

## **A Comparative Study of Pre-Professional Counselor/Principal Perceptions of the Role of the Counselor in Public Schools**

**Dr. William Ross**  
**Assistant Professor**  
**Prairie View A&M University**

**Dr. David Herrington**  
**Assistant Professor**  
**Prairie View A&M University**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

**This comparative study examined the views of pre-professional counselor and administration candidates regarding the role of the school counselor. The Public School Counselor Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (PSCRAQ) scale was administered to 534 candidates to determine whether they viewed the school counselor as specialized professional or as staff to be assigned ever-changing duties by a principal. Significant differences in PSCRAQ scores between the two groups were found. The findings of this study suggest a need for greater emphasis in both preparation tracks to ensure that counselors and principals are well-grounded regarding the role of the school counselor.**

**U**nderstanding the gap between the ideal and actual role that the counselor assumes is not high on the agenda of most counselors or principals engaged in the day-to-day grind of running a school. Daily emergencies cause priorities to shift unpredictably, placing demands on school staff to adapt and change focus. Without a well-grounded, informed vision of the counselor's role jointly held by principals and counselors, the assignments and duties of the counselor fluctuate with each new incident. "Counselor Role Drift" is an all too familiar concept for most public school counselors.

A recent example of counselor role drift occurred when a former counselor preparation candidate who now serves as a middle school counselor come back to the university seeking advisement as a prospective graduate candidate in educational leadership. When asked why she was doing this she replied: “As a middle school counselor I do a lot administrative work. So I think I need to take some administrative coursework so I can know what I am doing.” This counselor had embraced the counselor-as-administrative-staff role on her campus without reservation or question.

Counselor role drift occurs on both conscious and unconscious levels within the school community. When the principal calls upon the counselor to assume duties unrelated to counseling, an implicit negotiation process occurs. In order to meet the new requirements the counselor identifies with administrative team responsibilities, abandoning a more autonomous view of the counselor as a specialized professional. When counselors do the bidding of others without regard for the counseling mission, principals, teachers, parents, staff, students and others counselors ultimately learn to devalue the counselor’s time and specialized training.

### **Problem**

A real opportunity exists in graduate preparation programs for future counselors and principals to develop the values and skills needed to prevent “counselor role-drift” and to halt a breakdown of the guidance function. Preparation programs that teach candidates to anticipate circumstances leading to role drift, to reflect on whether role-drift is occurring, and to change behaviors that lead to a breakdown can enable professionals to leave their respective preparation programs better prepared to serve students.

Most graduate programs do not work collaboratively with both groups of practitioners to develop a unified, grounded vision for the role of the counselor. Unless counselors and principals understand that a concerted effort is required to protect the integrity of guidance counseling services, students in schools will continue to be underserved.

In light of “No Child Left Behind” initiatives, the counselor’s leadership role in improving the school learning environment for children and adults’ needs to be examined. Sink (2003) argued that during the past twenty years the accountability movement in the United States has called for schools to realign their counseling interventions and services within the context of a comprehensive school counseling program or CSCP. While Sink expressed optimism for such a vision developing among counselors, he did not address the need for school principals to understand and appreciate the same vision. There is a need therefore for counselors and principals to discuss the role of the counselor in improving student achievement but this type of collaboration is seldom conducted at a state or national level.

There exists a need to define operationally and measure the attitudes and beliefs of pre-service principals and counselors regarding the role of the school counselor. An instrument that measured counselor role clarity and ambiguity would enable universities and schools to work collaboratively to close gaps between theories professed and theories espoused regarding how counselor work is viewed.

---

## Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes and beliefs of principal and counselor graduate candidates regarding the ideal role of the counselor on a campus. This provided a baseline from which to make specific recommendations for graduate preparation programs and to assess improvements in the delivery of curriculum. A second purpose was implied by the first: to develop, validate and administer an instrument for assessing the attitudes and beliefs of administrators and counselors regarding the ideal role of the counselor.

