed to increased levels of burnout in the sample of school counselors.

This section described the results of research question one. First, the measurement of level of burnout (i.e., CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007) for the present study was discussed. Next, a review of the significant correlations with level of burnout was described. The, the multivariate contributions of the statistically significant predictor variables and level of burnout were discussed. The next section discusses the results in relation to research question two.

**Research Question Two: Level of Implementation of the ASCA National Model**

First, this section includes a discussion of the instrumentation for measuring the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model (i.e., SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010) for research question two. Next, the statistically significant findings of research question two are discussed. The variables which had statistically significant correlations with the
level of implementation of the ASCA National Model are reviewed, followed by the two predictor variables that explained the amount of variance in level of implementation of the ASCA National Model (i.e., percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity) for the sample of school counselors. The section concludes with a summary.

**SCPIS.** For the present study, the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model was measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010). Results of the confirmatory analysis completed for the SCPIS in this study established evidence to support its construct validity. However, results of the SCPIS should be interpreted with caution since it has not yet been validated in the school counseling literature.

There were potential limitations to establishing evidence to support the construct validity of the SCPIS through a confirmatory for this study. The SCPIS factors are measured by a four point Likert scale (i.e., 1 = Not Present; 2 = Development in Progress; 3 = Partly Implemented; 4 = Fully Implemented). The four point Likert scale may have limits to assuming normality distribution of scores (Dimitrov, 2009). Adding or clarifying the Likert scale points of measurement may provide for increased clarity of the progress towards implementation of the ASCA National Model into practice. Additionally, a confirmatory analysis is often used to test the measurement of a latent variable (e.g., burnout; Dimitrov, 2009). However, the SCPIS is an instrument used to measure the level of implementation of a model (i.e., the ASCA Nation Model). Finally, it may be helpful to include more items that measure the direct and indirect services of
school counselors in the SCPIS. Currently, the SCPIS primarily measures indirect services of school counselors. The next section discusses the statistically significant correlations for research question two.

**Statistically significant correlations.** Research question two sought to understand which demographic and environmental factors can be used to explain the variance in the ASCA National Model implementation in different school settings. Results of the present study showed percentage of time spent in counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, and level of role conflict had statistically significant correlations with the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. The variables, perceived job satisfaction and principal support, positively correlated with the school counselors’ ability to implement the ASCA National Model. Participants in the present study generally perceived their principals to be supportive, alongside experiencing increased perceived job satisfaction and ability to engage in larger percentages of counseling duties each week, while implementing higher levels of the ASCA National Model. School counselors may be increasing their advocacy efforts in educating principals of the appropriate roles of the school counselor and the ASCA National Model may be instrumental in describing the appropriate role of school counselors to their principals.

Similar findings related to the positive implications of principal support and school counselor practice has been upheld in the school counseling literature. Janson et al. (2008) reported the importance of building a collaborative relationship between the principal and school counselor depended upon the quality of their working alliance.
Since principals are often the supervisors of school counselors, it is important for principals to know and support the appropriate roles of school counselors. The support of principals and their understanding of appropriate school counselor roles may decrease the percentage of time school counselors engage in non-counseling duties. Additionally, Pyne (2011) found statistically significant positive relationships between perceived principal support and job satisfaction, along with job satisfaction and implementation of the ASCA National Model. It appears as school counselors experience increased job satisfaction, they may be more likely to implement the ASCA National Model and decrease the percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties. The next section discusses the statistically significant predictor variables for research question one.

**Statistically significant predictor variables.** Two statistically significant predictor variables explained the amount of variance of the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model for the sample of school counselors. Therefore, percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties was the highest statistically significant predictor variable for implementing the ASCA National Model into practice. Results suggested alongside school counselors engaging in increased amounts of non-counseling duties, their ability to practice within the ASCA National Model framework declined. Moreover, 4.5% of the variance in level of implementation of the ASCA National Model was uniquely explained by the variance in percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties. Second, the level of role ambiguity was the second statistically significant predictor variable for the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. A negative relationship was found between school counselors who experienced higher
levels of role ambiguity and their ability to implement the ASCA National Model. Furthermore, 7.3% of the variance in level of implementation of the ASCA National Model was uniquely explained by the variance in level of role ambiguity.

The ASCA National Model (2012), as described in Chapter 1, suggested school counselors engage in 20% or less of their time in non-counseling duties each week. However, the participants in the present study spent, on average, 26% of their time in non-counseling duties each week. The results reaffirmed that non-counseling duties continue to be assigned to school counselors at disproportionality large amounts.

A review of the literature in Chapter 1 described the historical context of school counseling, the ASCA National Model, and research completed of the ASCA National Model. Originally, school counseling was based on remedial-reactive approaches that evolved to increasing student competencies and outcomes (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Later, comprehensive school counseling programs (CSCPs) emerged and evolved into the adoption of the ASCA National Model, a framework for school counseling practice that professionalized school counselors’ roles and duties (Cinotti, 2014). Despite the adoption of CSCPs and the ASCA National Model, Studer and Oberman (2006) reported over 50% of school counselors from their study were not implementing a CSCP. The present study showed similar findings of Studer and Oberman. The majority of participants in this study were partly implementing the ASCA National Model into their practice. Additionally, Dixon Rayle and Adams (2007) described several barriers to implementing a CSCP including engaging in higher amounts of non-counseling duties and large student caseloads. The present study supported the findings that the
participants who were engaging in higher amounts of non-counseling duties were also not
implementing as much of the ASCA National Model into their practice as those
participants who were not engaging in high amounts of non-counseling duties.

The professional identity of school counselors has been debated in the literature;
are school counselors educators with mental health training or mental health workers in
an education setting (e.g., Cinotti, 2014; Paisley & Borders, 1995)? Overall, as school
counselors are assigned non-counseling duties outside of their practice, role ambiguity
continues to be experienced by school counselors (Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007;
Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). The present study provides evidence to support the
previous findings that describe as school counselors spend more time engaging in
inappropriate roles described in the ASCA National Model, they experienced increased
levels of role ambiguity. Therefore, as roles for school counselors become ambiguous,
they are alongside, implementing lower levels of the ASCA National Model into their
practice.

Pyne (2011) described the positive impact the ASCA National Model had for
decreasing school counselors’ role ambiguity. He reported a relationship between
decreased levels of role ambiguity and having a written philosophy statement that defined
the roles of school counselors. This written philosophy is contained within the
foundation section of the ASCA National Model. The results of the present study further
demonstrate the negative relationship between level of role ambiguity and level of
implementation of the ASCA National Model. The results of the present study also
provide evidence to support the importance of educating others about the appropriate
roles and duties of school counselors and aligning the appropriate roles of school counselors with the ASCA National Model.

The findings in the present study revealed the engagement of non-counseling duties was negatively associated with the school counselor participants’ ability to implement the ASCA National Model into their practice. Furthermore, the results of this study provide evidence to support the need to define the appropriate roles of the school counselor according to the ASCA National Model. Defining the appropriate roles to key stakeholders (i.e., principals) may help decrease role ambiguity and increase the amount of time school counselors spend in counseling duties to meet the needs of the students.

This section discussed the measurement of level of implementation of the ASCA National Model for the present study. A review of the significant correlations was described, followed by a discussion of the statistically significant predictor variables for the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. The next section first describes the implications for the school counseling profession and then the counselor education and supervision professions.

**Implications for the School Counseling Profession**

Various implications were concluded for the school counseling profession based upon the results of the present study. Implications for the school counseling profession are discussed in relation to the significant results found for research question one. Then, implications for the school counseling profession are discussed based upon the significant results of research question two.
**Research question one: Level of burnout.** Several implications may be generated for the school counseling profession based on the results of research question one. Results of the present study showed that perceived job stress was the highest statistically significant (positive) predictor variable. Level of role conflict was the second highest statistically significant (positive) predictor variable. Perceived job satisfaction was the third highest statistically significant (negative) predictor variable. Level of role ambiguity was the fourth highest statistically significant (negative) predictor variable and amount of time engaged in consultation was the fifth statistically significant (positive) predictor variable for level of burnout. Therefore, the following recommendations for the school counseling profession are based on the finding from research question two.

The findings of this study are important for the school counseling profession to apply when implementing strategies to safeguard against burnout. Results of the present study showed the impact perceived job stress had on predicting level of burnout. It may be advantageous for school counselors to realize that perceived job stress may occur on a daily basis. It is important for school counselors to understand the significant impact perceived job stress may have on burnout for school counselors at any point in their careers. School counselors may feel a lack of control in their job setting and feel less ownership of their job duties. It may be helpful for school counselors to engage in several ongoing and proactive strategies to limit perceived job stress. Additionally, despite school counselors actively engaging in coping styles and responses, they were unable to decrease burnout. School counselors may want to seek out support in understanding their sources of perceived job stress, along with helpful ways to alleviate
their perceived job stress. It may be helpful for school counselors to receive education related to the impact of the factors related to increasing burnout, review strategies that have been researched to decrease stress, create personal goals for alleviating stress and risks of burnout, and apply the goals and strategies into their practice. This may be in the forms of personal support and exploration, trainings, and mentoring from colleagues. Additionally, it may be helpful for school counselors to inventory their perceived job stress and monitor it through daily journal logs.

The execution of proactive strategies to decrease stress may additionally impact perceived job satisfaction. School counselors may want to reflect on sources of satisfaction related to their job and review them regularly, especially when experiencing job stress. A more supportive atmosphere from key stakeholders may also positively impact perceived job satisfaction for school counselors. The increase in perceived job satisfaction and appropriate roles may alleviate the day-to-day perceived job stress and allow for time for school counselors to implement the ASCA National Model into their practices. Finally, it may be important for school counselors to take a break from work. This may be during most or all of the summer months and through the use of personal days when able throughout the school year to increased perceived job satisfaction.

