Duquesne University
Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2006

School Administrators' Perceptions of the CACREP School Counseling Standards

Sandra M. Frey-Mckeown

Follow this and additional works at: https://dsc.duq.edu/etd

Recommended Citation
Frey-Mckeown, S. (2006). School Administrators' Perceptions of the CACREP School Counseling Standards (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/554

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillipsg@duq.edu.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION OF THE CACREP SCHOOL COUNSELING STANDARDS

by

Sandra Frey McKeown

submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education

Executive Counselor Education and Supervision Program

School of Education

Duquense University

May 2006

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Department of Counseling, Psychology and Special Education

Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)

Executive Counselor Education and Supervision Program

Presented by:

Sandra Frey McKeown

California University of Pennsylvania, B.S., 1967
California University of Pennsylvania, M.Ed., 1970

March 10, 2006

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE CACREP
SCHOOL COUNSELING STANDARDS

Approved by:

_____, Chair
William J. Casile, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

_____, Member
Joseph F. Maola, Ph.D.
Professor

_____, Member
Robert Furman, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor

Copyright 2006 by

Sandra Frey McKeown

Abstract

School administrators have broad influence on the selection and role of school counselors. However, administrators' training programs give them little, if any, understanding of the standards (CACREP) to which school counselors are trained and, perhaps more importantly, no information about the school counselors' role as defined by the counseling profession (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Borders & Drury, 1992; Fitch et al., 2001; Louis et al., 2001; Ponec & Brock, 2000) The purpose of this study was to describe how school administrators view the importance and use of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors. Questionnaires were mailed to 400 elementary, middle/jr. high, high school, and combined jr. high/high school administrators in Allegheny, Fayette, Greene, and Washington counties in southwestern Pennsylvania. The questionnaire, Professional School Counselors' Competencies, included the 38 knowledge and skill competencies from the CACREP School Counseling Standards. Data for the total population were analyzed, as well as the data for the variables of gender, school level, and years of experience. There were significant differences in how male and female school administrators responded to eight school counselor competencies, and how administrators from various school levels responded on nine of the school counselor competencies. However, the number of years of administrative experience was not a significant indicator of school administrators' responses to the Professional School Counselor's Competencies' questionnaire.

Table of Contents

Page

CHAPTER 1: Introduction 1

Statement of the Problem 15

Purpose of the Study 16

Significance of the Study 18

Definitions 19

Summary 20

CHAPTER 2: Review of the Research Literature 22

Education and Training of School Counselors 22

School Counseling Program Standards 33

The Role of the School Counselor 41

The Relationship Between School Counselors and Principals ... 50

Summary 62

CHAPTER 3: Methodology 64

Research Design 65

Participants 67

Instrumentation 68

Procedures 70

Delimitations 72

Summary 73

CHAPTER 4: Results 74

Findings 74

Summary 99

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

CHAPTER 5: Conclusions and Recommendations 101

Purpose of the Study 101

Discussion 103

Limitations of the Study 118

Conclusions 119

Recommendations for Further Research 121

Summary 123

References 125

Appendix A 137

Appendix B 144

Appendix C 147

Appendix D 150

Appendix E 153

Appendix F 161

Appendix G 164

Appendix H 166

Appendix I 172

Appendix J 180

Appendix K 183

Acknowledgments

The process of completing a dissertation is always long and arduous, but with the assistance of many others mine has finally come to a close. I want to thank my committee, Dr. William Casile, Dr. Joseph Maola, and Dr. Robert Furman, who were endlessly supportive as they provided guidance along the way. I am especially grateful to my chair, Dr. Casile, for his time, his endless patience, his wonderful humor, and most of all for his belief that I would finish.

The Beta cohort has been a source of pride for me. I thank each of them for their exemplary standards and their warm friendship. To Linda Lerza and Sandy Protulipac, a special thank you for always being there.

My friends and family provided me with such encouragement. My parents message,"You can do anything you want to" has sustained me throughout my life. What a wonderful gift. Hopefully, I have done the same for my children. Each of them, David, Amanda, Nathan, and Jordan, is a source of pride to me. Knowing they believed in me was constant encouragement to keep my goal in sight.

My husband, Michael, has lived through this process with me every step of the way. Words can hardly express my gratitude. He always believed it was possible. With love, he has been my editor, my sounding board, and my biggest fan. Thank you.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The education and training of school counselors has evolved over several decades, with many individuals and groups defining and evaluating the skills and knowledge counselors need to be effective and accomplished in their profession. Modern school counseling is rooted in the passage of the National Defense Act in 1958, which launched a boom period for the school counseling profession (Baker, 2001). Substantial increases in federal funds were available for education in general, but particularly for guidance and counseling programs and counselor training. However, it soon became apparent that there was little, if any, information or even informed opinion on what constituted an effective counselor education program, and which graduate institutions were capable of offering such programs (Byrne, 1963). “It was also painfully evident that there was little agreement among institutions about what they were educating the school counselor or guidance worker to do” (Katz, 1989, p. 3).

In the following decade, the counseling profession initiated purposeful attempts to define itself. According to Feit and Lloyd (1990), the hallmark of a profession is: a strong identity with the field, specialized training, and ethical standards. When the practicing counselors formed professional counseling associations and they, in turn, began to assume responsibility for defining the counseling profession, that started the process of professionalism. The American Counseling Association (ACA) and its precursors consistently advocated for the definition of knowledge and skills required for entry into the profession (Bobby &

Kandor, 1995). The leading professional organization for counselor educators, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), headed a national movement to develop standards for counselor training (Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983). The American School Counseling Association (ASCA), as a division of ACA, was also interested in developing standards, consequently "ACES coordinators decided to involve secondary school counselors in the study" (Steinhauser & Bradley, p.100). However, this professional cooperation between ACES and ASCA also brought disagreement as it became evident that each association had its own priority for the training of counselors. Therefore, ASCA pursued a companion study that specifically addressed school counseling concerns (Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983). As ASCA developed a policy statement, ACES established the first official standards in counselor education. A professional identity for school counselors took form as these professional associations continued to define the profession. By 1968, after extensive research and preparation, the *Standards for the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors*, *Standards for the Preparation of Elementary School Counselors*, and *Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Student Personnel Work in Higher Education* were adopted by the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA, the precursor to AACD and ACA) and ACES (Sweeney, 1992; Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983). These initial standards, although now regarded as minimal, were a joint effort of counselor educators and school counselors to lay the groundwork for the profession by defining the identity, role, and function of professional school counselors (Katz, 1989). As described by

Schmidt (1999), these “countless political and professional maneuvers” were the beginning of the accreditation movement in counselor education (p. 34).

During the 1970s, the counseling profession continued to bring these factions with vested interests together with the eventual adoption and implementation of the initial standards for counselor preparation by ACES and the American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD, formerly the APGA, and presently the American Counseling Association, ACA) (Cecil & Comas, 1986; Sweeney, 1992). In 1975, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) was formed “to provide national leadership on accreditation issues, to monitor federal and state activities affecting accreditation, and to educate the public about accreditation” (Leatherman, 1991,p. A16). Although critical to the process, these activities alone did not immediately gain credibility with the higher education community (Cecil & Comas, 1986; Sweeney, 1992). Therefore, ACES took on the responsibility of establishing a committee to look at standards implementation, and eventually, accreditation (Cecil & Comas, 1986; Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983). The ACES committee on accreditation continued to operate as the accrediting body until 1981, then in collaboration with AACD, formed the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP). Ultimately, recognition from COPA “was the test of CACREP‘s quality, need for being, and place among related disciplines” (Sweeney, p. 667).

Over the past two decades CACREP has become increasingly influential in counselor training. Today, 153 master’s degree programs and 45 doctoral programs in counselor education are accredited by CACREP in the United

States (http://www.cacrep.org/directory.html). Each of these programs prepares prospective school counselors in accordance with the existing standards of the profession. As stated in the CACREP Standards:

> CACREP Standards are written to ensure that students develop a professional counselor identity and also master the knowledge and skills to practice effectively. . . . The curricular experiences required by these revised standards are based on due notice and consultation with the professional community and represent collective and informed judgment about their relevancy and appropriateness. (http://www.cacrep.org/2001Standards.html)

Within six years of its inception, CACREP's recognition by the, later, defunct COPA confirmed the appropriateness and quality of CACREP Standards in the United States.

The CACREP standards have been regularly revised and updated to remain current with the requirements of the profession. The 2001 CACREP Standards are minimal criteria for the preparation of counselor educators, student affairs professionals, and professional counselors in the following programs: career counseling; college counseling; community counseling; gerontological counseling; marital, couple, and family counseling/therapy; mental health counseling; and school counseling. These standards require students to participate in, and demonstrate knowledge of, a designated core curriculum that includes: human growth and development, group work, social and cultural diversity, assessment, research and program evaluation, professional identity,

career development, and helping relationships.

In addition to demonstrating competency in the core curriculum subjects, students in CACREP accredited school counseling programs must also exhibit the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the following specialized course work: foundations of school counseling, contextual dimensions, and knowledge and skills for the practice of school counseling. With this required knowledge confirmed by graduation from CACREP counselor education programs, students are prepared to enter the job market. These prospective employees are poised to be effective school counselors in accordance with the CACREP curriculum.

Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan and Rahill (2002) looked at school counselors' perceptions of the CACREP School Counseling Standards. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2002) surveyed practicing school counselors to determine their perception of the importance of the 2001 CACREP School Counseling Standards. Each item on the survey represents a competency of a curricular experience from the CACREP Knowledge and Skills for the Practice of School Counseling Standards. To identify the underlying components of these Standards, the researchers completed a factor analysis of the participants' responses. The survey items loaded on the following four factors: "Counselor Program Development, Implementation and Evaluation"; "Counseling and Guidance Knowledge and Skills"; "Contextual Dimensions"; and "Knowledge and Skills for Specialized Assistance". Although these factors do not align perfectly with the CACREP Standards, Holcomb-McCoy et al. suggested further studies to examine the underlying knowledge and skills necessary for the demands of professional

school counselors. Results of this study suggest that the knowledge and skills that school counselors receive via their CACREP training shows that their professional identity is associated with both counseling and education.

The CACREP School Counseling Standards offer a definitive program for the preparation of school counselors, yet ironically, the literature is rife with lamentations about the difficulty of defining the counselor's role in the school (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Johnson, 1993; Murray, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Sears & Haag, 2002; Whiston, 2002).

> This leads to a critical question: Why is defining a school counselor's role so difficult? It may be that school counselors continue to be torn between two or more "lovers" (e.g. education versus guidance, guidance versus counseling, vocational health versus mental health). Continuing with the lovers metaphor, role definition would probably be simpler if the field of counseling would decide to be monogamous and only focus on one area. (Whiston, p. 151)

Although Whiston poses the concept of monogamy, she, along with many others, (Green & Keys, 2001; Gysbers, 2001; Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Sink, 1999) recognize that, "school counseling has been influenced by outside events and external forces" (Whiston, p. 152). These various external elements have contributed to the challenge of defining the ambiguous role, identity, and function of the school counselor. Rather than being able to refine their roles and responsibilities, school counselors have expanded their domain in response to changing contextual demands. As Borders (2002) states, "Instead, the profession

has sought to respond to—and keep up with—shifting educational philosophies, social movements, economic swings, and federal legislation that have driven the needs for and expectations of school counselors" (p. 181). This process of being pulled in various directions has resulted in a nebulous definition of the school counselor's role.

Another attempt to crystalize the function of the school counselor is tied to the school reform movement which focuses on school counseling programs, rather than school counselors, as integral components of educational systems. With an emphasis on student achievement, two forces, the Education Trust and the National Standards for School Counseling Programs, have supported this development (Baker, 2001; Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The Education Trust was funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund which introduced the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) in 1997 (Baker, 2001; Dahir, 2001; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004). The TSCI is an educational initiative whose focus is to close the gap in achievement between low-income, minority students and middle-class white students by retraining school counselors to use their skills for the purpose of improving student achievement.

The National Standards for School Counseling Programs was the outcome of Dahir's (1997) research which confirmed that school counselors want national standards based upon student's personnel/social, academic, and career development needs. The National Standards for School Counselors is a counseling initiative within the education system that has been endorsed by

ASCA, ACES, CACREP, the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), as well as the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) (Dahir, 2000; Dahir, 2001; Perusse et al., 2004). “As the content for a comprehensive school counseling program, the National Standards identify the attitudes, knowledge, and skills that students should acquire in a proactive and preventive manner through a broad range of experiences” that “are designed to support student success and promote student achievement” (Dahir, 2001, p. 323). Although each effort has a different thrust, both have, tangentially, undertaken the task of redefining the role of the school counselor by focusing on student academic success as the desired outcome.

Borders (2002) continues the discussion of defining the school counselors’ role amidst educational reform with a caution for the profession. School counselors have always advocated for students’ academic success, but by aligning too closely with the educational movement they may jeopardize their inimitable role in the school. As the only professional in the school setting that has counseling and mental health training and expertise, these skills are critical to the needs of today’s students. The educational reform movement does not appear to fully recognize the school counselor’s unique knowledge and skills. “What may need attention, however, is how the profession talks about the school counselor’s role and place in these efforts, so that the profession does not lose sight of the full role, unique skills, and varied contributions that school counselors bring to their schools” (Borders, p. 182).

Although the influential views of Dahir, Perusse et al., and Borders occasionally offer alternative perspectives, they are not contrary to the CACREP Standards. Indeed, the CACREP Standards' introduction states, "The counseling profession evolves in anticipation of and response to societal and other changes in the United States and throughout the world" (www.couseling.org/cacrep/2001standards), acknowledging the responsiveness and resiliency of the profession. The CACREP School Counseling Standards emphasizes the preparation of students to be counselors first, and then to be trained as specialists. To be trained as a professional school counselor, students are trained in the knowledge and skills specific to school counseling. Each of the three school counseling domains (academic, career, and personal/social) is comprehensively addressed within these training standards. To attain the skills that are commensurate with the demands of the profession, competency in all three domains is stressed. Consequently, the CACREP School Counseling Standards provide the necessary balance of educational and counseling criteria that are unique to the school counselor's identity, role, and function.

In addition to the profession's attempt to define the role and responsibilities of school counselors, there are external influences. For example, professional school counselors work in an environment where the context of their role is managed and frequently supervised by administrators who are not professional counselors. Early on it was noted by Carroll (1968) that the freedom of counselors to help determine their own role and functions within a school was limited by administrators with whom the counselor worked. Boy (1962), in

particular, believed, that the school's principal exercised the greatest influence upon the role and specific functions of the school counselor. Beale and Bost (1981) arrived at a similar conclusion when they surveyed school systems across the country. They not only identified the principal as the "single most influential person in the selection of secondary school counselors" (p. 102), they went on to say:

> Since principals do have the greatest influence on personnel selection, knowing what criteria these administrators use in the selection process should help potential counselors and those persons involved in the professional training of counselors to prepare them for a career in education. What, then, do principals value most when selecting individuals to serve as counselors in their schools? (p. 102)

Although extensive research suggests that CACREP School Counseling Standards appear to be appropriate to school counselors and counselor educators (Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, & Rahill, 2002; Pate Jr., 1990; Vacc & Charkow, 1999), it is still the school administrator who supervises and evaluates the appropriateness of the school counselor within this setting (Fitch, Newby, Ballestero & Marshall, 2001; Kaplan, 1995; Ponec & Brock, 2000). Administrators shape and prescribe counselors' duties, promoting what they believe counselors should do in the school (Dahir, 2000). "Informally, many school counselors perceive that what they can and cannot do is more generally determined by the direction of the school principals whose needs, ideas, and goals may or may not be considered a comprehensive guidance and counseling program" (Niebuhr,

Niebuhr & Cleveland, 1999, p. 676). Expectations for school counselors, therefore, will vary from one school to another, depending upon the vision and focus of the administrator, and how they wish to use the professional counselor to implement that vision and focus within their particular building (Louis, Jones, & Barajas, 2001; Studer & Allton, 1997).

In addition to supervising the role of school counselors, principals have a significant impact on decisions regarding the need for school counselors and who should be employed. When hiring school counselors, decisions about the best candidate to hire are usually made by an administrator who has a perception of the knowledge and skills a school counselor needs to be an effective counselor. Kaplan and Evans (1999) noted that although principals may interview prospective school counselors, they seldom understand the counselor's role and how it benefits the total school program. Furthermore, ". . . many administrators, often without realizing it, assume that counselors should perform a variety of tasks which, though often crucial to the school, take counselors away from the very tasks for which they were uniquely trained" (Niebuhr et al., p. 676). Henderson (1999) indirectly supported the existence of contrary requirements when she defined "the best guidance programs . . ." as those in which the "Highest priority activities are student centered, not system centered, and are professional, not clerical" (p. 78).

Administrators are typically responsible for supervising all faculty and staff in their buildings, and have likely received specific training on methods for supervising teachers (Cole, 1991). However, specific training on the supervision

of counselors is unlikely (Fitch, et al., 2001; Louis, Jones, & Barajas, 2001; Ponec & Brock, 2000; Shoffner & Briggs, 2001;Shoffner & Williamson, 2000; Studer & Allton, 1997). Nevertheless administrators' expectations will be reflected as they establish hiring standards for school counselors and evaluate the school counselor's performance annually. Consequently, school counselors may be prepared to function as prescribed by CACREP standards and their training, but it is the school principal who strongly influences the identity, role, and function of the school counselor through the assignment of daily tasks and responsibilities (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Beale & Bost, 1983; Borders & Drury, 1992; Cormany & Brantley, 1996; Coy, 1999; Fitch, et al., 2001; Gerler, 1992). Borders (2002) highlighted a major concern within the school counseling profession when she succinctly stated that ". . . too many school administrators do not have an accurate view of the role, appropriate functions, and relevant skills of their school counselors, and too often these administrators have too much decision-making over school counselors' worklife" (p. 182).

According to Kaplan (1995) counselors and principals view their roles from different paradigms. Despite the fact that they need to work closely together in the same environment with the same students and other professionals, they are trained separately, each having little knowledge of the other's roles, responsibilities, or perspectives (Shoffner & Briggs, 2001). School counselors who graduate from CACREP accredited programs are trained to be professional counselors who will work in schools. However, CACREP Standards require no training on the role and responsibilities of other school professionals. Most

principals are former teachers, and are familiar with the role of the teacher, but may have little, or no training regarding the role and responsibilities of the school counselor (Shoffner & Williamson, 2000). “School principals usually have had little exposure to counselors’ work, and administrator preparation programs rarely address how principals should use school counselors” (Louis, Jones & Barajas, 2001, p. 66). Niebuhr et al. (1999) concluded that “In many schools, counselors and principals are working toward the same desired end state, but often do not realize how their respective roles might complement the actions of the other” (p. 676). These divergent perspectives result in inevitable conflict (Cole, 1991; Fitch et al., 2001; Harris, 1999; Shoffner & Briggs, 2001), and contribute to confusion regarding the counselor’s role and professional identity in the school (Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Ponec & Brock, 2000; Sears & Haag, 2001).

“Administrators’ responsibilities are all-encompassing, from setting and enacting the school’s educational mission to finding substitute custodians” (Kaplan, 1995, p. 261). Whereas school counselors operate from a student centered practice model, and “view counseling as an important process to engage students in problem solving and decision making about personal, social, and educational issues” (Kaplan, p. 262). These paradigm differences have been noted in the literature with references to counseling as an ancillary service rather than an integral part of the education program (Coy, 1999; Gerler Jr., 1992; Green & Keys, 2001; Gysbers, 2001; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Kaplan, 1995; Stalling, 1991). In reality, “most educational administrators and classroom teachers have little understanding of what counselor education is all about and

what school counselors are qualified to provide in terms of developmental, responsive, and consultative services as a result of their graduate training" (Johnson, 1993, p. 32). Depending on the idiosyncratic perspectives of school administrators, the counselor's role in the school may vary widely and may, or may not, be consistent with the profession's description of the role as defined by CACREP and ASCA. As noted in the literature, some administrators view the counselor as an extension of the administrative staff (Napierkowski and Parsons, 1995). "Scheduling, participating in disciplinary functions, and conducting clerical duties absorb much of a school counselor's time" (Fitch et al., 2001, p. 89). Other principals may see counselors as specially trained teachers who should be scheduled into the teaching rotation to give the classroom teachers planning periods (Schmidt, 2003). At times, principals may view counselors as pseudo-psychologists who can diagnose and resolve any student problem (Schmidt, 2003). In some instances, however, counselors are truly encouraged and supported by principals to demonstrate "their commitment to the intricacies of their specialty" via the unique services that they are trained to provide for the entire school community (Breland and Sandhu, 2001, p. 13).