## Methodology

A review of current literature regarding the role of the school counselor including perceptions of the counselor's role held by counselors and administrators was conducted. The Public School Counselor Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (PSCRAQ) was developed to measure perceptions regarding the extent to which the respondent perceives the counselor as a professionally grounded, self-directed specialist. By contrast the instrument also measures the extent to which the respondent perceives the counselor as a member of administrative staff whose time and resources may be reallocated by the principal as problems emerge or changing circumstances evolve. The survey items were developed based on the literature surveyed in this article. Peer review was provided by a panel of professors of counseling to ascertain face validity of the items and of the construct. The PSCRAQ instrument was field-tested among 30 graduate candidates in counseling and 25 graduate students in educational administration yielding a Cronbach Alpha scores of .63 and .59 respectively. Normally higher alpha levels would be desirable for research purposes; however these numbers are adequate for this preliminary study.

The Public School Counselor Role Ambiguity Questionnaire was then administered to 534 (N=534) graduate candidates enrolled in principal preparation programs (N =225) counselor preparation programs (N=309).

## Conceptual Framework

Counselors undertake inappropriate activities (e.g., scheduling of classes, student discipline, clerical duties) (Coll & Freeman, 1997; Lapan, Gysbers, & Sun, 1997; Paisley & Mahon, 2001). These activities compromise the counselors' ability to deal with key dimensions of school counseling-such as individual and group counseling, consultation, case management,

program development and the implementation of school wide guidance programs (Baker, 2001; Fitch, Newby, Ballesterro & Marshall, 2001; Perusse, Goodnough, and Noel, 2001; Schmidt, 1999). Public school administrators and counselors often have different views of the public school counselor's role (Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt, & Williams, 1989b; Stone, & Clark, 2001). This is a major concern of school counselors because many believe their professional skills and abilities are not being utilized in ways that best help the student community they serve. School counseling roles are often problematic in definition, interpretation, and implementation. This role ambiguity has been present since the early days of the guidance movement, and remains an issue today (Hoyt, 1993; Schmidt, 1999).

Confusion and lack of clarity regarding the role and function of counselors in schools has been highly visible and problematic in the educational field for years. Observing the field decades ago, Dietz (1972) concluded that role confusion had been rife in the field up to that point. The intervening years did little to clarify the counselor role. A review by Murray (1995) similarly concluded that the role of the counselor reflects a history of unclear definition and confusion. Others writers and researchers confirm the lack of clarity and report that recognition of counseling as a profession is hampered by role confusion (Poidevant, 1991), role conflict (Coll & Friedman, 1997; Coll & Rice, 1993; Gysbers, 2001), and by the inability of the profession to maintain a consistent role (Coll & Friedman).

The implications of this on-going confusion of role and function are numerous. "The literature suggests that it is not only students who may suffer from poorly defined school counseling programs, but the very profession itself."(Ballard & Muratroyd, 1999, p. 21). A dire prediction for the field, as a result of this confusion, has come from many sources. Some have noted that the field of counseling is at risk (O'Dell, Rak, Chermote, Hamlin & Waina, 1996; Gysbers, 2001), a "Threatened Profession"(Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt & Williams, 1989a & 1989b), and an endangered species. The major problem is roles are not clearly defined by the profession, hence confusion exist between practitioners and supervisors (O'Dell, et al.). Stone & Clark (2001) further cautioned that administrators and the public are openly critical and are beginning to question the value of counselor positions.

### **Counselor Perspective**

School counselors provide counseling programs in three domains: academic, career and personal/social. Their services and programs help students resolve emotional, social or behavioral problems and help them develop a clearer focus or sense of direction. Effective counseling programs are important to the school climate and a crucial element in improving student achievement (American School Counselor Association, 2004). Perhaps the most significant challenge for public school counselors rests in the ongoing debate over role definition. Although the current focus in the profession is on program rather than person or services, public school counselors still struggle with priorities (Gysbers, Lapan & Blair, 1999).

As early as 1972, Deitz pointed out that of all professions in the school system, the jobs of public school counselors are most inadequately defined and are most subject to changes. An inherent problem of school counseling with few exceptions is the reality that different schools

encourage or require different models of school counseling (Herr, 1999). School counselors must address such issues with administrators as priorities for school counseling programs are established. Some educators (Baker, 2001; Beale & McCay, 2001; Campbell & Dahir, 2001; Schmidt, 1999) contend that school counseling programs need to become more closely aligned with state and national standards for school counselors.