Results of the present study found that increased role conflict and role ambiguity may lead to increased risk for school counselor burnout. School counselors who are able to protect their time by not being assigned to duties that were in conflict with their appropriate roles may have engaged in a crucial protective factor against burnout. Therefore, it may be helpful for school counselors to assess the ongoing amount of
appropriate and inappropriate duties assigned to them. This may provide administrators with Use-of-Time data (according to the ASCA National Model, 2012) of school counselors. School counselors may then be able to advocate for reassignment of excessive inappropriate job duties to others (i.e., secretary completing clerical work) in the school setting. School counselors may also collect data about the effect engaging in counseling related duties may have on students’ outcomes. School counselors may then be able to use the data to show the importance of engaging in appropriate roles and duties outlined by the ASCA National Model in meeting the needs of the students. Advocacy efforts from school counselors may include engaging in conversations and communication through the use of active listening skills over time regarding the roles of school counselors, showing accountability of the gap in students’ needs and professional issues, and problem solving to meet the needs of students’ in the school setting with various stakeholders. These collective advocacy efforts with role conflict and role ambiguity may collectively assist with decreasing school counselors’ levels of burnout.

When school counselors are able to decrease non-counseling duties and role ambiguity, they may also decrease their perceived job stress and potential for burnout. These positive outcomes related to increased time spent in appropriate roles and duties of school counselors may additionally positively impact professional vitality and safeguard against burnout. School counselors should be aware of the implications and utilize advocacy tools, such as the ASCA National Model and counseling skills, to guide their practice in ways that align the appropriate roles and duties with the positive and proactive
mission of the school and meeting students’ academic, career, and personal and social needs.

Finally, increased engagement in amount of time for consultation, an indirect service described by the ASCA National Model (2012), was another variable that predicted burnout. Consultation may involve school counselors spending time with a high number of challenging student cases. This indirect service may be taking them away from their time spent in counseling duties, leading to increased burnout. Since most school counselors do not receive supervision, they may have difficulty managing difficult student cases due to a lack of guidance. It may be helpful to provide mentoring partnerships and other outlets to provide support and a space to process school counselors’ experiences on the job beyond graduate training. Overall, there are several implications related to the results of the level of burnout for the school counseling profession. The next section discusses the implications related to the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model into practice and the school counseling profession.

**Research question two: Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model.** Several implications may be generated for the school counseling profession based on the results of research question two. Results of the present study showed that percentage of time engaged in non-counseling duties was the highest statistically significant (negative) predictor variable and level of role ambiguity was the second statistically significant (positive) predictor variable for research question two. Therefore,
the following recommendations for the school counseling profession are based upon the findings of research question one.

The question remains in the school counseling literature as to whether school counselors are primarily counselors or educators in the school setting (e.g., Cinotti, 2014; Paisley & Borders, 1995). The percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity significantly predicted the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model the participants were able to incorporate into their practice. School counselors who engaged in higher than 20% of their time in non-counseling duties (i.e., 20% is the amount recommended in the ASCA National Model [2012]) may be less likely able to incorporate the ASCA National Model into their practice. It may be helpful for school counselors to advocate for decreasing their non-counseling duties. Using the ASCA National Model to educate principals on the differences between counseling and non-counseling duties may increase key stakeholders (i.e., principals and administrators) understanding of appropriate and inappropriate roles of school counselors. School counselors may additionally find it helpful to collect and analyze data, as described by the ASCA National Model (2012), to show positive contributions, or potential differences they are making for students and the school, as a result of incorporating a comprehensive school counseling program and engaging in appropriate counseling roles.

Overall, it may be helpful for school counselors to understand potential benefits to implementing the ASCA National Model into their practice and decreasing non-counseling duties and role ambiguity. Implementing the ASCA National Model may provide a preventative tool for school counselor practice that allows them to advocate for
engagement of appropriate roles to prevent role ambiguity and provide a medium for opening communications with administrators and principals about realistic expectations of school counselors. It may allow school counselors to take ownership of their roles and practice, provide education to principals and administrators of the appropriate scope of practice, and show how school counselors can positively impact students’ academic, career, and personal and social needs. School counselors discussing the benefits of the ASCA National Model as a framework for practice may increase principal support of the school counseling program mission and advocate for increased appropriate usage of time in counseling related duties. Utilizing sections of the ASCA National Model (2012; i.e., Management templates that provide advocacy tools for school counselors to share with principals that show school counselors may be making a difference [e.g., Closing-the-Gap Action Plan and Program Results Report] and to guide their practice [e.g., Use-of-Time Assessment]) to educate principals on the benefits of engaging in increased counseling duties both for the students and the professional’s vitality, which may have additional benefits of lowering levels of role ambiguity.

Several implications were discussed in relation to the results of the level of burnout for the school counseling profession in the present study. Additionally, several implications were discussed for the school counseling profession in relation to the results of the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model in the present study. The next section first discusses the implications related to the level of burnout and the counselor education and supervision profession. The section concludes with a discussion
of the implications concluded by the results of the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model in relation to the counselor education and supervision profession.

**Implications for the Counselor Education and Supervision Profession**

Various implications were concluded based upon the results of the present study for the graduate preparation of school counselors, the Counselor Education and Supervision (CES) profession. First, implications for the CES profession are discussed in relation to the significant results presented for research question one. Then, implications for the CES profession are discussed in relation to the significant results presented for research question two.

**Research question one: Level of burnout.** Several implications may be generated for the CES profession based on the results of research question one. Results of the present study showed that perceived job stress was the highest statistically significant (positive) predictor variable. Level of role conflict was the second highest statistically significant (positive) predictor variable. Perceived job satisfaction was the third highest statistically significant (negative) predictor variable. Level of role ambiguity was the fourth highest statistically significant (negative) predictor variable, and amount of time engaged in consultation was the fifth statistically significant (positive) predictor variable for level of burnout. Therefore, the following recommendations for the CES profession are based on the findings from research question one.

Perceived job stress was the highest statistically significant predictor variable for level of burnout. It may be beneficial for CES professionals to understand and relay to
graduate students that most individuals experience stress on a daily basis. It may be helpful for graduate students to reflect on perceived job stress during graduate preparation and how they respond to stress. Incorporating educational components of stress throughout graduate preparation may proactively allow students to identify sources of stress, ways they are currently coping with stress, evaluating their levels of stress, and implementing proactive strategies to manage stress. CES professionals may want to measure or evaluate school counseling students’ perceived stress during the field experience courses using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4; S. S. Cohen et al., 1983). By identifying perceived job stress in individual or group supervision, this may allow for proactive management of stress before students enter the school counseling profession.

Perceived job satisfaction was a statistically significant predictor variable for level of burnout in the sample of school counselors. Since perceived job stress may be an ongoing experience of school counselors, it may be helpful to also consider the relationship between perceived job satisfaction and level of burnout. It may be helpful for CES professionals to focus class discussions on the benefits of the school counseling profession. Assignments and reflective discussions on why students want to pursue a degree in school counseling may foster reflections leading to future perceived job satisfaction. It may be helpful to bring in practicing school counselors as guest speakers to describe the benefits of being a school counselor and the benefits of the school counseling profession in the school setting. CES professionals may want to provide students’ time to report the satisfactions of their job during field experience courses and steer overt negative discussions.
Role conflict and role ambiguity were negatively related with burnout for the present sample of school counselors. It may be helpful to understand and discuss the realities of the job, along with the impacts of role conflict, role ambiguity, and perceived job stress on level of burnout during graduate training. For example, beginning in the content classes of graduate counseling training and spanning through the field (i.e., practicum and internship) courses, realistic expectations and realities of job stress, satisfaction, school counselor roles and duties, and burnout should be communicated with students. This may provide a foundation for preventative measures as students enter the school counseling profession. Additionally, school counselors-in-training may benefit from taking classes with clinical mental health students to begin collaborative efforts between schools and clinical mental health professionals. This may additionally provide school counseling students with advanced training in diagnosis and treatment of mental health disorders. This advanced training may alleviate perceived job stress experienced by consulting with other professionals on advanced student cases (i.e., students with mental health diagnoses, trauma, etc.) in the school setting. Finally, assignments related to discussing how school counselors are currently advocating for appropriate roles may provide increased understanding, tools, and evaluations of current school counseling practices.

Lastly, the amount of time engaged in consultation services was a statistically significant positive predictor variable for level of burnout. In the classroom setting, CES professionals may want to educate school counselors-in-training on their role as consultants in the school setting and benefits to engaging in consultation with other
professionals. School counselors often engage in collaborative preparation with other school personnel. As CES professionals engage in conversations about the appropriate roles and duties of school counselors, it may be helpful to infuse the role consultation and collaboration may have for school counselors. School counselors who may be expected to consult with other professionals on issues that are beyond their scope of practice and may report these interactions as stressful and overwhelming. It may be helpful for school counselors-in-training to learn more about the role of consultation in the school setting, job shadow a school counselor to learn more about their appropriate roles and duties, role play how to consult with other professionals in the classroom setting, and create projects related to increasing their knowledge of consultation services in the school setting.

Overall, there are several implications related to the results of the level of burnout for the CES profession. The next section discusses the implications related to the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model into practice and the CES profession.

**Research question two: Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model.** Several implications may be generated for the CES profession based on the results of research question two. Results of the present study showed that percentage of time engaged in non-counseling duties was the highest statistically significant negative predictor variable and level of role ambiguity was a statistically significant positive predictor variable for research question one. Therefore, the following recommendations for the CES profession are based on the findings from research question two.

Related to the results of research question two, it may be helpful for CES professionals relay realistic job duties of school counselors throughout graduate
preparation. For example, the ASCA National Model (2012) allows for school counselors to engage in indirect services up to 20% of their time. Due to the realities of the educational system (i.e., state mandated testing, etc.) non-counseling duties assigned to school counselors may never be fully eliminated. Therefore, it may be important to have conversations about the realities and realistic job expectations of school counselor duties during graduate training and preparation. For example, CES professionals may begin incorporating course assignments related to exploring the realities of school counselor jobs during an orientation to the school counseling profession course. CES professionals may also increase school counseling students’ advocacy skills and techniques during graduate training through assigned readings, and role plays, and additional experiential activities. Advocacy techniques may additionally assist school counseling students in subsequently increasing their engagement in counseling related duties in their field experience courses and in their professional practice.

