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Abstract

HEPP, EMILY C., Ph.D., August 2013, Counselor Education

Secondary School Counselor and Principal Preferences Regarding Key School Counselor Roles

Director of Dissertation: Thomas E. Davis

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare preferences of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals regarding school counselor activities and roles. The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2002) was used in this study. The SCARS addressed the activities of a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program (counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination) in addition to other activities commonly performed by school counselors (administrative).

The target population of this study was practicing secondary school counselors and principals that were members of the national professional organization. One-hundred forty subjects participated in this study. Of those, 81 (58%) were secondary school counselors and 59 (42%) were secondary school principals. Participants represented school districts across the nation in urban, suburban, and rural areas of the country. Participants were from school districts of various sizes and represented the secondary school level. The statistical methods used in this research included a 2x5 mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA), descriptive statistics, as well as supplemental analysis.

The findings of the research showed significant differences in preference ratings within the five key school counselor roles. There was a significant difference found
between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. And there was a significant interaction found between the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals across the five role areas. Further analysis found a significant difference between mean preference ratings of the administrative role and the other four key school counseling roles.

While statistically significant differences were found between preference ratings of secondary school counselors and principals, there was also evidence that school counselors’ and principals’ preferences were aligned in their overall preference ratings of the roles. Both school counselors and principals rated counseling as the most preferred role, followed by consultation, coordination, and curriculum. School counselors and principals showed the least preference for the administrative role. Implications, including using these results as a tool for school counselor advocacy and principal-school counselor relationship building, were discussed. And finally, areas for future research were examined.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The following introduction presents background information for the study, the research question, research hypotheses, significance of the study, limitations and delimitations, and the definition of terms.

School counseling is a profession that is challenging, fast-paced, and wonderfully fulfilling. It is also a profession that takes a lot of thought, tact, constant problem solving, and interpersonal communication. There are, at times, so many tasks and duties to complete that it can be overwhelming and the fundamental role of the school counselor (as counselor) can easily get forgotten in daily tasks. Additionally, the profession has been in an almost constant cycle of change and renewal since its’ inception (Baker, 2001; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Coy, 1999; Ginter, Scalise, & Presse, 1990; Lambie & Williamson, 2004). As we move forward and schools and districts make the changes necessary to keep up with societal demands, school counselors will need to continue to change and renew to meet the needs of tomorrow (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Bemak, 2000; Burnham & Jackson; Carroll, 1993; Gysbers, Lapan, & Blair, 1999; Sears & Coy, 1991). This process of renewal has been largely influenced by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), as well as state associations. Ponec and Brock (2000) describe the role definition of school counselors as an ongoing process. Not only with the high number of roles and activities that fall within the bounds of counseling (or guidance), but also with the constant change within the profession, it is understandable that stakeholders, such as administrators, teachers, parents, and community agencies, have had difficulty clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of school counselors (Coll & Freeman,
In the literature, themes that arise from the constant movement of the profession include school counselor roles and the development of standards and program models.

The roles and activities of professional school counselors are frequently misunderstood by stakeholders. These stakeholders include school administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community agencies. The result of this is that school counselor’s unique skills and abilities can often be misused in the school setting. Although school counselors are typically bargaining members of district and state teachers unions, they are viewed by some (teachers, administrators, students, and parents) as members of the administrative team (Anderson & Reiter, 1996; McDowell, 1995; Ponec & Brock, 2000). While the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has presented standards for the school counseling profession (2004) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) provides training standards for Counselor Education Programs (2009), neither are universally required by training programs or state mandated. Therefore, standards in education and training, as well as professional role expectations vary greatly from one graduate program to the next, and from state to state. This lack of uniformity in standards creates confusion for stakeholders in the ability to define school counselor roles. Numerous states have adopted school counseling program models, which provide uniformity in standards within those states and provides school counselors with specific roles within the schools. These models also vary from one state to the next, and there are approximately 14 states that do not have an adopted program model or curriculum (ASCA, 2010a).
The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare preferences of secondary school counselors and principals regarding school counselor activities. For the purposes of this study, the activities of school counselors fell into five key roles that have been described in the literature. The five roles included: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative. The administrative role included those activities that are not typically considered to be appropriate for school counselors such as coordination of standardized tests, extra duties (hallway, bus, cafeteria), and student scheduling.

**School Counselor Roles**

Much like other professionals, school counselors often struggle with role conflict and role confusion (Murray, 1995; Perkins, 2010). The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has produced National Standards for School Counselors (2004) and the ASCA National Model (2012), which have provided school counselors with guidelines for appropriate school counselor roles as well as inappropriate school counselor roles. However, school counselors across the country continue to perform vastly different functions within the schools. It may very well be the case that the lack of uniform guidelines and standards has led to school counselors having different views about their roles and functions within the school setting (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). While there are duties that all school personnel take on, as are expected as part of the larger team (fair share duties), the problem persists when school counselors are asked to take on a disproportionately large number of these duties. Perusse and Goodnough (2004) conducted a study that looked at school counselor and principal identification of
appropriate and inappropriate tasks as compared with the tasks that the ASCA identifies as appropriate and inappropriate. The results of this study indicated a discrepancy between these groups concerning appropriate and inappropriate school counseling tasks. This provides further evidence that there is a disparity between what school counselors are trained to do, what they view as appropriate, and what they are actually asked to carry out as job tasks and activities.

**Appropriate school counselor roles.** With the large number of varying roles that school counselors are performing in schools nationwide, it is important to note which have been deemed as appropriate by professional school counselors, counselor educators, and professional organizations alike. A study conducted by Fitch et. al. (2001) found that appropriate school counseling duties generally fall into the three categories of counseling, consultation, and coordination and scheduling, disciplinary functions, and clerical duties are three inappropriate duties that counselors often perform.

The 1997 publication, the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir) not only outlined foundational standards for school counselors, but essential indicators for students as well. School counseling programs that are based on the National Standards employ numerous strategies for intervention that include: counseling (individual, small group, classroom), consultation with stakeholders (administrators, parents, teachers, and outside agencies), and coordination of school-wide activities (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). The latest edition of these standards, the 2004 ASCA National Standards (ASCA) serve as the foundation for the ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (ASCA, 2012), which provides school
counselors with a delivery method for their school counseling program. The following activities are outlined in the ASCA National Model as appropriate activities for school counselors (ASCA, 2012, p. 45):

- individual student academic program planning
- interpreting cognitive, aptitude and achievement tests
- providing counseling students who are tardy or absent
- providing counseling students who have disciplinary problems
- providing counseling students as to appropriate school dress
- collaborating with teachers to present school counseling core curriculum lessons
- analyzing grade-point averages in relationship to achievement
- interpreting student records
- providing teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management
- ensuring student records are maintained as per state and federal regulations
- helping the school principal identify and resolve student issues, needs, and problems
- providing individual and small group counseling services to students
- advocating for students at individual education plan meetings, student study teams and school attendance review boards
- analyzing disaggregated data

ASCA recommends (as is typically taught to school counselors-in-training) that the greater part of the school counselor’s time be focused on providing direct services to the
student population in order for all students to benefit from the school counseling program (ASCA, 2012). The third edition of the ASCA National Model recommends that K-12 school counselors “spend 80% or more of their time providing direct student services (school counseling core curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services) or indirect student services (referrals, consultation, collaboration); thus leaving 20% or less of their time to be spent on program planning and support (program management and operations, professional development, data analysis, fair-share responsibilities”; ASCA, 2012, p. 136). While important to note, this ideal may be unrealistic in practice for many school counselors.

**Inappropriate school counselor roles.** While all school personnel are expected to take on additional duties and tasks (often referred to as fair share duties), this becomes problematic when school counselors are required to perform tasks and duties that are typically considered administrative on a regular basis (Anderson & Reiter, 1996; Aubrey, 1982; Bemak, 2000; Fitch, Newby, Ballesteros, & Marshall, 2001; Sears, 1993). A school counselor’s job description varies from building to building and is essentially determined by the school principal (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Armstrong, MacDonald, & Stillo, 2010; Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mitchell, 1990; Mason & Perera-Diltz, 2010; Paisley & Borders, 1995; Perusse & Goodnough, 2004). These roles are often assigned without regard to needs assessments (Ribak-Rosenthal, 1994), or school counselor preparation and knowledge (Anderson & Reiter, 1996; Burnham & Jackson, 2000). These administrative tasks are often time consuming and could be considered to be secretarial in
nature, particularly in situations where they consume the majority of a counselor’s school day.

Logically it follows that school principals and administrators utilize school counselors as they deem necessary in order to meet what they perceive as the highest needs and meet district and building level goals (Aubrey, 1982). As such, school counselors are frequently assigned non-counseling duties and tasks such as bus or cafeteria duty, student and teacher scheduling, new student registration, high-stakes test planning and administration, monitoring of lunch and after school detentions, record keeping, discipline of students, or substitute teaching in classrooms (Bemak, 2000; Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Fitch, Newby, Ballesteros, & Marshall, 2001). Again, while the assignment of some additional duties should be anticipated as each employee in the school is a member of the overall team, the problem arises when school counselors are given an excessive number of these duties and tasks to perform. Schmidt, Weaver, and Alldredge (2001) found that school counselors reported performing the following duties that are not related to their preparation: coordinating student information systems, handling student report cards, doing breakfast or lunch duty, handing out medication, ordering textbooks, compiling the school violence report, coordinating the school awards’ program, coordinating the English as a Second Language program, monitoring school attendance, and generating the honor roll. While some of these activities could be considered as providing direct service to the student population (lunch duty is a phenomenal way to observe and interact with students in their own environment), the
ASCA National Model provides additional support by outlining the following activities as inappropriate activities for school counselors (ASCA, 2012, p. 45):

- coordinating paperwork and data entry of all new students
- coordinating cognitive, aptitude and achievement testing programs
- signing excuses for students who are tardy or absent
- performing disciplinary actions or assigning discipline consequences
- sending students home who are not appropriately dressed
- teaching classes when teachers are absent
- computing grade-point averages
- maintaining student records
- supervising classrooms or common areas
- keeping clerical records
- assisting with duties in the principal’s office
- providing therapy or long-term counseling in schools to address psychological disorders
- coordinating schoolwide individual education plans, student study teams, and school attendance review boards
- serving as a data entry clerk

These activities are time-consuming and, more often than not, are tasks that are assigned to school counselors due to lack of funding, poor planning, or some combination of principal oversight or perceived necessity.
“The counselor has the skills and knowledge for providing counseling, consultation, coordination, guidance, and referrals within the total framework of the educational curriculum. To ask these individuals to use their skills and knowledge simply to make schedule changes and test is a misuse of their education” (Coy, 1999, p. 7). This statement reflects the frustration that many school counselors experience. As professionals, there are functions within the school that only school counselors are trained to handle, however, the more burdensome, clerical tasks often take precedence. Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) examined the activities in which school counselors prefer to spend their time as compared with the activities in which school counselors are actually spending their time. The results of this study showed a disparity between the activities and roles that school counselors want to do and the activities and roles that they are actually doing within the school (Scarborough & Culbreth). Specifically, Scarborough and Culbreth found school counselors would rather engage in interventions associated with improving student outcomes and less time in non-counseling related activities. There are copious barriers that impede professional school counselors from implementing the recommended roles and responsibilities. These obstacles include: the demands of school systems and stakeholder expectations of the counselor (Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Ribak-Rosenthal, 1994), less contact with student population due to increased pressure on teachers to prepare students for state testing (Baker, 2001), high counselor-student ratios (Kendrick, Chandler, & Hatcher, 1994; Mustaine, Pappalardo, & Wyrick, 1996), lack of input regarding daily activities and interventions (Paisley & Borders, 1995), and the high volume of paperwork and administrative tasks (Partin, 1993).
Not only do school counselor roles vary from district to district, but they also vary according to age level (Perusse & Goodnough, 2004; Sisson & Bullis, 1992). At times, it seems as though school counseling at the elementary level and school counseling at the secondary level could be entirely different professions. It has been reported that middle and high school counselors spend more of their time on activities that involve administration and remediation, whereas elementary school counselors work more closely with students and parents providing developmental interventions (Coll & Freeman, 1997). Additionally, it has been found that secondary school counselors spend more time engaged in clerical duties than elementary school counselors (Sink & Yilik-Downer, 2001). Essentially, the roles and functions of secondary school counselors are more directly aligned with administrators’ than the roles and functions of elementary school counselors (Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; Partin, 1993). In fact, school counselors practicing at the elementary school level report less role conflict than school counselors practicing at the secondary school level (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005). Because administrator perspective plays such a large part in the role and function of school counselors, it is imperative to make note of the findings of Mason and Perera-Diltz (2010) that administrator expectations are different at each education level. School counselors at all levels need to advocate for themselves in order to increase role congruence (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Armstrong, MacDonald, & Stillo, 2010; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; McGlothlin & Miller, 2008; Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Perkins, 2010; Sears & Granello, 2002).
The Comprehensive Developmental School Counseling Program

The multitude of roles and responsibilities of school counselors across the nation reflects a history of inconsistent role definitions and professional standards (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Murray, 1995; Sears & Granello, 2002). Over time, school counselors have taken on new roles and functions without giving up any of the current duties, and are constantly pulled in different directions by various stakeholders (Gysbers, 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; McGlothlin & Miller, 2008; Sears & Granello). School counselors can use a school counseling curriculum or program as a means to advocate for the assignment of appropriate roles. A comprehensive, developmental program calls for the school counselor to spend 70-80% of their time in direct contact with the student population (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

A school counseling curriculum or program provides school counselors with a framework for delivery, and a common language to define roles. The current focus for school counseling programs is on comprehensive and developmental programs. These programs typically include interventions such as individual, small-group, and large-group counseling, and infuse consultation and coordination components as well (Paisley & Borders, 1995). ASCA asserts that a school counseling program should be “comprehensive in scope, preventative in design, and developmental in nature” (2005, p. 13). Campbell and Dahir (1997) describe a comprehensive school counseling program using the same components as above (counseling, consultation, and coordination) along with the addition of collaboration, case management, guidance curriculum, and program evaluation as additional components.
According to the literature, there are countless positive outcomes that result from the utilization of a comprehensive school counseling programs. For example, Gysbers, Lapan, and Blair (1999) found that school counselors who rated their guidance programs as being more fully implemented were more likely to report higher levels of engagement within the school system. In addition, Lapan, Gysbers, and Sun (1997) found a correlation between student achievement and the implementation of comprehensive programs. The successful execution of a comprehensive developmental program can aid the professional school counselor in clarifying school counselor roles to principals, teachers, administrators, and boards of education – which in turn can help save school counseling jobs within school districts.

While ASCA provides a model for school counseling programs with the ASCA National Model (2012), there remains inconsistency in the adoption of comprehensive programs at the state level. There are countless states that have not adopted a school counseling curriculum or program. Without a state-adopted school counseling program, it is left to the individual school counselors to implement a program at the district level – a task that is time consuming and cumbersome in nature. Understandably, school counselors reported that the lack of time and available resources were limitations to their ability to fully implement a comprehensive school counseling program (Lehr & Sumarah, 2002). Additionally, it is important to note that administrator support is necessary in order to fully implement a comprehensive school counseling program (ASCA, 2005), therefore school counselors must lay the ground work for clearly defined roles and responsibilities (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).
School Counseling Across the United States

The ASCA recommended student-to-school counselor ratio is 250:1 (ASCA, 2009). ASCA compiled data from the US Department of Education’s Common Core of Data in order to produce a list of approximate student-to-school counselor ratios by state, which shows that the national student-to-school counselor ratio during 2008-2009 was approximately 457:1 (ASCA, 2010b). According to these statistics, the state of Wyoming has the smallest student-to-school counselor ratio with 197:1 and California has the largest with 814:1. The difference in student-to-school counselor ratios from state to state is staggering. This is one way in which geographic region dictates school counselor roles. Sears and Granello (2002) assert that it is not possible to serve all students in a meaningful way with high student-to-counselor ratios.

Not only are school counselor caseloads immensely different across the United States, but state mandates are a discrepancy factor as well. According to ASCA, approximately 67% of states mandate that a school counseling program be in place for students (2010a). Specifically, 28 states, along with the District of Columbia, require a school counseling program be in place at all levels. One state requires school counseling services for grades 7-12, and four states require school counseling services for grades 9-12 (ASCA, 2010a). Looking at these numbers, it is clear that the school counseling profession looks very different across the nation.

Research Questions

This study investigated secondary school counselor and secondary school principal attitudes regarding the preference of school counselor roles in five key role
areas. These key roles, that were identified in the literature, include: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative. For the purposes of this study, secondary schools include schools that have any combination of grades 6-12 (as long as grades 9-12 were also included). Secondary schools were identified as the focus due to the large amount of clerical and administrative expectations that are commonly placed on secondary school counselors (Coll & Freeman, 1997; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; Hutchinson, Barrick, & Groves, 1986; Ritchie, 1989; Sisson & Bullis, 1992; Wines, Nelson, & Eckstein, 2007). This study addressed the following research questions: In what roles do secondary school counselors prefer to spend their time? In what roles do secondary school administrators prefer school counselors to spend their time? What are the differences in preference ratings of school counselor roles among secondary school counselors and secondary school principals? Descriptive variables such as district and building student-to-school counselor ratios, and location of practice (urban, suburban, rural) were examined in relation to reported preferred school counseling activities. In addition, supplemental analyses examined demographic variables.

**Research Hypothesis**

This study addressed the following hypotheses:

1. there is a significant difference between preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles;

2. there is a significant difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals; and
3. the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals is not the same across the five key roles.

The research hypotheses were based upon past and current research in the areas of counselor roles and activities, and the current movement for comprehensive school counseling programs across the United States.

The null hypotheses for the study are as follows:

1. there is no difference between preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles;

2. there is no difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals; and

3. the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals is the same across the five key roles.