As school counselors attempt to prioritize, there have been simultaneous calls for reexamination of both school counselor preparation and practice. These calls for reexamination have been influenced by: 1) the need for an active response to educational reform, 2) concern for the neglected, 3) need of at-risk students, and 4) belief that schools counselor is neither being prepared nor used in ways that best meet the needs of all students (Stone & Clark, 2001).

National agendas focused on academic achievement and school violence encourages school counselors to be involved in both educational and mental health initiatives. While in many ways, counselor involvement in this discussion represents the professional responsibility of self-reflection; it also leaves many counselors questioning the focus of school counseling programs (Shoffner & Williamson, 2000). Attending to all demands for time and programming can place counselors in the unrealistic position of trying to be all things to their constituents.

According to the American Counseling Association (2004), the roles of public school counselors remain unclear in many school districts. School counselor's tasks, expectations, and demands vary from state to state, district to district, and school to school. Typically, school counselors are merely told what to do by administrators (House & Hayes, 2002). Paisley & Mahon (2001) argued that the ongoing debate over the definition of the role of public school counselors is probably the most significant challenge facing public school counselors. 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. As a result, public school counselors are pulled in different directions (Sears & Granola, 2002).

Public school counselors have contributed to their role confusion by failing to define their role to fit within the mission of the school and community. Because of this, school administrators, parents, teachers, and others may make their agenda the counselor's main concern (Campbell & Dahir, 2001). Public school counselors have also contributed to their role confusion by settling for ambiguous job descriptions and duties.

Paisley and Mahon (2001) concluded that the ongoing debate over role definition is probably the most significant challenge facing school counselors. Sears & Granola (2002) noted that the current national focus is on counseling programs rather than counseling services yet school counselors are still struggling with priorities.

Geysers (2001) argued that:

"There have been and continue to be a wide variety of purposes advanced for school counseling... these multiple purposes could result in unfulfilled expectations, role conflict for counselors as they try to respond to different demands, and fragmentation among the specialty" (p. 97).

The inconsistency in the use of terms to describe who school counselors are and what they do can only confuse principals, teachers, and parents (Sears & Granello). Often, school principals and school counselors do not agree on counselor roles and responsibilities (Lampe, 1985).

Today there is confusion and ambiguity concerning the role of the counselor. Uncertainties regarding the role of school counselors are an important issue that is a result of other circumstances. Sears & Granello (2002) believe that some of the confusion results from the use of the term guidance to describe guidance counselors and guidance programs. In addition, they state this inconsistency in the use of terms to describe who school counselors are and what they do has only confused principals, teachers, and parents. They explain that the continued failure to come to an agreement on terminology has only continued the confusion about who school counselors are and what they do.

The lack of consistent criteria for those desiring to become a school counselor has contributed to this role confusion (Sears & Granello, 2002). It has only been recently that most states have required a minimum of a master's degree to become certified as a school counselor. Sears & Granello further explain that counselors without the necessary preparation have been willing to take on inappropriate activities such as covering teacher's classes, clerical tasks, lunch duty, and any other duties assigned by administrators that need help.

Often, school principals and school counselors do not agree on counselor roles and responsibilities (Lampe, 1985). In the opinion of Sears & Granello (2002), school counselors have failed to assert themselves and clearly explain their roles to others. Schmidt (1999) believes that because counselors are "people pleasers" and want everything to run smoothly, many counselors have taken on extra duties because they have not had the ability to say no.

Shoffner and Williamson, (2000) stated that various professionals in the schools, including school counselors and school principals, are trained separately and have few opportunities to learn about the roles, responsibilities, and perspectives of one another. Principals often come from a teaching background and understand the teacher perspective. They receive minimal training regarding the roles and perspectives of other school personnel including counselors and often do not understand the role of the school counselor (Studer & Allton, 1996).