The ASCA National Model may be instrumental aiding school counselors in advocating for appropriate roles and duties, along with applying a framework for school counseling practice throughout the United States. Therefore, it may be helpful to have a graduate course focused on the understanding and application of the ASCA National Model. Subsequent field experience courses should focus on school counseling students applying the ASCA National Model into their practice. Group supervision during field experience courses may incorporate discussions of how students are aligning and incorporating the ASCA National Model into their practice.
There may be benefits to connecting educational administration and school counseling students and CES professionals within the university setting. For example, school counselors-in-training may consider taking a graduate class or seminar in educational administration to understand the roles and responsibilities of administrators and principals in the school setting. Additionally, principals-in-training may consider taking a graduate class or seminar in school counseling to understand the appropriate roles and responsibilities of school counselors in the school setting. This practice may allow school counselors and principals in-training to increase their knowledge of the appropriate roles and duties of the other profession. Trainings may additionally include a graduate course, seminar, guest speaker in classes, or workshop focused on partnerships between principals and school counselors. Content of the training may include the job duties of school counselors and principals, frameworks of respective practices, supervision models most commonly applied to the school setting, and ways to appropriately communicate needs with each other. It may be helpful for school counselors-in-training, CES professionals, and school counselors to engage in ongoing network opportunities with educational leadership professionals in the school and university settings. School counselors and CES professionals may additionally find it helpful to engage in research, attend conferences, or join professional organizations focusing on principal or the education system in general.

Finally, it is not a requirement for CES professionals to have specialized training in school counseling. For example, CES professionals who have backgrounds in clinical mental health counseling may be charged with teaching school counseling.
content-focused or field experience courses. In these circumstances, it may be helpful for those CES professionals to seek support from CES colleagues who are experienced in school counseling, bring in guest lecturers, or receive additional training in school counseling.

This section first discussed several implications related to the results for level of burnout of the CES profession. Next, the implications for the CES profession related to the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model into practice were discussed. The final section of this chapter discusses the limitations of the present study and recommendations for future research.

Limitations of the Present Study and Recommendations for Future Research

There were several limitations of the present study and recommendations for future research. This section discusses the limitations of the present study and corresponding recommendations for future research. Limitations and recommendations for future research are discussed related to the research methodology, demographic characteristics of the participants, participants’ response rates with timing of survey distribution, predictor variables, criterion variables, and variables for future research for the present study.

Research methodology. A quantitative research method of multiple regression analysis was utilized to investigate the research questions. There are several additional methods to selecting and including predictors into a regression equation. For example, a hierarchical regression analysis procedure would allow the researcher to include meaningful blocks of predictor variables into the regression one at a time based upon the
theoretical underpinnings of burnout (Dimitrov, 2009). The results of a hierarchical regression analysis may be able to provide strengthened conclusions for the predictions of burnout for school counselors in the present study. Additionally, it may be beneficial to complete qualitative research to understand the meaning of or lived experiences of the variables, complete a grounded theory of burnout, and a case study of how the ASCA National Model may be successfully implemented into practice. Additionally, a mixed methods approach may be helpful to gain further insight and identify the meaning or direction of relationships between the predictor and criterion variables for the present study. Overall, several additional research methodologies were discussed in relation to the present study. The next section discusses the limitations and recommendations for future research based upon the demographic characteristics of the participants.

**Demographic characteristics of the participants.** Participants were primarily White females in their 40s who worked as school counselors for approximately 14 years. There was a low response rate from participants of color despite collecting a national sample of school counselors. The present study was unable to compare levels of burnout and levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model with various races and ethnicities of participants. However, this limitation may be due to overall negligible diversity within the school counseling profession. Previous researchers have reported similar demographic statistics of the school counseling profession’s racial and ethnic makeup (i.e., Gnilka et al., 2015). Additionally, this researcher requested information regarding the racial and ethnic makeup of school counselors. The ASCA responded that they were unwilling to provide the national statistics of the racial and ethnic makeup of
the school counseling profession (personal communication, October 8, 2013). Results of the present study may have been impacted by the overall homogeneity of participants and should be interpreted with an understanding of the potential implications of a homogenous sample of participants. Underrepresented groups in school counselors may also experience other job stressors or have difficult experiences. This may be helpful to research in future studies. Additionally, future research efforts should be made to include diversified populations of school counselors. It may be beneficial to consider various ways to network and partner with school counselors of color. Research that includes a qualitative focus (i.e., understanding the meaning of stress and burnout) and action research may be a preliminary approach to larger scale, quantitative studies, of burnout and school counselors of color.

All participants were members of the ASCA and working full-time. It is unknown the results of school counselors not belonging to the ASCA. The school counselors of the ASCA may be more involved and engaged with the profession as part of their membership, which may impact their levels of burnout and implementation of the ASCA National Model. Future research may include a focus on school counselors who are not members of a professional organization. Overall, several considerations related to the demographic characteristics of the participants in the current study were reviewed. The next section discusses the limitations and recommendations for future research based upon the participants’ response rates with the timing of the instruments distribution.

**Participants’ response rates with timing of the instruments distribution.**

Overall, 4,000 emails were distributed to school counselors who were members of the
ASCA. Two hundred and eight ($N = 208$) participants fully completed the survey with a completion rate of 5.2%. The sample size was appropriate for analyses of the research questions. However, the response rate appears low even for survey research. School counselors were surveyed during the summer months (i.e., July and August) when schools were not in session. It is unknown how many potential participants did not respond due to being on summer break. Additionally, school counselors responded to questions regarding perceived job stress, perceived job satisfaction, and level of burnout, among other variables during a time when they may be off contract or not actively engaging in school counseling activities with students. School counselors reported significant levels of perceived job stress and burnout during the summer months despite the potential limitation of completing the survey during a time when schools were not in session. These findings may be related to the understanding that burnout is within the distress portion of the wellness to impairment continuum and may develop over time (Lawson et al., 2007). Despite these findings, it is unknown the impact on responses due to completing the survey during the summer months. It may be helpful to understand whether the time of school year (i.e., summer months vs. fall vs. state mandated testing time vs. end of the school year, etc.) may impact school counselors’ perceived job stress and burnout. Therefore, several considerations related to the participants’ response rates with the timing of the instruments distribution were considered. The next section discusses the limitations and recommendations for future research based upon the predictor variables for the research questions.
**Predictor variables.** There were several limitations and subsequent recommendations for future research regarding the predictor variables: (a) amount of time engaged in supervision, (b) amount of time engaged in consultation, and (c) coping responses and styles for the present study. There were recommendations for future research with the predictor variables: (a) perceived job stress, (b) level of role ambiguity, and (c) level of role conflict for the present study. Finally, the potential limitations from socially desirable responses of predictor variables were reported.

**Amount of time engaged in supervision.** The amount of time engaged in supervision in minutes on a monthly basis was inputted by each participant for the present study. Two hundred and seven \((n = 207)\) participants identified 600 minutes or less of supervision monthly and one participant reported engaging in 1,025 minutes of supervision monthly. It may be helpful to clarify the definition of supervision minutes or provide an example of how to respond to the question (i.e., 120 minutes = 2 hours of supervision each month; 90 minutes = one and a half hours of supervision each month).

The lack of significant findings between supervision and burnout in the present study may support the overall lack of understanding regarding school counseling supervision practices (e.g., Ockerman et al., 2013). An example may be the large variance in reported supervision minutes on a monthly basis by a participant in the present study. For the school counseling profession, supervision is not required for school counselors after receiving their master’s degree. Approximately 40% \((n = 84)\) of the participants in the present study were not receiving supervision monthly. Additionally, approximately 80% \((n = 168)\) of participants in the current study received
60 minutes or less of supervision monthly with the majority of participants \((n = 115; 66.1\%)\) receiving supervision by principals or other administrators who may not have advanced training in school counseling practice. Future research may focus on studying the current and preferred practices of school counseling supervision.

**Amount of time engaged in consultation.** The measurement procedure of the statistically significant predictor variable, amount of time engaged in consultation in hours on a monthly basis, may have limitations with interpreting its results. The method of measuring consultation in blocks of hours (i.e., 0–5 hours, 6–10 hours, etc.) may have limited its accurateness for data analysis and results. Obtaining a precise amount of time participants engaged in consultation services may provide an increased accuracy on its predictive value or explanation of variances for the criterion variable, level of burnout in school counselors. Therefore, future research should focus on uncovering a more accurate amount of time for data analysis (i.e., input the number of hours you engage in consultation on a weekly basis). Additionally, including a question that requires participants the rank order for frequency of type of consultation activities may provide or who they engage in consultation with and what the consultation is about may provide a more accurate understanding of what consultation may entail and which parts of consultation may lead to increased levels of burnout.

**Perceived job stress.** Previous literature has minimally focused on stress experienced by school counselors during graduate training. Understanding the risk of experiencing stress and potentially burnout during the field experiences (i.e., practicums and internship courses) may provide training and supervision methods to implement by
CES professionals in the classroom and school counselors in the school settings. Researching the outcome of educating students on the potential for stress and burnout, along with the realities of the job to limit role ambiguity and role conflict, may provide increased understanding of their impact during graduate training before entering the profession.

Coping responses and styles. There may be limitations to interpreting the instrumentation results regarding the predictor variable, coping styles and responses. The Brief COPE (Carver, 1997) was used to measure coping styles and responses and originally included 13 subscales. Carver discouraged researchers against grouping subscales into other factors than the 13 subscales or an overall score. This researcher chose to measure an overall score of coping styles and responses due to the large number of subscales, which would have added a significant number of additional predictor variables to the present study. Therefore, positive and negative coping styles and responses were combined into one score. This data analysis procedure may have impacted the overall predictive value of coping responses and styles with levels of burnout. Due to this limitation, it is unknown the predictive or explanatory value of the varying types of coping responses and styles with levels of burnout in the present sample of school counselors. Future research should focus on delineating positive and negative coping styles and responses. It may be helpful to understand how often school counselors are engaging in positive and negative coping styles and responses and their predictive contributions to level of burnout. This research may allow greater understanding on which coping styles and responses may impact burnout.
**Level of role ambiguity and role conflict as criterion variables.** Future research that explores the predictive values of various demographic and related variables on levels of role ambiguity and role conflict may help further understand their impact on the school counseling profession. Since level of role ambiguity and role conflict provided unique explanations for the criterion variables in the present study, future research should focus on understanding their implications as criterion (i.e., dependent) variables. This research would increase an understanding of the predictive or explanatory value of the predictor variables for level of role ambiguity and role conflict for school counselors.