Significance

School counselors are placed in schools in order to provide academic, social, and career/goal support for the students that they serve. This research problem is significant for practicing school counselors, counselor educators, and state and national professional school counseling associations, as well as principals, administrators, administrative training programs, and state and national professional administrators associations. The ability to describe and compare the roles that school counselors prefer and the roles that school principals prefer school counselor to fulfill will not only assist school counselors in ensuring that they are providing students with the necessary support, it will also assist
school counselors in promoting the profession and serve as a means for advocating for appropriate school counselor roles across the country. School counselors are not providing stakeholders with a clear mission and purpose. The lack of uniformity in role expectations across the profession creates an uncertain and unclear purpose of school counseling programs (Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Schmidt, Weaver, & Aldredge, 2001). More and more often, school districts are reducing and eradicating school counseling programs because of budget cuts and a lack of state funding (Anderson & Reiter, 1996; Paisley & Borders, 1995). Unfortunately, it is often the school counseling programs that suffer the effects of district cuts because many states do not mandate school counselors at all levels. The impetus for school counselors to get together and advocate for specific, well-defined roles and functions is now.

School counselors are the vehicles for the profession, but it is often the school principal that outlines school counselor roles and duties within the school. School counselors must work alongside principals and other stakeholders in advocating appropriate roles in order to provide essential services to the student population that they serve. School counselors are able to provide support to parents and students in ways that other school professionals cannot and in schools where there is greater agreement of role expectations, the counselors are viewed as a more valuable resource for teachers, students, parents, and administrators (Ginter, Scalise, & Presse, 1990). Ponec and Brock (2000) found that school counselors who maintained visibility within the community and defined their role for themselves, administrators, and other stakeholders were deemed beneficial.
The movement towards implementing state-wide comprehensive school counseling programs is an important step for many states, but it is also essential that school counselors are implementing similar programs across the nation. A comprehensive school counseling program provides a consistent, common language among school professionals and increases the likelihood that school counselors are able to meet the needs of the student population (Scarborough & Luke, 2008). At this point, the program that has been adopted by the national association may or may not meet the needs of today’s school systems in making the school counselor an essential asset in the education system. This research will illuminate the preferences of practicing school counselors to address whether a programmatic change is needed, and it will also address school principal preference which should also be a factor in a nationally adopted school counseling program.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The parameters of this study were delimited by the sampling of the specific population of practicing secondary school counselors and practicing secondary school principals. Therefore, the results of this study may not be generalizable to school counselors and principals that work with other grade levels and students of other ages.

The majority of limitations of this study centered around the sampling methods and the methodology. The populations of interest were practicing secondary school counselors and practicing secondary school principals, therefore, the researcher used national professional associations in order to generate a list of participants. This restricted participants to only those school counselors and principals who were currently members
of the national professional association. The results of this study may not be generalizable to all secondary school counselors or all secondary school principals across the country.

This study used a self-report survey method. This method requires participants to report on their preferences of the activities that are performed by secondary school counselors. The data gathered will be descriptive in nature and will give an idea of the relationships between variables – not causation.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Comprehensive School Counseling Program**: “Comprehensive school counseling programs, driven by student data and based on standards in academic, career, and personal/social development, promote and enhance the learning process for all students” (ASCA, 2012, p. xii), by providing a full range of services (Green & Keys, 2001).

2. **Consultation**: The collaboration between school counselors and stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, community agencies, outside professionals) in order to enhance student support (Borders & Drury, 1992), and more effective communication with students (ASCA, 1990).


4. **Counseling**: Providing academic, personal/social, and career focused support to students in order to promote student growth and foster educational and career
development (Borders & Drury, 1992). This includes individual counseling, small
group counseling, and large group (classroom) guidance (ASCA, 1990).

5. Key School Counselor Roles: For the purposes of this study, the activities of
school counselors fell into five roles that were identified by Scarborough (2005).
These five roles included: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and
administrative. The administrative role (described by Scarborough as Other)
included those activities that are not typically considered to be appropriate for
school counselors such as coordination of standardized tests, extra duties
(hallway, bus, cafeteria), and student scheduling.

6. Professional Identity: Professional identity describes the way in which a
professional perceives themselves as functioning within a profession and provides
a framework for carrying out professional roles (Brott & Myers, 1999).

7. Professional School Counselor: “Professional school counselors are
certified/licensed educators with a minimum of a master’s degree in school
counseling making them uniquely qualified to address all students’ academic,
personal/social and career development needs by designing, implementing,
evaluating and enhancing a comprehensive school counseling program that
promotes and enhances student success” (ASCA, 2009).

8. Role Conflict: “dealing with many conflicting messages and expectations from
work superiors, peers and constituents” (Coll & Freeman, 1997, p. 252).

9. Scope of Practice: “the responsibilities, methods, and techniques in which the
school counselor is trained to perform in today’s schools” (Sears, 1993, p. 384).
10. Standards: “Standards are a public statement of what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in a school counseling program; school counseling standards represent what a school counseling program should contain” (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

**Summary**

This chapter provided a brief introduction to the topic being investigated. The research question, hypotheses, and null hypotheses were presented. The significance of the study was addressed. The limitations and delimitations of the study were addressed. The literature review in Chapter 2 will further explain the need for research in the area of school counselor roles as it relates to comprehensive school counseling program implementation.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter presents an introduction and review of relevant literature. This chapter is divided into three sections. First, a brief review of the history of school counseling is presented. Second, school counselor roles and functions are discussed, focusing on non-counseling duties and high school counselor roles. Third, the principal-school counselor relationship will be discussed, which includes school counselor role preference and administrator perceptions of school counselor roles. Finally professional identity and counselor education will be discussed.

Brief Review of the History of School Counseling

“The dilemma that guidance and counseling has faced since its inception is that of stating positions and goals in overinflated terms without possessing an adequate framework and technology for delivery” (Aubrey, 1982, page 202). The change in professional terminology from guidance counselor to school counselor has caused confusion and blurred the role identity of the profession (Aubrey, 1982), even among school counselors themselves. According to Campbell and Dahir (1997) the term guidance has presented a confusing picture of school counseling because of its imprecise meaning and usage, however, the term remains to be widely used by school systems and school professionals, including school counselors. The change from guidance counselor, which has historical ties to the vocational guidance counselor, to school counselor signifies a change in the fundamental philosophy and the forward moving momentum of the school counseling profession (Bemak, 2000). The terminology used to describe the
guidance counselor role and function has changed, however, stakeholder and school counselors continue to use the terminology.

**Early days of school counseling.** The social reform movement during the 19th century initially began to shape the school counseling profession. The profession has evolved from the guidance model, which primarily focused on career development to the modern concept of a comprehensive, developmental and collaborative school counseling program (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Career counseling was at the foundation of vocational guidance during the Industrial Revolution, which required a focus on the transition from school to work (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The first school counselors were teachers that were assigned additional guidance-related duties to perform in addition to their expected teaching duties (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). The profession lacked an organized structure until 1913, when the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) was created (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). According to Gysbers and Henderson, people such as Frank Parsons, Meyer Bloomfield, Jessie Davis, Anna Reed, E.W. Weaver, and David Hill were significant contributors in creating and applying the early notions of guidance counseling.

The profession of school counseling experienced a leap forward in progress by the launch of Sputnik in 1957 (Lambie & Williamson, 2004), and the National Defense Education Act in 1958 (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001) that resulted more full-time personnel providing guidance and counseling. Subsequently, school counselors began to increase in number during the 1960’s (Baker, 2001). Also around this time period, it was believed that school counselors ought to put additional emphasis on the promotion of
personal development (Tennyson et. al., 1989a). In the 1960s nearly all states recruited school counselors from the teaching ranks and certified them after they took 15-30 semester hours of graduate coursework (Ritchie, 1989). In the 1950’s and 1960’s, the preparation of high school counselors has been described as inadequate. According to Sanciak (1995) counselors became more aligned with administrators because as school counselors, they lacked a clearly defined role and appropriate training standards in the absence of training standards of the time.

During the 1960’s and early 1970’s, the issue of what constituted the counselor’s role attracted the attention of educational administrators, teachers, counselor educators, and school counselors; during this period school counselors did not appear to have a well-defined role (Ginter, Scalise, & Presse, 1990). The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), which ensured the availability of special education services, again expanded the services provided by school counselors (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). At this time (in the mid-1970’s) the functions of guidance were described as orientation, assessment, information, counseling, placement, and follow-up (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). According to Gysbers and Henderson, this led to the initial formation of concepts regarding the enactment of comprehensive, developmental school counseling programs that continued into the 1980’s and 1990’s.

In the 1990s the economy flourished and subsequently there was growth in school counseling services (Baker, 2001). During this time school counselor roles were at the forefront of research and scholarly works. The changes in school counseling programs that took place during the 1990s and early 21st century, which included changes in the
delivery system and accountability practices, caused a renovation of the profession (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009). The history of the school counseling profession is a means to understand the current status of the profession as well as assist in formulating the future of the profession.

**Comprehensive developmental school counseling program models.** School counseling is a profession that has experienced great changes, and general inconsistencies of roles have come with these changes (Schmidt & Ciechalski, 2001). A comprehensive, developmental focus that addresses academic, personal/social, and career development has become ideal due to societal changes that have taken place over the last 30 years or so (Green & Keys, 2001). According to Green and Keys, the essential mechanisms of a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program include a clear mission statement, specific goals and objectives in the form of student competencies, and an organized and sequential curriculum.

The Missouri Comprehensive Guidance Program (MCGP) was one of the flagship comprehensive developmental school counseling programs. The MCGP that originated in 1984 now functions as the model that is used in school counselor training programs in the state of Missouri (Gysbers, Lapan, & Blair, 1999; Lapan, Gysbers, & Sun, 1997). The main goal of the MCGP was to expand upon the work of school counselors, outside of guidance activities, using a program framework (Gysbers, Lapan, & Blair). The organizational framework of the MCGP is broken into elements that include “structural components (definition and philosophy, guidance program facilities, advisory council, guidance resources, staffing patterns, and budget), program components and sample
processes (guidance curriculum, individual planning, responsive services, system support”; Gysbers, Stanley, Kosteck-Bunch, Magnuson, & Starr, 2011, p. 12). Gysbers, Lapan, and Blair suggest that for a district guidance program to be fully implemented and practical in the school setting, the following must be in place: (a) there must be a written program that has been adopted by the board of education, and (b) the written program must be actually implemented with school counselors at all levels devoting full-time to the program.

There have been numerous benefits of a comprehensive developmental program cited in the literature. According to Campbell and Dahir (1997), one of the advantages is that a comprehensive developmental school counseling program allows the counselor to identify the problems and issues that have the largest impact on student learning and achievement, and provide focused interventions. A study conducted by Lapan, Gysbers, and Sun (1997) discovered that students in schools with a more completely executed school counseling program reported that (a) they earned higher grades, (b) they felt that their education was better preparing them for their future, (c) their school made more career and college information available to them, and (d) their school had a more positive climate. Similarly, a study conducted by Fitch and Marshall (2004) found that counselors in higher achieving schools spent more time focused on managing their school counseling program, coordination of the school counseling program, and aligning their school counseling program with professional standards.

As noted by Coy (1991) “a comprehensive developmental school counseling program does not just occur; counselors, students, parents, staff, and administrators must
be willing to give time and effort to achieve a workable program for their community” (p. 17). There has been a seemingly modest amount of attention given to methods of training school counselors in how to implement programs within the constraints of the daily realities of practicing school counselors (Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995). One of the primary obstacles that school counselors face related to full program implementation is time; the numerous counseling and non-counseling tasks that are required takes time away from program implementation (Gysbers, Lapan, & Blair, 1999). An additional difficulty to the application of a comprehensive, developmental program is the absence of adequate professional development for school counselors (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009). It is often the case that school counselors are operating in isolation without colleagues to show support for the creation of a school counseling program.

A study conducted by Poynton, Schumacher, and Wilczenski (2008) investigated the views of school counselors throughout the state of Massachusetts about the changes that impact their daily work that were brought about by the newly adopted Massachusetts Model. Approximately half of the participants in this study expressed concern about the adoption of the model, specifically, how it would impact the school counselor’s roles and functions and day-to-day work (Poynton, Schumacher, & Wilczenski). School counselors may not be on the same page as professional associations when it comes to the priorities that are outlined in school counseling program models. A study conducted by Olson and Allen (1993) found that school counselors have not fully incorporated the activities that are recommended by ASCA into their programs, which implies that perhaps the recommendations that are found in the current school counseling literature, and the
initiatives of state and national professional school counseling organizations are not being implemented. In their 2002 study, Lehr and Sumarah found that school counselors almost unanimously articulated that lack of time and resources were the reasons that a comprehensive program could not be fully delivered.

The American School Counselor Association and the ASCA National Model.

As discussed, the school counseling profession has seen many changes since the beginning. In many ways, there has been a complete turn-around in how the profession is viewed. For example, when ASCA was founded in 1952, counseling was viewed as one of the functions of guidance, now guidance is one of the functions of counseling (Hoyt, 1993). ASCA has put forth numerous documents to promote the advancement of the profession, with the two most significant being the ASCA National Standards for Students (ASCA, 2004) and the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012). According to ASCA (2004), the ASCA National Standards for Students summarizes the essential knowledge and abilities that students acquire and demonstrate as a result of their exposure to school counseling program. The National Standards also provide indicators in three areas of competency: Academic Development, Career Development, and Personal/Social Development (ASCA, 2004). In addition, the National Standards also define the essential elements of a comprehensive school counseling program (Schmidt & Ciechalski, 2001). According to Paisley and McMahon (2001), school counseling programs that are based on the National Standards employ numerous approaches, including individual and small group counseling, classroom presentations, consultation with stakeholders, and coordination of school-wide activities.
The ASCA National Model, which was released in 2003, and revised in 2005 and 2012, outlines strategies for school counselors to make direct connections between their work as counselors and student achievement in order to demonstrate their professional value (accountability) utilizing data (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). The ASCA National Model is a step towards moving the profession away from the previous guidance model (often thought of as clerical) to a model that focuses on leadership (McGlothlin & Miller, 2008). The National Model purports to answer the questions: “What do school counselors do?” and “How are students different as a result of what we do?” (ASCA, 2005, p.9). Embedded in the guiding principles of the ASCA National Model are the historical categories used to describe the work of school counselors: the “three C’s” – counseling, consultation, and coordination (ASCA, 2005). The National Model brings forth the additional purpose of assisting school counselors in increasing the academic achievement of students (Brown & Trusty, 2005). Briefly, the ASCA National Model contains the following mechanisms (ASCA, 2012, p. xiii):

- Foundation: program focus, student competencies, professional competencies
- Management: school counselor competency and school counseling program assessments; use-of-time assessment; annual agreements; advisory councils; use of data, curriculum, small group, and closing-the-gap action plans; annual and weekly calendars
- Delivery: school counseling core curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services
Accountability: analysis of school and school counseling program data in order to show the impact of the school counseling program on student achievement, attendance, and behavior

In addition to the four main elements of Foundation, Delivery System, Management, and Accountability and the specific requirement contained therein, the ASCA National Model also infuses themes of leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change into the framework (ASCA, 2012).

There are many perceived benefits of aligning a school counseling program with the ASCA National Model including that it:

- ensures equitable access to a rigorous education for all students
- identifies the knowledge and skills all students will acquire as a result of the K-12 comprehensive school counseling program
- is delivered to all students in a systemic fashion
- is based on data-driven decision making
- is provided by a state-credentialed school counselor (ASCA, 2012, p. xii).

Ultimately, the accomplishments of the ASCA National Model will depend on the desire of school counselors to make changes to their current programs, and also for school counselors to be able and willing to advocate for the model (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). Hatch and Chen-Hayes conducted a study to explore school counselor views regarding the importance ASCA National Model components. Results of this study showed that school counselors replied that all items were more than moderately important to include in a comprehensive school counseling program; however, school counselors rated clear
goals for the school counseling program as the most important item, and student-to-counselor ratios as the second highest rating. Participants rated the use of data for program planning and use of data for accountability as being less important (Hatch & Chen-Hayes).

While there are perceived benefits of the National Model, there are barriers to implementation as well. A study conducted by Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) examined the readiness of a selection of school counselors in Alabama to deliver a comprehensive school counseling program. The results of this study found significant differences across school levels (elementary, middle, high, K-12) in school counselors’ feelings pertaining to the activities included in the ASCA National Model; elementary and middle school counselors were more closely aligned with the ASCA National Model, and high school counselors held beliefs that were more in line with the older, more conventional program priorities. This study provides an example of the barriers to program implementation that may exist for school counselors; school counselors, particularly at the secondary level, may not want to implement a school counseling program that is aligned with the ASCA National Model.

The future of school counseling. School counselors, counselor educators, and professional associations continue to describe and advocate the purpose and benefits of placing counselors in schools. While professional associations are making strides in creating foundational expectations for school counselors, states continue to differ in regulations for required training and experience, as well as role expectations (ASCA, 2010a). School counselor licensure and certification remains inconsistent; requirements
vary from state to state (Sears & Granello, 2002). There are still differences in requirements for entry into school counseling in state departments across the country, which is a possible cause of the unclear perceptions regarding counselor training and employment among school personnel (Smith, 1994).