In response to public school counselor's concern over how much of their time is spent in non-counseling activities, the Texas comptroller surveyed public school counselors on how they spend their time. In 2002, more than 4,000 grade K-12 counselors across the State of Texas responded to the survey. The results revealed that school counselors spend only 60 percent of their time on counseling. The report concluded that a good portion of their time is spent on other administrative tasks. One particular area of concern between public school counselors in the State of Texas was their role in administering statewide tests. While counselors believe they have a role in test assessment, they argued the role of coordinator of testing took too much of their time away from counseling. Most claimed that excessive administrative duties hampered their effectiveness and their availability to students (State of Texas, 2002).

Texas state law outlines the role of the counselor in the school setting (Texas Education Code §33.001). Texas Education Agency (1998) also set recommended guidelines for discharging counselor duties by type of counseling activity, depending on grade level. Yet in 2005 the State had not established guidelines determining the amount of non-guidance activities appropriate or acceptable for counselors.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (Parsal, Alexander, Farris, Hudson & Greene, 2003) conducted a survey on high school guidance counseling in spring, 2002 for the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. The survey, conducted through the NCES Fast Response Survey System (FRSS), provides a description of public high school guidance programs, activities, and staff in 2002.

The survey revealed that the two listed services that guidance counselors spent the most time in 2002 were the choice and scheduling of high school courses, and postsecondary education admissions and selections. Only 49 percent of public high schools reported that more than 20 percent of their guidance staff's time was spent on the choice and scheduling of courses and 43 percent indicated that more than 20 percent of their guidance staff's time was spent on postsecondary education admissions and selections. The third activity that guidance counselors spent the most time was students' attendance, discipline, and other school and personal problems; one-third of public high schools reported that more than 20 percent of their guidance staff's time was spent on this activity. Fewer public high schools (13 to 19 percent) indicated that more than 20 percent of their guidance staff's time was spent on academic testing, occupational choice and career planning, and other guidance activities. Schools were least likely to report that more than 20 percent of their guidance staff's time was spent on job placement and employability skill development (2 percent) and on non-guidance activities such as hall or lunch duty, substitute teaching, and bus duty (5 percent) (Parsal, et al., 2003).

### **Administrators' Perspective**

The appropriate utilization of school-based personnel has been related to student and school success (Lapan, et al., 1997; Niebuhr, Niebuhr & Cleveland, 1999). Effective utilization requires clarity regarding the role and function of all school-based professionals. Such clarity of role has not existed for school counselors for some time, with strong implications for schools and the counseling profession, as well as for school leadership.

Studies have shown that school administrators view the role of the public school counselor different from that of the professional counselor (Stalling, 1991). At most schools, administrators determine the role of the counselor; thus, the counselor's duties are often incongruent with state and national role statements (Fitch, et al., 2001). The lack of agreement can be a source of conflict between counselors and school administrators (Kaplan, 1995). Although administrators have expanded their knowledge of school counseling programs, some continue to base their knowledge on their own experience with counselors when they were in school (Coy, 1999).

Graduate students in educational administration are not required to enroll in courses related to counseling. The lack of focus on school counseling in an education administrator's training suggests schooling counselors that their supervisors might lack the knowledge of appropriate counselor roles (Fitch, et al., 2001). Knowing the perceptions of administrator's regarding the role of the school counselor is important because it helps counselors anticipate areas of agreement and conflict when they attempt to gain administrative support for the counselor's roles (Fitch, et al.).

In an effort to determine school counselor and administrator perceptions of counselor responsibilities, Frank (1986) surveyed 404 counselors and 315 administrators in Iowa and ranked their perceptions of actual and ideal counselor roles in each of 13 responsibilities areas. The results of the questionnaire revealed that elementary counselors seemed to stress direct work with students, teachers, and parents to enhance the best learning in the classroom. Secondary

school counselors seemed to stress direct contact with students, often on a one-to-one basis, to ease structured interventions, educational advisement, scheduling and placement, career guidance, and orientation and registration. Secondary counselors reported giving less attention to working with teachers or parents in reaching counseling goals. Elementary counselors appeared to have a closer relationship among perceived actual roles and ideal roles with junior/senior high counselors having the biggest gap between these roles.

While counselors tended to have considerable distance between their perceived actual role and their ideal role, administrators tended to have a very similar priority ranking between what they saw counselors actually doing and what they considered the ideal counselor role to be. If counselors are going to move closer to their perceived ideal role, they must communicate this role to the administrator (Frank, 1986).