**Socially desirable responses of predictor variables.** Several questions that were assessed may be sensitive topics to self-report (i.e., perceived job stress, negative coping styles and responses, role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout). It is unknown the number of participants who may have chosen to answer these questions in a socially desirable manner for the present study. It may be helpful to include a social desirability instrumentation (i.e., Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) in future studies to determine whether school counselors are honestly reporting their perceived job stress, negative coping styles and responses, and levels of role ambiguity, role conflict, and burnout. Several limitations and recommendations for future research of the predictor variables for the present study were discussed. The next section discusses the limitations and recommendations for future research of the criterion variables in the present study.
Criterion variables. There may be several limitations and subsequent recommendations for future research based on the criterion variables in the present research study.

Level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. There may be limitations with the instrumentation used to measure the criterion variable, level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens et al., 2010). The construct validity for the SCPIS has not yet been well established in the school counseling literature. Previous researchers have measured the implementation of the ASCA National Model in various ways. For example, Pyne (2011) used the Comprehensive School Counseling Implementation Measures (CSCIM) and recommended using the SCPIS in future research. Overall, the lack of validation related to measuring the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model may highlight the emerging research of its usage within the school counseling profession. Future research efforts should focus on modifying or investigating the construct validity of the SCPIS with school counselors.

The informed consent for the current study stated the researcher was studying several variables, including the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. Several potential participants contacted the researcher asking whether they could participate in the study if they did not identify with currently implementing the ASCA National Model into practice. The present study was meant to be inclusive to all currently practicing school counselors despite their level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. However, the wording related to the implementation of the ASCA
National Model in the informed consent may have been misleading. It is unknown the potential number of participants who did not partake in the study due to not identifying with implementing any portion of the ASCA National Model into their practice. In future studies, the researcher will specify that all school counselors may participate in the study, despite whether or not they have implemented any portion of the ASCA National Model or a comprehensive school counseling program into their practice.

The ASCA National Model was first incorporated into practice in 2003. Due to its inception within the past 15 years, many school counselors working in schools completed their graduate training before the ASCA National Model emerged as a framework for practice. Therefore, it may be helpful to explore potential differences between school counselors who graduated before the ASCA National Model implementation in 2003 and after its inception. This comparison may determine whether graduate training impacts school counselors’ implementation of the ASCA National Model and burnout. Additionally, future research may compare school counselors who have Recognized ASCA Model Programs (RAMP) and non-RAMP schools to compare difference between their levels of burnout.

**Level of burnout.** The Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI; S. M. Lee et al., 2007) was used as a measurement for the criterion variable, level of burnout, for school counselors. The CBI provides an overall level of burnout score. Additionally, the CBI contains five factors that describe unique contributions to understanding burnout in school counselors. Future research may include studying the extent of impact the ASCA National Model and additional predictor variables had on explaining the variances of
each of the factors of burnout measured on the CBI. Therefore, five multiple regression analyses could be completed to determine the unique contributions of the predictor variables with each of the CBI factors (i.e., negative work environment, devaluing clients, deterioration in personal life, exhaustion, and incompetence).

Additionally, to this researcher’s knowledge, no research has been completed on longitudinal studies of burnout or stress for school counselors. Questions remain in the literature regarding whether burnout manifests acutely or chronically (Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006), whether it may be cyclical, on a wellness to impairment continuum (Lawson et al., 2007), or understood as a theory (Meier, 1983). Lawson et al. (2007) reported that burnout does not indicate that school counseling professionals are not meeting the needs of students. However, future studies should focus on understanding burnout and the potential for impairment in school counselors. It may be helpful to complete longitudinal studies of burnout over the span of school counselors’ careers (i.e., graduate students to retirement) to gain a greater understanding of how burnout may progress over time.

School counselors are in the position to meet the needs of various student concerns. School counselors may be the only mental health professional with whom a student may interact (Farmer et al., 2003) and they are often responsible for making referrals for serious student needs (i.e., diagnosed mental health conditions, trauma counseling, etc.). Compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma are experienced when professionals work with trauma populations (Newell & MacNeil, 2010). School counselors may experience higher levels of compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma due
to assisting with a large range of serious student needs, including trauma experienced by students, on a daily basis. Future research should focus on the impact of compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma on stress and burnout for school counselors.

Several variables within the school setting may impact the level of burnout in school counselors. It may be beneficial to explore the potential effects of various work environments (i.e., school counselors who are of different cultural backgrounds or ethnicities of their students, experiences of working in a public, private and charter, or online school setting) on levels of burnout for school counselors. It may be helpful to explore the potential to safeguard against burnout due to engagement with other professionals or stakeholders (i.e., teachers, administrators, other mental health professionals). Public health literature (i.e., Clark & McLeroy, 1995) reported the positive influence community wellness may have on safeguarding against stress and burnout. The public health literature may be helpful to utilize since school counselors work as part of a school community and may provide additional support for including the elements of community wellness to protect school counselors’ against excessive perceived job stress and burnout. In addition to understanding school-based wellness, future research should focus on individuals’ satisfaction with their partners, family, friends, and community engagements and their relationship to burnout.

A significant relationship between personality factors and burnout has been reported in various helping professions (i.e., Maslach et al., 2001). To this author’s knowledge, no studies have researched the personality characteristics of school counselors. Additionally, no studies have explored the potential linkage between
personality characteristics and burnout in school counselors. Future research may focus on personality characteristics of school counselors and their potential link with burnout. The section discussed the limitations and recommendations for future research for the criterion variables for the present study. The final section discusses additional variables for future research in relation to the present study.

**Additional variables for future research.** There were additional questions included in the demographic questionnaire but not included in the research analyses due to being beyond the scope of the research questions. However, the questions may be the focus of future research. Participants reported on the demographic questionnaire the state they were employed as a school counselor. Future research may include comparing school counselors who have a state specific school counseling model of implementation and its impact on implementing the ASCA National Model and levels of burnout. Additionally, participants reported on the demographic questionnaire whether or not the principal knew the appropriate roles of the school counselor’s job according to the ASCA National Model. Future research could focus on whether principals’ knowledge levels have an impact on school counselors being able to implement the ASCA National Model and how principals may learn about the ASCA National Model. Future research may focus on the efforts of education between school counselors’ job duties and principals’ understanding of these roles in the ASCA National Model. This research may provide further understanding of variables that impact role ambiguity and conflict for school counselors. Additionally, research related to participants’ practice of using models as a framework for practice from other school professionals (i.e., school psychologists,
principals, administrators, etc.) may assist school counselors in generating a broader understanding of how to implement a model into practice. Finally, the number of hours participants worked each week was included in the demographic questionnaire but not included in the present data analyses. Future research may study the relationship between amount of hours worked each week and level of burnout. Future research may also include studying the relationship between another demographic variable, income, of school counselors and level of burnout. Additionally, it may be helpful to understand the factors of self-efficacy, hope, and resiliency in burnout of school counselors in future studies.

Overall, several limitations and recommendations for future research were discussed in relation to the present study. Limitations were reported and recommendations for future research were based upon the limitations of the present study. Chapter 4 concludes with a summary of the present study.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to determine which of the following independent variables were significant predictors for levels of burnout in the sample of school counselors: level of implementation of the ASCA National Model, age, sex, race and ethnicity, type of degree, years of experience, type of school district, level of practice, number of buildings served, student-to-school counselor ratio, amount of time engaged in supervision, amount of time engaged in consultation, percentage of time spent in counseling and non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, level of role ambiguity,
and level of role conflict. The purpose of this study was also to explain the extent of impact the independent variables predicted the levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model for school counselors. Multiple linear regression analyses were completed to test the research questions. The results of the study determined that perceived job stress, level of role conflict, perceived job satisfaction, level of role ambiguity, and amount of time engaged in consultation predicted the level of burnout in the present sample of school counselors. The results of the study also determined that percentage of time spent in non-counseling duties and level of role ambiguity predicted the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model. There was a discussion of the statistically significant correlations and the predictor variables for the research questions. Implications were reported for the school counseling and counselor education and supervision professions based upon the research findings. Various limitations were identified and recommendations for future research were discussed based on the limitations of the study. Overall, future research should continue to focus on increasing understandings of the level of burnout and the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model into practice for the school counseling profession.
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SCHOOL COUNSELOR PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY (SCPIS)
Appendix A

School Counselor Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STMT NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIVE STATEMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A written mission statement exists and is used as a foundation by all counselors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Services are organized so that all students are well served and have access to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The program operates from a plan for closing the achievement gap for minority and lower income students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The program has a set of clear measurable student learning objectives and goals are established for academics, social/personal skills, and career development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Needs Assessments are completed regularly and guide program planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All students receive classroom guidance lessons designed to promote academic, social/personal, and career development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The program ensures all students have academic plans that include testing, individual advice, long-term planning, and placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The program has an effective referral and follow-up system for handling student crises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School counselors use student performance data to decide how to meet student needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School counselors analyze student data by ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic level to identify interventions to close achievement gaps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School counselor job descriptions match actual duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>School counselors spend at least 80% of their time in activities that directly benefit students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The school counseling program includes interventions designed to improve the school's ability to educate all students to high standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>An annual review is conducted to get information for improving next year's programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>School counselors use computer software to access student data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>School counselors use computer software to analyze student data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>School counselors use computer software to use data for school improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The school counseling program has the resources to allow counselors to complete appropriate professional development activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>School counseling priorities are represented on curriculum and education committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>School counselors communicate with parents to coordinate student achievement and gain feedback for program improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PERMISSION TO USE AND REPRINT THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY (SCPIS)
Appendix B

Permission to Use and Reprint the School Counselor Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS)

Dear Elysia V. Clemens,

Greetings! My name is Heather Smith and I am a doctoral student at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio. I am currently working towards completing my dissertation and am proposing to complete a multiple regression study in order to understand how levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model and demographic variables predict burnout (as measured by the Counselor Burnout Inventory), role conflict and role ambiguity (as measured by the Role Questionnaire) in Professional School Counselors. Through my review of the literature and research thus far, I have read about the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS) you and colleagues developed (Clemens, Carey, & Harrington, 2010) and believe it to be an excellent questionnaire to use to measure the levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model in my study. Therefore, I am writing to ask you for permission to use the SCPIS for my dissertation research. If you do grant me permission, please let me know how I might attain copies of the SCPIS. Also, I was wondering if you have any new data collected, newer reliability or validity studies, or revisions made to the SCPIS since 2010? My goal is to use the questionnaire as part of an online survey for Professional School Counselors and furthermore, wanted to ask for permission to convert it to an online format. The survey will be offered to professionals through a private email with a link to the survey for interested participants.