These multiple differences between school administrators and school counselors viewpoints suggest that various, potentially influential, factors may affect administrators' expectations of school counselors. For example: Do male and female school administrators perceive the school counselor's role differently? Would an administrator's perspective of the school counselor's role be influenced by the school level (elementary, middle, high school) in which they

both work? Lastly, does the years of administrative experience influence the administrator's perspective of the school counselor's role?

The potential for widespread incongruence between the school counselors' training and the school administrators' expectations for their roles and functions raises questions. Although CACREP accredited counselor education programs are training counselors using CACREP Standards, are these programs preparing counselors for the job that school administrators expect them to do as school counselors? Alternatively, are school administrators hiring and supervising school counselors based on the counselors' knowledge and skills as defined by the CACREP standards or are they really looking for other competencies?

Statement of Problem

School administrators have broad influence on the selection and role of school counselors. Thus, they significantly impact the school counselor's professional identity. However, administrators' training programs give them little, if any, understanding of the standards to which school counselors are trained and, perhaps more importantly, no information about the school counselors' role as defined by the counseling profession (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; Borders & Drury, 1992; Fitch et al., 2001; Louis et al., 2001; Ponec & Brock, 2000). As predicted by the early studies of the counseling profession (Beale & Bost, 1981; Boy, 1962; Carroll, 1968), this has led to a precarious balance between school counselors and school administrators regarding the operational definition of the counselor's role in the school. Since the early 1980s, aspects that affect this

working alliance have been examined in the professional literature. Most studies have focused on the role of the school counselor (Bonebrake & Borgers, 1984; Cole, 1991; Fitch et al., 2001; Harris, 1999), and what administrators consider when hiring school counselors (Beale, 1995; Beale & Bost, 1983; Kaplan & Evans, 1999). Stalling (1991) addressed the administrator's view of school counselor's training, but did not examine the CACREP training standards. Coy (1999) reviewed the background and purpose of the role and training of school counselors, and suggested that school administrators be aware of school counselor's training. While recognizing the CACREP Standards in her article, there was no mention of administrators' perception of the CACREP Standards in light of the role, identity or function of the school counselor.

Since 1981, school counselor education programs accredited by CACREP have trained counselors in the knowledge and skills necessary to be proficient school counselors using the CACREP School Counseling Standards. School administrators, with limited, or no knowledge of CACREP Standards, interview, hire, supervise, and direct school counselors in their daily tasks. Yet, there are no studies that specifically examine the school administrator's views of the pertinence of the CACREP training standards.

Purpose of the Study

School counselors who have graduated from CACREP accredited programs are hired to work in schools where they are supervised by school administrators. These administrators are unlikely to have any training in school counseling, and there is no evidence to suggest that they are aware of the

knowledge and skills espoused in the 2001 CACREP Standards. Therefore, the professional identity and role school administrator's envision for the professional school counselor may be aligned with, deviate from, or even be in direct conflict with the CACREP Standards. There was a need for a study to examine school administrators' perception of the relevance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards to the hiring and the supervision of school counselors' responsibilities. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to describe how school administrators view the importance and use of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors. Specifically, this study attempted to address the following research questions:

1. What level of importance do school administrators place on CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?
2. Is there a difference in the level of importance that male and female school administrators assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?
3. Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators different school levels assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?
4. Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators with varying years of experience assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?

Significance of the Study

Throughout their history, school counselors have struggled with defining and communicating their professional role and identity within the educational setting. The literature has examples of school counselors constrained into accepting responsibilities that are not commensurate with their skills and training (Ballard & Murgatroyd, 1999; DeMato, 2001; Johnson, 1993; Katz, 1989; Sears, 1993). These administrative or clerical tasks and responsibilities are assigned by administrators who supervise school counselors. Although school counselors may be trained in accordance with the CACREP Standards which are considered appropriate by the counseling profession, it has not been determined if these standards are viewed as appropriate by other school professionals, particularly the administrators who are responsible for the hiring and supervision of school counselors. In this study, for the first time, school administrator's perception of the relevance of the CACREP standards was investigated.

The results of this research suggest implications for the training and practice of both school professionals. School administrators and school counselors are interdependent, perhaps even symbiotic. School counselors need the full support of their administrators to be effective as counselors. School administrators need proficient, effective counselors to make the school function smoothly. If administrative education programs included training on the skills and knowledge that school counselors bring to their positions, school administrators might be better equipped to select skillful counselors and better utilize the counselors' skills in day-to-day school activities. School counselors who work

with administrators cognizant of the counselors' role, can focus on what they are trained to do, rather than assume responsibilities incommensurate with their training. If counselor education programs included training on the relationship between the school administrator and the school counselor and a general job description of the administrator, counselors might have better understanding of how their skills and knowledge fit into the total school program. That is, counselors could advocate for their positions from a perspective of collaboration with the school administrator, which can only benefit the entire education program.

Definitions

CACREP Knowledge and Skills Standards - In addition to the CACREP common core curricular experiences, the CACREP Knowledge and Skills Standards are required by all students in a CACREP School Counseling Program. These standards include an understanding of: the foundations of school counseling, the contextual dimensions of school counseling, and the knowledge and skill requirements (program development, implementation, and evaluation; counseling and guidance; consultation).

Certified School Principals - Administrators who have completed an approved program of graduate study preparing him/her to direct, operate, supervise, and administer the organizational and general educational activities of a school l(http://www.teaching.state.pa.us/teaching/cwp/view).

Certified School Counselors - Have completed an elementary and/or a secondary school counselor preparation program that prepares them to: counsel

students in the areas of personal, social, occupational, and educational development; assist teachers in developing sensitivity to the particular needs of individual students and in utilizing referral procedures; make use of test data and psychological assessment findings; advise on the selections and use of appropriate group and individual tests, measures and inventories dealing with academic progress and achievement, interest inventories, social adjustment, physical growth and development, special aptitudes and intelligence quotients or factors; assist in the educational placement of departing students; conduct group guidance activities and teach courses or provide group guidance related to career information, educational requirements and opportunities; participate in individualized education program planning, and other similar activities which supplement the total guidance and counseling program objectives. (http://www.teaching.state.pa.us/teaching/lib/teaching)

Summary

Since its formation in 1981, CACREP has increasingly gained recognition as the premier accrediting body for the counseling profession. CACREP training standards provide counselor education students with a professional identity and the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective counselors. Specifically, graduates of CACREP accredited school counseling programs are prepared to assume positions as professional school counselors. However, school counselors are hired and supervised by school administrators who are not necessarily familiar with the training that school counselors receive in a CACREP accredited program, and therefore, may not be aware of the knowledge and skills

that professional school counselors bring to the educational community. Consequently, school counselors may be hired and assigned duties that are not commensurate with their professional training and professional identity. To clarify the potential conflict between CACREP's view of the role and identity of the professional school counselor and the perception of the school administrators, this study sought to determine if school administrators thought the CACREP School Counseling Standards were important when hiring school counselors.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Research Literature

This review will examine the literature regarding the standards that regulate counseling programs and the CACREP Standards that prescribe the training of school counselors. Also covered in this review is the role of the school counselor and the relationship between school counselors and school administrators.

Education and Training of School Counselors

School counselors trace their roots to the early 1900s and the rapidly increasing industrialization of the United States. As the country became more efficient in manufacturing and production, the economic, educational, and social needs of the workers became a more dominant issue. To adequately prepare the large influx of immigrants for the increasing demands of the workplace, education began to change its focus. For the first time, schools looked beyond academics and considered the value of vocational education (Herr, 2001). They recognized that students required specific job training, but soon it became evident that students also needed advice and direction to find a position that corresponded to their particular skills

> What was clearly needed to consummate the launch were guidance mechanisms that would insure their safe and efficient arrival on the job. Without guidance experts it was argued, other efforts at reform would be aborted. Therefore, in the name of social and economic efficiency, . . . the youth who had been carefully trained would also have to be carefully

counseled into a suitable occupational niche. (Stephens, 1970, p. xiv) Parsons who is “widely seen as the architect of vocational guidance in the United States . . . saw the process of adapting vocational guidance to the school as fully compatible with the calls for educational reform in the schools of the nation in the early 1900s” (Herr, p. 236).

Spurred by industrialization and the need for social reform, vocational guidance was incorporated into the evolving educational structure. However, by the early 1920s, “there was less emphasis on guidance for vocation (vocational guidance) and more on education as guidance (educational guidance)” (Gysbers, 2001, p. 98). For the first half of the twentieth century guidance in schools struggled to define its identity and purpose. Gysbers and Henderson (2001) appropriately summarized school counseling from an historical perspective. “As the decades of the 20th century unfolded, the influences of educational reform movements, the work of theorists and practitioners, and various social, political, and economic events, all combined to continue to shape the nature and structure of guidance and counseling in schools” (p. 247).

In 1957, Russia began the space exploration race with the launch of Sputnik I. In part, the United States responded with the congressional passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958. To counteract a perceived deficit in Russian technology, the United States looked for ways to prepare youth to be competitive in science and technology. NDEA gave funds to school districts to employ secondary school counselors and to establish testing programs that identified those students who seemed capable and interested in

the hard sciences (Herr, 2001). Federal funds were also available for colleges and universities to train secondary school counselors who, in turn, would encourage appropriate students to pursue academic careers in mathematics and science (Katz, 1989). Baker (2001) describes this as a boom period for the school counseling profession and the field of education in general.

Driven by such a powerful motive, and with available resources, the profession needed direction. Unfortunately, the institutional bodies were confused about how counselors should be trained and what they should be trained to do (Katz, 1989). Ultimately, according to Sweeney (1992), it took over twenty years for the development and adoption of secondary and elementary school counselor preparation standards. These standards were eventually adopted by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) in the 1970s—the professional association of counselor educators—and the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA, precursor to AACD and ACA) in 1979—the professional counseling association. As ACES grappled with the implementation of the training standards in the late 1970s, they finally established the ACES Committee on Accreditation in 1978 (Cecil & Comas, 1986; Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983). With respectable support from counseling professionals, a separate APGA committee was established in 1980 to explore and develop its own accreditation. Ultimately, due to the belief that APGA had stronger legislative support and greater financial resources, it was urged to take over ACES accreditation responsibilities (Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983). The new organization APGA created to handle these tasks adopted the name Council for

Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) in 1981 (Cecil & Comas, 1986; Schmidt, 1999; Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983; Sweeney, 1992). The creation of CACREP would not have been possible without the efforts of ACES, AACD (APGA), the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) (Kandor & Bobby, 1992).

In another development, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) was formed in 1975 as "the independent national body that has developed a recognition program for quality accrediting agencies" (Haight, p. 688). "COPA was the recognized authoritative body by which accrediting agencies were judged legitimate. . ." (Sweeney, p. 667). By 1987, CACREP achieved additional credibility when it was recognized as a specialized accrediting body by the now highly regarded COPA. Therefore, "The birth of CACREP provided the counseling profession with a formidable foundation on which the profession could be built" (Kandor & Bobby, p. 666).

Since its formation in 1981, CACREP's purpose has been to offer quality educational programs. By 1995, CACREP clearly stated its mission: ". . . to promote the advancement of education by establishing and administering a program for the accreditation of graduate programs at colleges and universities in the fields of counseling and related educational programs . . ." (http://www.cacrep.org/AboutCACREP.html) Maintaining this tradition, the 2001 CACREP Standards prepare professional counselors, counselor educators, and student affairs professionals in the following programs: career counseling;

college counseling; community counseling; gerontological counseling; marital, couple, and family counseling/therapy; mental health counseling; school counseling; student affairs; and at the doctoral level, counselor education and supervision. Students are required to participate in and demonstrate knowledge of a designated core curriculum that includes: human growth and development, group work, social and cultural diversity, assessment, research and program evaluation, professional identity, career development, and helping relationships. When specializing in school counseling, students must also exhibit the acquisition of knowledge and skills in the following specific course work: foundations of school counseling; contextual dimensions; and knowledge and skills for the practice of school counseling (http://www.cacrep.org/2001Standards.html). In the United States today, 174 master's degree programs in school counseling and 49 doctoral programs in counselor education and supervision are sanctioned by CACREP (http://www.cacrep.org/directory.html).

In the early years while CACREP was still establishing its own identity—separate from the American Psychological Association (APA)—and struggling to find its foothold within the profession, there was great anticipation about its future effect on counselor education. Although Weinrach (1991) challenged aspects of the 1988 CACREP Standards—particularly curriculum, membership and governance—he called for more counselor education programs to be accredited and considered CACREP as one of greatest accomplishments of AACD (precursor to ACA). "It has the potential for upgrading the quality of

counselor education programs for many years to come and, in turn, improving the quality of counseling services provided to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of clients around the world" (p. 494). In a nationwide survey of the professional identity of 521 counselor education programs, Zimpfer, Mohdzain, West, and Bubenzer (1992) concluded that the increased affiliation with "counselor education" over "counseling psychology", was fulfilling Weinrach's summons. "Based on the stated intentions of program faculties, the stature of CACREP accreditation is evidently growing: there seems to be a great deal of business to come before CACREP in the next few years" (p. 104).

In the same year, Haight (1992) noted that CACREP had made significant gains in the number of accredited programs during its first ten years. Although some questioned why it did not show more growth, CACREP did not succumb to this criticism by lowering its standards or compromising the accreditation process. Haight viewed the CACREP accreditation process as one that is:

> . . . of critical significance to the counseling profession and society, because it represents one level of control over access to the profession. The knowledge, skills, and experience that characterize counseling nationally through this accreditation process define the services that we can promote to consumers, as well as the ways in which the profession is perceived by external agencies and organizations (e.g., state legislatures, Congress, and boards of education). (p.693)

When Baker (1994) considered the value of prior teaching experience for school counselors, he concurred with ACA, ASCA, and ACES that the CACREP

standards should be the foundation of the school counseling profession. Baker maintained that, while teaching experience does not enhance the profession, “Counselor education training programs that are CACREP approved or CACREP-like will produce school counselors who have met these high standards” (p. 323).

For over twenty years, CACREP has maintained the standards for the preparation of the counseling profession. Since 1981, the CACREP Standards have been periodically revised and updated to keep current with the changing issues and needs of the profession. “Since its inception, . . . researchers have studied the perceptions of counselor educators, students, and graduates to examine the relevance of the standards for accreditation of counseling and related educational programs” (Schmidt, p. 35). Consequently, the standards have been consistently regarded as the ideal criteria which guide and direct the education of professional counselors. Researchers have repeatedly supported this opinion by acknowledging that the CACREP Standards are the hallmark for the counseling profession (Baker, 1994; Borders & Drury, 1992; Coy, 1999; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2002; Johnson, 1993; Pate, 1990; Sweeney, 1992; Wittmer, 1988).

Within CACREP’s first decade, Cecil and Comas (1986) conducted a survey of counselor education faculty in CACREP accredited institutions. Only 25 institutions were CACREP accredited at this time, and no program was totally compliant with all the criteria. Consequently, the issue of overall program improvement due to CACREP accreditation drew mixed reactions. However, the

results did indicate “Satisfaction with the Standards as criteria and with CACREP as the accreditation decision-making body was substantial” (p. 237).

Bobby and Kandor (1992) surveyed the perceptions of counselor educators in CACREP accredited and non-accredited programs to determine if select standards were a “hindrance to seeking and achieving accreditation” (p. 677). The results indicated support for the then current 1988 CACREP Standards, and made minimal suggestions. It was proposed that the 1994 standards revision process review the faculty to student ratio, the internship clock-hour requirement, and the differentiation of standards for the doctoral and master’s only programs.

Vacc’s research (1992) considered the relevancy of the CACREP Standards in the preparation of doctoral and master’s level counselors. In a survey of counselor education chairpersons or coordinators of 130 colleges and universities the results are notable regarding the pertinence of the standards. “It is noteworthy that most of the respondents judged the CACREP Standards to be crucial or important to accreditation regardless of whether they represented CACREP-accredited or non-accredited programs, whether they came from a faculty with few or many members, or whether their institution offered the master’s degree only or master’s degree and doctorate” (p. 687).

In the same year, Bobby (1992) reviewed the five stages of the CACREP accreditation process. A counselor education program seeking CACREP accreditation must comply with the following Four Stages:

Stage One - Faculty begin a self examination of the program’s objectives,

> curriculum, clinical instruction facilities, institutional support, faculty credentials, policies, and other organizational support materials.
>
> Stage Two - A written report states how the program meets each standard.
>
> Stage Three - An on-site visit by a 3-4 person team of professional counselors, and/or human development specialists who are CACREP trained to evaluate the self study data.
>
> Stage Four - Submitting the CACREP Board's accreditation decision. (p. 2)

The continuous evaluation of CACREP programs keeps all of the programs up to date on the current trends and concerns of the profession. Bobby (1992) concluded that, "CACREP accreditation is a powerful tool for self-evaluation and improvement of counselor education programs (p. 4).

Bobby and Kandor (1995) examined CACREP's voluntary review process for counselor preparation programs. The assessment and evaluation occurs simultaneously at the following four basic levels:

> 1) the program's internal assessment and evaluation of how the CACREP Standards are implemented; 2) an external review of the program by CACREP to determine compliance with the standards; 3) regular and systematic program evaluation based upon the program's own mission and objectives; and 4) regular and systematic evaluation of CACREP's accreditation process based upon its mission and objectives. (p. 2)

These researchers concluded that not only did CACREP Standards provide

guidelines for counselor education programs but that feedback from the ongoing evaluations ensured the “programs and the profession remain current with the problems faced by entering professionals” (p. 3).

Evaluation of the training for the practicum experience in CACREP accredited programs was conducted by Bradley and Fiorini (1999). Questionnaires were sent to the counselor educator who was the CACREP liaison from each program, regarding prerequisites for practicum, evaluation for practicum, and expected competencies. The results indicated that the programs were in compliance with CACREP about practicum prerequisite training and expectancies, but raised questions about procedures for evaluation. Bradley and Fiorini recommended further investigation to better understand the practicum experience.

Vacc and Charkow (1999) looked at the accountability of counselor preparation programs using a Delphi Study Technique. The Delphi Technique gains input from the experts in the field. In this study, chairpersons or directors of CACREP accredited programs in the United States were considered experts. “Counselor preparation programs have the CACREP standards as their implied paradigm. If the CACREP standards are assumed to be the universal and broadly defined goals of counselor preparation, then a framework or paradigm exists for making judgments concerning criteria for accountability of counselor education preparation programs” (p. 4). Although the profession is still struggling with self-evaluation, the criteria for what needs to be assessed has been firmly established via the CACREP Standards.

In New York Johnson, (1993), investigated the practice of school counseling to assessed how congruent it was with the standards that “define the field (i.e., what school counselors are supposed to be doing according to professional role statements and training standards)” (p. 56). The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, (ACES), ASCA, and CACREP standards were accepted as the guidelines to which the practice of school counseling was compared. Unfortunately, the outcome of this study did not support agreement between the standards and practice of school counselors. However, Johnson suggests that this discrepancy reveals that:

> those who work at designing legislation, professional role statements, and training curricula are often not in sync with what actually is going on in the schools. Worse yet, those who yield (sic) the most influence in determining day-to-day school counselor function (i.e. administrators at the school and district level, school boards, etc.) are frequently unaware of or ill-attuned to the professional precepts posited by the field. (p. 66)

Almost a decade passed before Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2002) specifically examined the school counselor’s perception of the importance of the CACREP school counseling standards to their actual work as school counselors. Each curricular experience from the CACREP Knowledge and Skills for the Practice of School Counseling Standards was an item on the survey. This survey also attempted to identify the underlying factors of the CACREP School Counseling Standards. To distinguish the underlying factors of these items, the researchers

completed a factor analysis of the participants' responses. The following four factors were identified: "Counselor Program Development, Implementation and Evaluation"; "Counseling and Guidance Knowledge and Skills"; "Contextual Dimensions"; and "Knowledge and Skills for Specialized Assistance". "The results of this study provide a more clear description of school counseling's professional identity by supporting the knowledge and skill base upon which school counseling programs are accredited" (p. 117). Interestingly, this study also acknowledges the unique connection that counselors have with both counseling and education.