School counselors have little input regarding the organization of programs because principals or central office administrators who have limited knowledge of counseling make these decisions (O'Dell, et al., 1996). As a result, this has been a source of conflict between school counselors and administrators. School counselors and administrators have contributed to this role confusion. Sears & Granello (2002) stated that school counselors have settled for ambiguous job descriptions and accepted evaluations that are related to teaching duties and not counseling duties.

### **Statistical Analysis**

The data from the PSCRAQ was entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences where some variables were transformed before analysis. For example, a score of "5" on the Likert scale indicated that a response indicated a high regard for the counselor as a professionally grounded, self-directed specialist. A score of "1" indicated that the counselor was viewed as a staff person whose duties and responsibilities could be altered at the discretion of the principal or emergent non-counseling circumstance that required immediate attention. Items 8, 14,15,16,17 and 20 remained unaltered since they represented the professional counselor orientation. Items 7, 10, 11,12,13,18 and 19 were recoded to reflect the opposite direction of that indicated on the PSCRAQ. The scores were totaled to reflect a scale score for each respondent. The possible range of scores ran from 0 to 65. The range of scores for the principals included values between and including 30 and 51. The range for counselors included scores between and including 24 to 60.

Once scores were totaled, descriptive statistics for each of the two comparison groups were calculated and are represented in Table I. Counselor preparation candidates showed both higher mean scores ( $M=41.44$ ) and greater standard deviation ( $SD=5.163$ ) scores than their principal preparation counterparts, ( $M=38.90$  and  $SD = 4.676$ ). A higher score on the scale indicates a view of counselor as a professional specialist. A lower score indicates a view of the counselor as administrative staff.



Table I

Descriptive Statistics of Responses to the School Counselor Role Inventory Questionnaire (N=534)

Program	Mean Score	High Score	Low Score	Standard Deviation
Counselor Preparation Candidates (N=309)	41.44	60	24	5.163
Principal Preparation Candidates (N=225)	38.90	51	30	4.676

A *t*-test for independent means was calculated to determine whether the difference between the two populations was statistically significant. These data are reported in Table II below.

Table II

Independent Samples t-test between Principal Preparation Candidates and Counselor Preparation Candidates' Perceptions Regarding the Role of the School Counselor as Measured by the Public School Counselor Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (PSCRA)

N	t	df	significance
533	5.827	32	.000

p < .001

The t-test revealed that, although the differences in means between the principal and counselor preparation groups on the PSCRAQ do not appear to be great, they are statistically significant (p = .000). The differences in standard deviation revealed that counselor preparation candidates were slightly higher, indicating greater disagreement within that population regarding the ideal role of the school counselor. The principal preparation candidates were slightly more in agreement regarding their attitudes and beliefs about counselors.

## Conclusions

The findings of this study shed light into the comparative perceptions between pre-professional administrators and counselors regarding the role of the counselor. These include:

1. There is a statistically significant difference ( $p < .000$ ) in mean scores on the PSCRAQ between principal candidates ( $M = 41.44$ ) and counselor candidates ( $M = 38.90$ ) regarding the extent to which the school counselor should be viewed as an autonomous professional specialist. Differences in mean scores revealed that candidates in the counseling program hold a greater sensitivity to the principal/counselor relationship than have candidates within the principal preparation program. Counselor preparation candidates held a more grounded view of the counselor's professional roles and responsibilities. The principal candidate data show conversely, that the counselor should be viewed as administrative staff assigned duties at the pleasure of the principal.
2. There is significant variation in the PSCRAQ score within both groups of respondents. A surprising finding was that the counselor preparation candidates ( $SD = 5.163$ ) showed greater variation in their perspective than their principal preparation counterparts ( $SD = 4.676$ ). This reveals that within both disciplines there remains a need to educate more fully all candidates regarding the importance of preserving counselor integrity.

## Discussion

It was assumed that the respondents from both groups in this study shared first-hand experience working with and observing the counselor/principal relationship. Based on experiences and career choice decisions, one might expect principal preparation candidates to have a less grounded view of the counselor as part of a helping profession than aspiring counselors. Interviews with professors of educational administration and counseling within the preparation programs under consideration and content analyses of their course syllabi reveal that at this institution the role of the counselor in shaping the learning climate of the school goes relatively unaddressed.