If you would like, I would be happy to share the results of the study with you once it is completed. Thank you for your time, consideration, and assistance. If you have any further questions, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Heather Smith

Heather J. Smith, M.Ed., NCC, LPC (OH)
Doctoral Candidate
Counseling and Human Development Services
Kent State University
PO Box 5190
310 White Hall
Kent, OH 44242
Clemens, Elyssa <Elyssa.Clemens@unco.edu>
To: Heather Smith <smith56@kent.edu>

Hi Heather:

Thanks so much for your email. You are welcome to use the SCPIS in your dissertation study. I think the instrument is available in the appendix of the manuscript - most people use that to create an online survey. Let me know if it's not there... It's been a little while since I've looked at it :)

As far as I know, Center for School Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation hasn't done additional validation studies. But if you send me a reminder email next week happy to double check as I'll be at CSORE then.

Best,
Elyssa Clemens

Sent from my iPhone
[Drafted text hidden]

Heather Smith <smith56@kent.edu>
To: "Clemens, Elyssa" <Elyssa.Clemens@unco.edu>

Hi Elyssa,

Thank you for giving me permission to use the SCPIS for my dissertation study. Yes, I saw the SCPIS in the back of the article and am happy to use that for the online survey. OK, sounds good. I will send you a reminder email next week :) I saw you are on sabbatical this year...hope you are having a successful semester and thank you for your quick reply!

Much appreciation,
Heather Smith
[Drafted text hidden]

Heather Smith <smith56@kent.edu>
To: "Clemens, Elyssa" <Elyssa.Clemens@unco.edu>

Hi Elyssa,

Hope you are having a good week. I was going through my email this afternoon and saw our conversation from last week...any recent validation studies of the SCPIS completed at the CSORE? :) Thanks!

On Wed, Nov 12, 2014 at 8:26 PM, Clemens, Elyssa <Elyssa.Clemens@unco.edu> wrote:

[Drafted text hidden]

[Drafted text hidden]
Dear Kathleen,

Hello, my name is Heather (Smith) Fye and I am a doctoral student at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio. I am currently in the final stages of my dissertation research on the impact of level of Implementation of the ASCA National Model and additional variables on burnout for school counselors. Evelyn Clements granted me permission to use the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPS) to Clevens, Casey, & Harrington, 2010 for my dissertation research on November 12, 2018. The topic may possibly sound familiar to you as I have corresponded with you in the past on writing an article for the ASCA School Counselor related to the topic.

I recently contacted Evelyn about whether or not I may be granted permission to include the SCPS in my dissertation appendices. She shared that ASCA has copyrights to the SCPS and provided your contact information. Therefore, I am writing to ask you for permission to re-print the SCPS in my dissertation appendices. If you do not provide permission, I will cite the SCPS appropriately and include Evelyn’s permission to use the SCPS, but not include the questions of the SCPS.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and assistance. If you have any further questions, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Heather (Smith) Fye
Permission granted.

Kathleen Beavers
Director of Communications
American School Counselor Association (ASCA)
1191 King St., Suite C10
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 961-2722
(202) 937-7872, fax
www.schoolcounselor.org
KBeavers@ASCA.org

Heather Smith <HSmith188@kent.ed>  Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 4:23 PM

To: Kathleen Beavers <KBeavers@schoolcounselor.org>

Thank you, Kathleen.

Heather
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Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.</th>
<th>Disagree very much</th>
<th>Disagree moderately</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree moderately</th>
<th>Agree very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Communications seem good within the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Raising are too few and far between.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responses (1-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>People get afraid as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I enjoy my coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Blanket Permission to Use the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

Sharing of Results for Researchers Who Use My Scales

All of my scales are copyrighted. I allow free use under two conditions:

1. The use is for noncommercial educational or research purposes. This means no one is charging anyone a fee. If you are using any of my scales for consulting purposes, there is a fee.

2. You agree to share results with me. This is how I continue to update the norms and bibliography.

What Results Do I Need?

1. Means per subscale and total score

2. Sample size

3. Brief description of sample, e.g., 220 hospital nurses. I don't need to know the organization name if it is sensitive.

4. Name of country where collected, and if outside of the U.S., the language used. I am especially interested in non-American samples.

5. Standard deviations per subscale and total score (optional)

6. Coefficient alpha per subscale and total score (optional)

I would love to see copies of research reports (thesis, dissertation, conference paper, journal article, etc.) in which you used the JSS. Summaries are fine for long documents (e.g., dissertation), and e-mailed documents are preferred (saves copy and mail costs). Be sure to indicate how you want the work cited in the bibliography.

You can send the material to me via e-mail: jppector [at] sign goes here] usf.edu or via regular mail:

Paulpector, Department of Psychology, PCD 4118, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL 33620 USA.

Last modified January 7, 2011.
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Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4)

INSTRUCTIONS:
The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during THE LAST MONTH. In each case, please indicate your response by placing an “X” over the circle representing HOW OFTEN you felt or thought a certain way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
2. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
3. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?
4. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?
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Blanket Permission to Use the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-4)

Dr. Cohen’s Scales:

We welcome anyone (e-mail OK) of any in person or published papers using any of Dr. Cohen’s scales that you are willing to share with us, and thank you in advance for your generosity. They will not be reprinted or linked without your permission.

Permission: Permission for use of scales is not necessary when use is for nonprofit academic research or nonprofit educational purposes. For other uses, please contact the lab at commonscale@psych.cmu.edu for instructions.

PERCEIVED STRESS SCALE (PSS)

PLEASE NOTE: The Perceived Stress Scale is not a diagnostic instrument, there are no normative cut-offs. There are only comparisons within your own sample. For normative data from large US samples, see articles at right.

NOTE about recalculating the recall period: We have not collected psychosomatic in other time periods. Our goal is that the longer the prospective period between, the less accurate the instrument will be. Shorter time periods (e.g., daily intervals) should not be a problem.

PSS (English, 4-item short version)
Word-Document version
The English version was validated. See the ZITO article (at right).

PSS (Spanish-4 item short version)

PSS Translations

How to Acquire Permissions for Translations: To acquire permission to use a translation in your project, please attempt to contact the translator directly. Non-English translations are the sole intellectual property of the translator, and permission requests should be sent to them, not Dr. Cohen. If you are uncertain at certifying a translation, please email their name and this website URL to your publication. Thank you.

PERCEIVED STRESS SCALE (PSS)

PAPERS ON PSS


PSS TRANSLATIONS

http://www.psy.cmu.edu/~socohen/scales.html

11/21/2014
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Brief COPE

These items deal with ways you’ve been coping with the stress in your life since you found out you were going to have to have this operation. There are many ways to try to deal with problems. These items ask what you’ve been doing to cope with this one. Obviously, different people deal with things in different ways, but I’m interested in how you’ve tried to deal with it. Each item asks something about a particular way of coping. I want to know to what extent you’ve been doing what the item says. How much or how frequently. Don’t answer on the basis of whether it seems to be working or not—just whether or not you’re doing it. Use these response choices. Try to rate each item separately in your mind from the others. Make your answers as true FOR YOU as you can.

1 = I haven’t been doing this at all
2 = I’ve been doing this a little bit
3 = I’ve been doing this a medium amount
4 = I’ve been doing this a lot

1. I’ve been turning to work or other activities to take my mind off things.
2. I’ve been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I’m in.
3. I’ve been saying to myself “this isn’t real.”
4. I’ve been using alcohol or other drugs to make myself feel better.
5. I’ve been getting emotional support from others.
6. I’ve been giving up trying to deal with it.
7. I’ve been taking action to try to make the situation better.
8. I’ve been refusing to believe that it has happened.
9. I’ve been saying things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.
10. I’ve been getting help and advice from other people.
11. I’ve been using alcohol or other drugs to help me get through it.
12. I’ve been trying to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive.
13. I’ve been criticizing myself.
14. I’ve been trying to come up with a strategy about what to do.
15. I’ve been getting comfort and understanding from someone.
16. I’ve been giving up the attempt to cope.
17. I’ve been looking for something good in what is happening.
18. I’ve been making jokes about it.
19. I’ve been doing something to think about it less, such as going to movies, watching TV, reading, daydreaming, sleeping, or shopping.
20. I’ve been accepting the reality of the fact that it has happened.
21. I’ve been expressing my negative feelings.
22. I’ve been trying to find comfort in my religion or spiritual beliefs.
23. I’ve been trying to get advice or help from other people about what to do.
24. I’ve been learning to live with it.
25. I’ve been thinking hard about what steps to take.
26. I’ve been blaming myself for things that happened.
27. I’ve been praying or meditating.
28. I’ve been making fun of the situation.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Carver

Original version of the COPE

http://www.psy.miami.edu/faculty/carver/scICCOPE.html

11/17/2014
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Blanket Permission to Use the Brief COPE

University of Miami, Psychology

Graduate

- Faculty
- Alumni
- Directory

Brief COPE

The items below are an abbreviated version of the COPE Inventory. We have used it in research with breast cancer patients, with a community sample recovering from Hurricane Andrew, and with other samples as well. The citation for the article reporting the development of the Brief COPE, which includes information about factor structure and internal reliability from the hurricane sample is below. The Brief COPE has also been translated into several other languages, which have been published separately by other researchers (see below).