The school counseling profession continues to change. As noted by Ross and Herrington (2006) “the national agenda for school counseling changes its focus as it reacts to national agendas and events, moving from an emphasis on at-risk students to school violence, and more recently to academic achievement” (p. 5). Changes in any profession, particularly when talking about changes to the fundamental roles associated with the profession, will likely take a substantial amount of time to come to fruition in a meaningful way (Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007). Therefore, it comes with reason that notifying and educating school counselors and administrators is vitally important (Poynton, Schumacher, & Wilczenski, 2008). There have been, and continue to be changes regarding school counselor roles, which sheds light on the fact that school counselors have had difficulty clearly defining their role identity (Bardoshi & Duncan, 2009). Accounting for the opinions and role preferences of professional school counselors is exceedingly important for a state or national school counseling model to have an impact (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009). It is also essential to account for the perceptions and role preferences of the school administrators that influence the school counselor’s job description.
School Counselor Roles

A school counselor’s role and function can differ from one state to the next, as well as from school district to school district. As the professional terminology that is used to describe school counselors has been inconsistent, so have the expectations and tasks of school counselors. School counseling, as a profession, has endured through extreme changes, and in turn, the roles and functions of the school counselor have changed dramatically as well (Dodson, 2009). School funding is critically low and school districts across the country are making cuts to education programs. School counseling programs are being impacted by the current educational climate and cuts are being made, perhaps, in part due to the lack of clarity and consistency of school counselors’ role and function (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999). This creates a situation where school counselors are forced into a reactive role – trying to complete tasks that are part of the workload and maintain a semblance of a quality program.

Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell (2009) describe role definition as pertaining to the identity of counselors within a school, how time is spent within the school, and the programs that are implemented. ASCA (2009) states that the professional school counselor’s role is as follows: “professional school counselors have a minimum of a master’s degree in school counseling, meet the state certification/licensure standards, and abide by the laws of the states in which they are employed; they uphold the ethical and professional standards of ASCA and other applicable professional counseling associations, and promote the development of the school counseling program based on the following areas of the ASCA National Model: foundation, delivery, management, and
accountability.” While this may be the ideal, it is far from the reality of most school counseling programs.

Paisley and McMahon (2001, p. 107) contend that school counselors are expected to:

1. provide individual and small group counseling sessions;
2. conduct classroom guidance interventions;
3. consult with parents, teachers, administrators, and community agency representatives;
4. advocate for all students to enhance education experience and outcomes;
5. build partnerships and teams within and outside of the school;
6. be a member of school leadership and policy-making groups;
7. provide individualized, focused, and intensive interventions for at-risk students;
8. be the developmental specialist in the school setting;
9. be the mental health specialist in the school setting;
10. provide family counseling interventions;
11. coordinate school-wide programs;
12. prevent suicides, pregnancies, dropouts, drug use, and general moral decay;
13. maintain the necessary levels of expertise in all the above areas to ensure quality in all interventions and programs.

Schmidt, Weaver, and Alldredge (2001) conducted a study to investigate the ways in which recently employed school counselors located in eastern North Carolina were being utilized in schools and their amount of professional satisfaction with their roles.
The researchers also assessed the perception of principals about preparation, role, assigned functions, and level of job satisfaction of newly hired school counselors. Most (62%) of the school counselors reported that they coordinate testing in their schools (Schmidt, Weaver, & Alldredge). This results of this survey found that 58% of counselors in this study spent less than half of their time providing direct services to students. One-fifth of the counselors predicted they would remain in their current position less than two years, and 48% said they would probably remain in their position between two and five years. Approximately 29% of the school counselors indicated that they were not satisfied or were unsure about their satisfaction with their role (Schmidt, Weaver, & Alldredge). Counselors stated that the state’s testing program was the least satisfying aspect of being a school counselor; many of the counselors in this sample were responsible for coordinating the testing program and believe that testing takes up too much time in schools. In addition, the school counselors that participated in the study by Schmidt, Weaver, and Alldredge noted that a lack of support from the administration and teachers, unreasonably high demands and expectations that counselors can do everything, people not understanding the role of counselor, and being spread too thin as contributors to counselors’ dissatisfaction; many expressed frustration that they are not doing what they were trained to do.

Role conflict and stress. Role stress (also called role conflict or role ambiguity) has been identified by Bacharach, Bamberger, and Mitchell (1990) as an important factor related to school effectiveness. Role conflict is defined by Coll and Freeman (1997) in terms of dealing with conflicting messages and expectations from superiors and peers.
Role conflict may occur when school counselors are asked to make out class schedules for students when they have many students to interview for personal counseling (Moracco, Butcke, & McEwen, 1984). Additionally, role ambiguity occurs when the school counselor lacks clarity regarding his or her role and function (Moracco, Butcke, & McEwen). A study conducted by Bacharach, Bamberger, and Mitchell (1990) found moderate levels of role conflict and ambiguity in elementary and secondary schools.

Moracco, Butcke, and McEwen (1984) studied school counselor role stress. Results of this study suggest that counselors who would not choose to be counselors again perceived significantly greater stress and counselors in schools with higher enrollments perceived greater stress. The school counselors that participated in this study reported concern about being asked to perform numerous duties that were perceived as not being part of their role (Moracco, Butcke, & McEwen). Approximately 17% of the counselors involved in this study reported that they did not want to be in the profession. The results of a study conducted by Culbreth et. al. (2005) found that the predictors of reduced role stress include deeming that the actual job matched the initial perceptions of the job, sufficient school counselor preparation, and the availability of peer supervision and support. With school reform, funding shortages, and the changing and challenging population of children, role conflict is a possible consequence (Coll & Freeman), but the consequences of role stress can be extensive (Perkins, 2010).

**Role conflict and burnout.** Burnout has been described in the literature in relationship to many of the helping professions (Kirk-Brown & Wallace, 2004; Lambie, 2007). However, there is also evidence in the literature that links role conflict with higher
burnout in school counseling. Bardhoshi (2012) found evidence that one predictor of school counselor burnout is the assignment of non-counseling duties. The findings of Bardhoshi’s study indicated that the assignment of non-counseling duties predicted outcomes such as fatigue, a negative work environment, decline in one’s personal life, and generally increased incompetence in school counselors.

Non-counseling duties. While all school professionals are expected to take on a portion of supplemental duties, school counselors are often assigned these supplemental duties and responsibilities in larger quantities that have little or nothing to do with counseling; these non-counseling duties take a tremendous amount of time and impact a school counselor’s capability to provide a comprehensive school counseling program (Nelson, Robles-Pina, & Nichter, 2008). School counselors and school principals often have similar roles – which further blur the line between counselor function and administrative function (Cole, 1991). Ross and Herrington (2006) describe a situation that occurs when principals expect the school counselor to regularly perform tasks that are unrelated to counseling; in turn the school counselor begins to identify themselves more with administrators. This phenomenon where school counselors begin to identify themselves as administrators is called counselor role drift.

The duties that school counselors often struggle with, such as testing and scheduling, are connected to the early history of the profession (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Responsibilities that counselors perform that are not related to their preparation as school counselors include: coordinating student information systems, handling student report cards, doing breakfast or lunch duty, handing out medication, ordering textbooks,
compiling the school violence report, coordinating testing, coordinating the school awards’ program, coordinating ESL, chairing the SAT team, writing section 504 plans, monitoring school attendance, handling discipline, monitoring records, and generating the honor roll (Schmidt, Weaver, & Alldredge, 2001). A study conducted by Burnham and Jackson (2000) found that a large amount of the school counselors in the study were required to perform at least some clerical duties; because they are frequently time consuming and burdensome, these clerical tasks become a part of a school counselor's every day activity.

A study conducted by Wines, Nelson, and Eckstein (2007) found that secondary school counselors are continuing to perform the job duties that are defined by ASCA as inappropriate. The four most frequently reported inappropriate non-counseling duties included student scheduling, coordination of standardized testing, enrollment and withdrawal of students, and maintenance of educational records (Wines, Nelson, & Eckstein). Wines, Nelson, and Eckstein more specifically reported that 89% of respondents routinely schedule students for classes and more than half of the respondents (56.7%) reported that it is their preference to routinely schedule students for classes.

**Secondary school counseling.** Numerous school counselors at the secondary school level perform an abundance of clerical tasks (Ritchie, 1989). The job roles and expectations are distinctly different at the elementary, middle school, junior high, and high school levels, and different perceptions of the importance given to the roles and tasks of school counselors at each level as well (Sisson & Bullis, 1992). Elementary school counseling more frequently contains elements of developmental intervention and
counseling, whereas middle school and high school counseling typically includes elements closely associated with administration and remediation (Coll & Freeman, 1997). Overall, elementary school counselors experience less role conflict than high school counselors (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005), which, according to Hardesty and Dillard (1994) may be due in part to elementary school counselors’ more frequent activity with activities in the coordination and consultation areas. Student scheduling was of lowest importance to elementary school counselors, whereas the upper grade counselors ranked it as higher. Completing paperwork is also more highly ranked at the upper grades. The school counselors in the upper grade levels are more closely tied to administrative work than elementary school counselors, which suggest that secondary school counselors may work more administratively than elementary counselors (Hardesty & Dillard).

One of the biggest differences between elementary school and secondary school counseling is scheduling. Scheduling consumes an extraneous amount of time and attention and secondary school counselors generally accept this as an appropriate activity (Wines, Nelson, & Eckstein, 2007). Hutchinson, Barrick, and Groves (1986) found that scheduling, testing, record keeping, and non-counseling activities required more time and attention than counselors believed was warranted. Not only is the function of student scheduling time consuming, but Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt, and Williams reported that school counselors engage in scheduling more often than any other activity (1989b). Partin (1993) found that elementary, middle school, high school counselors all rated paperwork as their most time consuming activity. High school counselors rated scheduling duties as
being as time consuming as paperwork. High school counselors rated administrative tasks as a more significant problem than elementary school counselors. Overall, Partin discovered that school counselors at the elementary school level spend significantly more time engaged in guidance activities, whereas school counselors at the high school level spend more time engaged in administrative and clerical activities.

The professional school counselor is ultimately the person that is responsible for advocating for the school counseling program and appropriate school counselor roles (Wilgus & Shelley, 1988). There is a certain amount of aggression and clarity that is necessary for school counselors to maintain in order to sufficiently communicate the importance of the school counselor to stakeholders – administrators, teachers, parents, outside professionals – in educational systems (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Campbell & Dahir, 1997). In a school where a consensus of role expectations exists, counselors are more likely to be viewed as a resource for teachers and to be called upon more frequently (Ginter, Scalise, & Presse, 1990). Bemak (2000) suggests that the following activities are essential in contributing to the direction and definition of school counselors’ work: work well with administrators, work directly with teachers, and coordinate closely with other support services personnel such as school psychologists, social workers, special educators, and nurses.

Supervisors (principals, department heads) in schools serve as a primary source of role information for teachers (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mitchell, 1990). It is critical that school counselors and principals work towards developing and maintaining a positive
relationship. In doing so, the school counselor is able to strongly advocate for appropriate roles and functions and the adoption of a school counseling program.

**Principal-School Counselor Relationship**

While school counselors and principals may have differing backgrounds and training, it is crucial for school counselors to interact symbiotically with principals in a way that facilitates the sharing of ideas (Chata & Loesch, 2007; Clemens, Milsom, & Cashwell, 2009; Stone & Clark, 2001). As noted by Kaplan (1995), when the school counselor and the school principal have different views of counseling’s role in school, it leads to different opinions about how school counselors should best focus their efforts. School principals have direct influence over the quality of the school counseling program, and therefore establishing a quality working relationship between the school counselor and principal is critical for student success (Armstrong, MacDonald, & Stillo, 2010). Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell (2009) conducted a study that investigated whether a correlation existed between the quality of the school counselor-principal relationship and school counselor role assignment. Results of the study indicated that stronger relationships between a school counselor and principal yielded more alignment between the school counselors roles and what school counselors believe to be ideal (Clemens, Milsom, & Cashwell). In addition, Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell found that school counselors who advocated for themselves were practicing more as they preferred.

Ross and Herrington (2006) conducted a study to investigate the beliefs and viewpoints of school counselors-in-training and principals-in-training about the ideal school counselor roles and tasks. The Public School Counselor Role Ambiguity
Questionnaire was administered to 534 students enrolled in principal preparation programs and 225 students enrolled in school counselor preparation programs. Results of this study revealed that counselors-in-training were more sensitive to the principal/counselor relationship than principals-in-training (Ross & Herrington). The study by Ross and Herrington also found that the principals-in-training reported that the school counselor ought to be viewed as administrative staff and that school counselor duties should be assigned at the principal’s discretion.

School counselors may face difficulty in creating and maintaining a positive relationship with the principal; it depends on the ability of both parties to work together. This is particularly true if the school counselor is consistently required to perform duties that are not aligned with his or her training. A study conducted by Armstrong, MacDonald, and Stillo (2010) found that while secondary school counselors rated the school counselor-principal relationship most negatively, the secondary school principals involved in this study rated the relationship with the highest ratings of any group. School counselors at all levels believed that they received inadequate training to work collaboratively with administrators (Armstrong, MacDonald, & Stillo). In order for school to be successful in teaching all students, school counselors must work closely with school principals; there are separate and shared responsibilities that make the school work (Kaplan, 1995). Ross and Herrington (2006) make the following recommendations for principals and counselors (p. 11):
• Practitioners should learn how to carefully manage and cultivate the relationship between the principal and the counselor, due to the complexity of the relationship.

• Principals should work towards understanding boundaries and counselors should work towards being more assertive in making them aware of these boundaries. This would enable both to manage the complexity of their relationship as colleagues and leaders.

• Counselors should work towards balancing the immediate needs of the school with the long-range goals of the guidance function.

• Counselors must learn to be a team player as well as leader of the counseling program.

• Counselors have a duty to educate the principal of the dangers of role-drift and should advocate assertively on behalf of the guidance function within the school community.

• Both principals and counselors should work towards an understanding that academic staff and office staff are better suited to perform many of the duties that can fall in the counselor’s lap. These include scheduling classes, organizing social functions such as birthday parties, running errands or making copies.

School counselors and principals are constantly working together for the improvement of the school community, teachers, staff, students, and parents, but their training and background are often very different. Along with that, school counselors and
principals frequently perceive the suitable roles and duties of the school counselor very differently. Often, school counselors and school principals have different priorities for time spent in school counseling activities.

School counselor role preference. School counselors are unique professionals in the school; their training and skills are different from other educational professionals. However, as noted by Ross and Herrington (2006), many school counselors believe that their skills and abilities are not being utilized to the full extent possible in order to serve the student population. Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) conducted a study of 475 high school counselors from Texas in order to compare actual and preferred practices. Results indicated that high school counselors would prefer to be more engaged in activities related to counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination, and that high school counselors would prefer to have fewer clerical duties. Results of the study by Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter also indicate a positive correlation between secondary school counselors’ years of experience and their satisfaction with the work activities in which they are engaged.

A study conducted by Kendrick, Chandler, and Hatcher (1994) found that school counselors reported that their job expectations were excessively immense. In fact, participants in Kendrick, Chandler, and Hatcher’s study reported that they were providing service to countless students in more than one school, that they were required to be involved in an array of duties that had nothing to do with appropriate school counseling roles, and ultimately that the amount of work that they were expected to complete was overwhelming and exhausting. A study by Baggerly and Osborn (2006) investigated the
predictors of career satisfaction and commitment of participating school counselors. Their study of 1,280 school counselors in Florida found that most of the school counselors that were surveyed reported being satisfied in the profession of school counseling, with 39.8% of respondents being “very satisfied” and 44.7% of respondents being “somewhat satisfied.” Baggerly and Osborn identified several predictors of job and career satisfaction to be appropriate duties, high self-efficacy, and district and peer supervision. Negative predictors of career satisfaction were inappropriate duties and stress. In addition, appropriate counseling duties were found to be the only positive predictor of career commitment, and stress was found to be the only negative predictor of career commitment. According to Baggerly and Osborn, the school counselors involved in this study reported having higher levels of self-efficacy for appropriate duties than inappropriate duties.

Foster, Young, and Hermann (2005) conducted a study to investigate the significance that school counselors allot to common school counseling tasks. The highest scores, which reflected the most importance, included: providing school counseling, facilitating students’ development of decision-making skills, identifying systems of support for students, promoting healthy lifestyle choices, and planning and conducting classroom guidance lessons (Foster, Young, & Hermann). Additionally, the following tasks were rated by participants in Foster, Young, and Hermann’s study as very important school counseling tasks: counseling students regarding physical abuse, carrying out prevention activities, facilitating conflict resolution among peer group members,
facilitating the group process, counseling students regarding sexual trauma, and
counseling students regarding family changes and divorce.

Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) conducted a study in order to investigate the
differences between how school counselors reported they would prefer to spend their
time and how school counselors reported that they actually spend their time. Scarborough
and Culbreth identified the following characteristics as being related to the discrepancy
between actual and preferred quantity of time spent on everyday school counseling
activities: school level of employment, years of experience as a school counselor, number
of students on the caseload, the amount of time spent in non-counseling related activities,
level of attempt to implement the ASCA National Standards, membership in ASCA,
membership of a state-level school counseling association, counselor education master’s
program accreditation by CACREP, participation in peer consultation, self-efficacy as a
school counselor, and reported school counselor support. Experience was found to be
related to the inconsistency between actual and preferred school counselor practice; there
was a positive correlation between school counselors having more years of experience
and the likeliness that they were practicing as they preferred. Additionally, it was found
by Scarborough and Culbreth that elementary school counselors were most likely to be
performing the duties that they preferred and high school counselors were least likely to
be performing the duties they preferred. Following with this is the finding of Mustaine,
Pappalardo, and Wyrich (1996) that the most commonly reported reasons for differences
between school counselors’ actual and preferred time on task were the administrative
assignment of the counselor’s role and elevated student-counselor ratios.
It seems, as noted by Partin (1993), that school counselors would rather spend more time in individual counseling, group counseling, and professional development activities and considerably less time engaged in testing and student appraisal that are associated with administrative and clerical activities. Carroll (1993) found that counselors felt most congruence in the more traditional roles of consultant, coordinator, and counselor; the newer roles of teacher and manager yielded the most dramatic actual versus ideal role and preparation discrepancies, especially role of teacher.