---

### **Recommendations for Practice**

The data suggest the following recommendations for principals and counselors:

1. Understanding that the relationship between the principal and the counselor is complex, practitioners should learn how to carefully manage and cultivate it.
2. Principals understanding boundaries and counselors being more assertive in making them aware of these boundaries would enable both practitioners to manage the complexity of their relationship as colleagues and leaders.
3. Balancing the immediate needs of the school with the long-range goals of the guidance function is the specific duty of the counselor. The counselor must learn to be a team player as well as leader of the counseling program. He must become self-defining in his role.
4. Counselors have a duty to educate the principal of the dangers of role-drift and to advocate assertively on behalf of the guidance function within the school community. Because the principal is the leader of the entire school enterprise she may fail to grasp important details related to specializations, missions and purposes of the counseling profession.
5. Both principal and counselor need to understand 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.

The counselor who is firmly grounded in the professional standards, who manages their relationship with their boss and who advocates tirelessly on behalf of the guidance services of the school will be best capable of serving the students.

The roles of school administrators and counselors have developed separately. Current demands for school reform suggest collaboration between these school leaders would result in greater delivery of services for students and a more likely achievement of the school's goals (Niebuhr, Niebuhr, & Cleveland, 1999). Collaboration between counselors and administrators is essential. Graduate programs in administration and counseling that emphasize reflection on the role of the counselor are highly desirable. Even more desirable are programs that hold candidates accountable for cultivating mental models of counseling that respect counselors' time, valuing the mission and encouraging them to advocate on behalf of the guidance mission for the ultimate benefit of all students.

### **Implications for Principal and Counselor Preparation Programs**

Graduate programs that prepare school principals and counselors have a brief window of opportunity in which to influence the individuals who will become practitioners within schools. Most are graduate school candidates in either educational administration or educational

counseling and most have worked for a number of years as classroom teachers. These individuals bring mental models to the graduate experiences that are informed by what they have witnessed and experienced as classroom teachers. They have not in all cases experienced settings where the counselor role is defined in the best interest of students. For candidates seeking principal certification in Texas there is no specific reference to counseling or counselors on the required TExES exam for principal certification.

In conclusions, the combination of poorly modeled principal/counselor relationships, lack of emphasis on the principal/counselor relationship, and absence of reference to the counseling function on the state certifying exam, principal preparation candidates will not likely develop the awareness that is necessary to guide a campus toward a collaborative model that ensures a high degree of quality student guidance.

The following recommendations are made in the interest of increasing awareness of educational administration and counseling candidates to collaborate as future professionals include:

1. Develop a joint course for counselor and principal candidates that provide data related to the role of the affective domain in the learning process and the role of counselors in enhancing that aspect of students' lives.
2. Provide forums for exploring the principal/counselor relationship including role-playing, interviews of principal-counselor dyads, guest panel discussions including both counselors and principals.
3. Assertiveness training for counselor candidates and learning organization training for administrative candidates.
4. Cross training of principals in various aspects of delivery of the guidance and counseling function and administrative decision-making.
5. More specific reference in principal training literature to the guidance function, its organization, and role. Protecting the boundaries of the counseling and guidance services will do much to improve the learning climate of the school and student learning.

### **Recommendations for Research**

This study involved individuals preparing for a career as either school counselor or principal. It provided an opportunity to develop and validate an instrument for use in evaluating a graduate preparation program. The researchers have noted several areas of research that would be helpful in identifying and preventing counselor "role-drift." These include:

1. Develop an instrument that can be used to measure the views of practicing principals and counselors regarding the same issues with principal and counselor responses paired and compared according to campus. This would provide a measure of the degree of agreement between principal and counselor on a campus-by-campus basis.

2. Examine school accountability measures by campus as a function of the degree of agreement between principal and counselor.
3. Incorporate for each item on the PSRACQ a comparable item to measure both the importance of an item as well as the actual practice of that item.