School Counseling Program Standards

Borders and Drury (1992) reviewed thirty years of research on school counseling programs and presented an exhaustive search of the literature from the 1960s through January 1990. They also examined the professional standards, developmental theories, and current developments in the field. The consensus of this enquiry resulted in the identification of the following four core principles of school counseling programs:

1. Independent Educational Program - The program is comprehensive, purposeful, and sequential. Its curriculum is grounded in a philosophy or mission statement.
2. Integrative Program - Guidance is infused into all areas of the traditional curriculum.
3. Developmental Program - Effective counseling programs are

clearly based in human development theories. Program content, goals, and interventions should reflect this theoretical foundation.

4. Equitable Program - Effective school counseling programs serve all students equally. (p. 3-5)

These principles are a summary of the necessary fundamentals of comprehensive developmental school counseling programs (Sink & MacDonald, 1998). Borders and Drury's review of comprehensive school counseling programs provided a foundation for later researchers (Dahir, 2001; Herr, 2001; MacDonald & Sink, 1999; Schmidt & Ciechalski, 2001; Sink & MacDonald, 1998; Sink & Yillik-Downer, 2001).

In the search for a comprehensive school counseling program, recent forces have greatly influenced its development. For example, one emerged in 1997, when the Education Trust, funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, introduced the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) (Baker, 2001; Dahir, 2001; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004). Concern for the gap in achievement between low-income and minority students and middle-class white students led the Fund to research school counseling as a possible solution to this growing problem. The DeWitt Wallace Fund began "a national initiative to transform the education and training of school counselors and to encourage school districts to use these newly trained counselors' skills differently" (Sears, 1999, p. 47).

TSCI advocates that school counselors should concentrate on overall

school improvement via student academic achievement, and focus less on providing mental health services to address individual student issues (Dahir, 2001; Perusse et al., 2004;). Fitch and Marshall (2004) compiled information from school counselors in Kentucky regarding their perception of school counseling duties and the students' achievement level on standardized group achievement tests. Their findings indicated that counselors in high achieving schools spent more time organizing and planning their counseling program. This result aligns with the Education Trust's goal of using data to direct school counseling programs. "However, school counselor advocacy and leadership roles, two other areas of focus for Education Trust, were not more evident in high-achieving schools in this limited sample" (Fitch & Marshall, p. 175).

Another example is the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). "As a complement to comprehensive programs, the National Standards for School Counseling Programs are designed to guide the development of the program content for student growth and achievement in the academic, career, and personal-social domains" (Dahir, 2001, p. 324). Currently, these standards are revolutionizing what constitutes a school counseling program. "National standards for school counseling programs are what ASCA believes to be the essential elements of a quality and effective school counseling program. The standards address program content and the knowledge, attitudes, and skill competencies that all students will develop as a result of participating in a school counseling program" (Campbell & Dahir, p. 3).

No longer are school counselors conceptualized as providers of ancillary services, but as a comprehensive developmental school counseling specialist (Dahir, 2001). As a specialist, “While continuing to perform responsive services (e.g., individual and group counseling), school counselors are expected to implement a guidance program—one that is proactive and preventive in design and structured in scope and developmental sequence” (Sink & MacDonald, 1998, p. 89).

The National Standards for School Counselors are not only supported by school counseling associations, they are also endorsed by CACREP, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, ACES, and the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC) (Dahir, 2001; Dahir, 2000; Perusse et al., 2004. In the National Association of Secondary School Principal’s (NASSP) Bulletin, Dahir (2000) directly addressed principals as partners with school counselors in the implementation of the National Standards for School Counselors. Dahir encouraged school principals to rethink their priorities, time, resources, and outcomes by stating, “A new paradigm cannot take hold, however, without an understanding of the elements of a school counseling program and how school counseling programs promote student success” (p. 68).

The development of the National Standards for School Counselors was very timely with the surge in development of comprehensive school counseling programs across the country. Administrators or department of education officials

in all 50 states were surveyed to gather information about each state's comprehensive guidance and counseling program (MacDonald & Sink, 1999; Sink & MacDonald, 1998). The telephone interviews of state officials yielded information from 41 states. Of the 41 states that responded, 24 had a model for a comprehensive guidance and counseling program, 17 other states reported that they were in the process of developing a model or they permitted school districts to develop their own programs (Sink & MacDonald, 1998). When MacDonald & Sink (1999) looked at the identical data a year later for the *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, they considered specific developmental characteristics in light of ASCA's (1984) guidelines and the National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). MacDonald & Sink concluded that:

> It is our contention that student learning and mastery of important personal/social, educational and vocational competencies can be increased, if the developmental features of state comprehensive programmes are significantly strengthened. As state plans continue to be refined and clear developmental indictors devised, it is our hope that school counsellors will further modify their work with students, placing less emphasis on non-guidance-related activities (e.g. administrative tasks) and more emphasis on direct learner-centred interactions. (p. 426)

Encouraging counselors to clarify their role in the school has been a consistent theme in the counseling literature for over forty years (Borders &

Drury; 1992; Boy, 1962; Carroll, 1968; Katz, 1989). Schmidt and Ciechalski (2001) observed that the contemporary literature of school counseling is still urging school counselors to define their roles and functions. Nonetheless, these researchers were impressed with ASCA's attempt to create national standards for school counseling that ". . . provide a comprehensive effort to move the school counseling profession toward a proactive developmental program model" (p. 329). In their study, Schmidt and Ciechalski compared the standards for school counselors with other student service standards: school social work, school nursing, and school psychology. They discovered a significant difference in the other student service program standards and those from school counseling. School counseling standards concentrate on the academic, career, and personal/social standards that students will achieve. "In contrast, school social work, school nursing, and school psychology each have developed their most recent standards to focus on the role, responsibilities, and measures of competency for practitioners in their respective professions" (p. 332). The recommendation from these researchers is that school counselors utilize the standards of the other student service specialists as models to "ensure that school counselor standards of practice include appropriate professional practices, standards of supervision for school counselors, and responsibilities of employing school systems" (p. 332).

The purpose of the study of Perusse et al. (2001) was to ascertain if the National Standards for School Counseling Programs were used by counselor

educators in the education of school counselors. Following are the researchers' three primary implications for counselor educators:

1. Only about one in seven programs used the National Standards consistently.
2. More than 30% of counselor educators confused the National Standards with ethical or CACREP Standards. However, adherence to the CACREP Standards does not preclude use of the National Standards in school counselor preparation programs.
3. Efforts should be directed towards collaboration among professional school counselors and counselor educators in raising the level of awareness about the National Standards. (p. 53)

Perusse et al. (2001) also offered implications for professional school counselors to educate their colleagues, administrators, counselor educators, and school counseling students about the importance of the National Standards. Further research suggestions included examining how school counselors implement the National Standards for School Counseling into their school counseling program.

Gysbers (2001) and Gysbers and Henderson (2001) agreed that comprehensive guidance and counseling programs are the future of school counseling programs, but the profession is only beginning to understand the benefits of such programs. Sink and Yillik-Downer's (2001) study indirectly addressed school counselors' degree of understanding of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs. They surveyed school counselors'

perceptions of their school districts' development and implementation of a comprehensive guidance and counseling program (CGCP). School counselors representing eight states from the south, midwest, and western United States expressed ". . . overall concerns (anxieties) about their CGCP (total score) as well as their more narrow concerns about the need for program collaboration, the tasks required to develop and implement the program, and how their CGCP impacts student and program outcomes." The researchers stated that the concerns of the school counselors were a predictor of the school counselors' level of involvement in the CGCP, (i.e., if school counselors were comfortable with CGCP, they had a lower level of anxiety).

Perusse et al. (2004) sought information from 1000 ASCA school counselors, 500 NASSP secondary principals, and 500 NAESP elementary principals. They were questioned regarding their perceptions of the nine National Standards for School Counselors. The data indicated that ". . . not only are elementary and secondary school counselors significantly different from each other on many stem items, but they are more different from each other than they are from their respective school principals" (p.159). The school counselors and principals were also questioned regarding appropriate and inappropriate school counseling tasks. The data indicated that there was no clear agreement from counselors or principals on what is an appropriate or inappropriate school counseling task. Lack of task agreement between school counselors and principals supports the literature that suggests that principals influence what

counselors do, although they may have little concept of what counselors are supposed to do (Borders & Drury, 1992; Coy, 1999). Finally, the school counselors and principals were questioned about their perception of the TSCI's five domains: Leadership; Advocacy; Teaming and Collaboration; Counseling and Coordination; and Assessment and Use of Data. Although these domains are integral to The Education Trust's initiative, the data indicates that most counselors and principals do not accept the goals of TSCI as requisite to the school counselor's role. Perusse et al. (2004) concluded that the lack of agreement between the participants of this study suggest that "further investigations might be focused on ways these stakeholders can work together towards a unified vision for professional school counseling" (p. 160).

The Role of the School Counselor

The roots of school counseling are over a hundred years old, yet a clear definition of the role of the school counselor has eluded the profession. Murray (1995) recognized that school counselors have developed into "persons for all seasons" (p.5) where "the actual duties and tasks of the position (as opposed to the printed job description) have multiplied and guidance counselors seem to be involved with, or even in charge of nearly every aspect of school operation" (Murray, p. 5). A school counselor may have many, or all of the following responsibilities: conduct parenting groups; provide student prevention and intervention sessions or groups for substance abuse, teen pregnancy, suicide, bereavement, children of alcoholics, children of divorce, etc.; plan and facilitate

test taking and study skills groups; career planning; work with individuals, small or large groups on decision making, goal setting, or self esteem; consultation with teachers, administrators, and parents; and individual counseling (Murray, 1995; Sears, 1993). This list does not include the administrative, teaching, or clerical tasks that may also come under the school counselor's all-inclusive duties.(Anderson & Reiter, 1995; Brown, 1989; Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995). "It is no wonder that most school personnel are hard pressed to accurately define the role of the school counselor, let alone the overall function of the school counseling program" (Johnson, p.32).

For decades, the profession has attempted to define the role of the school counselor (Borders & Drury, 1992), however this definition has often been altered by the necessities of the current social and political culture (Murray, 1995;). In higher education and accreditation agencies the role of the counselor had to be distinguished from the role of the psychologist and counseling psychologist (Hanna & Bemak, 1997; Lanning, 1988; Randolph, 1988; Wittmer, 1988). More recently, the school counselor's role has been defined within the context of a comprehensive developmental counseling program (Borders & Drury, 1992; Gerler, 1992). As the constructs of this program are better delineated through the ASCA National Standards, a greater consensus may be reached concerning the role and identity of the school counselor.

Considering several perspectives, Hanna and Bemak (1997) reviewed the complexity of counseling's identity issue. They questioned if the quest for an

identity was “based on an illusion or is it a necessary step for the survival of Counseling as a profession?” (p. 203). These researchers suggest that counseling’s lack of its own knowledge base and its own published research may contribute to the problem. Hanna and Bemak (1997) noted that mixed affiliations between counseling and psychology have only complicated the identity dilemma. Although their review is not conclusive and not specific to school counseling, they contend that the variations among the disciplines are largely political.

Deck, Cecil, and Cobia (1990) addressed the lack of school counseling research in a survey of leaders in school counseling. The researchers “attempted to (a) elicit information related to professional credentials, research training, and research experience of school counselors and (b) assess the opinions of leaders in the field related to research issues” (p. 13). The results revealed that the then current school counseling leaders believed that school counselors had little interest, and did not see research as a pertinent activity. Deck et al. (1990) predicted that until a sound research base is established, “school counseling will continue to flounder in a sea of ambiguity, pulled first in one direction and then in another” (p. 18). This ominous forecast hangs over the struggle for identity for the school counselor.

Johnson (2000) laments the identity crisis of the school counselor amidst the transformation of school counseling in the new millennium. “Furthermore, if school counselors are to attain their rightful place as primary players in the educational system during this era of school reform, their operational identity

needs to be shifted from focusing on the individual services they provide to focusing on the integrated school counseling program as a whole" (Johnson, p. 32). This researcher proposed "A Three-Phase Initiative to Promote the Identity of the School Counseling Program" to enhance the identity of the school counselor through promotion of the school counseling program. Implementation is recommended through the following goals:

1. Building consensus around program goals
2. Preparing a plan of action
3. Informing, engaging, and promoting (Johnson, pp. 34-39)

Johnson's plan strongly encouraged school counselors to emphasize accountability and affiliate with the mission of the educational community.

Other researchers have undertaken the task of defining the role of the school counselor within the context of the school counseling program. Both Coy (1999) and Sears (1999) wrote articles for the school principals' journal, the *National Association of Secondary School Principal's Bulletin*. Perhaps they felt their intended audience (school principals) would be more receptive to reading about the role of the school counselor if it was presented within the framework of an educational program where accountability could be easily determined. Coy (1999) compared the history of school counseling to the problems facing young people and the resulting changes in the modern school counselor's role. The guidelines that Coy offered were identical to the CACREP core curriculum and the specialized curricular experiences for school counselors. Coy (1999) concluded, "The school counselor, as a part of the total educational team, can

assist students in building a bridge to the future" (p. 7). Sears (1999) pointed out that school counselors have concentrated little time or energy on improving student achievement. Picking up the gauntlet laid by the DeWitt Wallace Fund and the Education Trust, Sears (1999) advocated transforming school counseling through the implementation of the "eight essential elements" (p. 49) identified by the Education Trust. This researcher also presented examples of the following activities that school counselors should be doing: leading, advocating, teaming and collaborating, counseling and coordination, and assessing and using data.

Napierkowski and Parsons (1995) noted that "Within the profession there has been a concerted effort to define the school counselor as being an integral part of the school system" (p.364). Despite the fact that schools may recognize and respect the importance of the counselor, they may not demonstrate support due to "the inertia of the school as a system" (p. 365). This resistance to change, although inherent in most organizations, sustains the status quo. Napierkowski and Parsons advocated for school counselors to confront this resistance by utilizing their knowledge and skills to change their role in the school.

The role of the school counselor as a change agent was also promoted by House and Martin (1998). They suggested "a new social advocacy role for school counselors based on the belief that they must be proactive leaders and advocates for student success in schools" (p. 284). Like Napierkowski and Parsons' (1995), these researchers call for school counselors to stand up to the established modus operandi, for they are looking beyond just changing the

counselor's role. House and Martin proposed that school counselors take responsibility for removing the "systemic barriers that impede academic success for all students" (p. 284). This is a tall order for counselors, but not a new one (Baker, 2001; Borders, 2002; Gerler,1992). Sometimes, fortuitously, change begets change, as counselors modify their work with students, they modify their role in the school. Borders (2002) and Gerler (1992), however, cautioned counselors about the possibility of compromising their identity if they align themselves to closely with the educational initiative.

Defense of the school counselor's role was the purpose of Ballard and Murgatroyd's (1999) research. Comparison of the similarities and differences of the counselor's role and function were gathered in a survey of school counselors in Louisiana and Oregon. Analysis of the data from both states revealed similar definitions for the school counselor's role and function, which the researchers' identified as "three distinct factors" (p. 21). These factors: College and Career Counseling, Crisis Intervention Counseling, and Developmental Counseling are also supported by the counseling literature (Borders & Drury, 1992; Deck, Cecil, & Cobia, 1990) and the ASCA role statements. In addition to identifying similarities in the counselor's role, Ballard and Murgatroyd also suggested "that school counselors are primarily engaged in providing valuable counseling services, versus an array of administrative and clerical functions" (p. 23).

Johnson (1993) used her own survey instrument to analyze the relationship between the professional standards (ASCA, ACES, CACREP) and practice for school counselors on Long Island (Nassau and Suffolk counties),

New York. This research uncovered discrepancies between what counselors actually do and what the standards propose. “It is clear from these results that a number of the functions that are given strong emphasis in the ASCA’s position papers and CACREP’s standards for counselor training curricula are not being carried out with equal emphasis in practice” (p. 64). Johnson also suggested that counselors take the initiative and assume responsibility for defining their own role according to the professional standards.

Tennyson, Miller, Skovholt, and Williams (1989) surveyed Minnesota school counselors regarding their compliance with the 1981 ASCA role statements that were incorporated into the 1982 Minnesota licensure rule for school counseling. Secondary counselors were asked how often they performed each function and the degree of importance attached to it. The response of the school counselors led the researchers to conclude that: extensive individual counseling; the amount of time devoted to scheduling and individual career counseling; and the structure and administration of the school were all incompatible with ASCA’s developmental role statements. Unfortunately, this study also did not support a parallel between professional role statements and actual school counseling practice.

A dissertation by Katz (1989) compared the congruence of school counselor education to actual practice by surveying school counselors in New Jersey. This researcher questioned what percentage of secondary school counselors’ time was devoted to counseling functions determined by ASCA and the professional literature, and to what extent New Jersey State College

graduate counseling students were prepared for their jobs— professionally and non-professionally. The study also assessed how satisfied the counselors were with their education and professional role. Results indicated that 58% of the counselor's time was spent on appropriate functions, 42% was spent on non-counseling functions. The data suggested that counselor preparation programs in New Jersey devote 100% of their time on the professional and no time on the non-professional aspects of their jobs. "In general, counselors expressed more dissatisfaction with their role than satisfaction. The majority did not expect the role that they are called on to perform and almost three-quarters of the respondents felt that they were not adequately prepared to perform the job" (Katz, p. 106).

Sears (1993) outlined the scope and practice of the secondary school counselor. This overview identifies a litany of legitimate responsibilities for school counselors, as well as duties for which school counselors have received no training. Advocating skills-based school counseling programs, this researcher suggested that the school counselor design, implement, and manage such a program, as well as evaluate the effectiveness of this effort. Sears also supports rigorous education and training for school counselors in addition to on-going professional development.

Perception of the role of the middle school counselor was the focus of a survey of Kansas' counselors and principals (Bonebrake & Borgers, 1984). Both professionals agreed that individual counseling, teacher consultation, and student assessment should be emphasized, and discipline and teaching

nonguidance classes should not be emphasized by middle school counselors. Bonebrake and Borgers (1988) concluded that there were no simple solutions for defining the school counselor's role, for counselors serve many publics (administrators, community, parents, teachers, and students) with diverse expectations. "Consequently, counselors must determine priorities for their programs and engage in systematic efforts to implement these priorities" (Bonebrake & Borgers, p. 198).

A dissertation by DeMato (2001) to determine the job satisfaction of elementary school counselors in Virginia resulted in over 90% of the respondents indicating that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs. Although counselors were positive about their positions as elementary counselors, they also reported they were effected by the social and political climate that resulted in a lack of a state mandated counseling program and felt "stress and pressure from conflicting role expectations and demands" (p. iii).

A study in Missouri that investigated the response of high school students to a comprehensive guidance program revealed positive findings. Lapan and Gysbers (1997) examined the relationship between implementation of the Missouri Comprehensive Guidance Program (MCGP) and the experiences of high school students. Overall, results confirmed the four goals of the study. Students reported improvement in their grades, that their school climate was more positive, that they were more prepared for their future, and finally that the comprehensive guidance program was available equitably to all students. These findings challenge the approximation that counseling has a nebulous definition

and is viewed as an ancillary role in the school. Lapan and Gysbers' (1997) research supports the school counselor as an integral part of the total school program.