We created the shorter item set partly because earlier patient samples became impatient at responding to the full instrument (both because of the length and redundancy of the full instrument and because of the overall time burden of the assessment protocol). In choosing which items to retain for this version (which has only 2 items per scale), we were guided by strong loadings from previous factor analyses, and by item clarity and meaningfulness to the patients in a previous study. In creating the reduced item set, we also “tuned” some of the scales somewhat (largely because some of the original scales had dual focuses) and omitted scales that had not appeared to be important among breast cancer patients. In this way the positive reinterpretation and growth scale became positive reframing (no growth); focus on and venting of emotions became venting (focusing was too tied to the experiencing of the emotion, and we decided it was venting we were really interested in); mental disengagement became self-distraction (with a slight expansion of mentioned means of self-distraction). We also added one scale that was not part of the original inventory—a 2-item measure of self-blame—because this response has been important in some earlier work.

You are welcome to use all scales of the Brief COPE, or to choose selected scales for use. Feel free as well to adapt the language for whatever time scale you are interested in.

http://www psy miami ed u/faculty/ccarver/c cope t/ sc lBrCOPE.html

11/17/2014
Citation: Carver, C. S. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol’s too long: Consider the Brief COPE. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*, 92-100.  [abstract]

Following is the BRIEF COPE as we are now administering it, with the instructional orientation for a presurgery interview (the first time the COPE is given in this particular study). Please feel free to adapt the instructions as needed for your application.

Scales are computed as follows (with no reversals of coding):

Self-distraction, items 1 and 19
Active coping, items 2 and 7
Denial, items 3 and 8
Substance use, items 4 and 11
Use of emotional support, items 5 and 15
Use of instrumental support, items 10 and 23
Behavioral disengagement, items 6 and 16
Venting, items 9 and 21
Positive reframing, items 12 and 17
Planning, items 14 and 25
Humor, items 18 and 28
Acceptance, items 20 and 24
Religion, items 22 and 27
Self-blame, items 13 and 26

I have had many questions about combining scales into "problem focused" and "emotion focused" aggregates, or into an "overall" coping index. I have never done that in my own use of the scales. There is no such thing as an "overall" score on this measure, and I recommend no particular way of generating a dominant coping style for a given person. Please do NOT write to me asking for instructions to for "adaptive" and "maladaptive" composites, because they do not have any such instructions. I generally look at each scale separately to see what its relation is to other variables. An alternative is to create second-order factors from among the scales (see the 1989 article) and using the factors as predictors. If you decide to do that, I recommend that you use your own data to determine the composition of the higher-order factors. Different samples exhibit different patterns of relations.

If you can not figure out from these instructions how to examine your data, please consult with your own statistical person rather than sending me questions.

If you are interested in a Spanish version of the Brief COPE.
If you are interested in a French version of the Brief COPE.
If you are interested in a German version of the Brief COPE.
If you are interested in a Greek version of the Brief COPE.
If you are interested in a Korean version of the Brief COPE.

http://www.psy.miami.edu/faculty/ccc/cop/brCOPE.html

11/17/2014
Appendix I

Role Questionnaire (RQ)

Respond to each role item, indicating the degree to which the condition exists for you at work:

1 = Very False, 2 = False, 3 = Somewhat False, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Somewhat True, 6 = True, 7 = Very True

Role Conflict:
1. I have to do things that should be done differently.
2. I have to work on unnecessary things.
3. I receive an assignment without the proper manpower to complete it.
4. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.
5. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.
6. I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.
7. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
8. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

Role Ambiguity:
9. I know exactly what is expected of me.
10. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
11. Clear, planned goals exist for my job.
12. I know that I have divided my time properly.
13. I know what my responsibilities are.
14. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.
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Permission to Use and Reprint the Role Questionnaire (RQ)

Dear Gerald Davis,

Hello! My name is Heather Smith and I am a doctoral student at Kent State University. I am reaching out to you in hopes of finding information related to an instrument I would like to incorporate into my dissertation research. I am proposing to complete a multiple regression study in order to understand how levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model and demographic variables predict burnout, role conflict, and role ambiguity in Professional School Counselors.

Through my review of the literature and research thus far, I have read about the Role Questionnaire [Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. Administrative science quarterly, 150-163.] and believe it to be an excellent questionnaire to use to measure role conflict and role ambiguity in my sample. Therefore, I am writing to ask you for your assistance with receiving permission to use the scale in my study. I have attempted to receive permission from John Rizzo but my contact has been unsuccessful. I sadly read that Robert House passed away, and have had difficulty contacting Sidney Lirtzman. A colleague suggested I contact the current editor of Administrative Science Quarterly to see if they may be able to provide assistance or permission. If you do grant me permission, please let me know how I might attain copies of the Role Questionnaire if different from the published 14 items and the full Likert Scale (1-7). Additionally, my goal is to use the questionnaire as part of an online survey for Professional School Counselors and furthermore, wanted to ask for permission to convert it to an online format, if permission is granted to use the RQ. The survey will be offered to professionals through a private email with a link to the survey for interested participants.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and assistance. If you have any further questions, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,
Heather Smith

Heather J. Smith, M.Ed., NCC, LPC (OH)
Doctoral Candidate

1/19/2015 6:21 PM
Counseling and Human Development Services
Kent State University
PO Box 5190
310 White Hall
Kent, OH 44242

Jerry Davis <gfudavis@umich.edu>  
To: Heather Smith <hsmith66@kent.edu>, "Linda M. Johanson" <linda.johanson@cornell.edu>, Joan Friedman <jfriedman@cornell.edu>

Hi Heather,
Thanks for the inquiry—I'm forwarding this to the managing editors at ASQ, who will know how to clear this.
Jerry Davis
[quoted text hidden]

Heather Smith <hsmith66@kent.edu>  
To: Jerry Davis <gfudavis@umich.edu>

Thank you for your quick response, Jerry! Heather
[quoted text hidden]

Joan Friedman <jfriedman@cornell.edu>  
To: Heather Smith <hsmith66@kent.edu>
Cc: Jerry Davis <gfudavis@umich.edu>, "Linda M. Johanson" <linda.johanson@cornell.edu>

Good morning, Heather,
Small world—I am a Kent State alum (journalism school, many moons ago). I will be happy to forward this request to the permissions dept. at Sage Publications, which now handles all matters like this. You should hear from them promptly, but if you don't receive a response by early next week, please let me know and I'm happy to follow up. Best of luck with your research!

Best,
Joan

Joan Friedman
Associate Managing Editor
Administrative Science Quarterly
The Johnson School at Cornell University
130 East Seneca Street, Suite 400
Ithaca, NY 14850-4353
tel.607/254-8304
From: Jerry Davis [mailto:jfdavis@umich.edu]
Sent: Monday, November 24, 2014 10:10 AM
To: Heather Smith; Linda M. Johnson; Joan Friedeman
Subject: Re: Inquiry for dissertation research

Like us on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/ASQJournal

---

Heather Smith <hsmith56@kent.edu>
To: Joan Friedeman <jfriedman@cornell.edu>

Hi Joan,

Yes, small world, neat, and thanks for sharing! I really enjoy the Kent area— if you haven't been here in a while, you would be surprised how much downtown has changed from even ten years ago. Thank you for forwarding this on and will keep you posted if I don't hear anything by early December. Hope you have a nice holiday.

Sincerely,
Heather Smith

---

permissions (US) <permissions@sagepub.com>
To: "hamith56@kent.edu" <hamith56@kent.edu>

Dear Heather Smith,

Thank you for your request. You can consider this email as permission to use the material as detailed below in your upcoming dissertation. Please note that this permission does not cover any 3rd party material that may be found within the work. We do ask that you properly credit the original source, Administrative Science Quarterly. Please contact us for any further usage of the material.

Best regards,
Michelle Binar

Rights Assistant
SAGE Publications, Inc.
Hi Michelle,

I hope all is well. I contacted you last year requesting permission to use the Role Questionnaire for my dissertation study. I am now in the final stages of the dissertation process. One permission request I did not include in my correspondence with you last year was regarding publishing the Role Questionnaire (RQ) in my dissertation. I am writing to ask your permission on whether or not I publish the RQ in the appendices of my dissertation. If you agree to the RQ being published in my dissertation, as it appeared in Administrative Science Quarterly, I will include our correspondence sharing your permission to use the RQ and the RQ. If you request I do not publish the RQ in my dissertation, I will only include your email granting me permission to use the RQ from 11/2014. I received some impactful results from my dissertation study and would like to submit them for potential publications. Would you need to remove your permission to publish results related to the RQ findings in peer-reviewed journal articles? If so, would you also provide me permission to publish the RQ results in my dissertation study. Thank you for your time and consideration.
the RQ findings in peer-reviewed journal articles? If so, would you also provide me permission to publish the RQ results of my dissertation study. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Heather (Smith) Fyo
(underlined)
Heather J. Fyo, M.Ed., NCC, LPC (OH)
Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education and Supervision
Kent State University
PO Box 6660
410 White Hall
Kent, OH 44242

permissions [UB] <permissions@sagepub.com>
Fri, Jan 22, 2016 at 8:31 PM

To: Heather Smith <hamil666@kent.edu>

Hello Heather,

When we granted you permission initially, that covers the Role Questionnaire to be reprinted in your dissertation. You may still include the questionnaire in your dissertation.

However, if you are planning to publish the actual questionnaire into an article in a peer-reviewed journal for publication, you will need to obtain permission via a permissions license through www.CopyingIt.com. You would type in the title or ISSN of the journal, select the correct format, and then fill out the appropriate form. There will most likely be a permissions fee.