**Administrator perceptions of school counselor roles.** School principals are directly involved in the assignment of duties and job responsibilities of all school personnel. Principal’s perceptions and ideals have a direct influence on the duties and roles of school counselors (Mason & Perera-Diltz, 2010). It does not follow that school principals are best utilizing school counselor knowledge and skill.

Several studies in the literature examine principal preferences as related to school counselor roles. Bardoshi and Duncan (2009) conducted a study that examined the perceptions of rural principals’ concerning school counselor roles. Results of this study indicated that the principals rated responsive services as highly valued, with crisis counseling being rated as very important (93%). Bardoshi and Duncan found that the top five rated tasks were: crisis counseling; peer relationships, coping strategies and effective social skills; individual counseling; assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs and problems; and consultation, collaboration and teaming. Bonebrake and Borgers (1984) studied the differences between school counselor and principal opinions of counselors’ roles. The following four subscales were used:
counseling, consulting, coordinating, and problem areas (including tasks such as lunchroom duty, scheduling and class changes, administration of disciplinary action, and teaching of non-guidance classes). Differences were found in disciplinary tasks, supervision, and scheduling with school principals rating these functions higher than school counselors rated them.

A study conducted by Amatea and Clark (2005) found concurrence among administrators in articulating the fundamental school counselor work responsibilities (individual and group counseling, classroom guidance, teacher or parent consultation, coordination of exceptional student education staffing, coordination of orientation, coordination of the school-wide testing program, and class scheduling). However the administrators that participated in this study showed differences in terms of the significance they gave to work activities. According to Amatea and Clark, there were four distinct types of roles that were described by administrators: innovative school leader, collaborative case consultant, responsive direct service provider, and administrative team player.

The way in which administrators learn the roles of school counselors may influence their utilization of school counselors. Mason and Perera-Diltz (2010) found that the majority of the pre-service administrators that participated in their study identified school counselor duties from their own experiences with school counseling and that their ideas of appropriate duties included both duties that are considered by ASCA to be appropriate and duties that are considered by ASCA to be inappropriate. While the pre-service administrators involved in this study had differing perceptions of appropriate
roles for school counselors at different grade levels (elementary, middle, high school), they did not view enhancing student academic development as an appropriate duty for school counselors at any grade level (Mason & Perera-Diltz). One reason that school administrators may use their own experiences with school counselors as the basis for their knowledge is that, according to the 2011 Educational Leadership Constituent Council’s (ELCC) Program Standards (National Policy Board for Education Administration; NPBEA, 2011), there are no provisions contained within a principal training standards that addresses school counselor roles or expectations. The only place in NPBEA’s 2011 ELCC standards that addresses school counselors in any way is in the glossary under advanced programs (master’s programs/certificate programs) and specialized professional organizations.

The literature reflects that administrators may have inconsistent preferences for school counselor roles and tasks. A study conducted by Fitch, Newby, Ballesterro, and Marshall (2001) found that pre-service administrators rated the following as the most important activities of school counselors: crisis intervention, assisting with transitions, and personal counseling. Participants of this study also identified administrative and disciplinary duties as significant tasks for the counselor. However, pre-service administrators rated five non-counseling related tasks (registration, testing, special education assistance, record keeping, discipline) as the five least important duties of school counselors (Fitch et. al.). In contrast with this, more than half of the future administrators in the study identified that the following non-counseling related tasks were significant or highly significant: record keeping, registration, and testing (Fitch et. al.).
These are tasks that are often time consuming and laden with an abundance of paperwork.

Since the hiring of staff is most often performed by the school principal, this leads to question the qualities and skills that principals look for in a school counselor. Beale (1995) found that principals rated the personal interview, character references, former employer’s recommendation, and internship supervisor’s grade as most critical in choices linked to the hiring of school counselors. The personal interview was the item that was the highest rated by the largest number of respondents (Beale). Evidence of overall academic success was considered to be marginally valued, with less than 50% of the principals in this study reporting academic performance as important in the selection process (Beale). School counseling experience and prior teaching experience were viewed as at least very important by 50% or more of the respondents, with counseling experience valued more highly than teaching experience (Beale). Beale found that more than half (55%) of the principals in this study stated that applicants without teaching experience would be considered for school counseling positions, and high school principals were more likely to consider non-teacher applicants than were elementary or middle school principals (Beale). At least 50% of the respondents in Beale’s study rated prior teaching experience as either very important or critical to the selection process, pointing to the idea that there remains a subset of principals that seem to believe that it is imperative for counselors to have had teaching experience.

A study conducted by Chata and Loesch (2007) investigated the beliefs of school principals-in-training regarding the roles of school counselors so as to determine if
principals-in-training favor ASCA-recommended roles and functions above those not endorsed by ASCA. The results of this study indicated that principals-in-training were able to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate school counselor roles in that the activities that were consistent with the ASCA National Model were rated as more appropriate than the activities that are typically considered inappropriate by ASCA. However, although the respondents differentiated between appropriate and inappropriate roles as a group, there remained significant inconsistencies among the principals-in-training, which, according to Chata and Loesch, possibly suggests that agreement is lacking regarding school counselor roles and functions.

Dodson (2009) conducted a study to compare administrators’ views of the high school counselors’ role in schools that had been recognized as being a Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) and in school that have not received the RAMP designation. The results from Dodson’s study indicated that administrators from RAMP-designated schools observed school counselors in the classroom providing a school counseling curriculum more frequently than administrators from non-RAMP-designated programs.

Perusse and Goodnough (2004) found differences between the activities that the ASCA National Standards categorize as appropriate and inappropriate tasks, and the activities that school counselors and school principals identify as appropriate and inappropriate tasks. The results of this study indicated that the school principals that participated in this study believed clerical tasks (registration and scheduling of new students), test administration, and student records maintenance are appropriate tasks for school counselors (Perusse & Goodnough).
Professional Identity and Counselor Education

Leadership and professional identity are often intertwined constructs. According to Bemak (2000) the school counseling profession is in need of a direct and precise course that defines the profession as one that characterizes the future school counselor as a leader. Counselor Education programs are primarily responsible for instilling and developing the professional identity of school counselors-in-training (Brott, 2006), however professional identity continues to develop and evolve as school counselors develop as practitioners (Brott and Myers, 1999). Counselor education programs could promote the profession by having a focus on training effective school counselors at the core of their program (Brott), and including leadership and advocacy as an integral part of the program as well.

Similarly to the ways in which school counseling may vary from state to state, the training standards of counselor education programs may vary from program to program. According to McGlothlin and Miller (2008) it is not uncommon for counselor education programs to have differing views concerning school counselor training. Perusse and Goodnough (2005) found discrepancies between elementary and secondary school counselors’ views regarding the significance of course content areas. Elementary and secondary school counselors responded with similar ratings for the five highest ranked content areas, however, secondary school counselors responded that school counselor training programs need to include discussions of scheduling and administrative tasks in order to make training more applicable to secondary school settings (Perusse & Goodnough). In contrast, the elementary school counselors that participated in this study
responded that they would prefer course work that is focused on the implementation of a comprehensive program (Perusse & Goodnough). Counselor education programs may find difficulty in bridging the differences between these two vastly different work environments.

A significant way in which counselor education programs differ is whether a program has CACREP accreditation or not. CACREP provides common standards for learning. Research conducted by Culbreth et al. (2005) found a significant positive correlation between matriculation from a CACREP-accredited program and participants’ beliefs that their training program had effectively prepared them for their position as a school counselor. House and Sears (2002) outline eight components that counselor education programs ought to address in order to successfully renovate their programs, which include: “(a) criteria for selection and recruitment of candidates for counselor preparation programs; (b) curricular content, structure, and sequence of courses; (c) methods of instruction, field experiences, and practice; (d) induction process into the profession; (e) working relationships with community partners; (f) professional development for counselor educators; (g) university/school district partnerships; and (h) university/state department of education partnerships” (p. 157). Since counselor education programs provide school counselors with an induction into the profession, it is imperative that there remains consistency of standards for learning across programs.

**Summary**

This chapter provided an introduction and review of relevant literature. First, a brief review of the history of school counseling was presented. Second, school counselor
roles and functions were discussed. Third, the principal-school counselor relationship was examined. Finally professional identity and counselor education was discussed. Chapter 3 will outline the process for conducting this research study. A discussion of the research design, population, sampling plan, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis procedures will be included in the following chapter.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The following chapter outlines the process for conducting this research study. A discussion of the research design, population, sampling plan, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis procedures are included in this chapter.

Research Design

The research design was non-experimental. The purpose of this study was to investigate secondary school counselor and secondary school principal attitudes regarding the preference of school counselor roles in five key role areas. These key roles include: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative. The administrative area included those activities that are not typically considered by ASCA (2012) to be appropriate for school counselors.

The null hypothesis for this study stated that there was no difference between preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles. Additional null hypotheses were: there was no difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals; and the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals is the same across the five key roles.

Identification of Population

The target population of this study was practicing secondary school counselors in the United States who were members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and practicing secondary school principals in the US who were members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). Participants represented
school districts across the nation in urban, suburban, and rural areas of the country. Participants were from school districts of various sizes and represented the secondary school level.

**Sampling Plan**

Participants’ contact information was obtained from the American School Counselor Association’s membership database and the National Association of Secondary School Principals’ membership database. These databases contained the name and email addresses for members of the association.

The researcher selected a random selection of 1,500 member email addresses from ASCA (from the ASCA membership database of approximately 5,500 secondary/high school counselors) and a random selection of 1,500 member email addresses from NASSP (from the NASSP membership database of approximately 12,000 secondary school principals). The researcher set up a database of administrator email addresses and a database of school counselor email addresses using Microsoft Excel. Next, the emails were randomized by assigning a random number (using Excel) to each email address. The first 800 participants (500 from each for the first mailings, 300 from each for the second) from each randomized database were used as the random sample. A total of 1600 administrators and school counselors were invited to participate in this study by email request. The timeline for each selection emailing was as follows: introductory email request in week one, follow-up request in week two, final request in week three. Further information on sampling is presented in the Procedures for Collecting Data section.
Instrumentation

The *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS)* (Scarborough, 2002) was used in this study. The *SCARS* was created by Scarborough in order for school counselors to be able to use it as a data gathering tool. According to Scarborough (2002), the *SCARS* examines the common activities of a comprehensive developmental school counseling program (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination) in addition to other duties commonly performed by school counselors. For the purposes of this study, these other duties are grouped together under the umbrella of administrative duties. The four categories of counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination are the generally recognized helping processes used by school counselors (ASCA, 1990). Permission was obtained by the researcher to use this survey instrument in the current study (see Appendix B), as well as change the format by randomizing the items (see Appendix C). In addition, the role area that is described by Scarborough as *other* will be referred in this document as the administrative role area.

Development of the SCARS occurred in two separate phases (Scarborough, 2005). First, in Phase 1, Scarborough created a list of typical work activities that fit in under the four interventions described in the ASCA National Model. The instrument was then formulated to include task statements, the rating scale, and final formatting was completed. Finally, in Phase 2, the instrument was pretested (Scarborough, 2005).

Survey construction. The *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS)* was designed to measure the frequency with which the responding school counselor actually performs the activity, as well as the frequency with which the responding school
counselor prefers to perform each activity. For the purposes of this study, participants were only asked to respond to the preferred frequency of each activity. On preferred activity, participants were asked to rate their preference on a 5-point Likert verbal frequency scale as follows: 1 (never) to 2 (rarely) to 3 (occasionally) to 4 (frequently) to 5 (routinely).

The second phase for Scarborough (2005) was to conduct a pretest to assess the possible mistakes that were made in production, assess the construction of questions and statements, assess the scale that was used, and assess readability and understanding. For this phase, Scarborough utilized knowledgeable colleagues with expertise in the area of school counseling to provide feedback. Due to the feedback that was received from the pretest, a selection of task statements were removed and replaced with additional task statements (Scarborough, 2005).

**Reliability and validity.** The SCARS was field tested by Scarborough (2005) utilizing a random selection of 600 participants that were selected from elementary, middle, and high school counselors in two Southern states. Of the initial 600 participants that were selected, a total of 361 surveys were returned and used for analysis; 117 were from elementary school counselors, 120 were from middle school counselors, and 124 were from high school counselors (60% response rate; Scarborough, 2005).

Scarborough used factor analysis in order to assess construct validity (2005). Each role was analyzed independently from the others (Scarborough, 2005). In addition, according to Scarborough (2005) construct validity was assessed with the use of a one-
way analysis of variance (ANOVA), as well as a correlation between subscales, and internal consistency and reliability were assessed using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha.

Based on item loadings, Scarborough (2005) named the factors with the following designations: curriculum, coordination, counseling, and consultation. The counseling subscale included 9 items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the counseling subscale was found to be .85 for Actual and .83 for Prefer (Scarborough, 2005). The consultation subscale included 7 items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the consultation subscale was found to be .75 for Actual and .77 for Prefer (Scarborough, 2005). The curriculum subscale included 8 items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the curriculum subscale was found to be .93 for Actual and .90 for Prefer (Scarborough, 2005). The coordination subscale included 13 items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the coordination subscale was found to be .84 for Actual and .85 for Prefer (Scarborough, 2005).

Scarborough (2005) used a different method for the Other subscale. Scarborough conducted an analysis of the results of the Actual and Prefer scales in order to evaluate the validity of the subscales. After examination, the three-factor solution of the Prefer scale was used to develop additional subscales (Clerical, Fair Share, and Administrative). The Clerical subscale consisted of 3 items and Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were found to be .84 for Actual and .80 for Prefer. The Fair Share subscale includes 5 items and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were found to be .53 for Actual and .58 for Prefer. The Administrative subscale consisted of 2 items that were deemed as not being related to school counseling activities, and the Cronbach’s alpha reliability
coefficients were found to be .43 for Actual and .52 for Prefer (Scarborough, 2005). For the current study, these subscales were combined into one in order to form the administrative role subscale.

A study conducted by Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) also utilized the SCARS as the instrument and they reported similar reliability findings. Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter reported Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the counseling subscale was .85 for Actual and .86 for Prefer. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the consultation subscale was .77 for Actual and .78 for Prefer. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the curriculum subscale was .93 for Actual and .93 for Prefer. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the coordination subscale was .86 for Actual and .87 for Prefer. And finally, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the other subscale was .61 for Actual and .68 for Prefer (Nelson, Robles-Pina, & Nichter, 2008).

These results by Scarborough (2005) and Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) support the use of the SCARS as a survey instrument to be used to measure how school counselors actually spend their time versus how they prefer to spend their time in job-related activities. In addition, the subscales that are used in the SCARS reflect the competencies that are addressed in the ASCA National Standards of School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) as well as the four categories of intervention (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination) recognized by national and state models.
**Procedures for Collecting Data**

The first step in data collection involved the researcher extracting a random selection of member emails from ASCA and NASSP. Once the data was extracted, the researcher created a database of administrator email addresses and a database of school counselor email addresses in which email addresses were randomized using Microsoft Excel. Initially, the first 500 email addresses were selected from each database and participants were invited to participate in the online survey via email. The internet survey tool *Qualtrics* (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) was used to collect survey responses from participants. The benefits of an internet survey are numerous, including a rapid survey rate, low cost to the researcher, and the high number of those that can be reached via email (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Follow-up emails were sent to participants at one week and again at two weeks after the initial invitation.

Due to the high number of invalid email addresses and extremely low response rate, the next 300 email addresses were selected from each database and participants were sent the email invitation to participate in the online survey via email. Again, follow-up emails were sent to participants at one week and again at two weeks after the initial invitation. The researcher provided written informed consent information to the participants.

The statistical power of this research study was assessed using the G*Power program (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). It was computed that for a medium effect size (.25) and an alpha of .05 the total number of participants needed this study is
approximately 84 (N=84). With 84 participants, the power was estimated to be approximately .95 (1-β=.95).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

In order to address the research questions and hypotheses, quantitative methods were used. Measures were compared within and between groups resulting in a two group repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) design. This two-way mixed model ANOVA was conducted to determine the extent to which secondary school administrators and secondary school counselors hold beliefs within the five school counselor role areas. Next, the between-within ANOVA detected any statistical difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school principals and secondary school counselors. Lastly, analysis determined if there was any interaction between mean role preference ratings of secondary school principals and secondary school counselors across the five role areas. Post-hoc tests were conducted, including multiple paired sample t-tests and independent t-tests. Statistical analyses were performed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Mac, version 21.0.

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the statistical method suitable for conducting data analysis to examine the research questions and all hypotheses was a 2x5 mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA), where the between factor was whether the participant was a school counselor or a school principal and the within factor was the five school counselor role areas. In this study, data analysis began with the use of frequencies and descriptive statistics for examination of reported demographic backgrounds of
participants. Next, tests for assumptions applied to the use of a 2x5 mixed ANOVA statistical procedure involved the utilization of descriptive statistics, both visually and numerically, to determine normality of the distribution and the effects of outliers, skewness, and kurtosis. Assumptions to be met by the data in order to complete this analysis were as follows:

1. The random sampling of participants (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2001). This assumption was met by utilizing the randomized database of participants to extract the sample.

2. Dependent variable scores are independent of one another (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2001). This assumption was met since each participant independently filled out a separate questionnaire.

3. The population distributions on the dependent variable are normally distributed (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2001). To assess for normality, frequency histograms were used with the normal distribution as an overlay. Scatter plots and additional scanning of the data were used to identify outliers.

4. An assumption of sphericity must be met for a between-within repeated measure ANOVA (Cohen, 2001), therefore, Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity was conducted. According to Cohen, when the significance of Mauchly’s test is less than .05, sphericity cannot be assumed. If sphericity is violated, obtained F-ratios will be evaluated against new degrees of freedom using the Greenhouse-Geisser adjustment.
5. The dependent variable that is measured multiple times must be comparable and related (Cohen, 2001). This assumption was met in the initial design as the mean item response was computed for each of the role areas, which made them comparable.