The Relationship Between School Counselors and Principals

The relationship between counselors and principals is both critical and influential. Both professionals have unique responsibilities and need a synergetic working relationship with each other. For principals, the benefit is having a professional within the school setting who is trained as a counselor and an educator. This unequaled combination of knowledge and skills offers a unique contribution to an effective school program. On the other hand, school counselors only get to use their training if it is sanctioned by their administrator. When Ponec and Brock (2000) looked at the relationship between elementary school counselors and principals, they recognized that for comprehensive counseling programs to be effective, the support of the principal is mandatory. This position is not new (Bonebrake & Borgers, 1984; Boy, 1962; Byrne, 1963) and has been corroborated by additional current research (Cormany & Brantley, 1996; Studer & Allton, 1996). Ponec and Brock's qualitative study stressed "the necessity of principal support and communication of the role of the counselor. In addition, the study offered an innovative extension of the literature as it explored and described the relationships developed among school counselors and principals and how those relationships supported and maintained guidance and counseling program implementation" (p. 217).

Henderson (1999) acknowledged that principals are leaders of the school,

but may not be the most appropriate leaders for guidance programs. This researcher recommended that the head of the guidance department, as a trained school counselor, would be the most suitable person in the school to assume this responsibility. Henderson states, “We encourage principals to delegate some of their leadership authority to professional school counselors so as to ensure provision of the highest quality guidance programs delivered by school counselors working as a team and striving for ever higher levels of professionalism“ (p. 83).

School principals, as supervisors, frequently define the school counselor’s role, but define it in light of their own perspective of the school.

> Counselors and principals view the school world differently and operate from different philosophies. As school reform changes the future role of the counselor, enhancing an understanding of the counselor’s training and skills, supporting the needs of the counseling program, and providing programming to increase student potential and achievement will improve the educational milieu of all students.” (Studer & Allton, p. 59)

These researchers also acknowledged that without the support of their principal, school counselors cannot function in accordance with their skills and training. However, Studer and Allton (1996) also stated that counselors have not taken responsibility for communicating their attributes to parents, teachers, and administrators.

The need for improved communication between school counselors and administrators was also noted by Cole (1991) in a comparison of these two roles.

This researcher not only defined both roles according to what each professional was trained to do, but also addressed the roles that both counselors and administrators share, as well as the roles in the school for which no one has received training. Interestingly, Cole looked at the shared roles in light of each professional's specific skills and training, and noted that, "Typically, counselors and administrators work as a team in situations requiring community interaction" (p 11). Cole also noted that counselors and principals deal with issues which neither has been trained to handle, but by working together will discover suitable solutions.

Kaplan (1995) also addressed the separate and shared roles of principals and counselors. This researcher emphasized that the differences in roles and training are significant, but the fact that principals and counselors operate from a different paradigm is the real source of conflict. In particular, Kaplan addressed the dissimilarities in how each professional viewed confidentiality, student advocacy, student discipline, and student climate. There is recognition of the significance of the counselor/principal relationship, but it is the counselor who is urged to become cognizant of the principal's perspective. "Counselors can strengthen their role and effectiveness in school by understanding their principal's point of view and by using some of these insights to enhance their counseling effectiveness" (p. 267).

Indirectly, Cormany's (student services adviser for the Pennsylvania Department of Education) interview of Brantley (former assistant superintendent of West Chester School District, PA) (Cormany & Brantley, 1996) gives support

to the opinion that it is the responsibility of the school counselor to define their role for the school's administrators. Brantley addressed an array of issues from counselor's communication to legal considerations to staying visible. The scope of the counselor's role was far-reaching, however there was not a single reference to any responsibility on the part of the administrator to gain understanding of the skills and knowledge that are a result of the school counselor's training.

When Stalling (1991) questioned school counselors, principals, and superintendents from Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota about their perception of the role of the school counselor, there was little agreement between the perceptions of the school counselors and those of the principals and superintendents. This researcher attempted to determine a definitive role for the school counselor from the perceptions of the three school professionals. In Stalling's Review of the Literature, she stated, "It appeared that the educational training for counselors may have differed from the educational training of principals and superintendents in the perceived importance of the counselor's role and functions in the schools" (Stalling, p. 277). Apparently, due to their different background and perspectives, the counselor's point of view was not in sync with that of school administrators.

> School principals usually have had little exposure to counselors' work , and administrator preparation programs rarely address how principals should use school counselors. Thus, each principal must invent a counseling department and function with the most minimal guidance and

> expertise—often limited to experience gained during an internship or in a previous position. (Louis, Jones & Barajas, 2001, p. 64)

Without knowledge or a philosophical basis, principals determine what counselors should do. These researchers place the burden of responsibility for changing the counselor's role on the school administrator. Specifically, Louis, Jones, and Barajas (2001) recommend that the administrators align the counselor's role with improvement in student achievement, align counselor's duties with their training to improve student performance, and lastly, research school counselor training to learn how to capitalize on counselor's knowledge and skills.

Coy (1999) also advocated for the school administrator to assume some responsibility for their relationship with school counselors. "For the school administrator to properly define the role of the school counselor, he or she should be aware of the training required of those individuals" (p. 6). This researcher credited principals with expanding their understanding of the counselor's role through research and the fact that many administrative training programs require a course in school counseling. After citing the core curriculum , and specific specialized school counseling coarse work for the CACREP standards, Coy (1999) described school counselors as competent professionals with the knowledge and skills to develop and implement a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program. The assumption may be that if administrators raise their awareness of school counselors training, they may press school counselor's to use their knowledge and skills.

Many other researchers have called for school counselors and administrators to assume a collaborative relationship (House & Martin, 1998; Murray, 1995; Rhodes, 2003). Rather than operate from a conflict model, these researchers stress the benefits of both professionals working toward the common good—the success of the student. With the ever-present struggle to define the role of the counselor in the school, this is a refreshing approach. “Every school is a busy place. Working with a multitude of student needs, school personnel often feel as if everyone is running in all directions to help students be successful in school. With planning and collaboration, school counselors and administrators can define the school counselor’s role in a way that will make a difference in student success” (Sparks, 2003, p. 17).

Other researchers have recognized the advantage of school counselors and administrators’ collaboration as a benefit to the school counseling program (O’Bryant, 1991; Rhodes, 2003). Johnson and Semrau (2003) refer to “the relational triangle” between school counselors, teachers, and principals. Borrowing concepts from corporate America, they suggested that “the individual people within the relational triangle must balance their own missions and accountability” (p. 26). Stressing individual responsibility, they also explored “how school counselors can use this inclusive relational triangle to develop and further enrich their own comprehensive school counseling program” (p. 26).

To address this concern of professional cooperation, the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, developed a seminar that addresses interprofessional collaboration. Shoffner and Williamson

(2000) described how joint discussion was used with groups of school counseling and school principal students in their preservice training.

> The seminar was designed to help students gain knowledge about their colleagues; develop a greater appreciation of the roles, responsibilities, and perspectives of each other in their respective professions; and learn to work together on school issues using case studies of school-based vignettes. A longer term objective was to facilitate more collaborative and cooperative efforts once students finished their respective programs and began to work in the schools. (Shoffner & Williamson, p. 130)

These researchers emphasized that both professions have few opportunities to learn about the other's role and perspective. Therefore, it is important to address this issue during the training period while individuals are still forming their ideas and concepts about the professional roles of school counselors and principals. "It is vital for school counselors to understand and appreciate their different roles, responsibilities, and paradigms so that they can engage in collaborative work that addresses student development and learning goals (Shoffner &Williamson, p. 134).

A year later, Shoffner and Briggs (2001) described how this seminar was developed into an interactive CD-ROM that could be used by students who are preparing to be teachers, school principals, and school counselors. "The central element of the CD-ROM was to be a vignette of a student who would potentially need various services. Each of the school professionals identified on the CD-ROM could conceivably have something to offer in a collaborative approach to

serving the student" (p. 195). Again, these researchers pointed out the critical need for collaboration among school professionals to meet the needs of students.

Williams (2004) supported the idea of promoting collaboration while training school professionals. "To help educators understand the unique paradigm of the school counselor, an effort to teach others about the role must be part of the curriculum in the preservice teacher education and leadership training institutions as well as the practice of school counseling professionals" (p. 46). By changing the training models, the perspective of new professionals may be open to leveling the playing field to all entities and embracing collaboration to improve communication and implement effective programs that meet the academic, career and personal/social needs of all students.

Niebuhr, Niebuhr, and Cleveland (1996) reminded school professionals that the current demands for school reform motivate the need for collaboration. In order to address the summons from the professions and the ever growing needs of students, school counselors and principals must bond together in a united effort. "In many ways, the principals and counselors are perceived as the school leaders; it is critical that they collaborate for the benefit of the entire school community" (p. 678). Stone and Clark (2001) supported this view when they predicted the possibility that school counselors and principals could be "powerful allies for school reform, focusing on helping students understand and meet more rigorous academic standards" (p. 46). These researchers also describe the partnership between school counselors and principals as ideally

suited to collectively influence student's academic opportunities as well as deter school practices that affect inequity in the opportunities available to all students.

Harris (1999) also looked at this issue when he declared that as the most visible individuals within the school setting, school counselors and administrators can promote cultural diversity by working collaboratively. This researcher observed that public schools are among the few social arenas where individuals from different cultural backgrounds regularly come together for a common purpose. By capitalizing on this opportunity, school counselors and administrators can "break the silence and explore innovative ways of promoting cultural diversity" (p. 59).

Another unique dimension to this professional relationship is that administrators often are the decision makers when hiring school counselors. Kaplan and Evans (1999) offered suggested questions for school principals to use when interviewing prospective school counselors. Although principals supervise, interview, and often hire school counselors, few understand how to utilize the counselors knowledge and skills. "As a result, many principals do not fully understand how the school counselor can contribute to student achievement, to school improvement, and to a positive school climate" (Kaplan & Evans, p. 34).

Several surveys of principals and guidance supervisors in Virginia (Beale, 1992; Beale, 1995; Beale & Bost, 1983) indicated that principals had the most influence in the selection of school counselors. In order to learn what principals value most in school counselors, Beale and Bost (1983) surveyed 59 principals

on their preferences regarding sixteen criteria in the selection of school counselors. Teaching experience within the school system and school counseling experience were the two factors that emerged as being most influential in the school counselor selection process. Nine years later, Beale (1992) surveyed 133 supervisors of guidance, with one of the research questions directed at determining who is most influential in the selection of school counselors. The data indicated that building principals, guidance supervisors, and personnel directors are all involved in the hiring process, yet again the principal emerged as being most influential. Beale (1995) chose a much larger sample (1000) of principals, but once more included the question of who was most influential in the selection of school counselors (supervisor of guidance, director of guidance, or school counselor). Results of the data indicate that school counselors are only actively involved in the selection of counselors 36% of the time. Whereas, guidance supervisors and guidance directors are involved 75% and 67% respectively. Beale contends that the principal is still most influential, and concludes that: “Because the selection of counselors determines in large measure the overall quality of school counseling programs, it is imperative that principals, and prospective applicants, be aware of what counts and why when it comes time to make hiring decisions” (p. 216).

Roberts, Coursol, and Morotti (1997) surveyed the chief school administrator (superintendent, or assistant superintendent, principal, assistant principal, or another appointed designee) of each school district in Minnesota. The purpose of the study was “to measure chief school administrator . . .

impressions of the training, skill level, and overall utility of the employability of the professional school counselor in Minnesota public and private schools" (p. 281). The respondents overwhelmingly (over 87%) perceived the school counselors as "highly qualified and trained" or "appropriately qualified and trained" (p. 283). These researchers sought the opinions of those persons in the school district who make decisions about hiring school counselors.

The implication that the principal is most influential in the hiring of counselors is indicated in another survey by Towner-Larsen, Granello, and Sears (2000). These researchers chose to query school administrators, who were deemed to be responsible for hiring and recruiting, to determine their perception of the need for teachers, and elementary, middle, and secondary school counselors in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The data revealed little differences between the three levels of school counselors, and overall a slight shortage of counselors was predicted, therefore employment opportunities for the year after the survey, and in that particular region appeared to be favorable. However, Towner-Larsen et al. (2000) warned that a shortage of qualified counselors could result in the hiring of less qualified applicants.

In the early years of school counseling, teaching experience was a prerequisite.(Baker, 1994; Baker, 2001). Olson and Allen's (1993) study attempted to determine school principals' perceptions of Wisconsin school counselors with and without teaching experience. The results indicated that there were no significant differences in the principals' perceptions of the counselors with or without teaching experience. To clarify the issue, these researchers

suggested duplicating this study in other states. “Although teaching experience as a prerequisite for school counseling does not seem to be supported by reality, perceptions of its importance continue to be held” (p. 19).

Remley and Allbright’s (1988) research focused on the role of the middle school counselor. The purpose of their study “was to determine current perceptions of the role of middle school counselors held by students, teachers, principals, and parents” (p. 291). To allow time for the respondents to convey their perceptions of middle school counselors, structured interviews of students, teachers, principals, and parents were conducted by trained interviewers. Eleven principals were interviewed, and all had positive perceptions of the middle school counselors, although there was no consensus on the perceived role of the middle school counselor. Interviews with students, teachers, and parents also resulted in conflicting opinions, and lack of agreement on the appropriate role of the school counselor at the middle level.

It might be assumed that with the recent surge of activity around the development of National School Program Standards, current research around principal’s regard for the counselor’s role may yield different results. Thirteen years after Remley and Albright’s (1988) study, such a study was implemented by Fitch, Newby, Ballestero, and Marshall (2001). These researchers developed an inventory based upon the state of Kentucky”s and ASCA standards for professional practice. Graduate students in educational administration graduate programs, who were certified teachers, completed the survey. “The results of this study indicated that many misperceptions toward the role of the school counselor

still exist" (p. 98). Although the participants agreed that the counselor's role as defined by the standards of Kentucky and ASCA were important, many also recognized discipline, record keeping, registration, special education assistance, and testing as significant counseling duties. Consequently, these future administrators may appreciate the current school counseling standards, yet still cling to the traditional pitfalls that bind school counselors to responsibilities that are not commensurate with their role, identity, and training. Fitch et al. (2001) cautioned school counselors and counselor educators to be cognizant of the influence of the school administrator on the school counseling program.

Summary

The education and training of school counselors has evolved from vocational guidance in the early 1900s to the 153 master's degree programs in school counseling and 45 doctoral programs in counselor education that are accredited by CACREP in 2005. In addition to quality training, the National School Counseling Standards and the National Trust are developing school counseling programs to address the needs of students in the twenty-first century. The combination of these training and program initiatives provide the basis for the school counselor's role, identity, and function.

For school counselors to truly function in a manner that befits the professional standards, they need the support of their school administrator. In the absence of this endorsement, administrators often channel school counselors toward duties that are not in keeping with their purpose, or for which they are not trained. Administrators who are aware of the school counselor's

knowledge and skills are able to maximize the school counselor's potential within the school. The relationship between school counselors and their administrators is paramount, and ultimately, determines the success of the school counseling program.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to describe how school administrators view the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors. Specifically, this study determined if the 38 specific CACREP School Counseling Standards represented the skills and knowledge base that school principals believe are important and, therefore, use when hiring school counselors that will be under their supervision.

The CACREP School Counseling Standards are accepted by the counseling profession as unequivocal criterion for training school counselors (Schmidt,1999; Vacc & Charkow, 1999; Haight, 1992; Vacc, 1992; Weinrach, 1991; Pate, Jr., 1990). However, school counselors are frequently hired and supervised by school administrators who may have little knowledge of the training that school counselors receive in a CACREP-accredited program. Although the CACREP Standards are significant to the counseling profession, it has not been determined if school administrators, as supervisors of school counselors, also perceive these Standards as significant descriptors of the school counselors' role. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to describe how school administrators view the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors.

In this study, school administrators were surveyed to ascertain their perception of the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards by describing how frequently they used these Standards if they were hiring a school

counselor. Therefore, this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What level of importance do school administrators place on CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?
2. Is there a difference in the level of importance that male and female school administrators assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?
3. Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators different school levels assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?
4. Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators with varying years of experience assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?

Research Design

When planning how to execute this research, it was necessary to utilize a research design that comprehensively addressed the proposed research questions. In addition to addressing these research questions, it was necessary to collect information from school administrators about their perception and behavior when hiring school counselors, and collect this information in a practical, cost-effective way.

These considerations supported the use of a nonexperimental descriptive

survey design. Descriptive survey designs are observational studies that collect information from a target population about attitudes and behavior at one-fixed point in time, over a period of time (longitudinal), or from the past (which might explain current attitudes and behavior) (Kitchenham & Pfleeger, 2002). Additionally, research question 4 presented the possibility of employing a correlational approach to explore the relationship between a school administrator's years of experience and the school administrator's perception of importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors (Mathers, Fox, & Hunn, 2002).

For this study, the target population was school administrators, currently working as principals in the southwestern counties of Allegheny, Washington, Fayette and Greene in the state of Pennsylvania. These administrators were asked to reveal information about their perception of the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards if they were hiring a school counselor.

Considering the purpose of this study, it was time and cost effective to collect the necessary data via a mail survey questionnaire. Self-administered mail surveys have many advantages. The relatively low cost of the mail survey enabled this researcher to gather information from a large sample of school administrators. Because no special equipment or other personnel were needed to conduct the survey, this researcher managed the collection of the data without assistance. It was also presumed that the mail survey gave opportunity for truthful responses due to the participants' anonymity (Bourque & Fielder, 2003).

Participants

The participants of this study were certified school administrators who were currently working as principals in elementary, middle/jr. high, and high schools within the southwestern section of the state of Pennsylvania. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, in these four counties there were 400 school principals working in 68 school districts with a student enrollment of 225,228 (http://www.pde.state.pa.us/k12statistics/cwp/view.asp?a=3&q=118086, Allegheny, Fayette, Greene, and Washington). The 68 school districts are located in rural, suburban, and urban municipalities. Southwestern Pennsylvania has a large urban area around Pittsburgh in Allegheny County, surrounded by suburban and rural communities in Allegheny, Washington, Fayette and Greene counties. Some participants were principals of large institutions, and therefore were one of two or more administrators for their particular building. Other participants were the only administrator for two or more small buildings.

Participation in this study was voluntary. Complete disclosure and voluntary consent to participate was provided to the subjects via a written informational letter and two copies of an informed consent. Participants were instructed to read the informed consent, and if they agreed to participate, sign and return one copy with the survey, and keep the other for their personal records. Subject numbers were assigned to each survey and corresponding informed consent, and only used to track which participants had responded. The master list of participant's names and corresponding number are kept in a locked file in the researcher's home to maintain the confidentiality of the participants. All

data were aggregated. No individual identifying data were reported.

Questionnaires were returned by 142 school administrators, 71 males and 71 females, for a total return rate of 35.7%. The response distribution by school level was: 84 elementary (34.8%), 29 middle/jr. high (36%), 25 high school (38.5%), and 4 from combined jr. high/high school (28.6%) administrators. The response distribution by experience was: 40 administrators with 1 - 5 years, 40 administrators with 6 - 10 years, 31 administrators with 11 - 15 years, and 31 administrators with more than 16 years experience. Administrators from all four counties returned questionnaires and are included in the sample.

Instrumentation

The instrument that was used for this study was a 38-item survey that was adapted from a survey developed by Holcomb-McCoy (2002), “The Importance and Preparedness of School Counselors (According to the 2000 CACREP Standards)”. This survey was previously used in a 2002 study conducted by Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan and Rahill to determine school counselors’ ratings of the CACREP school counseling standards. “Each CACREP curricular experience was stated as an item on the survey” (Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan & Rahill, p. 113). Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each item to the work of a school counselor. To address the research questions of this study, the demographic questions were modified and adapted for school administrators. In order to reduce the possibility of the influence of the terms, “CACREP School Counseling Standards” on the participants’ response, the survey did not indicate that the 38 items are “CACREP School Counseling Standards”. Instead, the

general term “competencies” was used to describe the 38 individual items, and the instrument was titled, Professional School Counselors’ Competencies (Appendix A).