For your knowledge, if you are only publishing the results of the questionnaire and not the actual questionnaire, you do not need to obtain a license for the use. We only ask that you credit the source.

Please let us know if you have questions.

Best regards,

Michelle Bloor

Rights Coordinator
SAGE Publishing
501, 1st Street
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
USA
www.eaglepublishing.com
Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

From: Heather Smith [mailto:hsmit85@kent.edu]
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 2:14 PM
To: permissions (US)
Subject: Re: Inquiry for dissertation research

Hi Michelle,

[Censored text hidden]
[Censored text hidden]

---

Heather Smith <hsmit85@kent.edu>                   Mon, Jan 25, 2016 at 11:36 AM
To: "permissions (US)" <permissions@eaglepub.com>

Hi Michelle,

Thank you for the clarification regarding parameters for permission to use the RQ in my dissertation. I will only publish the RQ in my dissertation but not in any potential peer-reviewed articles. In peer-reviewed articles, I will cite the source accordingly. I appreciate your time regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
Heather (Smith) Fye
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## Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI)

Counselor Education Program  
Korea University

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to measure the counselor’s burnout level. There are no right or wrong answers. Try to be as honest as you can. Beside each statement, circle the number that best describes how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Never True</th>
<th>Rarely True</th>
<th>Sometimes True</th>
<th>Often True</th>
<th>Always True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Due to my job as a counselor, I feel tired most of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel I am an incompetent counselor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am treated unfairly in my workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am not interested in my clients and their problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My relationships with family members have been negatively impacted by my work as a counselor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel exhausted due to my work as a counselor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel frustrated by my effectiveness as a counselor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel negative energy from my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have become callous toward clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel like I do not have enough time to engage in personal interests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Due to my job as a counselor, I feel overstressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am not confident in my counseling skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel bogged down by the system in my workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I have little empathy for my clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel I do not have enough time to spend with my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Due to my job as a counselor, I feel tightness in my back and shoulders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I do not feel like I am making a change in my clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel frustrated with the system in my workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am no longer concerned about the welfare of my clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I feel I have poor boundaries between work and my personal life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Scoring Information for the Counselor Burnout Inventory

This inventory is designed to assess the five dimensions of counselor burnout.

**Dimension 1 = Exhaustion**
Item 1, Item 6, Item 11, Item 16

**Dimension 2 = Incompetence**
Item 2, Item 7, Item 12, Item 17

**Dimension 3 = Negative Work Environment**
Item 3, Item 8, Item 13, Item 18,

**Dimension 4 = Devaluing Client**
Item 4, Item 9, Item 14, Item 19

**Dimension 5 = Deterioration in Personal Life**
Item 5, Item 10, Item 15, Item 20
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Permission to Use and Reprint the Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI)

Dear Dr. Sang Min Lee,

Greetings! My name is Heather Smith and I am a doctoral student at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio. I am currently working towards completing my dissertation and am proposing to complete a multiple regression study in order to understand how levels of implementation of the ASCA National Model (as measured by the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey) and demographic variables predict burnout (as measured by the Counselor Burnout Inventory), role conflict and role ambiguity (as measured by the Role Questionnaire) in Professional School Counselors.

Through my review of the literature and research thus far, I have read about the Counselor Burnout Inventory (CBI) you and colleagues developed (Lee et al., 2007) and believe it to be an excellent questionnaire to use to measure burnout with the participants in my study. I have been in contact with you previously, during January 2012, for permission to use the CBI in another research project and would like to extend its usage to include my dissertation study. Therefore, I am writing to ask you for permission to use the CBI for my dissertation research. If you do grant me permission, may I continue to use the same copy of the CBI you sent previously? My goal is to use the questionnaire as part of an online survey for Professional School Counselors and furthermore, wanted to ask for permission to convert it to an online format. The survey will be offered to professionals through a private email with a link to the survey for interested participants.

If you would like, I would be happy to share the results of the study with you once it is completed. Thank you for your time, consideration, and assistance. If you have any further questions, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Heather Smith

--
Heather J. Smith, M.Ed., NCC, LPC (OH)  
Doctoral Candidate  
Counseling and Human Development Services  
Kent State University  
PO Box 5193  
310 White Hall
Kent, OH 44242

On Mon, Jan 23, 2012 at 6:18 AM, Lee, Sang Min (대간한) <leesang@korea.ac.kr> wrote:

You have my permission to use this scale.

Sang Min Lee

---------------- Original Message ----------------
From: "Heather Smith"
To: leesang@korea.ac.kr
Mail Subject: Counselor Burnout Inventory Measurement Inquiry
Sent: Sun, 22 Jan 2012 17:05:54 -0600

Dear Dr. Sang Min Lee,

Greetings! My name is Heather Smith and I am a doctoral student at Kent State University located in Kent, Ohio, USA. Myself, Dr. Lynne Guillot-Miller, a faculty member at KSU, and two student colleagues are working on a research study regarding school counselors and their levels of burnout, coping styles, and perfectionism. In my literature review of burnout and counselors/school counselors, I have read about the Counselor Burnout Inventory: and colleagues developed (article: Lee, S. M. et al., (2007). Development and initial psychometrics of the counselor burnout inventory. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 40, 142-154.) and a few research studies that have employed the CBI scale. We are interested in using the CBI for our study and asking for your permission to use the CBI. Also, we were wondering if you have any new data collected, newer reliability or validity studies, or revisions made to the CBI since 2007, and if so, are you willing to share that information with us? If you would like, we would be happy to share the results of our study with you once it is completed. Thank you for your time, considerations, and assistance. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,
Heather Smith
Doctoral Student & Graduate Assistant
Kent State University
Counseling and Human Development Services Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>細目과목</th>
<th>크기</th>
<th>다운로드 가능</th>
<th>기타</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[다운로드] MEC2006_final.pdf</td>
<td>5922666</td>
<td>2012.01.30까지</td>
<td>PC용 자료</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bigAttachFile0, 2203512008136360836</td>
<td>2012/01/30</td>
<td>2012/01/30</td>
<td>PC용 자료</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

이동함께를 저작권 제한에, 본지방행은 사용 무상 중 2008을 포함한 다운로드 가능합니다. 다운로드, 자료의 보호권은 대한민원 중 법률에 내재한 범위지가 두고자 사후에 다운로드가 불가능한 다.

Heather J. Smith, M.Ed., NCC, LPC (OH)
Doctoral Candidate
Counseling and Human Development Services

2 of 3 11/09/2012 2:05 PM
Sure, you can use CBI for your dissertation study.

Sang Min.

---

Heather Smith <hsamth56@kent.edu>  
To: Eesang <eesang@korea.ac.kr>  
Wed, Nov 12, 2014 at 9:44 PM

Thank you and appreciate your quick reply!

Sincerely,  
Heather Smith  
[Quoted text hidden]
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Dr. Wang's Lab
Korea, KN 44774

To: Heather Smith <mismith@korea.ac.kr>

Wed, Nov 15, 2014 at 8:50 PM

Sure, you can use CBI for your dissertation study.

Sang Min.

Heather Smith <hanth66@korea.ac.kr>

Wed, Nov 12, 2014 at 3:04 PM

Thank you and appreciate your quick reply!

Sincerely,
Heather Smith
[Department Head]

Heather Smith <hanth66@korea.ac.kr>

Thu, Jan 21, 2016 at 4:02 PM

Hi Sang Min.

I hope all is well. I contacted you last year requesting permission to use the CBI for my dissertation study. I am now in the final stages of the dissertation process. Our permission request did not include the CBI in my dissertation. I am writing to ask your permission on whether or not I should include the CBI in the appendix of my dissertation. If you agree to the CBI being included in my dissertation, I will include our correspondence sharing your permission to use the CBI and the CBI instrument. If you request, I will not include the CBI in my dissertation. I will only include your email granting the permission to use the CBI from 2012-14. Thank you for your time and consideration. I received some nice results from my dissertation study and I am looking forward to sharing them with the counseling community.

Sincerely,
Heather Smith
[Department Head]
You have my permission to include the DBI in the appendix of your dissertation.

Best,

Sang Min

Sent from my iPhone

2016.1.22. 07:32 Heather Smith <hamil55@kent.edu> 보낸 사람:

[Student Name]

Thank you, Sang Min. I appreciate the contributions you and colleagues have made to the research on burnout in the counseling profession. Heather

[Date: 2016.1.22. 10:41 AM]
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Demographics Survey

Please indicate the state in which you are employed as a school counselor:

Please input the number of hours you work per week as a school counselor:

Please indicate your age:

Please indicate your sex:
  - Male
  - Female
  - Other:

Please indicate your race/ethnicity (check all that apply):
  - American Indian/Alaskan Native
  - Asian/Pacific Islander
  - African American/Black (not of Hispanic Origin)
  - Bi Racial/Multi Racial
  - Hispanic
  - White (Not of Hispanic Origin)

Please check the type of degree you hold:
  - M.A./M.S./M.Ed./MA.Ed. in School Counseling
  - M.A./M.S./M.Ed./MA.Ed. in Clinical Mental Health Counseling or Community Counseling
  - Master’s Degree in Social Work
  - Ph.D.
  - Ed.D.
  - Other, Please specify:

Please indicate your years of experience as a school counselor:

Please check the type of school district that best describes the area in which you work:
  - Rural
  - Suburban
  - Urban

The next few questions are about your level of practice:
  - Please check all of the grades you are responsible for as a school counselor:
    - Kindergarten
    - 1st
    - 2nd
    - 3rd
    - 4th
    - 5th
    - 6th
Please check all of the grades in your school setting:

Kindergarten
1st
2nd
3rd
4th
5th
6th
7th
8th
9th
10th
11th
12th

Please indicate the number of buildings you are responsible for:

1
2
3
4
5 or more

Please indicate the approximate number of students you are assigned to for counseling or advising (number of students on your caseload):

0-100
101-200
201-300
301-400
401-500
501-600
601-700
701-800
801-900
901-1000
1001-1100
1101-1200
1201-1300
1301-1400
1401-1500
1501-1600
1601-1700
Please indicate the number of school counselors in your building(s) who may have their own caseloads including yourself:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 or more

Please estimate the average amount of time and input the minutes you engage in supervision each month:

Supervision (Ex. refers to receiving services (i.e., learning, professional development) from a senior level professional that monitors the services to the students) each month:

_____ minutes

Who do you primarily complete supervision with:
Principal
Senior level school counselor
Other mental health profession
Other:

Please indicate the average amount of consultation you engage in each month:
Consultation (Ex. refers to your engagement with stakeholders to support, advocate and promote student achievement and services delivered in the academic, career, and personal and social domains for students) each month:

0-5 hours
6-10 hours
11-15 hours
16-20 hours
20 or more hours

Who do you consult with (check all that apply)?
Teachers
Parents
Principals / administrators
Other Mental Health professionals
Other School Counselors
Please take a moment and consider your work week. In a typical week, what approximate percentage of work time do you spend in the following activities. Remember, the total percentage must equal 100 percent.