Summary

This chapter provided a description of the methodology used to explore secondary school counselors’ and secondary school principals’ preference as related to school counselor roles. A non-experimental research design was implemented for this study. This chapter included a discussion of the research design, identification of the population, and the sampling plan. The instrument used in this research was described, including survey construction, reliability, and validity. The procedures used for data collection and data analysis were outlined.
Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate secondary school counselor and secondary school principal attitudes regarding the preference of school counselor roles in five key role areas. These key roles included: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative. The administrative area included those activities that are not typically considered to be appropriate for school counselors. This chapter provides the results of a between-within repeated measures ANOVA procedure and supplementary analyses described in the previous chapter.

This chapter presents demographic characteristics of the participants. The reliability analyses of the current instrument and additional descriptive data are described. Finally, results of the null hypothesis tests, post-hoc, supplemental analyses, and additional findings are presented.

Description of Participants

The participants for this study were practicing secondary school counselors and principals. Email requests were submitted to 1,600 participants. Fifty emails were eliminated due to faulty email addresses, or because recipients were not currently practicing or were retired. A total of 224 participants (28%) responded to the survey request, however 58 surveys were discarded because of missing data on all Likert scale items. Seven surveys were discarded due to missing a portion (2 or more responses in each role area) of the data. Additionally, 19 responses were eliminated due to respondents not currently practicing in the field (8 of the school counselor respondents were elementary or middle school counselors, 5 participants responded to the administrator
questionnaire but were currently practicing school counselors, 3 administrators were retired, 1 participant responded with a current job title of CEO/President, 1 responded with a current job title of college professor, and 1 responded with a current job title of Superintendent). Therefore, responses from 140 (17.5%) of the 1,600 invited participants were included for the statistical analyses in this research study. Of the 140 participants included in the analyses, 81 (57.9%) participants were practicing secondary school counselors and 59 (42.1%) participants were practicing secondary school administrators.

Of the 140 participants, 44 respondents were missing one or two of their Likert item responses in responding to a role area. Averaging within each role area (mean substitution) is recognized by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) as an acceptable way to replace data that is missing. Therefore, averages of the remaining corresponding scale items replaced the missing items. The mean was then computed to account for the missing data within the role area. Role 1 (Counseling) had 7 participants that were missing one or two responses, Role 2 (Consultation) had 7, Role 3 (Curriculum) had 11, Role 4 (Coordination) had 10, Role 5 (Other) had 9. Scatter plots did not reveal any additional outliers.

Demographic Characteristics

The demographic questionnaire consisted of questions regarding age, gender, race/ethnicity, current job title, year of program completion, program CACREP accreditation status (school counselors only), years practicing, years at current school, school level of current employment, current client population, approximate number of students enrolled at current school, number of school counselors at current school, current
certifications/licensure, and years spent teaching (if applicable). The demographic data are described by group (school counselors and school principals).

Sixty-six school counselors responded to the question regarding age. The ages of the school counselors that responded to this question ranged from 27 to 64, with the average school counselor age being 46 (mean=45.38; SD=11.182). Fifteen school counselors did not respond to this question. Forty-nine administrators responded to the question regarding age. The ages of the administrators that responded to this question ranged from 37 to 69, with the average administrator age being 53 (mean=53.29; SD=7.687). Ten administrators did not respond to this question.

All of the school counselors that participated in this study (n = 81) responded to the question regarding gender. Of the school counselor participants, 63 (77.8%) were female, and 18 (22.2%) were male. Of the administrator participants, 20 (33.9%) were female, and 37 (62.7%) were male. Two of the administrator participants did not respond to the question.

Eighty (98.8%) school counselors responded to the question regarding race/ethnicity with 72 (89.0%) school counselors identified as White, four (4.9%) Black or African American, two (2.5%) Hispanic or Latino, one (1.2%) Asian, and one (1.2%) multi-racial. One (1.2%) school counselor did not respond to this question. All 59 administrators responded to the question regarding race/ethnicity with 53 (89.8%) administrators identified as White, three (5.1%) Black or African American, two (3.4%) Hispanic or Latino, and one (1.7%) Asian. See Table 1 for a summary of participant demographic characteristics.
Table 1

*Participant Demographic Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46 (11.18)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53 (7.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63 (77.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (33.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 (62.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72 (89)</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 (89.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>4 (4.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (5.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1 (1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1 (1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workplace characteristics.** Seventy (86.5%) school counselors responded that they are currently employed at a high school (Grades 9-12), 2 (2.5%) school counselors responded that they are currently employed at a secondary school (Grades 6-12), 4 (4.9%) school counselors responded that they are currently employed at a secondary school (Grades 7-12), 1 (1.2%) school counselor responded that they are currently employed at an secondary school (Grades 8-12), and 4 (4.9%) school counselors responded with other or combination. Of the school counselor participants that described their current level of employment as other, 2 (2.5%) responded with 10-12, 1 (1.2%) responded with K-12, and 1 (1.2%) responded with Career Technical Center (Grades 11-12). Forty (67.8%) administrators responded that they are currently employed at a high
school (Grades 9-12), 6 (10.2%) administrators responded that they are currently employed at a secondary school (Grades 6-12), 7 (11.8%) administrators responded that they are currently employed at a secondary school (Grades 7-12), and 6 (10.2%) administrators responded with other or a combination. Of the administrator participants that described their current level of employment as other, 2 (3.4%) responded with K-12, 1 (1.7%) responded with vocational high school, 1 (1.7%) responded with intermediate 9-10, 1 (1.7%) responded with PK-12, and 1 (1.7%) responded grades 7-9. None of the administrators that responded were currently employed at a secondary school (Grades 8-12).

When describing the area in which respondents work, 17 (21%) school counselors and 8 (13.6%) administrators responded with urban. Thirty-eight (46.9%) school counselors and 28 (47.5%) administrators described the area in which they work as suburban. Twenty-four (29.6%) school counselors and 23 (39%) administrators described the area in which they work to be rural. Two (2.5%) school counselors did not respond to this question.

Seventy-nine school counselors responded to the question regarding the number of students enrolled at the school in which they currently work. The number of students ranged from 180 students to 4,500 students, with the average number of students being approximately 1,106 students (mean=1,106.01; SD=769.306). Fifty-seven administrators responded to the question regarding the number of students enrolled at the school in which they currently work. The number of students ranged from 150 students to 3,000
students, with the average number of students being approximately 930 students (mean=929.84; SD=715.572). Two administrators did not respond to this question.

Seventy-seven school counselors responded to the question regarding how many school counselors work within their school. The number of school counselors ranged from 1 to 18, with the average number of school counselors within the school being 4 (mean=3.994; SD=2.577). All of the administrators responded to the question regarding how many school counselors work within their school. The number of school counselors ranged from 1 to 9, with the average number of school counselors within the school being 3 (mean=2.981; SD=2.1795). See Table 2 for a summary of participant workplace characteristics.
Table 2

**Participant Workplace Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td>70 (86.5)</td>
<td>40 (67.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-12</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>6 (10.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-12</td>
<td>4 (4.9)</td>
<td>7 (11.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 8-12</td>
<td>1 (1.2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (4.9)</td>
<td>6 (10.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>17 (21.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>38 (46.9)</td>
<td>28 (47.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24 (29.6)</td>
<td>23 (39.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Enrolled</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,106 (769.31)</td>
<td>930 (715.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number School Counselors</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4 (2.58)</td>
<td>3 (2.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job title, training, and certification.** Eighty (98.8%) school counselor participants responded to the question regarding current job title. Fifty (61.7%) participants described their current job title as School Counselor, 11 (13.6%) described their current job title as Guidance Counselor, 13 (16.1%) described their current job title as Director of Guidance, and 6 (7.4%) responded with Other (Lead Counselor, College Counselor, Career and Technical Counselor, Academic Counselor, Head Counselor, College and Career Counselor). One school counselor participant did not respond to this question. All administrator participants (59; 100%) responded to the question regarding
current job title. Fifty-five (93.2%) participants described their current job title as Principal, 4 (6.8%) described their current job title as Vice Principal.

Seventy-seven (95.1%) school counselors responded with the year in which their graduate program was completed. The year of completion ranged from 1974 to 2013. Three (3.7%) school counselors completed their program in the 1970’s, eight (9.9%) in the 1980’s, 20 (24.7%) in the 1990’s, and 46 (56.8%) after the year 2000. Four (4.9%) school counselors did not respond to this question. Eleven (18.6%) administrators responded with the year in which their graduate program was completed. The year of completion ranged from 1981 to 2012. Four (6.8%) administrators completed their program in the 1980’s, one (1.7%) in the 1990’s, and six (10.2%) after the year 2000. Forty-eight administrators did not respond to the question.

School counselor participants responded to a question regarding CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs) accreditation. Forty-three (53.1%) school counselors responded that the Counselor Education program in which their degree was completed was a CACREP accredited program. Seventeen (21%) school counselors responded that the Counselor Education program in which their degree was completed was not a CACREP accredited program. Eighteen (22.2%) school counselors were unsure if the Counselor Education program in which their degree was completed was a CACREP accredited program. Three (3.7%) school counselors did not respond to this question.

Participants were asked to indicate the additional licenses/certificates they hold. Forty-five (55.6%) school counselors responded that they hold a teaching
license/certificate. Fourteen (17.3%) school counselors responded that they hold the title of National Certified Counselor (NCC). Six (7.4%) school counselors responded that they hold the title of National Certified School Counselor (NCSC). Ten (12.3%) school counselors responded that they hold a professional counselor (PC) license. Ten (12.4%) school counselors responded that they hold a license/certificate described as other. Of these, 2 (2.5%) filled in Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) for other, 2 (2.5%) filled in Licensed Social Worker (LSW) for other, 2 (2.5%) filled in Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC) for other, 2 (2.5%) filled in School Administration for other, 1 (1.2%) filled in College Counseling for other, and 1 (1.2%) filled in NBPTS for other. Nineteen (23.5%) school counselors responded that they hold no other license/certificate other than a state school counseling license/certificate. Forty-one (69.5%) administrators responded that they hold a teaching license/certificate. Nine (15.3%) administrators responded that they hold a school counselor license/certificate. Twenty (33.9%) administrators responded that they hold a superintendent license/certificate. And 5 (8.5%) administrators responded that they hold a license/certificate described as other. Of these, 2 (3.4%) filled in Education Leadership for other, 2 (3.4%) filled in Special Education for other, and 1 (1.7%) filled in Counseling Supervisory Certificate as other. All administrators reported holding at least one additional license/certificate. See Table 3 for a summary of participant characteristics related to job title, training, and certification.
Table 3

Participant Job Title, Training, and Certification Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>50 (61.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td>11 (13.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Guidance</td>
<td>13 (16.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6 (7.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 (93.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Program Completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970’s</td>
<td>3 (3.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980’s</td>
<td>8 (9.9)</td>
<td>4 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990’s</td>
<td>20 (24.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000’s</td>
<td>46 (56.8)</td>
<td>6 (10.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CACREP Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43 (53.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17 (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>18 (22.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licenses/Certificates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>45 (55.6)</td>
<td>41 (69.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC*</td>
<td>14 (17.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSC*</td>
<td>6 (7.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC*</td>
<td>10 (12.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (12.3)</td>
<td>5 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 (15.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (33.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NCC stands for National Certified Counselor; NCSC stands for National Certified School Counselor; PC stands for Professional Counselor

**Work experience.** Eighty school counselor participants responded to the question regarding years spend as a school counselor. School counselor experience ranged from 1
year to 39 years, with the average experience being approximately 12 years as a school counselor (mean=11.89; SD=7.490). One school counselor did not respond to this question. All of the administrator participants responded to the question regarding years spent as an administrator. Administrator experience ranged from 4 years to 34 years, with the average experience being approximately 18 years as an administrator (mean=17.63; SD=7.353).

Eighty school counselor participants responded to the question regarding years employed at their current school. School counselors reported being employed at their current school from 1 year to 33 years, with the average number of years at current school being approximately 10 years (mean=10.19; SD=8.251). One school counselor did not respond to this question. All of the administrator participants responded to the question regarding years employed at their current school. Administrators reported being employed at current school from 1 year to 44 years, with the average number of years at current school being approximately 12 years (mean=11.64; SD=9.038).

School counselor’s experience as a teacher ranged from 1 year of experience to 38 years experience, with the average school counselor’s teaching experience being approximately 10 years (mean=10.093; SD=8.0358). Thirty-eight school counselors did not respond to this question, which could indicate that they had no teaching experience. Fifty-six administrators responded to the question regarding number of years spent as a teacher. Administrator’s experience as a teacher ranged from 3 years experience to 35 years experience, with the average administrator’s teaching experience being approximately 12 years (mean=11.741; SD=6.6435). Three administrators did not
respond to this question. Forty-three school counselors responded to the question regarding number of years spent as a teacher. See Table 4 for a summary of participant work experience characteristics.

Table 4

*Participant Work Experience Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>School Counselors</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12 (7.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Current School</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10 (8.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10 (8.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Counseling Program Model.** When asked about their familiarity with the components of a comprehensive, developmental school counseling model, 43 (72%) administrators responded that they were familiar with this model, 9 (15.3%) administrators responded that they were not familiar with this model, and 5 (8.5%) administrators were unsure. Two (3.4%) administrators did not respond to this question. Sixty-six (81.5%) school counselors responded that they attempt to model their school counseling program based on a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program model. Ten (12.3%) school counselors responded that they do not attempt to model their school counseling program based on a comprehensive, developmental school
counseling program model, and 5 (6.2%) school counselors were unsure about this question.

**National Standards of School Counseling Programs.** When asked about their familiarity with the National Standards of School Counseling Programs published by the American School Counselor Association, 35 (59.3%) administrators responded that they were familiar with the National Standards, 15 (25.4%) administrators responded that they were not familiar with the National Standards, and 8 (13.6%) responded that they were unsure. One (1.7%) administrator did not respond to this question. Sixty-one (75.3%) school counselors responded that they are incorporating the National Standards of School Counseling Programs as part of their school counseling program. Fifteen (18.5%) school counselors responded that they are not incorporating the National Standards as part of their school counseling program, and 4 (4.9%) school counselors responded that they were unsure if they are incorporating the National Standards. One (1.2%) school counselor did not respond to this question.

**Reliability and Validity Issues**

The five key school counselor roles were measured by a single instrument, the SCARS (Scarborough, 2002). For the purposes of this study, the items on the SCARS were randomized using SPSS. In addition, the role that was referred to as other is referred to in this study as the administrative role. The survey asked participants to rate how often they would prefer each of the school counselor activities be performed. The activities of school counselors fell into five key role areas, which included (1) counseling; (2) consultation; (3) curriculum; (4) coordination; and (5) administrative (the administrative
role included those activities that are not typically considered to be appropriate for school counselors). The role area of counseling was measured in ten statements, consultation was measured in seven statements, curriculum was measured in eight statements, coordination was measured in thirteen statements, and administrative was measured in ten statements, for a total of 48 survey items.

The internal consistency of the instrument was assessed by calculating the Cronbach’s alpha where coefficient alphas ranged from $\alpha = .66 - .85 \ (p < .01)$, as shown in Table 5. Correlations between the individual scales were obtained to determine subsequent reliability as shown in Table 6. Table 7 contains the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable. Items utilized a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 2 (rarely) to 3 (occasionally) to 4 (frequently) to 5 (routinely).

<p>| Table 5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability of Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $j = $ number of school counselor activities that make up each of the roles
As shown in Table 5, the subscales were found to be fairly reliable with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from $\alpha = .66 - .85 \ (p < .01)$.

Table 6

*Correlations Among Subscale Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Counseling</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.595*</td>
<td>.507*</td>
<td>.473*</td>
<td>.313*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consultation</td>
<td>.595*</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>.500*</td>
<td>.434*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum</td>
<td>.507*</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.559*</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordination</td>
<td>.473*</td>
<td>.500*</td>
<td>.559*</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>.474*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administrative</td>
<td>.313*</td>
<td>.434*</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.474*</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the $p < .01$ level, two-tailed

As shown in Table 6, all of the roles were found to be positively correlated. All were found to be statistically significant except one pair. The roles that were not found to have a significant correlation were the curriculum role and the administrative role.
Table 7

*Means and Standard Deviations for Subscale Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Area</th>
<th>Administrators M</th>
<th>Administrators SD</th>
<th>School Counselors M</th>
<th>School Counselors SD</th>
<th>Overall M</th>
<th>Overall SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7 shows, secondary school counselors and principals in this study rated the counseling role as being the most preferred role overall and the administrative role as being the least preferred role overall.

**Statistical Analyses to Test Null Hypothesis**

Statistical analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Mac, version 21.0. Descriptive statistics were computed to test for assumptions and supplemental analyses were carried out.

**Testing of the Null Hypothesis**

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. there was no difference between preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles;
2. there was no difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals; and
3. the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals was the same across the five key roles.

A between-within repeated measure ANOVA was computed to determine any significant differences in secondary school counselor and principal preferences for school counselor roles across the five key roles (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative).

**Null hypothesis 1.** The first null hypothesis was rejected because the results showed a significant difference across the dependent measures, $F(3.27, 451.12) = 117.12, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .46$. Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 63.113, p < .05$); therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .817$).

**Null hypothesis 2.** The second null hypothesis was rejected because there was a significant difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals, $F(1, 138) = 35.844, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .206$.

**Null hypothesis 3.** The third null hypothesis was rejected because the results show that the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals was not the same across the five role areas, $F(3.27, 451.12) = 11.441, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .077$. Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 63.113, p < .05$); therefore degrees of freedom were
corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .817$). The interaction between job title and role preference is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1](image)

*Figure 1.* Mean scores of principal and counselor preferences of the five key roles.