In Part 1, school administrators were asked four demographic questions regarding their gender, which school level they presently worked, how many years of experience they had as an administrator, and where they completed their school administrator’s certification. In Part 2, school administrators were asked to respond to each of the 38 items by indicating the importance of each competency if they were hiring a school counselor for their building. Degree of importance was recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “great importance” to “no importance”. In Part 3 of the survey, administrators were asked to list any additional knowledge and skills criteria that they considered important when hiring a professional school counselor. Soliciting other criteria gave administrators the opportunity to report additional factors which might influence their decisions when hiring a school counselor.

Holcomb-McCoy addressed the reliability and validity of her survey. According to Holcomb-McCoy (2002), “The scale demonstrated an internal consistency reliability (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha) of .89" (p. 113). She established validity in the following manner:

> Validity of the survey items was addressed by soliciting feedback from eight school counselor educators from CACREP-accredited school counseling programs, all of whom teach school counseling courses and are contributors to the school counseling literature. As a result of their

recommendations, several format and wording changes were made to the initial survey to better reflect the 2001 CACREP standards. (p. 113)

To establish validity of the adaptations to the instrument for this study, a group of five experienced school administrators presently working as principals were asked to review the survey. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and provide feedback to the researcher. Specifically, this researcher needed to determine the following about the questionnaire: ease of use and readability, time required to complete the questionnaire, and need for any revisions.

Procedures

The school counseling profession has deemed the CACREP School Counseling Standards as appropriate and essential for the training of school counselors (Coy, 1999; Baker, 1994; Johnson, 1993; Borders & Drury, 1992; Haight, 1992; Kandor & Bobby, 1992; Sweeney, 1992; Weinrach, 1991; Pate, 1990; Wittmer, 1988). Therefore, school administrators were asked to complete the survey, “Professional School Counselors’ Competencies“, to determine their perception of the importance of the 38 specific school counseling knowledge and skills competencies which correspond to the 38 CACREP School Counseling Standards. The self-administered questionnaire was mailed to all certified elementary, middle, and high school administrators working as school principals in public schools in the southwestern Pennsylvania counties of Allegheny, Fayette, Greene, and Washington. The envelopes were addressed to the principals by name, and included a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study.

Participants did not sign or include their name on the return survey to maintain confidentiality, however they were asked to sign the informed consent to indicate their intention to participate. Surveys were numbered for the purpose of tracking the participants that responded. All data will be maintained for five years beyond the completion of the study.

Surveys were mailed in late July 2005 before school staff returned for the start of the new school year. All correspondence (cover letter, informed consents, and survey) was mailed in a flat manila envelope that was addressed personally to the school administrator. The flat envelope was used for it was more visible in a stack of mail that may be received by a busy administrator. To encourage a return of the survey, a stamped, addressed return envelope was included. Dillman (2000) suggests that follow up contact with the participants helps to achieve a high rate of response. Therefore, after three weeks, a postcard was mailed to all participants thanking them for their participation if they had mailed their survey. The postcard also reminded the participants that if they had not returned their survey that this researcher was hopeful that they would complete and mail their response soon. Finally, the researcher's phone number and e-mail address was included if the participant had not received their survey, or needed a replacement survey.

Initially, the data were analyzed to determine the mean response for each of the 38 competencies on the questionnaire. To address the research questions, further analysis revealed the mean responses for each of the subgroups (gender, school level, and years of experience). To determine if there

were significant differences among the responses of each subgroup, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was administered on each set of data. The number of responses from each of the groups of elementary, middle/jr. high, high school, and combined jr. high/high school administrators was so disproportionate that the data were re-analyzed using a regression analysis. When the competencies which had significantly different responses were identified, a Bonferroni post hoc analysis revealed where the differences occurred.

Delimitations

Whenever a sample of a population is identified in a study, general and specific limitations are apparent from the sample itself. This study assumed that by sampling certified school principals, this sample was representative of a cross-section of the total school principal population. However, it is unrealistic to claim this sample was an absolute cross-section of the population. Two factors prevented this sample from being a microcosm of school principals: the size of the sample limited the interpretation of the; the geographic location limited generalization of the findings to other areas of the state or country.

Another major limitation was the nature of the survey itself. There are statistical limitations with a survey that is given only once to a single group (Bourque & Fielder, 2003). Having only one particular group complete the survey, without a pretest-posttest, limited how the results might be compared.

Possibly, the most significant limitation of the survey was its reception. It was not known if subjects would, or would not, respond and if the quality of their response was affected by issues such as: time constraints and personal attitude

toward surveys. Also it was inaccurate to assume that school principals who did choose to respond to the questionnaire had the same perceptions of those who did not choose to respond. The survey was constructed to elicit the beliefs and perceptions of school principals as they related to their actual and/or assumed experience with school counselors. A further assumption was that participants would complete the instrument seriously, divulging their true perceptions. But there is always the possibility that school principals responded as they thought they should respond in accordance with societal pressures and accepted professional norms when faced with the specific questions of the questionnaire.

Summary

This study surveyed the perceptions of certified school principals in regard to the importance of 38 skills and practices of school counselors. These identified items were derived from the CACREP Standards for school counselors. The purpose was to determine if the CACREP School Counseling Standards have importance to school administrators when they make decisions about hiring school counselors. Additionally, the study examined the relationship between these factors and the administrators' gender, school level, and administrators' years of experience.

CHAPTER 4

Results

This section describes the results of the data gathered from the questionnaire, Professional School Counselors' Competencies. The purpose of this study was to describe how school administrators view the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring and supervising school counselors. Specifically, this study attempted to determine if the 38 specific CACREP School Counseling Standards represent the skills and knowledge base that school principals believe are important and, therefore, use when hiring school counselors who will be under their supervision.

Findings

Professional School Counselor's Competencies' questionnaires were mailed to the 400 school principals in elementary, middle/jr. high, and high schools in Allegheny, Washington, Fayette, and Greene counties in southwestern Pennsylvania. Questionnaires were returned by 142 school administrators for a return response of 35.7%. Of these 142 responses, 71 were from male administrators and 71 were from female administrators. The response rate by school level is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1

Questionnaire Responses

Level	Total # Surveys	Total # Returned	Percent
Elementary	241	84	34.8%
Middle/Jr. High	80	29	36%
High School	65	25	38.5%
Jr. High/High School	14	4	28.6%
All Schools	400	142	35.7%

Of the 142 school administrators who participated in this study, 138 responded to the demographic question asking where they had received their training as administrators and indicated they were trained at 22 different institutions. Those attending schools in Pennsylvania equaled 121 and those attending schools in other states equaled 17. Eleven administrators (7.7% of the total number of respondents to the questionnaire) were the sole representative of their particular training institution. While 127 administrators (89% of the total number of respondents to the questionnaire) received their training at 11 institutions. The detailed data appear in Appendix B. All school administrators who responded to the questionnaire reported their years of experience as administrators. The range was from 1 to 40 years. For the purpose of organizing this information in manageable units, a frequency distribution was established for this data. The reported years of experience were divided into four groups as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Years of Administrative Experience

	Years of Experience	Total # of Respondents
1	1 - 5 years	40
2	6 - 10 years	40
3	11 - 15 years	31
4	16 or more years	31

The school administrators indicated their responses to the 38 competencies on the Professional School Counselor's Competencies' questionnaire. School administrators were asked to consider the importance of each competency as it relates to their decision to hire a school counselor. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale with the following indicators: 1 (no importance), 2 (little importance), 3 (neutral), 4 (moderate importance), and 5 (great importance). Results were analyzed using the SPSS 10.0 statistical package.

The results of this study's finding are described for each of the 38 school counseling competencies. The data are reported as they address three of the four questions that have directed this research: the importance of these competencies to all school administrators; the importance to school

administrators of different gender; and the importance to administrators at different school levels.

Competency 1: Knowledge of philosophy, history, and trends in school counseling.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 3.9, for male school administrators it was 3.8, and for female school administrators it was 4.1 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.04). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.1, middle/jr high schools was 3.8, high schools was 3.8, and combined jr. high/high schools was 2.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.004) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.003) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of the combined jr. high/high school administrators and administrators from all other school levels.

Competency 2: Ability to relate school counseling training to the academic and student services program in the school.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.6, for

male school administrators it was 4.5, and for female school administrators it was 4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.01). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools were 4.7, middle/jr high schools were 4.7, high schools were 4.5, and combined jr. high/high schools were 4.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.03) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.02) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of the combined jr. high/high school administrators and administrators from all other school levels.

Competency 3: Knowledge of role and function of the school counselor in conjunction with the roles of other professional and support personnel in the school.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.4, for male school administrators it was 4.3, and for female school administrators it was 4.6 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.04). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of

administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.4, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.10) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 4: Knowledge of leadership strategies designed to enhance the learning environment of schools.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.2, for male school administrators it was 4.2, and for female school administrators it was 4.1 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.61). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.2, middle/jr high schools was 4.2, high schools was 4.1, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.2. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.92) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 5: Knowledge of the school setting and curriculum.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.6, for male school administrators it was 4.7, and for female school administrators it was 4.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.12). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.8, high schools was 4.9, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.2. An ANOVA

(Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.002) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.009) of the response differences between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of the elementary school administrators and high school administrators.

Competency 6: Knowledge of ethical standards and guidelines of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA).

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.6, for male school administrators it was 4.5, and for female school administrators it was 4.6 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.24). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.7, middle/jr high schools was 4.4, high schools was 4.5, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.2. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.09) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 7: Knowledge of policies, laws, and legislation relevant to school counseling.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.7, for

male school administrators it was 4.7, and for female school administrators it was 4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.40). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.8, middle/jr high schools was 4.6, high schools was 4.8, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.62) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 8: Knowledge of demographic and lifestyle diversity as it relates to students and the school setting.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.6, for male school administrators it was 4.4 and for female school administrators it was 4.7 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.02). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.6, middle/jr high schools was 4.5, high schools was 4.6, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.77) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 9: Knowledge and understanding of community, environmental, and institutional opportunities that enhance or impede student academic, career, and personal success, and overall development.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.6, for

male school administrators it was 4.5 and for female school administrators it was 4.6 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.56). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.6, high schools was 4.7, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.59) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 10: Knowledge and application of current technology to assist students, families, and educators in using resources that promote informed academic, career, and personal/social choices.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.1, for male school administrators it was 4.1 and for female school administrators it was 4.1 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (1.00). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.0, middle/jr high schools was 4.1, high schools was 4.4, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.09) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 11: Knowledge and ability to advocate for all students and for effective school counseling programs.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.7, for

male school administrators it was 4.6 and for female school administrators it was 4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.07). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.7, middle/jr high schools was 4.6, high schools was 4.7, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.96) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 12: Ability to refer children and adolescents for specialized help.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.8, for male school administrators it was 4.7 and for female school administrators it was 4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.11). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.8, middle/jr high schools was 4.7, high schools was 4.7, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.61) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 13: Ability to coordinate activities with resource persons, specialists, businesses and agencies outside the school.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.5, for male school administrators it was 4.4 and for female school administrators it was 4.6 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the

data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.29). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.6, middle/jr high schools was 4.4, high schools was 4.5, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.15) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 14: Ability to integrate the guidance curriculum in the total school curriculum.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.4, for male school administrators it was 4.3 and for female school administrators it was 4.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.08). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.3, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.11) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 15: Ability to promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.3, for male school administrators it was 4.2, and for female school administrators it was 4.4 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not

significant (.18). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.2, high schools was 4.3, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.03) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.02) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of the elementary school administrators and combined jr. high/high school administrators.

Competency 16: Ability to plan and present guidance related educational programs for school personnel.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.3, for male school administrators it was 4.2 and for female school administrators it was 4.3 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.71). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.3, middle/jr high schools was 4.2, high schools was 4.2, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.29) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 17: Knowledge of methods of planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating comprehensive developmental counseling programs.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.4, for male school administrators it was 4.3, and for female school administrators it was 4.4 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.18). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.2, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.00) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.00) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of the combined jr. high/high school administrators and administrators from all other school levels.

Competency 18: Knowledge of prevention and crisis intervention strategies.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.8, for male school administrators it was 4.8 and for female school administrators it was 4.9 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not

significant (.19). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.8, middle/jr high schools was 4.7, high schools was 4.9, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.37) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 19: Ability to plan and present guidance related educational programs for parents.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.4, for male school administrators it was 4.3, and for female school administrators it was 4.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.04). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.6, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.008) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that indicated the difference was not significant (.93) between administrators from the four school levels. To identify a source of this disagreement, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated. It indicated the significance of the ANOVA arose from the difference between the response of the combined jr. high/high school administrators and administrators from all other school levels.

Competency 20: Ability to use surveys, interviews, and needs assessments.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.1, for male school administrators it was 4.0 and for female school administrators it was 4.1 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.43). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.1, middle/jr high schools was 4.0, high schools was 4.2, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.42) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 21: Ability to design, implement, and evaluate comprehensive guidance and counseling programs.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.3, for male school administrators it was 4.2 and for female school administrators it was 4.3 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.54). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.1, high schools was 4.3, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.14) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 22: Ability to implement and evaluate specific strategies and interventions to meet program goals and objectives.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.4, for male school administrators it was 4.3 and for female school administrators it was 4.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.04). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.3, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.24) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 23: Ability to identify student academic, career, and personal/social competencies and to implement activities to assist students in achieving these competencies.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.5, for male school administrators it was 4.4 and for female school administrators it was 4.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.54). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.4, high schools was 4.7, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.20) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 24: Ability to prepare a counseling schedule reflecting appropriate time commitments and priorities in a comprehensive guidance program.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.2, for male school administrators it was 4.1 and for female school administrators it was 4.3 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.16). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.3, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.3, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.23) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 25: Knowledge of strategies for securing alternative funding for program expansion.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 3.5, for male school administrators it was 3.4 and for female school administrators it was 3.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.45). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 3.6, middle/jr high schools was 3.4, high schools was 3.3, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.63) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 26: Ability to use technology to design, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive guidance program.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 3.9, for male school administrators it was 4.0 and for female school administrators it was 3.9 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.61). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 3.9, middle/jr high schools was 3.8, high schools was 4.0, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.2. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.78) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 27: Ability to implement individual and group counseling for children and adolescents.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.7, for male school administrators it was 4.6, and for female school administrators it was 4.7 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.19). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.8, middle/jr high schools was 4.6, high schools was 4.4, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.01) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data

were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.005) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of elementary administrators and high school administrators.

Competency 28: Ability to implement classroom or group guidance designed to assist children and adolescents with developmental tasks.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.5, for male school administrators it was 4.5, and for female school administrators it was 4.5 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.45). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.7, middle/jr high schools was 4.4, high schools was 4.1, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.2. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.001) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.000) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of elementary administrators and high

school administrators.

Competency 29: Ability to design and implement peer helper programs.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.2, for male school administrators it was 4.1, and for female school administrators it was 4.3 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.19). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.0, high schools was 4.1, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.006) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.003) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant difference was between the responses of elementary administrators and middle/jr. high school administrators.

Competency 30: Knowledge of issues which may affect the development and functioning of children and adolescents (e.g., substance abuse, eating disorders).

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.7, for male school administrators it was 4.6 and for female school administrators it was

4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.07). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.7, middle/jr high schools was 4.6, high schools was 4.7, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.72) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 31: Knowledge of how to assist students and parents at points of educational transition (e.g., post-secondary education, career options).

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 4.2, for male school administrators it was 4.2, and for female school administrators it was 4.1 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.55). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.0, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.8, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.001) in the administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.000) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. To identify the source of the significance, the Bonferroni post hoc procedure (Appendix H) was calculated and indicated the significant

difference was between the responses of elementary administrators and high school administrators.

Competency 32: Ability to construct partnerships with families and communities in order to promote student success.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.5, for male school administrators it was 4.4 and for female school administrators it was 4.6 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.01). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.6, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.7. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.31) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 33: Knowledge of systems theories and how systems interact to influence students.

School administrators' mean response for this competency was 3.8, for male school administrators it was 3.7, and for female school administrators it was 3.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.77). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 3.9, middle/jr high schools was 3.5, high schools was 3.7, and combined jr. high/high schools was 3.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were significant differences (.03) in the

administrators' mean responses. However, since the number of respondents from each of the four school levels of administrators was unequal, these data were further examined via a regression analysis (Appendix G) that confirmed the significance (.01) of the response difference between administrators from the four school levels. However, in the Bonferroni post hoc analysis (Appendix H) there appeared to be no significant difference in the interaction between the administrators at the four identified levels.

Competency 34: Ability to recognize and assist students who may use alcohol or other drugs.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.7, for male school administrators it was 4.5 and for female school administrators it was 4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was significant (.03). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.6, middle/jr high schools was 4.7, high schools was 4.8, and combined jr. high/high schools was 5.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.48) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 35: Ability to enhance teamwork within the school community.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.5, for male school administrators it was 4.5 and for female school administrators it was 4.4 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not

significant (.30). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.5, middle/jr high schools was 4.5, high schools was 4.6, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.5. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.68) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 36: Ability to consult with parents, teachers, administrators, support staff, and community agency personnel.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.8, for male school administrators it was 4.8 and for female school administrators it was 4.8 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.85). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.7, middle/jr high schools was 4.8, high schools was 4.8, and combined jr. high/high schools was 5.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.61) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 37: Ability to empower families and communities to act on behalf of their children.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.4, for male school administrators it was 4.4 and for female school administrators it was 4.4 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.58). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of

administrators in: elementary schools was 4.4, middle/jr high schools was 4.3, high schools was 4.6, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.2. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.62) in the administrators' mean responses.

Competency 38: Knowledge and skills in conducting programs that are designed to enhance students' developmental needs.

School administrators mean response for this competency was 4.5, for male school administrators it was 4.5 and for female school administrators it was 4.6 (Appendix C). An analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Appendix D) applied to the data from male and female administrators indicated the difference was not significant (.36). The mean response (Appendix E) for each group of administrators in: elementary schools was 4.6, middle/jr high schools was 4.4, high schools was 4.6, and combined jr. high/high schools was 4.0. An ANOVA (Appendix F) indicated that there were no significant differences (.15) in the administrators' mean responses.

Initially, a research question was posed to determine the importance of the 38 school counseling competencies to school administrators of varying administrative experience. The analysis of the mean responses of the school administrators, as arranged into four groups (Table 2), revealed that there were no significant differences between these groups to any of the 38 competency questions (Appendix I and an ANOVA in Appendix J).

School administrators had the option of providing additional information that they considered to be important in Part 3 of the Professional School

Counselors' Competencies' questionnaire. The participants were instructed to: "Please list any additional competencies you would consider important if you hiring a professional school counselor for your building(s)." Thirty-nine administrators wrote 64 separate additional statements. This array of comments ranged from a single word response to a list of competency statements and are included in Appendix K. The content of each additional competency was analyzed and similar statements were clustered together in the following thematic categories: personal traits, specific counseling topics, professional identity or organizations, interpersonal skills, administrative skills, and general platitudes.

Summary

In an attempt to determine if the 38 specific CACREP School Counseling Standards represent the skills and knowledge base that school principals believe are important and, therefore, use when hiring school counselors that will be under their supervision, this study considered the total population mean for each competency and three independent variables. Gender, school level, and years of experience were reviewed for significant differences in the responses from administrators in each group. The analysis of the data revealed that there are significant differences in how male and female school administrators responded to eight school counselor competencies. Significant differences also existed among administrators from various school levels on nine of the school counselor competencies. However, the number of years of administrative experience was not a significant indicator of school administrators' responses to the Professional

School Counselor’s Competencies’ questionnaire.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section discusses the purpose of the study, major findings, limitations of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research. The major findings are presented in conjunction with the corresponding research questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe how school administrators view the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors. Specifically, this study attempted to determine if the 38 CACREP School Counseling Standards represent the skills and knowledge base that school principals believe are important, and therefore use, when hiring school counselors that will be under their supervision. Therefore, school administrators were surveyed and asked to, “Please indicate the **importance** of each competency **if** you were hiring a school counselor for your building(s).” Four research questions were considered in this study: (1) What level of importance do school administrators place on CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors? (2) Is there a difference in the level of importance that male and female school administrators assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors? (3) Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators different school levels assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors? (4) Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators with

varying years of experience assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?