Most of the literature on this important issue has been anecdotal. There is a strong need to continue gathering quantitative as well as qualitative data to understand and improve the collaboration between principal and counselor to improve school climate and student achievement.

**Public School Counselor  
Role Ambiguity Questionnaire**

**Instructions:** Please respond to the following questions by checking the appropriate category for each item. Thank you.

1. **Major Area:**  Counseling  Administration  
2. **Age:**  Below 25 years old  
 26-34 years old  
 35-44 years old  
 45 or above
3. **Gender:**  Male  Female  
4. **Current Occupation:**  Teacher  
 Ass't Principal  
 Counselor  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_
5. **Years of Experience:**  0-5 years  6-10 years  
 11-15 years  Over 15 years  
6. **Ethnicity:**  African American  
 Anglo  
 Latino/Latina  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

From a counselor or administrative perspective, please respond to each question by circling the number that best represents your professional opinion. The scale is 1 = strongly agree (SA); 2 = agree (A); 3 = don't know or unsure (DK); 4 = disagree (D); and 5 = strongly disagree (SD).

	SA	A	DK	D	SD
7. I am satisfied with the current duties and job responsibilities of public school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Public school principals should have the task of assigning the duties and job responsibilities of public school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Public school principals have too much involvement in defining the job responsibilities of public school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Public school principals don't understand the duties and job responsibilities of public school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Public school counselors should be involved in determining the duties and job responsibilities of public school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Public school counselors should only be engaged in those activities that are traditionally recognized as counselor duties.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Public school counselors should dialogue with administrators when permanently assigned non-counseling duties and job responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5

From a counselor or administrative perspective, please respond to each question by circling the number that best represents your professional opinion. The scale is 1 = strongly agree (SA); 2 = agree (A); 3 = don't know or unsure (DK); 4 = disagree (D); and 5 = strongly disagree (SD).

	SA	A	DK	D	SD
14. Public school counselors should be used as substitute Instructors when teachers don't show for work.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Disruptive students should be sent to the counselor when they have discipline problems (classroom acting-out).	1	2	3	4	5
16. Public school counselors should be engaged in scheduling school field trips.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Public school counselors should be involved in the administrative function of student course scheduling.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Public school counselors should be conducting in-school personal counseling sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Public school counselors should be required to develop and conduct in-school group counseling sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Public school counselors should be assigned parent involvement and PTA job responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Public school counselors don't have the time to provide in-school counseling services.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Public school counselors don't conduct counseling sessions because human service agencies are on-site and provide counseling services.	1	2	3	4	5

Any Additional comments you want to make concerning the duties and job responsibilities of public school counselors.

---



---



---



---



---



---

Thank you for your participation.

## References

- American Counseling Association. (2001). *Briefing paper: U.S. student-to-counselor ratios 2001*. American Counseling Association. Alexandria, VA.
- American School Counselor Association. (2004). *The role of the professional school counselor*. Retrieved on March 13, 2005, from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=240>
- Baker, S.B. (2001). Reflections on forty years in the school counseling profession: Is the glass half full or half empty? *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 75-83.
- Ballard, M. B. & Murgatroyd, W. (1999). Defending a vital program: School counselors define their roles. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(603), 19-26.
- Campbell, C.A. & Dahir, C.A. (2001). *Sharing the vision: The national standards for counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: American School counseling Association.
- Coll, K.M. & Rice, R.L. (1993). Role conflict among community college counselors. *Community College Review*, 21(1), 58-67.
- Coll, K.M. & Freeman, B. (1997). Role conflict among elementary school counselors: A national comparison with middle and secondary school counselors. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, 31(4), 251-61.
- Coy, D. (1999). The role and training of school counselor: background and purpose. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(603), 2-8.
- Dietz, S.C.; (1972). Counselor role, function, and job satisfaction. *NASSP Bulletin*, 56(363), 72-75.
- Frank, R.L. (1986). *Counselor/administrator perceptions of counselor responsibilities*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service (ED 270 705).
- Fitch, T., Newby, E., Ballesteros, V. & Marshall, J.L. (2001). Future school administrator perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Counselor Education and Preparation*, 41(2), 89-100.
- Gysbers, N.C. (2001). School guidance and counseling in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Remember the past into the future. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 96-105
- Gysbers, N.C., Lapan, R.T. & Blair, M. (1999). Closing in on the statewide implementation of a comprehensive guidance program model. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(5), 357-368.
- Herr, E. L. (1999). The impact of national policies, economics and school reform on comprehensive guidance programs. *Professional school counseling*, 4(1), 236-245.
- Hoyt, K.B. (1993). Guidance is not a dirty word. *The School Counselor*, 40(4), 267-273.
- Kaplan, L.S. (1995). Principles versus counselors: Resolving tensions from different Practice models. *The School Counselor*, 42(4), 261-267.
- Lampe, R.E. (1985). Principals' training in counseling and development: A national survey. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 25(1), 44-47.
- Lapan, R.T., Gysbers, N. C. & Sun, Y. (1997). The impact of more fully implemented guidance programs on the school experiences of high school students: A statewide evaluation study. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 75(4), 292-302.