**Post Hoc Analysis**

To control for Type I error rate, the Bonferroni approach was used in post hoc analysis to determine significant differences among the measures. Paired t-tests (using a Bonferroni adjustment, $\alpha=.05/10=.005$) showed that overall, participants rated the
Administrative role with significantly lower preference ratings than the remaining four roles, with the largest group mean differences between the roles of Counseling (M = 3.14, SD = .632) and Administrative (M = 2.56, SD = .749); t(139) = 16.77, p < .001, and between the roles of Consultation (M = 3.63, SD = .585) and Administrative (M = 2.56, SD = .749); t(139) = 17.52, p < .001. The Administrative role was rated significantly lower than Curriculum and Coordination as follows: Curriculum vs Administrative; t(139) = 10.22, p < .001, Coordination vs Administrative; t(139) = 16.77, p < .001. Additional significant differences were as follows: Counseling vs Curriculum; t(139) = 5.76, p < .001, Consultation vs Curriculum; t(139) = 3.77, p < .001. The smallest group mean differences in preference ratings were found between Counseling and Consultation; t(139) = 1.80, p = .07 and between Consultation and Coordination; t(139) = 1.64, p = .10. These roles did not yield a significant difference in mean preference ratings. A graph was obtained to further explain the mean differences, as seen in Figure 2.

To further explain the interaction effect, using a Bonferroni adjustment, (α = .05/5 = .01) independent t-tests were conducted. Due to the results of the Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance, it is important to note that all of the variables were tested using pooled variance, meaning that the variances were assumed to be equal. On average, administrators rated each of the five role areas with higher preference than school counselors. Administrators reported higher preference for the role area of Counseling (M = 3.96, SD = .602), than school counselors (M = 3.54, SD = .595). The difference was significant t(138) = 4.13, p < .01, d = .71. Administrators reported higher preference for the role area of Consultation (M = 3.88, SD = .559), than school counselors (M = 3.45,
SD = .535). The difference was significant $t(138) = 4.70$, $p < .01$, $d = .80$. Administrators reported higher preference for the role area of Coordination ($M = 3.74$, $SD = .540$), than school counselors ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .581$). The difference was significant $t(138) = 3.39$, $p < .01$, $d = .58$. The largest mean difference was found in administrator preference ratings for the administrative role. Administrators reported higher preference for the Administrative role ($M = 3.08$, $SD = .655$), than school counselors ($M = 2.18$, $SD = .566$). The difference was significant $t(138) = 8.65$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.49$. The higher average preference ratings were significantly higher for all of the role areas except for the Curriculum role area.

Figure 2. Mean differences within the five key role areas.
Supplementary Analysis

Supplemental frequencies and descriptive data were examined in order to better describe the findings of this study.

Overall, participants rated the counseling role as the most preferred role (M = 3.71; SD = .63). Counseling as the most preferred role was followed by consultation (M = 3.63; SD = .59), coordination (M = 3.55; SD = .58), and curriculum (M = 3.38; SD = .74). Participants rated the administrative role as the least preferred role (M = 2.56; SD = .75).

Participants rated the counseling role with highest preference. Participants rated counseling students regarding academic issues as the most preferred counseling activity (M = 4.63; SD = .60), followed closely by counseling students regarding personal/family concerns (M = 4.31; SD = .83), and following up on individual and group counseling participants (M = 4.16; SD = .92). Participants rated conducting small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues as the least preferred counseling activity (M = 2.74; SD = 1.14).

The consultation role was rated with the next highest preference. Participants rated consulting with school staff concerning student behavior (M = 4.14; SD = .90) as the most preferred consultation activity. This was followed by consult with community and school agencies concerning individual students (M = 3.91; SD = .85). Participants rated assist in identifying exceptional children (special education; M = 2.95; SD = 1.15) as the least preferred consultation activity.
Under the role of coordination, participants rated *coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program* (M = 4.48; SD = .87) as the most preferred activity and *conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs* (M = 2.87; SD = .88) as the least preferred activity. Under the role of curriculum, participants rated *conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students* as the most preferred activity and *conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse* (M = 2.87; SD = 1.10) as the least preferred activity, followed closely by *conduct classroom lessons on personal safety issues* (M = 2.89; SD = 1.02).

Participants rated the administrative role with lowest preference overall. Participants rated *schedule students for classes* (M = 3.86; SD = 1.28) as the most preferred administrative activity. This was followed closely by *participate on committees within the school* (M = 3.81; SD = 1.11) as the second most preferred administrative activity. Participants rated *handle discipline of students* (M = 1.59; SD = .90) and *substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at your school* (M = 1.60; SD = .82) as the least preferred administrative activities.

There were areas of agreement between the groups (school counselors and principals). The counseling activity *counsel students regarding academic issues* was rated as the most preferred by both school counselors (M = 4.50; SD = .69) and principals (M = 4.81; SD = .39). The counseling activity *conduct small groups regarding substance abuse* was rated as the least preferred by school counselors (M=2.37; SD = 1.03) and principals (M=3.24; SD = 1.10).
The consultation activity *consult with staff regarding student behavior* was rated as the most preferred consultation activity by both school counselors (M = 3.93; SD = .92) and principals (M = 4.44; SD = .79). The consultation activity *assist in identification of exceptional children (special education)* was rated as the least preferred by school counselors (M = 2.60; SD = .995) and principals (M = 3.44; SD = 1.18).

The curriculum activity *conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program* was rated as the most preferred curriculum activity by both school counselors (M = 4.11; SD = .92) and principals (M = 4.08; SD = 1.02). However, school counselors and principals did not agree on the least preferred curriculum activity. School counselors rated *conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse* as the least preferred curriculum activity (M = 2.68; SD = 1.04) and principals rated *conduct classroom lessons regarding personal safety issues* as the least preferred curriculum activity (M = 3.02; SD = 1.12).

The coordination activity *coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program* was rated as the most preferred coordination activity by both school counselors (M = 4.24; SD = .92) and principals (M = 4.80; SD = .48). The coordination activity *conduct/coordinate teacher in-service programs* was rated as the least preferred coordination activity by both school counselors (M = 2.86; SD = .90) and principals (M = 2.88; SD = .86).

The administrative activity *schedule students for classes* was rated as the most preferred administrative activity by both school counselors (M = 3.46; SD = 1.29) and principals (M = 4.42; SD = 1.05). School counselors and principals did not agree on the
least preferred administrative activity. School counselors rated *handle discipline of students* as the least preferred administrative activity (M = 1.35; SD = .57) and principals rated *substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at school* as the least preferred administrative activity (M = 1.78; SD = .97).

**Additional Findings**

Several additional statistical tests were used in an attempt to better understand the data. However, these tests were not included as supplemental analyses because they do not necessarily shed additional light on the current research study. Exploratory analyses regarding gender, age, years of experience, and years of teaching experience should be interpreted with caution.

**Gender.** In regard to gender, Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 88.63, p < .05$); therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .76$). There was a significant difference in preference ratings across the five school counselor role areas, $F(3.05, 415.21) = 110.82, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .45$. There was a significant difference in the role preference ratings of male and female participants, $F(1, 136) = 7.87, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .055$. There was also a significant difference in role preference between male and female participants across the five role areas, $F(3.05, 415.21) = 3.48, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$. See Figure 3 for mean scores regarding gender and the five role areas.
It is unclear if this difference is due to gender or the relationship between gender and job title (school counselor or principal). Therefore, further analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between gender, job title, and role preferences.

A between-within repeated measure ANOVA was computed to determine any significant differences by gender in secondary school counselor and principal preferences for school counselor roles across the five key roles. This was done by utilizing a split-file command in order compare school counselor preferences by gender and school principal
preferences by gender. There was no difference between the role preference ratings of male and female secondary school counselors $F(1, 79) = .27, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$ and there was no difference between the role preference ratings of male and female secondary school principals, $F(1, 79) = 1.33, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The reason these results are not included in the supplementary analyses is that there were not enough participants to split the groups and maintain adequate power. Figure 4 shows the interaction between principal gender and school counselor role preference and Figure 5 shows the interaction between school counselor gender and school counselor role preference.
Figure 4. Mean scores of male and female principal preferences of the five key roles.
In regard to age, Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 59.80, p < .05$); therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .78$). There was a significant difference in preference ratings across the five school counselor role areas, $F(3.13, 347.40) = 90.13, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .45$. There was not a significant difference in the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals with regards to age, $F(3, 111) = 1.84, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. There was also not a
significant difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals across the five role areas with regards to age, $F(9.39, 347.40) = .67, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. See Figure 6 for mean scores regarding age and the five role areas.

*Figure 6.* Mean scores for age and the five key roles.

**Years of experience.** In regard to years of experience, Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 76.25, p < .05$); therefore
degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .78$). There was a significant difference in preference ratings across the five school counselor role areas, $F(3.12, 424.07) = 102.59, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .43$. There was a significant difference in the role preference ratings of professionals who have worked in the field for zero to ten years, those who have worked in the field for 11-20 years, and those who have worked in the field for 21 or more years, $F(2, 136) = 3.07, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. There was not a significant difference in role preference between school professionals with difference amounts of experience across the five role areas, $F(6.24, 424.07) = 1.53, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. See Figure 7 for mean scores regarding years experience and the five role areas.
Figure 7. Mean scores for years of experience and the five key roles.

**CACREP accreditation.** A between-subjects repeated measure ANOVA was computed to determine any significant differences among school counselors by whether their school counseling program was CACREP accredited or not. For this analysis, the participants that responded that their training program was CACREP accredited were in one group ($n = 43$) and participants that responded with either no or unsure if training program was CACREP accredited were in the second group ($n = 35$). While there were no significance differences found between the role preference ratings of school
counselors that attended CACREP accredited training programs and those that did not or were unsure \( F(1, 76) = .917, p > .05 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .01 \), an observation of the profile plot (see Figure 8) shows that there were differences in ratings for the curriculum role. Again, these results are not included in the supplementary analyses because there were not enough participants to maintain adequate power.

Figure 8. Mean scores for CACREP accreditation and the five key roles.
Summary

This chapter reported participant demographics, institutional demographics, and results from the statistical analysis. The findings on the between-within repeated measures ANOVA and follow up analysis found significant differences between preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles. Additionally, the results found a significant difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals and the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals was found to be significantly different across the five key roles. Supplementary analyses were conducted in order to better describe the data and additional findings were reported in this chapter as well. The following chapter provides a discussion of the sample, null hypothesis, supplemental and additional analyses, limitations, implications and directions for future research.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate and compare preferences of secondary school counselors and principals regarding school counselor activities. For the purposes of this study, the activities of school counselors fell into five key roles, which included: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative. Interactions were explored between secondary school counselor and secondary school principal role preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles. This chapter presents a discussion of the sample characteristics, and supplemental analyses. Next, a review of the findings, and implications are presented. Lastly, recommendations for future research are discussed.

Sample Characteristics

A sample of 800 school counselors and 800 administrators were requested to participate in this study. The response rate was 28% (N = 224) of participants and 17.5% (N = 140) of usable survey responses. Of these participants, 81 (57.9%) were practicing secondary school counselors and 59 (42.1%) were practicing secondary school principals.

The overall response rate was fairly low. This may have been due in part to the researcher’s timeline in sending requests during the months of February and March, which can be a very busy time for all school personnel. It appeared as though the low response rate was due, in part, to faulty email addresses or messages not going through correctly. This was evident from the extremely high number of emails that bounced back to the researcher. Additionally, the response rate may be due to a lack of participant interest, lack of incentive, or time constraints of participants.
School counselor demographic characteristics of this study were representative of the profession. The age range of school counselors in this study was 27 to 64, which is very similar to the findings of Bruce and Bridgeland’s (2012) findings from the College Board’s 2012 National Survey of School Counselors, which found a fairly evenly distributed age range of 25 to 65. Of the school counselor respondents in this study, approximately 78% were female and 22% were male. This was exactly the statistic that was found by Bruce and Bridgeland’s study – they also reported that in their national survey of school counselors, 78% were female and 22% were male.

The school counselors in this study were less diverse than the school counselors that were surveyed by Bruce and Bridgeland (2012). School counselors in the current study responded to the question regarding race/ethnicity with 89% of school counselors self-identified as White, 5% as Black or African American, 3% as Hispanic or Latino, 1.5% as Asian, and 1.5% as multi-racial. In their national survey of school counselors, Bruce and Bridgeland found reported that 77% of school counselors self-identified as White, 10% as Black or African American, 13% as Hispanic or Latino, and 2% as Asian.

School principal demographic characteristics of this study were representative of the profession according to statistics from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 2010). Of the administrator participants in this study, 33.9% were female and 62.7% were male. NASSP reported that 36% of the membership was female and 64% of the membership was male (2010). The ages of the administrators that responded to this question ranged from 37 to 69, with the average administrator age being 53 (mean=53.29; SD=7.687). While the report from NASSP reported age in a different
manner, approximately 41% of NASSP members were age 52 or older, 31% were between the ages of 42 and 51, 26% were between the ages of 32 and 41, and 2% were age 31 or less (2010). When describing the area in which respondents work, 13.6% of administrators in the current study responded with urban, 47.5% described the area in which they work as suburban, and 39% described the area in which they work to be rural. These numbers are slightly different from the numbers reported in the NASSP report, with 23% practicing in urban locations, 33% practicing in suburban locations, and 44% practicing in rural locations (NASSP, 2010). The NASSP Profile (2010) did not include information regarding race/ethnicity.

Principal participants were asked about their familiarity with the ASCA National Model. Seventy-two percent of principals responded that they were familiar with this model, 15.3% responded that they were not familiar with this model, and 8.5% were unsure. With 72% of principal respondents being familiar with the ASCA National Model speaks to the ability of current school counselors to get the message about the National Model to principals. School counselor participants were asked about modeling their school counseling program based on a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program. Eighty-one and a half percent of school counselors responded that they attempt to model their school counseling program based on a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program model, 12.3% responded that they do not attempt to model their school counseling program based on a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program model, and 6.2% school counselors were unsure about this question.
Secondary school principals were asked about their familiarity with the National Standards of School Counseling Programs published by ASCA. Of the respondents, 59.3% of principals responded that they were familiar with the National Standards, 25.4% responded that they were not familiar with the National Standards, and 13.6% responded that they were unsure. Secondary school counselors were asked if they are incorporating the National Standards of School Counseling Programs as part of their school counseling program. Of the respondents, 75.3% of school counselors responded that they are incorporating the National Standards as part of their school counseling program, 18.5% responded that they are not incorporating the National Standards as part of their school counseling program, and 4.9% responded that they were unsure if they are incorporating the National Standards.

The numbers reflect that the majority of the participants of this study know about and are incorporating the ASCA National Model and the National Standards of School Counseling Programs. This information cannot be generalized to the entire school counselor or principal population because the sample was chosen from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). These results could genuinely reflect the tendencies of the population of secondary school counselors or it could reflect that the professionals that are members of the national associations are more likely to know about the National Model and Standards.
Review of the Findings

A between-within repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed to evaluate any significant differences in preferences of secondary school counselors and principals toward the five key school counselor roles. The null hypotheses were as follows:

1. there is no difference between preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles;
2. there is no difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals; and
3. the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals is the same across the five key roles.

**Null hypothesis 1.** The first null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference in preference ratings across the five key school counselor roles, $F(3.27, 451.12) = 117.12$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .46$. A profile analysis did not indicate flatness, which is described by Tabachnick & Fidell (2013) as whether the dependent variables have elicited the same average response thus resulting in flat lines on the profile, among the measures as mean differences were evident among the five key roles. Post hoc tests found that eight of the ten paired samples t-tests were significant. Overall, participants rated the Administrative role with significantly lower preference ratings than the remaining four roles. This finding is a contrast with the findings of Fitch, Newby, Ballesteros, and Marshall (2001) that more than half of the future administrators identified tasks typically related with the administrative role (record keeping, registration, and
testing) as significant or highly significant. However, this is a very positive finding for the school counseling field because it does indicate that the tasks identified with the administrative role are not the top priority for school counselor or principals. The largest group mean differences were found between the Counseling Role and the Administrative Role, and between the Consultation Role and the Administrative Role.

Participants rated the counseling role as the most preferred role (M = 3.71; SD = .63). This finding is in line with the findings of Foster, Young, and Hermann (2005) regarding school counselors having more preference for the counseling roles, and Fitch, Newby, Ballester, and Marshall’s (2001) and Bardoshi and Duncan’s (2009) findings that principals reported favoring the counseling role as well. Counseling was followed by consultation (M = 3.63; SD = .59), coordination (M = 3.55; SD = .58), and curriculum (M = 3.38; SD = .74). Participants rated the administrative role as the least preferred role (M = 2.56; SD = .75). These findings are consistent with the findings of Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) that high school counselors would prefer to be more engaged in activities related to counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination and they would prefer fewer clerical duties.

Participants rated counseling students regarding academic issues as the most preferred counseling activity (M = 4.63; SD = .60). This follows with the ASCA National Model (2012) ideal that school counseling be focused on academic-oriented outcomes. Participants rated conducting small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues as the least preferred counseling activity (M = 2.74; SD = 1.14). The four counseling activities that received the lowest preference were related to small group
counseling. This finding could indicate that school counselors and principals view small group counseling as less of a priority for school counselor time.

The consultation role was rated as the second highest preferred. Participants rated *consulting with school staff concerning student behavior* (M = 4.14; SD = .90) as the most preferred consultation activity. It is logical that this was rated as the most preferred activity because student behavior is a primary concern of stakeholders and school counselors alike. Participants rated *assist in identifying exceptional children* (special education; M = 2.95; SD = 1.15) as the least preferred consultation activity. Under the role of coordination, participants rated *coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program* (M = 4.48; SD = .87) as the most preferred activity and *conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs* (M = 2.87; SD = .88) as the least preferred activity. Again, this is a positive finding for the school counseling profession because it indicates that a school counseling program is a priority for school counselors and principals alike. Under the role of curriculum, participants rated *conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students* as the most preferred activity and *conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse* (M = 2.87; SD = 1.10) as the least preferred activity.