The questionnaire, “Professional School Counselors’ Competencies” consisted of 38 knowledge and skill competencies which are the CACREP School Counseling Standards. Administrators returned a separate informed consent in compliance with university requirements, but they did not sign their returned questionnaire. However, in Part 1 of the questionnaire they were requested to share information regarding four specific demographic questions. These questions revealed the participant’s gender, level of their school, years of experience as a school administrator, and where and when they received their school administrative certification. School administrators were then asked in Part 2 of the questionnaire to respond to each of the 38 items by indicating the importance of each competency if they were hiring a school counselor for their building. The level of importance was recorded on a 5-point Likert scale with number 1 representing “no importance”, number 2 representing “little importance”, number 3 representing “neutral”, number 4 representing “moderate importance” and number 5 representing “great importance”. In Part 3 of the survey, administrators were asked to list any additional competencies that they considered important when hiring a professional school counselor. Asking for other criteria gave administrators the opportunity to report additional factors which might influence their decisions when hiring a school counselor.

This study solicited the participation of all certified elementary, middle, and high school administrators working as school principals in public schools in

the southwestern Pennsylvania counties of Allegheny, Fayette, Greene, and Washington. Four hundred school administrators were mailed and asked to complete the questionnaire, “Professional School Counselors’ Competencies“, to determine their perception of the importance of the 38 specific school counseling knowledge and skills competencies which correspond to the 38 CACREP School Counseling Standards.

Of the 400 questionnaires mailed to school administrators, 142, or 37.7%, were returned. Of the total number of questionnaires, 241 were mailed to elementary principals, 80 were mailed to middle/jr. high school principals, 65 to high school principals, and 14 were mailed to combined jr. high/high school principals. Eighty-four elementary principals responded to the questionnaire for a return rate of 34.8%. Middle school principals responded at a rate of 36%, returning 29 questionnaires. Principals in high schools returned 25 questionnaires, for a return rate of 38.5%, and 28.6% of principals in combined jr. high/high schools returned 4 questionnaires. The response rates for all school administrators and each of the subsequent school levels were similar. None of the groups were disproportionately represented in the total response.

Discussion

The first research question asked, “What level of importance do school administrators place on CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?” The 142 school administrators who participated in this study rated the school counseling competencies as generally important. Mean responses for each of the 38 items were between 3.5, between neutral and

moderately important, and 4.8, indicating that the competency was greatly important. This response suggested that school administrators endorsed the CACREP School Counseling Standards as important when hiring school counselors. More importantly, it is interesting that none of the mean responses for any of the competencies indicated that school administrators believed the competencies had little or no importance. One interpretation is that school administrators were knowledgeable and in agreement with the CACREP Standards. However, there are many different ways administrators may have gained this knowledge and yet other interpretations may suggest no specific knowledge was applied in responding to this questionnaire. In the latter category, some or all administrators may have responded arbitrarily to each competency without regard to its wording or intention. Some or all administrators may have responded by choosing what they regarded as the socially acceptable response, not necessarily reflecting their own feelings of the importance of a particular competency. Some or all administrators may have read the competencies and agreed with them, assuming each was what counselors should be or do, but without concern about whether the specific competency was important during the hiring process or even the specific competency was a discernable role/skill during the interviewing process. It is more likely, however, that administrators' views were more determined by knowledge acquired as a result of: specific courses about the roles and skills of counselors during the administrator's initial training; specific courses about the roles and skills of counselors during the administrator's continuing education; unassigned reading of books, journals,

internet sites, etc. by administrators to enhance their own knowledge of the roles and skills of counselors; observation of their school counselor's interaction with students, parents, teachers, and administrative staff; and finally, specific face-to-face meetings between administrators and their counselors during which the subjects of counselor roles and skills were raised and explained by the counselors.

Of the 142 responses, there were 71 responses from male administrators, and 71 from female administrators. The second research question asked, "Is there a difference in the level of importance that male and female school administrators assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?" There were significant differences in how male and female administrators responded to eight of the competencies. The significance of the differences in the responses of the female and male administrators was determined by analyzing the data using an ANOVA analysis.

Three of these competencies refer directly to the skills that counselor's need to be able to interact and provide services to students. These competencies state that school counselor's have the: "Ability to relate school counseling training to the academic and student services program in the school", "Knowledge of demographic and lifestyle diversity as it relates to students and the school setting", and the "Ability to recognize and assist students who may use alcohol or other drugs". Female administrators' mean responses were 4.8, 4.7, and 4.8 respectively, indicating that these competencies are particularly important when hiring a school counselor. The mean responses of the male

administrators for these three competencies were 4.5, 4.4, and 4.5 respectively. Male administrators did not view these three competencies as important as their female colleagues, but males still see them as moderately to greatly important when hiring a school counselor.

Two competencies pertain to the school counselor's attempt to actively reach out to parents and families stating that counselors have the "Ability to plan and present guidance related educational programs for parents" and the "Ability to construct partnerships with families and communities in order to promote student success". Female administrators mean responses were 4.5 and 4.6 respectively while the male administrators' responses of 4.3 and 4.4 indicate that they believe that these competencies are slightly less important than their female colleagues. Once again, males and females view both competencies as important, but females see them as somewhat more important.

Three competencies refer to the broader concepts of schools and school counseling in the schools. For the competencies "Knowledge of philosophy, history, trends in school counseling", "Knowledge of role and function of the school in conjunction with the roles of other professional and support personnel in the school" and "Ability to implement and evaluate specific strategies and interventions to meet program goals and objectives", female administrators' mean responses were 4.1, 4.6 and 4.5 respectively. Male administrators' mean response rate were 3.8, 4.3 and 4.3 indicating that their responses fell between neutral and moderately important, slightly less than the female colleagues.

When considering the responses of the male and female administrators

with respect to these eight competencies, the differences—while statistically significant—are not substantial. Although female school administrators rate the specific competencies as more important, the mean responses of both male and female school administrators support these CACREP School Counseling Standards as important. While it may be posited that in this study certain counseling competencies may influence the hiring decisions of female administrators more than their male counterparts, a search of recent literature revealed no available evidence supporting the proposal that the school administrator's gender is a predictor of their decisions about hiring school counselors.

The response ratio for school administrators across grade levels were similar. However, considering the unequal number of elementary (241), middle/jr. high (80), high school (65), and combined jr. high/high school (14) administrators the number of actual responses across grade levels were appreciably disproportionate. Therefore, when addressing research question three, "Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators different school levels assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?", the size of the categorized respondent groups needed to be considered. Initially, an ANOVA was used to analyze the data, but the unequal size of the groups made the appropriateness of this type of analysis contestable. Therefore, the data were re-examined via a regression analysis which was then compared to the ANOVA results. The results of both statistical measures identified nine school counseling competencies (CACREP School Counseling

Standards) that had significant differences at the .05 alpha level. Post hoc analysis of these nine competencies revealed where the differences in importance occurred among the four identified school levels.

Five of the nine competencies referred to broad counseling skills or knowledge via counseling programs or services. In four of the five particular competencies, administrators in combined jr. high/high schools rated these competencies less important than did their colleagues in some or all other levels. For the competency, “Knowledge of philosophy, history, trends in school counseling”, the mean response was 4.1 for elementary, 3.8 for middle/jr. high, and 3.8 for high school administrators implied some level of importance. However, administrators in combined jr. high/high schools rated this competency as 2.5, that is, of neutral to little importance.

Similar discrepancies emerged for “Knowledge of methods of planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating comprehensive developmental counseling programs”. Elementary, middle/jr. high, and high school administrators’ mean responses of 4.5, 4.3, and 4.2 respectively while administrators in combined jr. high/high schools’ mean response was 3.0. Again there were significant differences between the mean response of administrators in combined jr. high/high schools and the other school levels. Elementary, middle/jr. high, and high school administrators rate this competency as moderately to greatly important to them when hiring school counselors, yet jr. high/high administrators implied that they are neutral about its importance.

For the competency “Ability to relate school counseling training to the

academic and student services program in the school", elementary and middle/jr. high administrators indicated that they believed this competency to be moderately to greatly important when hiring a school counselor. The mean responses for both elementary and middle/jr. high administrators were 4.7 indicating great importance. This is significantly higher than their combined jr. high/high school colleagues, whose mean response of 4.0 indicated moderate importance.

Significant differences for the competency "Ability to promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community" were between the mean responses of elementary administrators and combined jr. high/high school administrators. The elementary administrators' mean response was 4.4, and combined jr. high/high school administrators' response was 4.0. This suggests that elementary administrators placed moderate to great importance on this competency, while combined jr. high/high school administrators indicated that they believe this competency is moderately important when hiring a school counselor. Once again, administrators working in combined jr. high/high schools viewed the competency as less important.

In these four competencies, each of which is focused on broad counseling skills, the ratings of importance by school administrators in combined jr. high/high schools was consistently less than administrators from the other school levels. This may be evidence that administrators working in this unique environment of a 7-12th grade building have very different perceptions about the importance of the counseling competencies for school counselors they would

hire. However, this “perception” has been inferred by the responses of only four participants. It is understandable that this unique educational setting with its range of developmental needs of the students, may require professionals with a larger range of skills, but the lack of an adequate sample restricts such conjecture. It is imprudent to conclude that the significant difference between the responses of the combined jr. high/high school administrators and the administrators from the other school levels actually indicates a true difference in the importance that the combined jr. high/high school level place on the competencies when hiring a school counselor.

The fifth competency that pertains to broad counseling skills or knowledge via counseling programs or services is, “Knowledge of the school setting and curriculum”. For this competency, the significant difference in mean responses was between middle/jr. high school administrators and elementary administrators and was distinctly different in direction of the perceived importance. Middle/jr. high school administrators’ mean response was 4.4, and elementary school administrators’ response was 3.5. Therefore, middle/jr. high school administrators believe this competency to be moderately to greatly important, and elementary administrators see the competency as neutral to moderately important when making a decision to hire a school counselor.

Three competencies that yielded significant differences in the mean responses among school administrators across school levels referred specifically to the recipients of counseling programs or counseling services by use of the terms: parents, students, peers or adolescents. All are definitive statements that

pertain to a school counselors direct contact with students. The data reveal that the mean response of the elementary administrators was not only the highest indicating they believe these competencies to be important, but also significantly higher than some of their colleague level-groupings.

For the “Ability to implement individual and group counseling for children and adolescents”, elementary administrators mean response was significantly higher than high school administrators. Elementary administrators mean response was 4.8, while high school administrator’s response was 4.4. Obviously both groups see this competency as important, but more elementary administrators rated individual and group counseling skills to have great importance, while more high school counselors reported that these skills were no more than moderately important.

Similarly, statistically significant differences appeared between elementary and high school administrators for the “Ability to implement classroom or group guidance designed to assist children and adolescents with developmental tasks”. Again, elementary administrators’ mean response of 4.7 was higher than the mean response of 4.1 of their high school counterparts. Once more, both groups of administrators believe that it is important for school counselors to demonstrate this competency. But the elementary school administrators rated this competency as greatly important, while it is moderately important to high school administrators.

The statistically significant differences in the mean responses for the “Ability to design and implement peer helper programs” were between

elementary and middle/jr high school administrators. Once more, elementary administrators' mean response of 4.4 was higher than their high school colleagues mean response of 4.0. Evidently, elementary school administrators found this skill to be more important than middle/jr. high school administrators who implied that this competency is moderately important when hiring a school counselor.

Since these particular competencies emphasize direct contact with students, it is not unexpected that elementary school administrators ratings of importance were significantly higher than administrators from other school levels. Most elementary schools have only one school counselor (or one counselor who is shared with another building), hence all students in the building(s) have the same school counselor from kindergarten until middle school. Similarly, the elementary school principal works with one school counselor. Despite the large number of students, elementary school counselors tend to know all their students personally over their elementary years. Also, as a consequence of the intense concentration on basic reading and math skills acquisition in the elementary school, school counselors are aware of the academic needs of individual students. Support teams comprised of principals, teachers, support teachers, and school counselors meet regularly to determine how to meet the individual students' needs. Recommended strategies and interventions are likely to include peer tutoring, individual or group counseling. Indeed, it is the flexibility of the elementary school schedule that permits more opportunities for students to participate in individual or small group counseling. Elementary school

administrators may have rated the three competencies as important because they may value these competencies in their present elementary counselors. Although administrators from the other school levels may perceive these competencies as important, they may not have experienced the benefit of the direct, consistent contact a school counselor has with students at the elementary level.

The last competency that was statistically significant was the “Knowledge of how to assist students and parents at points of educational transition (e.g., post-secondary education, career options)”. Although students have various transitions throughout their education (i.e. elementary to middle school, middle to high school), clearly, the content and vocabulary of this particular competency connects it directly to high school counselors. Therefore, it was not surprising when high school administrators’ mean response was 4.8. Considering the language used in the competency, the mean response of 4.0 for elementary administrators was predictably lower. High school administrators obviously considered this competency to be greatly important, and elementary administrators’ deemed this competency to be moderately important when a hiring school counselor. If the parenthetic “e.g.” for this competency used language that was more applicable to middle/jr. high and elementary school settings, administrators at these level may have perceived this competency to be of greater importance and reflected this perception in their ratings.

In the nine competencies that had significant differences in the responses of school administrators from the four school levels, elementary administrators

had the highest mean responses for six competencies, tied with middle/jr. high administrators for one competency, and, interestingly, had a lower response for two competencies. The question arises as to why this is so. A detailed examination of the specific competency phrasing shows that for the two in which the administrators in elementary school responded with lower numbers, the competencies contained the phrases ". . . school setting and curriculum" and ". . . at points of educational transition (e.g., post-secondary education, career options)". It is not unreasonable to conclude that elementary school administrators regard these skills and knowledge as appropriate for other levels but less relevant to an elementary school. By contrast, of the six competencies that drew the highest responses from elementary school administrators, three contain language addressing trends in, implementation of, or promotion of school counseling programs and three directly address 'group counseling' for children or the implementation of 'peer helper' programs. That is, it is possible that these six CACREP School Counseling Standards are more closely aligned with the elementary counselor's role, or conversely, that the elementary counselor's role is more closely aligned with these particular standards, as seen by the elementary school administrator.

Research question four asked, "Is there a difference in the level of importance that school administrators with varying years of experience assign to the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors?" The rate of response across the groups were as follows: group 1, 40 administrators; group 2, 40 administrators; group 3, 31 administrators, and group 4, 31

administrators.

Generally, the school administrators, regardless of experience, indicated that the CACREP School Counseling Standards had some importance when hiring school counselors. Their mean responses ranged from 3.3, between neutral and moderately important, to 4.9, most administrators considered these competencies to be greatly important. An ANOVA was used to analyze the difference between the mean responses of the four groups of school administrators. The results indicated that none of the responses between the groups of school administrators with varying years of experience were statistically significant. The conclusion from this lack of statistical significance is that there is no evidence that school administrators' perception of the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors is dependent upon the administrators' years of administrative experience. The school administrators who participated in this survey had work experience ranging from 1 to 40 years. It might be presumed that the range of administrators' experience would be reflected in their range of responses to the questionnaire, that is, novice and seasoned administrators would have dissimilar perceptions of the importance of the CACREP Standards. However, this study's determination that school administrators' experience is not a factor in their ratings of importance of the school counselor's competencies raises the question: why not? Has an administrator's training about the role of the school counselor not changed over the past 40 years? Are administrative preparation programs not educating future administrators about the competencies and

appropriate role of school counselors? Are such programs not updated to reflect evolving standards of the other professionals whom the administrator supervises? Are continuing education courses for administrators removing any experience 'bias' that might be anticipated in relation to the importance of CACREP Standards? Whatever the validity of these possible answers, school administrators of any experience level reported that they found the CACREP School Counseling Standards to be important when hiring a school counselor. This raises one more, that professional school counselors—directly and indirectly—influence their administrators, regardless of the administrator's experience, to expect that school counselors will assume a role commensurate with the CACREP School Counseling Standards?

In Part 3 of the Professional School Counselors' Competencies' questionnaire, administrators were requested to "Please list any additional competencies you would consider important if you were hiring a professional school counselor for your building(s)". Of the 142 administrators responding, 39 administrators replied with 64 separate written responses (Appendix K) ranging from a single word to a list that included statements suggesting the addition of multiple competencies. The content of each additional competency was analyzed and similar statements were clustered together in the following thematic categories: personal traits, specific counseling topics, professional identity or organizations, interpersonal skills, other professional skills, and general platitudes.

Sixteen comments referred directly to personal traits that would be

desired in professional school counselors. For example, statements such as: “Warm, caring, and compassionate–a vested interest in the children” and “Character attributes (honesty, confidentiality, integrity)”. Flexibility, as a personal trait, was included in the comments of three administrators. Specific counseling topics, such as test interpretation, bullying, and child abuse, were included in comments from fourteen administrators. In the category of professional identity, two administrators referred directly to ASCA in their suggestions for additional school counseling competencies. One suggested membership in the professional organization, while the other recommended that school counselors have an understanding of the ASCA model.

The importance of good interpersonal skills for school counselors was mentioned by six respondents. Another interpersonal theme was the necessity for counselors to collaborate and coordinate with their colleagues in the school setting. Under the heading of general platitudes, eight respondents commented on “experience”, or having “knowledge of district policies and procedures”, and “needs excellent time management & organization skills”. Other general statements referred to developing technology skills.

In addition to the appropriate responses categorized above, fifteen references were to responsibilities, such as development of schedules, discipline, attendance, and special education, that are unrelated to the CACREP School Counseling Standards. For example, five school administrators suggested that a school counselor’s competency for developing a school schedule be included. Three administrators want counselors to know the laws

regulating special education. Two other administrators made direct statements about counselors being administrators. Yet other, typically administrative responsibilities such as, knowledge of attendance and truancy laws and policies (mentioned by three administrators), and discipline (two administrators) were also reported. These responses were not consistent with the school administrators' endorsement of the 38 competencies from the questionnaire. However, these responses do tend to support previous research by Murray (1995) who determined that counselors are expected to be involved in all facets of school operations. It has been suggested that the school counselors assumption of multiple counseling responsibilities, as well as taking on teaching, clerical and administrative tasks, is a primary reason that the school counselor's role is so difficult to define (Murray, 1995; Anderson & Reiter,1995; Napierkowski & Parsons, 1995; Johnson, 1993; Sears, 1993 Brown, 1989). There is a degree of irony that although school administrators deem the CACRECP School Counseling Standards as important competencies for hiring school counselors, some school administrators would also recommend that school counselors assume additional responsibilities unsupported by the school counseling profession or included in the CACREP School Counseling Standards.

Limitations of the Study

Surveying administrators from public schools in four counties in southwestern Pennsylvania limits the generalization of these findings to other geographic areas. Therefore, this research should be replicated with different demographic groups. Within the four counties where these data were gathered,

the schools are located in urban, suburban, and rural communities. School administrators in urban areas are from small cities with populations under 24,000 and Pittsburgh, a mid-size city. There were participants from rural schools, however they do have proximity to suburban and urban areas within 35 miles. Gathering information from school administrators in other areas with greater diversity would provide more comprehensive data on their perception of the importance of the CACREP Standards when hiring school counselors.

Because there are few schools that fit the category of combined jr. high/high schools, generalization of these data across elementary, middle/jr. high and high schools is limited. This was the case in this study, the small population of administrators of grades 7 - 12, leads to a low number of responses that can potentially skew the interpretation of the results of any research. One possible approach would be to include the responses from combined jr. high/high schools with high schools.

Conclusions

The administrators who participated in this study reported that the competencies in the questionnaire were important when hiring a school counselor. Therefore, it can be assumed that these administrators believed that the 38 CACREP School Counseling Standards are important skills and knowledge needed by the school. While there are significant differences in the degree of importance recorded by male and female administrators and administrators from different school levels, the administrators' overall perception of the competencies' importance is an endorsement of the CACREP School

Counseling Standards.