Counseling related activities. Any activity or duty directly related to the development, implementation, or evaluation of your school counseling program (i.e., educational planning, classroom guidance lessons, individual and group counseling, individual student planning, program planning and management, etc.).

NON Counseling related activities. Any activity or duty not related to the development, implementation, or evaluation of your school counseling program (i.e., bus duty, testing coordinator, substitute teaching, clerical duties, paperwork, scheduling, etc.).

Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5 the level of support within your professional relationship that you receive from your principal to complete your job with 1 feeling very unsupported in the professional relationship to complete your job and 5 feeling very supported in the professional relationship to complete your job.

1- very unsupported, 2- unsupported, 3- neither supported or unsupported, 4- supported, 5- very supported

Do you believe your principal knows the appropriate roles of your job according to the ASCA National Model? Yes or No
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Institutional Review Board Approval

Kent State University Mail - IRB Level I, category 2 approved for POC.  http://mail.google.com/url?sa=r&source=web&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&frm=1&ie=UTF-8&ei=BNZme-YiOFjx4gGyqXmE&usg=AFQjCNGZQaGM0k0zlH44p6xLMl83Q1osEw

KENT STATE

Heather Smith <hsmith56@kent.edu>

IREB Level I, category 2 approval for Protocol application #15-408 - please retain this email for your records.

From: "KENT STATE RESEARCH COMPLIANCE"<research.compliance@kent.edu>
To: "RAINIER, JOHN"<jrainier@kent.edu>
Cc: "heather.smith@kent.edu"<hsmith56@kent.edu> "GULLOT, MILLER, LYNN"<mgullot@kent.edu>

Subject: RE: Protocol #15-408 - entitled "Factors Related to Professional issues in School Counselors"

We have assigned your application the following IRB number: 15-408. Please reference this number when corresponding with our office regarding your application.

The Kent State University Institutional Review Board has reviewed and approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as Level I/Exempt from Annual review research. Your research project involves minimal risk to human subjects and meets the criteria for the following category of exemption under federal regulations:

- Exemption 2: Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, Public Behavior Observation

This application was approved on July 9, 2015.

Submission of annual review reports is not required for Level I/Exempt projects. We do NOT stamp Level I/protocol consent documents.

If any modifications are made in research design, methodology, or procedures that increase the risks to subjects or includes activities that do not fall within the approved exemption category, those modifications must be submitted to and approved by the IRB before implementation.

Please contact an IRB discipline specific reviewer at the Office of Research Compliance to discuss the changes and whether a new application must be submitted. http://sites.google.com/ear/kent.educ/education-of-research-and-sponsored-programs-intranet/home/office-of-research-compliance

Kent State University has a Federal Wide Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP). OHRP Number 00000139.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact us at Researchcompliance@kent.edu or by phone at 330-672-2704 or 330-672-8068.

Kent State University Office of Research Compliance
224 Cartwright Hall | Fax 330.672.2658
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APPENDIX O

FIRST EMAIL INVITATION
Appendix O

First Email Invitation

Dear School Counselor,

If you are currently a practicing school counselor, please consider participation in this dissertation study on the relationship of demographic factors, implementation of the ASCA National Model, perceived job stress and satisfaction, coping responses and styles, role conflict and ambiguity, and burnout. Please feel free to share the link below with other school counselors. The findings may help inform school counselors and counselor educators understand issues related to implementing the ASCA National Model into practice and burnout experienced by school counselors. We hope to disseminate the results at professional conferences and through the publication of manuscripts.

In order to participate, you need to be at least 21 years old and employed as a full-time school counselor working 35 or more hours per week in either a public or private school. Participation includes completing an online survey which will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Participation is anonymous and no identifying information will be collected. Some of these questions will be personal in nature and will ask about your perceived job satisfaction and stress, your coping responses and styles, role conflict and ambiguity experienced in the school setting, and level of burnout. At any point you may choose to stop participating and you may skip any question that you are uncomfortable answering.

At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of two $50 Amazon gift cards. If you are interested in the lottery drawing for the gift cards, you will be prompted to enter your email address at the conclusion of the survey. When you click on the Qualtrics link for the lottery drawing, it will take you out of the data collection survey and into a separate Qualtrics survey to enter only your email address. There will be no way to connect your email address to your participant responses in the data collection survey.

This research has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board (July, 2015; IRB # 15-408).

If you are interested in participating, please click here: *Hyperlink included in email.*

If you have any questions or concerns, we encourage you to contact Heather Smith (814-591-8785). We offer our sincere thanks for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Heather Smith, Steve Rainey, & Lynne Guillot Miller
APPENDIX P

SECOND EMAIL INVITATION
Appendix P

Second Email Invitation

Dear School Counselor,

We hope you are having a wonderful summer and start to August! To all of you who have taken the dissertation survey titled, “Factors related to professional issues in school counselors,” we sincerely Thank You. To those who have not yet taken the survey and would like to or if you would like to finish the survey you started, this is a reminder email requesting your participation.

**Follow this link to the Survey:**
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}$

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}$

At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of two $50 gift cards. Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Heather Smith, Steve Rainey, & Lynne Guillot Miller
Kent State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}$
APPENDIX Q

THIRD EMAIL INVITATION
Appendix Q

Third Email Invitation

Dear School Counselor,

Welcome back to a new school year! As you transition from summer into the school year, please consider taking this dissertation survey titled, “Factors related to professional issues in school counselors.” This is a final reminder email request for your participation. If you have not yet taken the survey and would like to or would like to finish a survey you started:

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of two $50 gift cards. Thank you for your time to complete this research for the school counseling profession. We wish you a successful academic year and beyond!

Sincerely,
Heather Smith, Steve Rainey, & Lynne Guillot Miller
Kent State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}
APPENDIX R

INFORMED CONSENT
Appendix R

Informed Consent

Kent State University

Factors related to professional issues in school counselors

Before taking part in this study, please read the consent form below and click on the “I agree/Next” button at the bottom of the page if you understand the statements and freely consent to participate in the study.

Consent Form

This study involves web-based instruments designed to understand the relationship between demographic factors, implementation levels of the ASCA National Model, perceived job satisfaction, perceived job stress, coping responses and styles, levels of role ambiguity, levels of role conflict, and burnout in school counselors. The primary investigator for this study is Heather Smith of Kent State University and it has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. No deception is involved, and the study involves no more than minimal risk to participate (i.e. the level of risk encountered in daily life). Participation in this study typically takes approximately 20 minutes and is strictly anonymous. Participants begin by answering a demographic questionnaire and then a series of survey questions.

All responses are treated as confidential, and in no case will responses from individual participants be identified. Rather, all data will be pooled and published in aggregate form only. Participants should be aware that the survey is being run from a “secure” https server of the kind typically used to handle credit card transactions, so there is little possibility that responses could be viewed by unauthorized third parties (e.g., computer hackers). Since this is a confidential online survey, we will not be collecting names or IP addresses.

In this study, you should not have any more risks than you would in a normal day of life. Participation in this study may benefit you personally. You may benefit from thinking about your job as a school counselor and the personal factors that are contributing or decreasing the symptoms of burnout you may experience. Finally, what we learn from the study may help the profession to better understand factors that contribute to implementing the ASCA National Model into practice and factors that lead to burnout in school counselors. We hope that through the results we are able to share with participants and the profession how personal factors may impact school counselors when implementing the ASCA National Model and their potential for burnout. We also hope to devise methods to help prevent burnout in school counselors.
If at any point you experience psychological discomfort during or after the completion of the questionnaire, we urge you to seek psychological services in your area (e.g. counseling) from someone you trust. If you are unfamiliar with the psychological resources in your area, please contact the primary researcher, Heather Smith at (814) 591-8785, and she will direct you to services in your geographic area. Additionally, the researchers will not be asking sensitive information that may damage their reputation nor will the data be linked to any of the participants’ work settings.

Participation is voluntary, refusal to take part in the study involves no penalty or loss of benefits to which participants are otherwise entitled, and participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of two $50 Amazon gift cards. If you are interested in the lottery drawing for the gift cards, you will be prompted to enter your email address at the conclusion of the survey. When you click on the Qualtrics link for the lottery drawing, it will take you out of the data collection survey and into a separate Qualtrics survey to enter only your email address. There will be no way to connect your email address to your participant responses in the data collection survey. After the winners have been notified, all email addresses will be discarded. If you are chosen as a winner, you will be required to fill out a RPR-1 form that includes your signature acknowledging your compensation. For tax purposes and questions, the gift card is not considered reportable income. The researcher will keep the form for her records in a locked area separate from the research data. No other information will be kept by the researcher from the participants.

If participants have further questions about this study or their rights, or if they wish to lodge a complaint or concern, they may contact the principal investigator, Heather Smith, at (814) 591-8785; or the Kent State University IRB, at (330) 672-2704.

You may print a copy of this consent form to keep at this time.

If you are 21 years of age or older, understand the statements above, and freely consent to participate in the study, click on the “I agree/Next” button below to begin the survey.
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