- Murray, B. A. (1995). Principals: Proponents of High School Guidance Programs. *NASSP Bulletin*, 79(570), 64-68.
- Niebuhr, K.E., Niebuhr, R.E., Cleveland, W.T. (1999). Principal and counselor collaboration. *Education*, 119(4), 674-677.
- O'Dell, F.L., Rak, C.F., Chermonte, J.P., Hamlin, A. & Waina, N. (1996). Guidance for the 1990's: Revitalizing the counselor's role. *The Clearing House*, 69(5), 303-308.
- Paisley, P.O., Mahon, G. H., (2001). School counseling for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 106-122.
- Parsal, B., Alexander, D., Farris, E., Hudson, L., & Greene, B., (2003). *High School guidance counseling*. E.D. Tabs. National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC. Report NO. NCES-2003-015.
- Perusse, R., Goodnough, G.E., & Noel, C.J. (2001). A national survey of school counselor preparation programs: Screening methods, faculty experiences, curricular content, and fieldwork requirements. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40(4), 252-262.
- Poidevant, J. M. (1991). Perspectives on school counseling--C.H. Patterson: A personal view. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 26(2), 83-95.
- House, R.M. & Sears, S.J. (2002). Preparing school counselors to be leaders and advocates: A critical need in the new millennium. *Theory into Practice*, 41(3), 154-162.
- Schmidt, J.J. (1999). *Counseling in schools*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schmidt, J.J. & Osborne, W. L. (1982). The way we were (and are): A profile of elementary counselors in North Carolina. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 16(3), 163-71.
- Schoffner, M., & Williamson, R. (2000). Engaging preservice school counselors and principals in dialogue and collaboration, *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 40(2), 128-141.
- Sears, S.J. & Granello, D.H. (2002). School counseling now and in the future: A reaction. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(3) 164-171.
- Sink, C.A. (2003, June). Raising achievement test scores of early elementary school students through comprehensive school counseling programs. *ASCA Professional School Counseling*, 6(5), 350-364.
- Stalling, J.E.N. (1991). The role of the school counselor as perceived by school counselors, principals, and superintendents (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 2416.
- State of Texas, Comptroller of Public Accounts (2002). *Guiding our children toward success: How Texas school counselors spent their time*. Austin, Texas. Retrieved on 03/17/05 from <http://www.window.state.tx.us/specialrpt/counselor/>
- Stone, C.B. & Clark, M.A. (2001). School counselors and principals: Partners in support of academic achievement. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 85(624), 46-53.
- Studer, J.R. & Allton, J.A. (1996). The professional school counselor: Supporting and understanding the role of the guidance program. *NASSP Bulletin*, 80, 53-60.
- Texas Education Agency (1998). *A model development guidance and counseling program for Texas public schools: A guide for program development Pre-K-12<sup>th</sup> grade*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Austin, Texas.
- Tennyson, W.W., Miller, G.D., Skovholt, T.G., & Williams, R.D. (1989a). Secondary School Counselors: What Do They Do? What Is Important? *School Counselor*, 36(4), 253-59.

Tennyson, W.W., Miller, G.D., Skovholt, T.G., & Williams, R.D. (1989b). How they view their role: A survey of counselors in different secondary schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67(7), 399-403.