One might assume that the school administrators' perceptions of the CACREP Standards' importance would parallel their perception of the unique skills and knowledge that counselors bring to positions in schools. Although administrators value their counselor's attributes, often they also expect those counselors to assume additional responsibilities that may not agree with the counselor's role as defined by the CACREP School Counseling Standards. One may question this contradiction. Perhaps school counselors are assigned administrative duties because the administrators lack an adequate number of administrative assistants to perform those duties. Perhaps school counselors are expected to perform clerical chores because there is a dearth of clerical staff to handle these tasks. Perhaps school counselors are asked to assume substitute teaching duties because genuine substitute teachers are in short supply. All of these possibilities may explain the school administrator's behavior, but not justify it.

The relationship between school counselors and school administrators is mutually beneficial. Both professionals, working together to support the needs of the students, could and should capitalize on each others' strengths and skills. If school administrators hired school counselors because their competencies are commensurate with the CACREP School Counseling Standards, they should maximize the utilization of the school counselors' unique education and mental health training. If administrators appreciate their counselors' unique training, the latter can assume their appropriate role with the other professionals in the

school. School administrators and counselors, both performing their separate roles, can and should form a symbiotic relationship creating a powerful team of professionals who support the academic, career, and personal needs of their students.

Recommendations for Further Research

Previous researchers have examined the CACREP Standards from the viewpoint of school counselors (Holcomb-McCoy et al,2002) and counselor educators (Vacc & Charkow,1999; Bobby and Kandor,1992; Vacc, 1992; Cecil & Comas,1986). Over the years there has been inquiry by researchers into school administrators' decisions regarding the hiring of school counselors (Towner-Larsen, Granello, & Sears. 2000; Kaplan and Evans, 1999; Roberts, Coursol, & Morotti,1997; Beale, 1995; Beale, 1992; Beale & Bost, 1983). This study was an attempt to learn if school administrators perceived the CACREP School Counseling Standards as important in the process of hiring school counselors.

The questionnaire used in this study asked school administrators where they were trained, but did not ask how they learned about the role of the school counselor (i.e. from their administrative training, from school counselors). Having this information may clarify questions about the quality and extent of administrative training about the role of the school counselor. Furthermore, if school counselors have a primary responsibility for educating their administrators about the counselors' role in the school, this needs to be addressed in the preparation of school counselors since it adds another dimension to the relationship between school counselors and their administrators.

It is possible that administrators who are also certified school counselors, and possibly have even worked as a school counselor, may have a very different response to the “Professional School Counselors’ Competencies” questionnaire. Their frame of reference for determining their level of importance of the 38 competencies could result in responses unlike their administrative colleagues who have no school counseling experience. This questionnaire did not ask if the school administrators were also certified school counselors. Further research could compare the responses of administrators with and without school counseling training and experience to see if there are differences in their perception of the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards.

The CACREP School Counseling Standards are recognized by the counseling profession as the hallmark of counselor training (Holcomb-McCoy et al, 2002; Coy, 1999; Baker, 1994; Johnson, 1993; Borders & Drury, 1992; Sweeney, 1992; Pate, 1990; Wittmer, 1988). Presently, there is much emphasis on school counseling program standards, such as the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) from the Education Trust and the National Standards for School Counseling Programs and the ASCA National Model. Prior research by Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones’ (2004) looked at school principals and school counselors’ perceptions of both initiatives. Results were inconclusive and indicated that the participants were confused about the various standards. It may be interesting to examine the school administrators’ perception of the importance of the National Standards and the TSCI program standards along with the CACREP School Counseling Standards for training school counselors.

A final recommendation would be to use an alternative research method to gather information from school administrators. Rather than a mail survey, a personal face-to-face interview with school administrators may reveal additional data and insight into their perception of the importance of the CACREP School Counseling Standards when hiring school counselors. Particularly, the differences in perceptions of administrators from the four identified school levels may document the distinct needs of all school administrators as well as the specific needs of administrators from the elementary, middle/jr. high, high school, and combined jr. high/high schools.

Summary

School administrators have considerable influence over the hiring of school counselors (Beale & Bost, 1983; Beale, 1992; Beale, 1995) for their buildings. This study attempted to learn if the CACREP School Counseling Standards used in training programs for school counselors was in accordance with the competencies school administrators seek in the school counselors they hire. Knowing what is important to those who make these hiring decisions could have significance for the training programs of both administrators and counselors.

The results of this study indicate that the participating school administrators found the CACREP School Counseling Standards to represent important role competencies of the school counselors they would hire. While this appears to be an indication of their endorsement of these standards, it does not explain the tendency of school administrators to add administrative roles to the

counselors they supervise as described in the literature. Therefore, additional research is needed to examine the differences between these findings and current practice.

References

Anderson, R. S., & Reiter, D. (1995). The indispensable counselor. *The School Counselor*, *42*, 268-276.

Baker, S. B. (1994). Mandatory teaching experience for school counselors: An impediment to uniform certification standards for school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 314-326.

Baker, S. B. (2001). Reflections of forty years in the school counselin profession: Is the glass half full or half empty? *Professional School Counseling*, *5*, 75-83.

Ballard, M. B., & Murgatroyd, W. (1999). Defending a vital program: School counselors define their roles. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*, 19-26.

Beale, A. V. (1992). Getting hired as a school counselor: Who decides and what counts the most. *Virginia Counselors Journal, 20*, 61-66.

Beale, A. V. (1995). Selecting school counselors: The principal's perspective. *The School Counselor, 42,* 211-217.

Beale, A. V.,& Bost, W. A. (1983). Selecting school counselors: Ranking the characteristics. *NASSP Bulletin, 67*, 102-106.

Bobby, C. L. (1992). *CACREP accreditation: Setting the standard for counselor preparation.* (Report No. RI88062011). Ann Arbor, MI: Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347470)

Bobby, C. L., & Kandor, J. R. (1992). Assessment of selected CACREP

standards by accredited and nonaccredited programs. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 677-684.

Bobby, C. L., & Kandor, J. R. (1995). *CACREP accreditation: Assessment and evaluation in the standards and process*. (Report No. RR93002004). Ann Arbor, MI: Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services. (ERIC Document Reproductions Service No. ED388884)

Bonebrake, C. R., & Borgers, S. B. (1984). Conselor role as perceived by counselors and principals. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 18,* 194-199.

Borders, L.D. (2002). School Counseling in the 21st century: Personal and professional reflections. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 180-185.

Borders, L. D., & Drury, S. M. (1992). Comprehensive school counseling programs: A review for policy makers and practitioners. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 487-498.

Bourque, L. B., & Fielder, E. P. (2003). *How to conduct self-administered and mail surveys* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Bradley, C., & Fiorini, J. (1999). Evaluation of counseling practicum: A national study of programs accredited by CACREP. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 110-119.

Breland, A. M., & Sandhu, D. S. (2001). A model of school counseling: Using a proactive and positive approach. In D.S. Sandhu (Ed.), *Elementary school counseling in the new millennium* (pp. 7-14). Alexandria, Virginia:

American Counseling Association.

Brown, D. (1989). The perils, pitfalls, and promises of school counseling program reform. *The School Counselor, 37*, 47-53.

Byrne, R. H. (1963). *The school counselor*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). *The national standards for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counseling Association.

Carroll, M. R. (1968). School counseling—potpourri for education. *The School Counselor, 16,* 21-23.

Cecil, J. H., & Comas, R. E. (1986). Faculty perceptions of CACREP accreditation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 25*, 237-245.

Cole, G. C. (1991). Counselors and administrators A comparison of roles. *NASSP Bulletin, 75*, 5-13.

Cormany, R. B., & Brantley, W. A. (1996). It's our problem: An administrator looks at school guidance. *The School Counselor*, 43, 171-173.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), The 2001 Standards. Retrieved March 8, 2006, from http://www.cacrep.org/2001Standards.html.

Coy, D. R. (1999). The role and training of the school counselor: Background and purpose. *NASSP Bulletin, 83,* 2-8.

Coy, D. R., & Sears, S. (1994). The scope & practice of the high school counselor. In J. Wittmer (Ed.), *Managing your school counseling program:*

K-12 developmental strategies (pp. 52-60). Minneapolis, Minnesota: Ed. Med.

Deck, M. D., Cecil, J. H., & Cobia, D. C. (1990). School counselor research as perceived by american school counselor association leaders: Implications for the profession. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 25*, 12-20.

DeMato, D. S. (2001). *Job satisfaction among elementary school counselors in Virginia: Thirteen years later*. doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Dahir, C. A. (1997). *Supporting a nation of learners: The development of national standards for school counseling programs*. doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, New York.

Dahir, C. A. (2000). Principals as partners in school counseling. *The ASCA Counselor, 38*, 13.

Dahir, C. A. (2001). The national standards for school counseling programs: Development and implementation. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 320-327.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys* (2nd ed). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Feit, S. S., & Lloyd, A. P. (1990). Point/counterpoint: Counseling is a profession. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 29*, 216-219.

Field, A. (2000). *Discovering statistics: Using SPSS for windows*. London: SAGE Publications.

Fitch, T., Newby, E., Ballestero, V., & Marshall, J. L. (2001). Future school administrators' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 89-99.

Fitch, T. J., & Marshall, J. L. (2004). What counselor do in high-achieving schools; a study on the role of the school counselor. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 172-177.

Gerler, E. R. (1992). What we know about school counseling: A reaction to Borders and Drury. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 499-502.

Green, A., & Keys, S. (2001). Expanding the developmental school counseling paradigm: Meeting the needs of the 21st century student. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 84-95.

Gysbers, N. C. (2001). School guidance and counseling in the 21st century: Remember the past into the future. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 96-105.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2001). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A rich history and a bright future. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 246-256.

Haight, D. A. (1992). The pursuit of quality: A look into the future of CACREP. *Journal of Counseling and Development,70*, 688-694.

Hanna, F. J., & Bemak, F. (1997). The quest for identity in the counseling profession. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 36, 194-206.

Harris, L. H. (1999). School counselors and administrators: Collaboratively

promoting cultural diversity. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*, 54-61.

Henderson, P. (1999). Providing leadership for school counselors to achieve an effective guidance program. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*, 77-83.

Herr, E. L. (2001). The impact of national policies, economics, and school reform on comprehensive guidance programs. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 236-245.

Holcomb-McCoy, C., Bryan, J., & Rahill, S. (2002). Importance of the CACREP school counseling standards: School counselors' perceptions. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 112-120.

Johnson, L. S. (2000). Promoting professional identity in an era of educational reform. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 31-40.

Johnson, L. (1993). School counseling: Standards versus practice. *NYSACD Journal,* pp. 56-69.

Johnson, M, & Semrau, S. (2003). Three sides to a common goal. *ASCA School Counselor, 40*, 25-29.

Kandor, J. R., & Bobby, C. L. (1992). Special feature: CACREP. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 666.

Kaplan, L. S. (1995). Principals versus counselors: Resolving tensions from different practice models. *The School Counselor, 42*, 261-267.

Kaplan, L. S., & Evans, M. W. (1999). Hiring the best school counseling candidates to promote students' achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*, 34-49.

Katz, S. (1989). *A comparison of the congruence of school counselor*

education/preparation to actual school counselor practice. dissertation, Rutgers University, New Jersey.

Kitchenham, B. A., & Pfleeger, S. L. (2002). Principles of survey research, part 2: Designing a survey. *Software Engineering Notes, 27*, 18-20.

Lanning, W. (1988). Alternative to elitism? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27*, 295-297.

Leatherman, C. (1991). Leaders of regional accrediting agencies voice dissatisfaction with national organization; some say defections are possible. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 37, A15-A16.

Louis, K. S., Jones, L. M., & Barajas, H. (2001). Districts and schools as a context for transformed counseling roles. *NASSP Bulletin, 85*, 62-72.

MacDonald, G., & Sink, C. A. (1999). A qualitative developmental analysis of comprehensive guidance programmes in schools in the United States. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 27*, 415-429.

Mathers, N., Fox, N., & Hunn, A. (2002). *Surveys and questionnaires.* Sheffield, England: Trent focus group.

Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O. (1998). *Psychological testing: Principles and applications* (4th ed.) Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Murray, B. A. (1995). Validating the role of the school counselor. *The School Counselor, 43*, 5-9.

Napierkowski, C. M., & Parson, R. D. (1995). Diffusion of innovation: Implementing changes in school counselor roles and functions. *The*

School Counselor, 42, 364-369.

Niebuhr, K. E., Niebuhr, R. E., & Cleveland, W. T. (1999). Principal and counselor collaboration. *Education, 119*, 674-678.

Olson, M. J., & Allen, D. N. (1993). Principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of school counselors with and without teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 10-21.

Paisley, P. O., & McMahon, G. (2001). School counseling for the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 106-115.

Pate, Jr., R. H. (1990). The potential effect of accreditation standards on the type of students who will enter counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 29*, 179-187.

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Educational Specialist Certification. Retrieved March 15, 2006 from http//www.teaching.state.pa.us/teaching/lib/teaching.

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Administrative Certificates. Retrieved March 15, 2006 from http//www.teaching.state.pa.us/teaching/cwp/view.

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Enrollment projections for public schools by county, Retrieved March 23, 2006 from http://www.pde.state.pa.us/k12statistics/lib/k12statistics/Washington09_05.PDF.

Perusse, R., Godnough, G. E., & Noel, C. J. (2001). Use of the national standards for school counseling programs in preparing school counselors.

Professional School Counseling, 5, 49-55.

Perusse, R., Goodnough, G. E., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). Perceptions of school counselors and school principals about the national standards for school counseling programs and the transforming school counselor initiative. *Professional School Counseling, 7*, 152-161.

Ponec, D. L., & Brock, B. L. (2000). Relationships among elementary school counselors and principals: A unique bond. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 208-217.

Randolph, D. L. (1988). The enemy is us. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27*, 301-307.

Remley, T. P., & Albright, P. L. (1988). Expectations for middle school counselors: Views of students, teachers, principals, and parents. *The School Counselor, 35*, 290-296.

Rhodes, G. R. (2003). Hand in hand. *ASCA School Counselor, 40*, 10-13.

Roberts, W. B., Coursol, D. H., & Morotti, A. A. (1997). Chief school administrator perceptions of professional school counselors on measures of employability in Minnesota. *The School Counselor, 44*, 280-287.

Sandhu, D. S. (2001). Challenges for elementary school counselors in the new millennium. In D. S.Sandhu (Ed.), *Elementary school counseling in the new millennium* (pp. 3-6). Alexandria, Virginia: American Counseling Association.

Schmidt, J. J. (1999). Two decades of CACREP and what do we know?.

Counselor Education and Supervision,39, 34-45.

Schmidt, J. J. (2003). *Counseling in Schools*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schmidt, J. J., & Ciechalski, J. C. (2001). School counseling standards: A summary and comparison with other student services' standards. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 328-333.

Sears, S. J. (1993). The changing scope of practice of the secondary school counselor. *The School Counselor, 40*, 384-388.

Sears, S. J. (1999). Transforming school counseling: Making a difference for students. *NASSP Bulletin, 83*,47-53.

Sears, S. J., & Haag, D. (2002). School counseling now and in the future: A reaction. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 164-171.

Shoffner, M. F., & Briggs, M, K. (2001). An interactive approach for developing interprofessional collaboration: Preparing school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 193- 201.

Shoffner, M. F., & Williamson, R. D. (2000). Engaging preservice school counselors and principals in dialogue and collaboration. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 128 -140.

Sink, C. A. (1999). Reflections on the future of school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 11-12.

Sink, C. A., & MacDonald, G. (1998). The status of comprehensive guidance and counseling in the United States. *Professional School Counseling, 2*, 88-94.

Sink, C. A., & Yillik-Downer, A. (2001). School counselors' perceptions of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A national survey. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 278-288.

Sparks, E. (2003). Defining 'skool koun'se-ler. *ASCA School Counselor, 40*, 14-17.

Stalling, J. E. N. (1991). *The role of the school counselor as perceived by school counselors, principals and superintendents*. dissertation, The University of South Dakota, South Dakota.

Steinhauser, L., & Bradley, R. (1983). Accreditation of counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 23*, 98-108.

Stephens, W. R. (1970). *Social reform and the origins of vocational guidance*. American Personnel and Guidance Association: Washington, D.C.

Stone, C. B., & Clark, M. A. (2001). School counselors and principals: Partners in support of academic achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 85*, 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.

Sweeney, T. J. (1992). CACREP: Presursors, promises, and prospects. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 667-672.

Towner-Larson, R., Granello, D. H., & Sears, S. J. (2000). Supply and demand for school counselors: Perceptions of public school administrators. *ASCA Professional School Counseling, 3*, 270-276.

Vacc, N. A. (1992). An assessment of the perceived relevance of the CACREP standards. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 685-687.

Vacc, N. A.,& Charkow, W. B. (1999). Then and now: Examining quality dimensions of counselor preparation programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 3-22.

Weinrach, S. G. (1991). CACREP: The need for a mid-course correction. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 491-494.

Whiston, S. C. (2002). Response to the past, present, and future of school counseling: Raising some issues. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 148-155.

Williams, R. (2004). The power of many. *ASCA School Counselor, 41*, 42-48.

Wittmer, J. (1988). CACREP or APA: A counselor educator's personal view. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27*, 291-294.

Zimpfer, D. B., Mohdzain, A. Z., West, J. D., & Bubenzer, D. L. (1992). Professional identification of counselor preparation programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 32*, 91-107.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Professional School Counselors' Competencies

Developed by Sandra Frey McKeown

(Adapted from a survey by Cheryl C. Holcomb-McCoy, Ph.D)

PART 1: Demographic Information

Please identify your gender: Male Female

Please identify your school setting: Elementary Middle/Jr. High High School

How many years have you worked as a school administrator?_____

Please indicate where you completed your school administrators' certification:

_____

What year?_____

PART 2: School Counseling Knowledge Areas

Below are listed school counseling competencies that are typical for professional school counselors. Please indicate the **importance** of each competency **if** you were hiring a school counselor for your building(s).

		No Importance	Little Importance	Neutral	Moderate Importance	Great Importance
1	Knowledge of philosophy, history, and trends in school counseling					
2	Ability to relate school counseling training to the academic and student services program in the school.					
3	Knowledge of role and function of the school in conjunction with the roles of other professional and support personnel in the school.					
4	Knowledge of leadership strategies designed to enhance the learning environment of schools.					
5	Knowledge of the school setting and curriculum.					
6	Knowledge of ethical standards and guidelines of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA).					
7	Knowledge of policies, laws, and legislation relevant to school counseling.					
8	Knowledge of demographic and lifestyle diversity as it relates to students and the school setting					
9	Knowledge and understanding of community, environmental, and institutional opportunities that enhance or impede student academic, career, and personal success, and overall development					

		No Importance	Little Importance	Neutral	Moderate Importance	Great Importance
10	Knowledge and application of current technology to assist students, families, and educators in using resources that promote informed academic, career, and personal/social choices.					
11	Knowledge and ability to advocate for all students and for effective school counseling programs.					
12	Ability to refer children and adolescents for specialized help.					
13	Ability to coordinate activities with resource persons, specialists, businesses and agencies outside the school.					
14	Ability to integrate the guidance curriculum in the total school curriculum.					
15	Ability to promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community.					
16	Ability to plan and present guidance related educational programs for school personnel.					
17	Knowledge of methods of planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating comprehensive developmental counseling programs.					
18	Knowledge of prevention and crisis intervention strategies.					
19	Ability to plan and present guidance related educational programs for parents.					
20	Ability to use surveys, interviews, and needs assessments.					

		No Importance	Little Importance	Neutral	Moderate Importance	Great Importance
21	Ability to design, implement, and evaluate comprehensive guidance and counseling programs.					
22	Ability to implement and evaluate specific strategies and interventions to meet program goals and objectives.					
23	Ability to identify student academic, career, and personal/social competencies and to implement activities to assist students in achieving these competencies.					
24	Ability to prepare a counseling schedule reflecting appropriate time commitments and priorities in a comprehensive guidance program.					
25	Knowledge of strategies for securing alternative funding for program expansion.					
26	Ability to use technology to design, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive guidance program.					
27	Ability to implement individual and group counseling for children and adolescents.					
28	Ability to implement classroom or group guidance designed to assist children and adolescents with developmental tasks.					
29	Ability to design and implement peer helper programs.					
30	Knowledge of issues which may affect the development and functioning of children and adolescents (e.g., substance abuse, eating disorders).					