Participants rated the administrative role with lowest preference overall. Participants rated *schedule students for classes* (M = 3.86; SD = 1.28) as the most preferred administrative activity. Scheduling students for classes is one of the most time consuming activities for school counselors (Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt, and Williams, 1989b), so it stands out that this activity was rated with the most preference. Participants
rated handle discipline of students (M = 1.59; SD = .90) and substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at your school (M = 1.60; SD = .82) as the least preferred administrative activities.

Null hypothesis 2. The second null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals, $F(1, 138) = 35.844, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .206$. Profile analysis showed mean differences between school counselor preference and principal preference for each role; the lines of the two groups were separated across roles.

A visual observation illustrates that, on average, secondary school principals rated each of the five key role areas with higher preference than school counselors. This was particularly true of the Administrative role. In looking closer at the data for each role area, it was found that while there are significant differences in the preference ratings of school counselors and principals, there are also several areas of agreement. The counseling activity counsel students regarding academic issues was rated as the most preferred by both school counselors (M = 4.50; SD = .69) and principals (M = 4.81; SD = .39). This finding is not congruent with the findings of Mason and Perera-Diltz (2010) that found that pre-service administrators did not view enhancing student academic development as an appropriate role for school counselors.

The consultation activity consult with staff regarding student behavior was rated as the most preferred consultation activity by both school counselors (M = 3.93; SD = .92) and principals (M = 4.44; SD = .79). The consultation activity assist in identification
of exceptional children (special education) was rated as the least preferred by school counselors (M=2.60; SD = .995) and principals (M=3.44; SD = 1.18).

The curriculum activity *conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program* was rated as the most preferred curriculum activity by both school counselors (M = 4.11; SD = .92) and principals (M = 4.08; SD = 1.02). However, school counselors and principals did not agree on the least preferred curriculum activity. School counselors rated *conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse* as the least preferred curriculum activity (M = 2.68; SD = 1.04) and principals rated *conduct classroom lessons regarding personal safety issues* as the least preferred curriculum activity (M = 3.02; SD = 1.12).

The coordination activity *coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program* was rated as the most preferred coordination activity by both school counselors (M = 4.24; SD = .92) and principals (M = 4.80; SD = .48). The coordination activity *conduct/coordinate teacher in-service programs* was rated as the least preferred coordination activity by both school counselors (M = 2.86; SD = .90) and principals (M = 2.88; SD = .86).

The administrative activity *schedule students for classes* was rated as the most preferred administrative activity by both school counselors (M = 3.46; SD = 1.29) and principals (M = 4.42; SD = 1.05). This supports the findings of Hardesty and Dillard (1994) that secondary school counselors rate students scheduling as an important task. It also follows the work of Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt, and Williams (1989b) that school counselors spend more time with scheduling than any other activity. This finding is also
similar to the results from Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) that found that high school counselors expressed beliefs more in line with more traditional program practices. More specifically, Wines, Nelson, and Eckstein reported that 89% of respondents in their study routinely schedule students for classes and more than half of the respondents (56.7%) stated that they prefer to routinely schedule students for classes.

School counselors and principals did not agree on the least preferred administrative activity. School counselors rated handle discipline of students as the least preferred administrative activity (M = 1.35; SD = .57) and principals rated substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at school as the least preferred administrative activity (M = 1.78; SD = .97). This is similar to the finding by Bonebrake and Borgers (1984) that found that the principals rated disciplinary tasks higher than school counselors rated them.

**Null hypothesis 3.** The third null hypothesis was rejected. The null hypothesis was rejected because the results showed that the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals was not the same across the five role areas, $F(3.27, 451.12) = 11.441, p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .077$. While these results yielded a small effect size, profile analysis supported this by visually showing that the data were not parallel by group.

The difference between school counselor and principal preference ratings were found to be significant in four of the five key role areas according to independent t-tests that were conducted using a Bonferroni approach ($\alpha = .05/5 = .01$). Secondary school principals reported significantly higher preference for the role area of Counseling,
Consultation, and Coordination. The higher average preference ratings were significantly higher for all of the role areas except for the Curriculum role area. There are several possible explanations for this. It could follow the work of Kendrick, Chandler, and Hatcher (1994) in which school counselors reported that job expectations were excessive. These expectations were described as being overwhelming and exhausting. This may serve as one explanation for why school counselors did not rate any of the roles with more preference than school principals.

The largest mean difference was found in secondary school principal preference ratings for the administrative role. Secondary school principals reported significantly higher preference for the Administrative role than school counselors. This finding is consistent with the research conducted by Perusse and Goodnough (2004), Wines, Nelson, and Eckstein (2007), Ross and Herrington (2006), and Fitch, Newby, Ballestero, and Marshall (2001) that also support the idea that, while administrators identify other roles as important or preferred, they rated the administrative roles with more preference than school counselors.

**Additional Findings**

Additional statistical tests were performed in order to better understand the data. However, the results of these analyses must be interpreted with caution as they do not necessarily contain adequate power in order to shed additional light on the current research study.

**Gender.** Additional analysis found a significant difference between gender and preferences of the five key school counselor roles. One-hundred thirty eight participants
responded to the question regarding gender. Of the respondents, 83 (59.3%) were female, and 55 (39.3%) were male. Of the school counselor participants, 63 (77.8%) were female, and 18 (22.2%) were male. Of the administrator participants, 20 (33.9%) were female, and 37 (62.7%) were male. Two participants did not respond to the question. Clearly there were more female participants than male participants overall, however there were more female school counselors than male school counselors and more male principals than female principals that participated in this study. It is difficult to separate whether the difference between preference ratings of males and females is due to gender, or whether it is due to job title.

A between-within repeated measure ANOVA was computed to determine any significant differences by gender in secondary school counselor and principal preferences for school counselor roles across the five key roles. This was done by utilizing a split-file command in order compare school counselor preferences by gender and school principal preferences by gender. There was no difference between the role preference ratings of male and female secondary school counselors, $F(1, 79) = .27, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$ and there was no difference between the role preference ratings of male and female secondary school principals, $F(1, 79) = 1.33, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. The reason these results are not included in the supplementary analyses is that there were not enough participants to split the groups and maintain adequate power. In looking at Figure 4 (p. 103) and Figure 5 (p. 104) it becomes more evident that the difference in mean preference ratings is more likely due to job title (school principal or school counselor) than gender.
**Age.** In regard to age, Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 59.80, p < .05$); therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .78$). There was a significant difference in preference ratings across the five school counselor role areas, $F(3.13, 347.40) = 90.13, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .45$. There was not a significant difference in the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals with regards to age, $F(3, 111) = 1.84, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$. There was also not a significant difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals across the five role areas with regards to age, $F(9.39, 347.40) = .67, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$. As shown in Figure 6 (p. 105), participants between the ages of 20 and 39 had an overall lower mean preference rating for all five key school counselor roles, which could be tied to the results found by Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) that indicated that high school counselors with more years of experience are more likely to be engaged in counseling activities.

**Years of experience.** In regard to years of experience, Mauchly’s test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(9) = 76.25, p < .05$); therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\varepsilon = .78$). There was a significant difference in preference ratings across the five school counselor role areas, $F(3.12, 424.07) = 102.59, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .43$. There was a significant difference in the role preference ratings of professionals who have worked in the field for zero to ten years, those who have worked in the field for 11-20 years, and those who have worked in the field for 21 or more years, $F(2, 136) = 3.07, p < .05$, partial
\( \eta^2 = .04 \). There was not a significant difference in role preference between school professionals with difference amounts of experience across the five role areas, \( F(6.24, 424.07) = 1.53, p > .05, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .02 \). As shown in Figure 7 (p. 107), participants who had between zero and ten years of experience had an overall lower mean preference rating for all five key school counselor roles. This finding could be related to the findings of Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) that school counselors with more years of experience were more likely to be practicing as they preferred.

**CACREP accreditation.** A between-subjects repeated measure ANOVA was computed to determine any significant differences among school counselors by whether their school counseling program was CACREP accredited or not. For this analysis, the participants that responded that their training program was CACREP accredited were in one group \( (n = 43) \) and participants that responded with either no or unsure if training program was CACREP accredited were in the second group \( (n = 35) \). While there were no significance differences found between the role preference ratings of school counselors that attended CACREP accredited training programs and those that did not or were unsure \( F(1, 76) = .917, p > .05, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .01 \), an observation of the profile plot (see Figure 8, p. 107) shows that there were differences in ratings for the curriculum role. Again, these results are not included in the supplementary analyses due to the fact that there were not enough participants to maintain adequate power. However, these results coincide with the findings of Carroll (1993) that counselors may experience more role congruence in the roles of consultant, coordinator, and counselor, while the role of teacher (curriculum role) yielded the most dramatic actual versus ideal role and
preparation discrepancies. The unanswered question is how the training program being CACREP accredited may or may not impact school counselors’ preference for the curriculum role.

**Implications**

The results of this study have several implications for practicing school counselors, counselor educators, and state and national professional school counseling associations, as well as principals, administrators, administrative training programs, and state and national professional administrator associations. The ability to describe and compare the preferences of secondary school counselors and principals regarding the five key school counselor roles will not only assist school counselors in promoting the profession, but it will also serve as a means for advocating for appropriate school counselor roles. In addition, the findings may provide educational programs with more direction concerning training, for both school counselors and principals.

Studies have certainly shown that secondary school counselors engage in much more clerical work than elementary counselors and are more aligned with administrators than elementary school counselors (Coll & Freeman, 1997; Burnham and Jackson, 2000; Hutchinson, Barrick, and Groves, 1986; Partin 1993; Wines, Nelson, and Eckstein, 2007), but very few studies have focused on the similarities of secondary school counselor and principal preference of the key school counselor roles. While the results of this study indicate that there are significant differences between the mean preference ratings of the five school counselor roles, it also shows that there are many similarities in the preference rating trends. For example, in looking at the overall mean preference ratings
of school counselors and principals, it is evident that both professions have preference ratings that fall in the same general pattern; counseling was rated as the most preferred role, followed by consultation, coordination, curriculum, and lastly administrative (see Table 7, p. 91). This gives evidence that principals may not prefer for school counselors to take on administrative or quasi-administrative roles, but principals may value the counseling role the most.

In addition, the patterns of mean ratings among the five roles were similar for school counselors and principals. This indicates that, while advocacy continues to be necessary for the school counseling profession, school counselors and principals have similar trends in their preferences of the five key school counselor roles. This was shown to be true in the areas of counseling, consultation, and coordination with school counselors and principals having similar ratings of preference for the most and least preferred activities for those roles. This aligns with the findings of Zalaquett and Chatters (2012) that middle school principals hold a positive perception of their school counselors in terms of the school counselors’ positive impact on school environment, student behaviors, and helping parents.

Counselor education programs and principal preparation programs are provided with an opportunity to discuss the importance of the school counselor and principal relationship. These relationships are ideally symbiotic by way of working together and combine leadership roles to benefit the school as a whole. Looking at the results of this study, it appears that school counselors and principals may not have different preferences across the key school counselor roles; therefore, it brings it back to the preparation
programs, along with professional associations, to underscore the key school counselor roles. In fact, it may be beneficial for principals-in-training to be required to take a school counseling course. Such a requirement would counteract the findings from Mason and Perera-Diltz (2010) that found that administrators use their own experiences with school counselors as a basis for school counselor expectations.

Along with this, it appears from the results of this study that school counselors’ preferences follow fairly closely with the preferences of school principals. Therefore, as suggested by Armstrong, MacDonald, and Stillo (2010), Culbreth et al. (2005), and Perusse and Goodnough (2005) counselors education programs may need to adjust training methods in order to give a more clear expectation of the job role, as well as focus more time and attention on fostering a collaborative relationship with administrators. As Ross and Herrington (2006) highlight, school counselors must learn to be team players in order to build positive working relationship with the principal.

Results also showed a difference between participant age and experience and mean preference ratings. Participants that were younger and had less experience in the field (as well as those who had less teaching experience) had lower mean preference ratings for all five key school counselor roles. This could be related to findings of Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) that found that school counselors with more years of experience were more likely to be practicing as they preferred. Similarly, Nelson, Robles-Pina, and Nichter (2008) found that high school counselor with more years of experience were more likely to be engaged in counseling activities. Age seemed to be an indicator of overall preference for the key school counselor roles.
And finally, the results of this study can be used by school counselors and the national association to provide a direction for advocacy. The current school counseling model is extremely complicated to use and describe and is itself continually changing (ASCA, 2012). Results of this study indicate that the ASCA National Model may not account for what school counselors prefer to do and what principals prefer for school counselor to be doing. Under the umbrella of program management, the ASCA National Model lists that curriculum, small group and closing-the-gap action plans are a fundamental part of the model. This is in direct opposition to the finding that both school counselors and school principals preferred the curriculum role as the second to least preferred role for school counselors. Additionally, the ASCA National Model (2012) lists school counseling core curriculum as an essential function of providing direct services to students, and secondary school counselors and principals in this study consistently rated the activities associated with classroom and small groups with lower preference ratings.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Further research is needed in order to look closer at the differences between male and female school counselor preferences. This study identified that there are differences, but there were not enough school counselor participants to disaggregate the school counselor data for analysis. Future studies could focus on only the differences of school counselor role preferences and compare based on gender.

Future studies could build on the work of Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell (2009) that found that a more positive counselor/principal relationship yielded more ideal school counselor role. Because the school counselor and principal relationship is important
regarding the services that students receive from school counselors, it seems vital to investigate the ways in which the counselor/principal relationship is related to the assignment of counselor roles and responsibilities.

A construct that was not resolved was the finding that principals had an overall higher mean preference rating for all five of the key school counselor roles. This could be due to several factors, but there is not enough information to make a determination from the data collected for this study. Therefore, future studies could utilize a mixed methodology to include personal interviews (qualitative) in the context of preference ratings (quantitative) in order to seek additional information from participants in order to understand this trend. A future study could build upon the work of Kendrick, Chandler, and Hatcher (1994) that found that school counselors reported providing service to countless students in more than one school, required to be involved in excessive amount of duties that is not aligned with school counseling training, and amount of work expected to complete overwhelming and exhausting. This may be linked to the current study’s finding that principals rated each role with more preference than school counselors.

A troubling finding from the current study was the generally mediocre preference ratings of school counselors. The highest mean preference rating was for the counseling role (M = 3.54; SD = .60). A rating of 3 on the 5-point Likert Scale indicated that the school counselor would prefer to occasionally do the task. Therefore, the results of this study indicate that school counselors prefer to perform the activities associated with the counseling role a little bit more than occasionally. This finding is startling due to the fact
that, at the most fundamental level, school counselors are trained to be counselors. This finding could stem from the findings of Schmidt, Weaver, and Alldredge (2001) that found that school counselors described feeling a lack of support from administrators and teachers, unreasonably high demands and expectations, and misunderstanding of school counselor roles, and being spread too thin as contributing to career dissatisfaction. Role conflict and ambiguity may contribute as well. This includes that the school counselors may be feeling conflict when asked to perform duties that are perceived as not being part of their role (Moracco, Butcke, & McEwen, 1984). Additionally, these mediocre preference ratings could be evidence of the burnout described by (Bardhoshi, 2012) from the assignment of non-counseling duties. The phenomenon that has been described by Ross and Herrington (2006) as counselor role drift could also be a factor. Ross and Herrington described a situation in which the more school counselors are expected to perform duties that are commonly associated as administrator roles, the more the school counselors begin to identify themselves as administrators. Future research must focus on this finding in order to seek answers for the lower preference ratings.

School counselors in this study rated the counseling activity counsel students regarding academic issues with the highest mean preference rating (M = 4.50; SD = .69). The preference rating of 4 on the 5-point Likert Scale indicates that the school counselors would prefer to frequently do this. Therefore, school counselor participants in this study report that they would prefer to counsel students regarding academic issues more than frequently. This falls in line with the academic focus of the third edition of the ASCA National Model (2012). The National Model now places counseling (individual and small
group counseling) under the umbrella of responsive services in the delivery of the program. School counselors that are trained under this model may learn to put less focus on providing counseling in the school setting. Again, it is essential that future research investigate this further for clarity.

An area for future research that was touched upon in this study, but was not addressed in enough detail (or with enough of a sample size) to fully gain an understanding is the way in which CACREP accreditation effects school counselor role preference, particularly in the curriculum role area. Since Culbreth et al. (2005) found a significant positive correlation between graduation from a CACREP-accredited program and participants’ beliefs that their training program had adequately prepared them for their position, it seems as though it is important to follow up regarding the curriculum role area and possible reasons for the difference in participant ratings of this area.

Future studies that examine school counselor and principal preferences should use a sample that includes those that are not members of their national association. Results may have been skewed due to the fact that all participants were members of their professional organization, which follows that they most likely receive newsletters and journals regarding best practices and current research. This may have an impact on their professional preferences as related to school counselor roles.

Additionally and more specifically, this research lends to a continuation of the exploration of school counselor and principal preferences, however, instead of looking at the roles and activities that are included in the SCARS (2005), looking at preferences of the roles and activities that are provided in the latest ASCA National Model (2012). Such
a study would perhaps shed additional light on the usefulness of the current national model for practicing school counselors. It is unclear whether school counselors are able to use the current model as a tool for advocating the profession as the document is cumbersome and it may be promoting roles and activities that school counselors are not performing (Olson & Allen, 1993). In addition, there is evidence that the current model is emphasizing activities and roles that school counselors may not want to perform (Poynton, Schumacher, & Wilczenski, 2008) and principals may not want school counselors to perform. For example, the latest edition of the ASCA National Model (2012) emphasizes data analysis and interpretation as a major role of school counselors. This may not be the direction that school counselors (or principals) prefer for the profession to go. While the ASCA National Model (2012) recommends that school counselors spend 80% of their time engaged in direct service to the student population, this is not a reality for most school counselors (Schmidt, Weaver, & Alldredge, 2001). Additionally, secondary school counselors continue to perform duties that are identified by ASCA as inappropriate (Wines, Nelson, & Eckstein, 2007). It is problematic that the national association may not be aligned with the realities involved in the day-to-day work activities of school counselors.

**Conclusion**

This research adds to the literature on secondary school counselor roles as related to school counselor and principal preferences of the five key school counselor roles. The emphasis of this study has been on the preferences of secondary school counselors and
principals regarding their preferences of school counselor roles that fall into five key role areas (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and administrative).

The findings of the research showed significant differences in preference ratings within the five key school counselor roles. There was a significant difference found between the role preference ratings of secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. And there was a significant interaction found between the difference in role preference between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals across the five role areas. Further analysis found a significant difference between mean preference ratings of the administrative role and the other four key school counseling roles.

Differences were also found in issues of gender, age, and years of experience among participants. These findings provide insight into school counselor and principal preferences regarding the five key school counselor roles. However, caution must be used when interpreting these results as it was not a representative sample of the school counseling or administrative professions as a whole. Implications, including using these results as a tool for school counselor advocacy and principal-school counselor relationship building, were discussed. And finally, areas for future research were examined.

While statistically significant differences were found between preference ratings of secondary school counselors and principals, there was also evidence that school counselors’ and principals’ preferences were aligned in their overall preference ratings of the roles. Both school counselors and principals rated counseling as the most preferred
role, followed by consultation, coordination, and curriculum. School counselors and principals showed the least preference for the administrative role. In addition, the findings of this study showed that secondary school counselors and principals rated the activities of school counselors with similar preference ratings. School counselors and principals may be similarly aligned in their preferences of the five key school counselor roles. This was shown to be true in the areas of counseling, consultation, and coordination with school counselors and principals having similar ratings of preference for the most and least preferred activities for those roles. This is an important element for school counselors to consider when working with their principals – there are similarities in the preferences of school counselors and principals and those similarities can be used as a starting point in working together to define job roles and functions.
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Appendix B: Permission to Use the Instrument

RE: request to use the SCARS
DATE: Thursday, January 27, 2011 2:13 PM
FROM: "Scarborough, Janna Lynn" <SCARBORO@mail.etsu.edu>
TO: "Emily Rittenhouse" <em_rittenhouse@yahoo.com>

Hello Emily,

Thank you for your interest in the SCARS. You absolutely may use it for your purposes including the modifications. I have had a few people request to use the instrument with administrators and teachers in addition to school counselors. I have not seen much published yet – as this usually takes time. I did find the SCARS referenced in a dissertation by Desiree Skinner examining perceptions of roles by principals so you may want to see if you can find it on-line. You might also check a 2005 publication by Amatea and Clark and a 2007 publication by Chata and Loesch both in Professional School Counseling. Deborah Hardy from Western Connecticut State University also examined perceptions of counselors and school administrators.

I have not talked with these authors specifically about the use of the instrument but I hope that this information is helpful.

Good luck and let me know if you have further questions.

-Janna

Janna L. Scarborough, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, LMHC
Acting Associate Department Chair,
Human Development & Learning
Associate Professor of Counseling and
Counseling Program Coordinator

Human Development & Learning
East Tennessee State University
PO Box 70548
Johnson City, TN 37614-0685
(423) 439-4191
www.etsu.edu/coe/hdal/counseling/default.asp
Appendix C: Permission to Revise the Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>RE: request to use the SCARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Scarborough, Janna Lynn (<a href="mailto:SCARBORO@etsu.edu">SCARBORO@etsu.edu</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:em_rittenhouse@yahoo.com">em_rittenhouse@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Saturday, July 9, 2011 2:41 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That would be fine Emily. You might want to run a factor analysis or something like that on the survey to see that the categories held true. Of course, discuss that with your committee.

Good luck,
Janna
Janna L. Scarborough, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, ACS, NYLMHC
Associate Professor and Counseling Program Coordinator
Counseling Program
Human Development & Learning Department
Box 70548
Johnson City, TN 37614-1707
(423) 439-4191
(423) 439-7790 - fax
scarboro@etsu.edu<mailto:scarboro@etsu.edu>
http://www.etsu.edu/coe/hdal/counseling/default.asp

From: Emily Rittenhouse [em_rittenhouse@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 8:34 AM
To: Scarborough, Janna Lynn
Subject: RE: request to use the SCARS

Greetings Dr. Scarborough,
In addition to the other modifications, I would also like to randomize the statements on the SCARS so that they are not in categories. Please let me know if this additional modification is alright with you.
Thanks again,
~Emily

Emily Hepp Rittenhouse, Professional School Counselor
Athens Middle School
740-517-0275
Appendix D: Informed Consent

Ohio University Consent Form

Title of Research: Secondary School Counselor and Principal Preferences Regarding Key School Counselor Roles

Researchers: Emily C. Hepp, Doctoral Candidate, Ohio University Department of Counseling and Higher Education

You are being asked to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form you will be asked to participate in this study. You may print a copy of this form for your records.

Explanation of Study

You are being asked to participate in a research study which involves an exploration of secondary school counselor and principal preferences of school counselor roles. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to answer questions related to your work experiences and your preferences for school counselor roles. You should not participate in this study if you are not currently working as a secondary school counselor or principal. Your participation in the study will last approximately 20 minutes.

Risks and Discomforts

There are no anticipated risks or discomforts.

Benefits

This study is important to the school counseling profession because it will investigate the preferences of school counselors and school principals regarding school counselor roles and functions.

Confidentiality and Records

The survey will be conducted anonymously online. No personal identification information is being requested.

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Emily Hepp at telephone number 740.517.0275 or em_rittenhouse@yahoo.com. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:

• you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered

• you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction.

• you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study

• you are 18 years of age or older

• your participation in this research is completely voluntary

• you may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.
Appendix E: Email Correspondence to Potential Participants

SUBJECT: Dissertation Research Request: School Counselor Roles
Dear Colleague,
I am a school counselor and a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision at Ohio University. Under the direction of Dr. Tom Davis, this study will investigate and compare preferences secondary school counselors and secondary school principals regarding school counselor activities and roles. Therefore, I am requesting participation from practicing secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

The survey consists of a demographic questionnaire and the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS). Participation in this study will require completing an electronic survey. The length of time required to complete the survey is approximately 10-15 minutes. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with participation in this study. Participation is anonymous and confidential. Please click on the link below to begin the survey.

Survey Link will appear here

Thank you so much for your time,

~Emily Hepp

If you have any questions or problems that arise in connection with your participation in this study, please contact the principal investigator, Emily Hepp, at em_rittenhouse@yahoo.com. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ohio University Institutional Review Board.

Emily Hepp
School Counselor
Athens Middle School
Appendix F: School Counselor Demographic Questionnaire and SCARS

1. Age: ________________

2. Gender:       Male       Female

3. Race/Ethnicity:   __ Black or African American   __ Asian
                     __ American Indian or Alaska Native __ Hispanic/Latino
                     __ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander __ White
                     __ Other:

4. What is your current job title:
   __ School Counselor
   __ Guidance Counselor
   __ Director of Guidance
   __ Other (please describe):

5. In your role as school counselor, do you attempt to model your school counseling program (plan, activities, scheduling, etc.) based on a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program model?
   YES       NO       UNSURE

6. As part of your school counseling program, are you incorporating the National Standards of School Counseling Programs published by the American School Counseling Association?
   YES       NO       UNSURE

7. Please fill in the year in which you completed/will complete your school counseling training program:

8. If you completed your Master’s degree in a Counselor Education program, was it CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs) accredited?
   YES       NO       UNSURE

9. How long have you been a practicing school counselor? (in years) ________________

10. How long have you been employed at your current school? (in years) ________________
11. At what school level are you currently employed as a school counselor?
   __ High School (Grades 9-12)
   __ Secondary School (Grades 6-12)
   __ Secondary School (Grades 7-12)
   __ Secondary School (Grades 8-12)
   __ Other or combination (please describe):

12. Would you describe the area in which you work to be:
   Urban          Suburban          Rural

13. Approximately how many students are enrolled in the school at which you currently work?

14. How many school counselors work within your school?

15. What certifications/licenses do you hold other than a state school counselor license/certificate (indicate all that apply)
   __ Teaching license/certificate
   __ National Certified Counselor (NCC)
   __ National Certified School Counselor (NCSC)
   __ Professional Counselor (PC)
   __ Other _______________
   __ None

16. If you hold teaching licensure/certification, for how many years did you work in the field of education as a teacher?

Below is a list of functions that may be performed by school counselors. Please indicate the frequency with which you would prefer that school counselors perform each function.

Conduct classroom lessons on various personal and/or social traits (e.g. responsibility, respect)
   o I would prefer to never to this
   o I would prefer to rarely do this
   o I would prefer to occasionally do this
   o I would prefer to frequently do this
   o I would prefer to routinely do this

Consult with community and school agencies concerning individual students
   o I would prefer to never to this
   o I would prefer to rarely do this
   o I would prefer to occasionally do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this

Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants
- I would prefer to **never** to do this
- I would prefer to **rarely** do this
- I would prefer to **occasionally** do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this

Conduct or coordinate parent education classes or workshops
- I would prefer to **never** to do this
- I would prefer to **rarely** do this
- I would prefer to **occasionally** do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this

Conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs
- I would prefer to **never** to do this
- I would prefer to **rarely** do this
- I would prefer to **occasionally** do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this

Perform hall, bus, or cafeteria duty
- I would prefer to **never** to do this
- I would prefer to **rarely** do this
- I would prefer to **occasionally** do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this

Attend professional development activities (e.g. state conferences, local in-service)
- I would prefer to **never** to do this
- I would prefer to **rarely** do this
- I would prefer to **occasionally** do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this

Conduct classroom lessons on relating to others (family, friends)
- I would prefer to **never** to do this
- I would prefer to **rarely** do this
- I would prefer to **occasionally** do this
- I would prefer to **frequently** do this
- I would prefer to **routinely** do this
Counsel students regarding academic issues
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Inform teachers/administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Counsel with students regarding personal/family concerns
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Consult with school staff concerning student behavior
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Coordinate referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g. mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Organize outreach to low income families (e.g. Thanksgiving dinners, Holiday families)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons on conflict resolution
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Counsel with students regarding relationships (e.g. family, friends, romantic)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Handle discipline of students
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Inform parents about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g. divorce, death)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Coordinate orientation process/activities for students
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Counsel with students regarding school behavior
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues
  o I would prefer to never do this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Participate on committees within the school
  o I would prefer to never do this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at your school
  o I would prefer to never do this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Schedule students for classes
  o I would prefer to never do this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Participate in team/grade level/subject team meetings
  o I would prefer to never do this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons on personal safety issues
  o I would prefer to never do this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Counsel with students regarding crisis/emergency issues
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Consult with parents regarding child/adolescent development issues
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Enroll students in and/or withdraw students from school
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Coordinate with an advisory team to analyze and respond to school counseling program needs
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling from student, teacher and/or parent perspectives
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Provide small group counseling for academic issues
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Coordinate the standardized testing program
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Assist in identifying exceptional children (special education)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons addressing career development and the world of work
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons on personal growth and development issues
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Coordinate school-wide response for crisis management and intervention
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Respond to health issues (e.g. check for lice, eye screening, 504 coordination)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Conduct needs assessments and counseling program evaluations from parents, faculty and/or students
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Provide consultation for administrators (regarding school policy, programs, staff and/or students)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Maintain/complete educational records/reports (cumulative files, test scores, attendance reports, drop-out reports)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this

Coordinate special events and programs for school around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g. career day, drug awareness week, test prep)
  o I would prefer to never to this
  o I would prefer to rarely do this
  o I would prefer to occasionally do this
  o I would prefer to frequently do this
  o I would prefer to routinely do this
Appendix G: School Principal Demographic Questionnaire and SCARS

1. Age: _______________

2. Sex: Male Female

3. Race/Ethnicity:  
   ___ Black or African American ___ Asian  
   ___ American Indian or Alaska Native ___ Hispanic/Latino  
   ___ Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ___ White  
   ___ Other: _________________

4. What is your current job title:  
   ___ Principal 
   ___ Assistant Principal 
   ___ Other (please describe): _________________

5. As an administrator, are you familiar with the components of a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program model?  
   YES ___ NO ___ UNSURE ___

6. Are you familiar with the National Standards of School Counseling Programs published by the American School Counseling Association?  
   YES ___ NO ___ UNSURE ___

7. Please fill in the year in which you completed/will complete your graduate training program: _________________

8. How long have you been a school administrator? (in years) _________________

9. How long have you been employed at your current school? (in years) _________________

10. At what school level are you currently employed as an administrator?  
    ___ High School (Grades 9-12)  
    ___ Secondary School (Grades 6-12)  
    ___ Secondary School (Grades 7-12)  
    ___ Secondary School (Grades 8-12)  
    ___ Other or combination (please describe): _________________
11. Would you describe the area in which you work to be:

Urban  Suburban  Rural

12. Approximately how many students are enrolled in the school at which you currently work?

13. How many school counselors work within your school?

14. What certifications/licenses do you hold other than a state principal/administrator license/certificate (indicate all that apply)

- Teaching license/certificate
- School Counselor license/certificate
- Superintendent license/certificate
- Other ____________
- None

15. If you hold teaching licensure/certification, for how many years did you work in the field of education as a teacher?

Below is a list of functions that may be performed by school counselors. Please indicate the frequency with which you would prefer that school counselors perform each function.

Conduct classroom lessons on various personal and/or social traits (e.g. responsibility, respect)
- I would prefer the school counselor never to this
- I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
- I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
- I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
- I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Consult with community and school agencies concerning individual students
- I would prefer the school counselor never to this
- I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
- I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
- I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
- I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants
- I would prefer the school counselor never to this
- I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
- I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
- I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Conduct or coordinate parent education classes or workshops
  o I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs
  o I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Perform hall, bus, or cafeteria duty
  o I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Attend professional development activities (e.g. state conferences, local in-service)
  o I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Conduct classroom lessons on relating to others (family, friends)
  o I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Counsel students regarding academic issues
  o I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this
Inform teachers/administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Counsel with students regarding personal/family concerns
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Consult with school staff concerning student behavior
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Coordinate referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g. mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this
Organize outreach to low income families (e.g. Thanksgiving dinners, Holiday families)
  o I would prefer the school counselor **never** to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **rarely** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **occasionally** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **frequently** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **routinely** do this

Conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse
  o I would prefer the school counselor **never** to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **rarely** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **occasionally** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **frequently** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **routinely** do this

Conduct classroom lessons on conflict resolution
  o I would prefer the school counselor **never** to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **rarely** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **occasionally** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **frequently** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **routinely** do this

Coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program
  o I would prefer the school counselor **never** to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **rarely** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **occasionally** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **frequently** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **routinely** do this

Conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students
  o I would prefer the school counselor **never** to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **rarely** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **occasionally** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **frequently** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **routinely** do this

Counsel with students regarding relationships (e.g. family, friends, romantic)
  o I would prefer the school counselor **never** to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **rarely** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **occasionally** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **frequently** do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor **routinely** do this
Handle discipline of students
  o I would prefer the school counselor  never  to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  rarely  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  occasionally  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  frequently  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  routinely  do this

Inform parents about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school
  o I would prefer the school counselor  never  to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  rarely  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  occasionally  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  frequently  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  routinely  do this

Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g. divorce, death)
  o I would prefer the school counselor  never  to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  rarely  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  occasionally  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  frequently  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  routinely  do this

Coordinate orientation process/activities for students
  o I would prefer the school counselor  never  to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  rarely  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  occasionally  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  frequently  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  routinely  do this

Counsel with students regarding school behavior
  o I would prefer the school counselor  never  to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  rarely  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  occasionally  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  frequently  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  routinely  do this

Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues
  o I would prefer the school counselor  never  to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  rarely  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  occasionally  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  frequently  do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor  routinely  do this
Participate on committees within the school
  - I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at your school
  - I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Schedule students for classes
  - I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Participate in team/grade level/subject team meetings
  - I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Conduct classroom lessons on personal safety issues
  - I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this

Counsel with students regarding crisis/emergency issues
  - I would prefer the school counselor *never* to this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *rarely* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *occasionally* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *frequently* do this
  - I would prefer the school counselor *routinely* do this
Consult with parents regarding child/adolescent development issues
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Enroll students in and/or withdraw students from school
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Coordinate with an advisory team to analyze and respond to school counseling program needs
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling from student, teacher and/or parent perspectives
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Provide small group counseling for academic issues
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Coordinate the standardized testing program
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this
Assist in identifying exceptional children (special education)
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons addressing career development and the world of work
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Conduct classroom lessons on personal growth and development issues
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Coordinate school-wide response for crisis management and intervention
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Respond to health issues (e.g. check for lice, eye screening, 504 coordination)
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Conduct needs assessments and counseling program evaluations from parents, faculty and/or students
  o I would prefer the school counselor never to this
  o I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
  o I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this
Provide consultation for administrators (regarding school policy, programs, staff and/or students)

- I would prefer the school counselor never to this
- I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
- I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
- I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
- I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Maintain/complete educational records/reports (cumulative files, test scores, attendance reports, drop-out reports)

- I would prefer the school counselor never to this
- I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
- I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
- I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
- I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this

Coordinate special events and programs for school around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g. career day, drug awareness week, test prep)

- I would prefer the school counselor never to this
- I would prefer the school counselor rarely do this
- I would prefer the school counselor occasionally do this
- I would prefer the school counselor frequently do this
- I would prefer the school counselor routinely do this