		No Importance	Little Importance	Neutral	Moderate Importance	Great Importance
31	Knowledge of how to assist students and parents at points of educational transition (e.g., post-secondary education, career options).					
32	Ability to construct partnerships with families and communities in order to promote student success.					
33	Knowledge of systems theories and how systems interact to influence students.					
34	Ability to recognize and assist students who may use alcohol or other drugs.					
35	Ability to enhance teamwork within the school community.					
36	Ability to consult with parents, teachers, administrators, support staff, and community agency personnel.					
37	Ability to empower families and communities to act on behalf of their children.					
38	Knowledge and skills in conducting programs that are designed to enhance students' developmental needs.					

PART 3: Additional School Counseling Knowledge Areas

Please list any additional competencies you would consider important if you were hiring a professional school counselor for your building(s).

Appendix B

School Administrators' Training Programs

School Administrators' Training Programs

Institution	# of administrators who attended	Percent
University of Pittsburgh	40	28
California Univ. of PA	25	18
Duquesne University	21	15
Indiana Univ. of PA	15	11
West Virginia University (WV)	8	6
Carlow University	6	4
Carnegie Mellon University	3	2
Westminster College	3	2
Franciscan University (OH)	2	1
Penn State University	2	1
Temple University	2	1
Bucknell University	1	.7
East Stroudsburg Univ. of PA	1	.7
Florida Atlantic University (FL)	1	.7
Kent State University	1	.7
Marshall University (WV)	1	.7
Nova Southeastern University (FL)	1	.7
Old Dominion University (VA)	1	.7
Saint Francis University	1	.7

Institution	# of administrators who attended	Percent
St. Joseph University	1	.7
Stephen F. Austin State University (TX)	1	.7
University of Virginia (VA)	1	.7
Institution not identified	4	3

Appendix C

Means for Gender

Means for Gender

	Males			Females			Total		
	Mean	N	Std. D	Mean	N	Std. D	Mean	N	Std. D
Q1	3.8310	71	1.0821	4.1549	71	.8392	3.9930	142	.9785
Q2	4.5775	71	.5519	4.8028	71	.5243	4.6901	142	.5482
Q3	4.3803	71	.7044	4.6056	71	.6432	4.4930	142	.6815
Q4	4.2394	71	.7647	4.1690	71	.8781	4.2042	142	.8212
Q5	4.7183	71	.5653	4.5493	71	.7129	4.6338	142	.6466
Q6	4.5775	71	.6015	4.6901	71	.5501	4.6338	142	.5771
Q7	4.7606	71	.5200	4.8310	71	.4777	4.7958	142	.4988
Q8	4.4930	71	.6519	4.7183	71	.5653	4.6056	142	.6184
Q9	4.5915	71	.6228	4.6479	71	.5372	4.6197	142	.5802
Q10	4.1831	71	.7984	4.1831	71	.8670	4.1831	142	.8304
Q11	4.6479	71	.6118	4.8028	71	.4007	4.7254	142	.5211
Q12	4.7606	71	.5468	4.8873	71	.3982	4.8239	142	.4808
Q13	4.4930	71	.6943	4.6056	71	.5727	4.5493	142	.6367
Q14	4.3239	71	.7324	4.5352	71	.6935	4.4296	142	.7185
Q15	4.2817	71	.6800	4.4366	71	.7118	4.3592	142	.6979
Q16	4.2817	71	.6800	4.3239	71	.7126	4.3028	142	.6943
Q17	4.3380	71	.7160	4.4930	71	.6519	4.4155	142	.6867
Q18	4.8169	71	.4570	4.9014	71	.3002	4.8592	142	.3876
Q19	4.3099	71	.6457	4.5352	71	.6725	4.4225	142	.6666
Q20	4.0704	71	.8506	4.1831	71	.8504	4.1268	142	.8494
Q21	4.2958	71	.7250	4.3662	71	.6599	4.3310	142	.6916
Q22	4.3803	71	.6180	4.5775	71	.5519	4.4789	142	.5921

	Males			Females			Total		
	Mean	N	Std. D	Mean	N	Std. D	Mean	N	Std. D
Q23	4.4648	71	.6510	4.5352	71	.7138	4.5000	142	.6816
Q24	4.1972	71	.8215	4.3803	71	.7244	4.2887	142	.7772
Q25	3.4648	71	1.0668	3.5915	71	.9498	3.5282	142	1.0084
Q26	4.0000	71	.8106	3.9296	71	.8672	3.9648	142	.8372
Q27	4.6620	71	.6749	4.7887	71	.4756	4.7254	142	.5852
Q28	4.5070	71	.6943	4.5915	71	.6454	4.5493	142	.6693
Q29	4.1972	71	.7294	4.3521	71	.6990	4.2746	142	.7160
Q30	4.6761	71	.5800	4.8310	71	.4468	4.7535	142	.5217
Q31	4.2958	71	.9007	4.1972	71	1.0773	4.2465	142	.9906
Q32	4.4085	71	.6882	4.6761	71	.6273	4.5423	142	.6697
Q33	3.7887	71	.8769	3.8310	71	.8942	3.8099	142	.8827
Q34	4.5915	71	.7668	4.8169	71	.4246	4.7042	142	.6278
Q35	4.5915	71	.5497	4.4789	71	.7341	4.5352	142	.6486
Q36	4.8310	71	.4468	4.8169	71	.4570	4.8239	142	.4504
Q37	4.4085	71	.6882	4.4789	71	.8428	4.4437	142	.7675
Q38	4.5070	71	.5574	4.6056	71	.7266	4.5563	142	.6471

Appendix D

Analysis of Variance for Gender

Analysis of Variance for Gender

Source	df	F	η	p
Q1	1	3.973	.166	.048
Q2	1	6.222	.206	.014
Q3	1	3.963	.166	.048
Q4	1	.260	.043	.611
Q5	1	2.450	.131	.120
Q6	1	1.357	.098	.246
Q7	1	.706	.071	.402
Q8	1	4.843	.183	.029
Q9	1	.333	.049	.565
Q10	1	.000	.000	1.000
Q11	1	3.187	.149	.076
Q12	1	2.493	.132	.117
Q13	1	1.113	.089	.293
Q14	1	3.115	.148	.080
Q15	1	1.759	.111	.187
Q16	1	.131	.031	.718
Q17	1	1.818	.113	.180
Q18	1	1.696	.109	.195
Q19	1	4.148	.170	.044
Q20	1	.623	.067	.431
Q21	1	.366	.051	.546
Q22	1	4.021	.167	.047
Q23	1	.377	.052	.540

Source	df	F	η	p
Q24	1	1.984	.118	.161
Q25	1	.559	.063	.456
Q26	1	.250	.042	.618
Q27	1	1.674	.109	.198
Q28	1	.564	.063	.454
Q29	1	1.670	.109	.198
Q30	1	3.179	.149	.077
Q31	1	.350	.050	.555
Q32	1	5.863	.200	.017
Q33	1	.081	.024	.777
Q34	1	4.694	.180	.032
Q35	1	1.072	.087	.302
Q36	1	.034	.016	.853
Q37	1	.297	.046	.586
Q38	1	.823	.076	.366

Appendix E

Means for School Level

Means for School Level

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q1	Elem	84	4.1548	.9377
	MS/JrH	29	3.8621	.9533
	HS	25	3.8400	.8981
	Comb	4	2.5000	1.2910
Q2	Elem	84	4.7381	.5404
	MS/JrH	29	4.7586	.4355
	HS	25	4.5600	.6506
	Comb	4	4.0000	.0000
Q3	Elem	84	4.5952	.6232
	MS/JrH	29	4.3103	.7608
	HS	25	4.4400	.5831
	Comb	4	4.0000	1.4142
Q4	Elem	84	4.2024	.8751
	MS/JrH	29	4.2759	.7510
	HS	25	4.1200	.7810
	Comb	4	4.2500	.5000
Q5	Elem	84	4.4881	.7027
	MS/JrH	29	4.8276	.3844
	HS	25	4.9600	.2000
	Comb	4	4.2500	1.5000
Q6	Elem	84	4.7262	.5230
	MS/JrH	29	4.4828	.5745
	HS	25	4.5600	.6506
	Comb	4	4.2500	.9574

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q7	Elem	84	4.8214	.4698
	MS/JrH	29	4.6897	.6038
	HS	25	4.8400	.4726
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000
Q8	Elem	84	4.6190	.6382
	MS/JrH	29	4.5172	.5745
	HS	25	4.6800	.5568
	Comb	4	4.5000	1.0000
Q9	Elem	84	4.5714	.6264
	MS/JrH	29	4.6897	.4708
	HS	25	4.7200	.5416
	Comb	4	4.5000	.5774
Q10	Elem	84	4.0833	.8810
	MS/JrH	29	4.1379	.6930
	HS	25	4.4800	.7703
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000
Q11	Elem	84	4.7262	.5455
	MS/JrH	29	4.6897	.4708
	HS	25	4.7600	.5228
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000
Q12	Elem	84	4.8690	.3732
	MS/JrH	29	4.7586	.5766
	HS	25	4.7600	.6633
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q13	Elem	84	4.6190	.5788
	MS/JrH	29	4.4138	.6823
	HS	25	4.5600	.5831
	Comb	4	4.0000	1.4142
Q14	Elem	84	4.5238	.7194
	MS/JrH	29	4.3448	.6695
	HS	25	4.3200	.6904
	Comb	4	3.7500	.9574
Q15	Elem	84	4.4524	.6659
	MS/JrH	29	4.2414	.7863
	HS	25	4.3200	.6272
	Comb	4	3.5000	.5774
Q16	Elem	84	4.3690	.7244
	MS/JrH	29	4.2414	.6356
	HS	25	4.2400	.6633
	Comb	4	3.7500	.5000
Q17	Elem	84	4.5595	.5881
	MS/JrH	29	4.3103	.7608
	HS	25	4.2800	.6782
	Comb	4	3.0000	.0000
Q18	Elem	84	4.8810	.3258
	MS/JrH	29	4.7586	.5110
	HS	25	4.9200	.4000
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q19	Elem	84	4.4048	.6963
	MS/JrH	29	4.3793	.5615
	HS	25	4.6800	.5568
	Comb	4	3.5000	.5774
Q20	Elem	84	4.1429	.8801
	MS/JrH	29	4.0690	.8422
	HS	25	4.2400	.7789
	Comb	4	3.5000	.5774
Q21	Elem	84	4.4048	.6423
	MS/JrH	29	4.1724	.7592
	HS	25	4.3600	.7000
	Comb	4	3.7500	.9574
Q22	Elem	84	4.5595	.5672
	MS/JrH	29	4.3793	.6219
	HS	25	4.3200	.6272
	Comb	4	4.5000	.5774
Q23	Elem	84	4.4286	.7806
	MS/JrH	29	4.4828	.5085
	HS	25	4.7600	.4359
	Comb	4	4.5000	.5774
Q24	Elem	84	4.3095	.8356
	MS/JrH	29	4.3103	.7123
	HS	25	4.3200	.5568
	Comb	4	3.5000	1.0000

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q25	Elem	84	3.6190	1.0049
	MS/JrH	29	3.4138	1.0183
	HS	25	3.3600	.9950
	Comb	4	3.5000	1.2910
Q26	Elem	84	3.9643	.8565
	MS/JrH	29	3.8621	.8752
	HS	25	4.0400	.7895
	Comb	4	4.2500	.5000
Q27	Elem	84	4.8333	.4345
	MS/JrH	29	4.6897	.5414
	HS	25	4.4000	.9129
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000
Q28	Elem	84	4.7143	.5047
	MS/JrH	29	4.4483	.6317
	HS	25	4.1600	.9866
	Comb	4	4.2500	.5000
Q29	Elem	84	4.4405	.6466
	MS/JrH	29	4.0000	.8018
	HS	25	4.1200	.6658
	Comb	4	3.7500	.9574
Q30	Elem	84	4.7857	.5393
	MS/JrH	29	4.6552	.4837
	HS	25	4.7600	.5228
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q31	Elem	84	4.0238	1.0639
	MS/JrH	29	4.3103	.9298
	HS	25	4.8800	.4397
	Comb	4	4.5000	.5774
Q32	Elem	84	4.5714	.6817
	MS/JrH	29	4.3448	.7209
	HS	25	4.6400	.5686
	Comb	4	4.7500	.5000
Q33	Elem	84	3.9643	.8977
	MS/JrH	29	3.5517	.9482
	HS	25	3.7200	.6137
	Comb	4	3.0000	.8165
Q34	Elem	84	4.6429	.7053
	MS/JrH	29	4.7586	.5110
	HS	25	4.8000	.5000
	Comb	4	5.0000	.0000
Q35	Elem	84	4.5000	.6855
	MS/JrH	29	4.5172	.6877
	HS	25	4.6800	.4761
	Comb	4	4.5000	.5774
Q36	Elem	84	4.7857	.4926
	MS/JrH	29	4.8621	.3509
	HS	25	4.8800	.4397
	Comb	4	5.0000	.0000

	Level	N	Mean	Std. D
Q37	Elem	84	4.4405	.8118
	MS/JrH	29	4.3448	.7689
	HS	25	4.6000	.5774
	Comb	4	4.2500	.9574
Q38	Elem	84	4.6190	.6568
	MS/JrH	29	4.4138	.6823
	HS	25	4.6000	.5774
	Comb	4	4.0000	.0000

Appendix F

Analysis of Variance for School Level

Analysis of Variance for School Level

Source	df	F	η	p
Q1	3	4.569	.206	.004
Q2	3	3.079	.137	.030
Q3	3	2.122	.207	.100
Q4	3	.163	.064	.921
Q5	3	5.330	.291	.002
Q6	3	2.158	.208	.096
Q7	3	.583	.119	.627
Q8	3	.365	.103	.778
Q9	3	.635	.109	.594
Q10	3	2.172	.188	.094
Q11	3	.084	.050	.969
Q12	3	.599	.114	.617
Q13	3	1.799	.176	.150
Q14	3	2.047	.159	.110
Q15	3	2.938	.176	.036
Q16	3	1.250	.117	.294
Q17	3	8.663	.254	.000
Q18	3	1.051	.158	.372
Q19	3	4.113	.181	.008
Q20	3	.928	.090	.429
Q21	3	1.813	.164	.148
Q22	3	1.406	.173	.244
Q23	3	1.544	.166	.206

Source	df	F	η	p
Q24	3	1.427	.049	.238
Q25	3	.579	.109	.630
Q26	3	.363	.050	.780
Q27	3	3.778	.265	.012
Q28	3	5.486	.315	.001
Q29	3	4.313	.282	.006
Q30	3	.446	.102	.720
Q31	3	5.415	.328	.001
Q32	3	1.204	.143	.311
Q33	3	3.016	.222	.032
Q34	3	.827	.119	.481
Q35	3	.504	.115	.680
Q36	3	.599	.103	.617
Q37	3	.586	.126	.625
Q38	3	1.785	.154	.153

Appendix G

Regression Analysis for School Level

Regression Analysis for School Level

Source	df	F	p
Q1	1	8.913	.003
Q2	1	5.268	.023
Q5	1	7.015	.009
Q15	1	4.863	.029
Q17	1	15.787	.000
Q19	1	.006	.937
Q27	1	8.328	.005
Q28	1	15.594	.000
Q29	1	9.368	.003
Q31	1	13.947	.000
Q33	1	5.858	.017

Appendix H

Post Hoc Analysis

Post Hoc Analysis

		(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q1	Bonferroni	1	2	.2927	.2032	.912
			3	.3148	.2149	.872
			4	1.6548	.4828	.005
		2	1	-.2927	.2032	.912
			3	2.207E-02	.2574	1.000
			4	1.3621	.5031	.046
		3	1	-.3148	.2149	.872
			2	-2.2069E-02	.2574	1.000
			4	1.3400	.5080	.056
		4	1	-1.6548	.4828	.005
			2	-1.3621	.5031	.046
			3	-1.3400	.5080	.056
Q2	Bonferroni	1	2	-2.0525E-02	.1155	1.000
			3	.1781	.1222	.884
			4	.7381	.2745	.048
		2	1	2.053E-02	.1155	1.000
			3	.1986	.1464	1.000
			4	.7586	.2861	.054
		3	1	-.1781	.1222	.884
			2	-.1986	.1464	1.000
			4	.5600	.2889	.328
		4	1	-.7381	.2745	.048
			2	-.7586	.2861	.054
			3	-.5600	.2889	.328

		(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q5	Bonferroni	1	2	-.3395	.1333	.072
			3	-.4719	.1410	.006
			4	.2381	.3167	1.000
		2	1	.3395	.1333	.072
			3	-.1324	.1689	1.000
			4	.5776	.3300	.494
		3	1	.4719	.1410	.006
			2	.1324	.1689	1.000
			4	.7100	.3332	.209
		4	1	-.2381	.3167	1.000
			2	-.5776	.3300	.494
			3	-.7100	.3332	.209
Q15	Bonferroni	1	2	.2110	.1473	.926
			3	.1324	.1558	1.000
			4	.9524	.3500	.044
		2	1	-.2110	.1473	.926
			3	-7.8621E-02	.1867	1.000
			4	.7414	.3648	.264
		3	1	-.1324	.1558	1.000
			2	7.862E-02	.1867	1.000
			4	.8200	.3683	.166
		4	1	-.9524	.3500	.044
			2	-.7414	.3648	.264
			3	-.8200	.3683	.166

		(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q17	Bonferroni	1	2	.2492	.1371	.428
			3	.2795	.1451	.336
			4	1.5595	.3259	.000
		2	1	-.2492	.1371	.428
			3	3.034E-02	.1738	1.000
			4	1.3103	.3396	.001
		3	1	-.2795	.1451	.336
			2	-3.0345E-02	.1738	1.000
			4	1.2800	.3429	.002
		4	1	-1.5595	.3259	.000
			2	-1.3103	.3396	.001
			3	-1.2800	.3429	.002
Q27	Bonferroni	1	2	.1437	.1225	1.000
			3	.4333	.1296	.006
			4	8.333E-02	.2910	1.000
		2	1	-.1437	.1225	1.000
			3	.2897	.1552	.385
			4	-6.0345E-02	.3033	1.000
		3	1	-.4333	.1296	.006
			2	-.2897	.1552	.385
			4	-.3500	.3062	1.000
		4	1	-8.3333E-02	.2910	1.000
			2	6.034E-02	.3033	1.000
			3	.3500	.3062	1.000

		(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q28	Bonferroni	1	2	.2660	.1377	.333
			3	.5543	.1457	.001
			4	.4643	.3272	.949
		2	1	-.2660	.1377	.333
			3	.2883	.1745	.605
			4	.1983	.3411	1.000
		3	1	-.5543	.1457	.001
			2	-.2883	.1745	.605
			4	-9.0000E-02	.3443	1.000
		4	1	-.4643	.3272	.949
			2	-.1983	.3411	1.000
			3	9.000E-02	.3443	1.000
Q29	Bonferroni	1	2	.4405	.1491	.022
			3	.3205	.1577	.264
			4	.6905	.3542	.320
		2	1	-.4405	.1491	.022
			3	-.1200	.1889	1.000
			4	.2500	.3691	1.000
		3	1	-.3205	.1577	.264
			2	.1200	.1889	1.000
			4	.3700	.3727	1.000
		4	1	-.6905	.3542	.320
			2	-.2500	.3691	1.000
			3	-.3700	.3727	1.000

		(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Q31	Bonferroni	1	2	-.2865	.2040	.974
			3	-.8562	.2158	.001
			4	-.4762	.4847	1.000
		2	1	.2865	.2040	.974
			3	-.5697	.2585	.175
			4	-.1897	.5052	1.000
		3	1	.8562	.2158	.001
			2	.5697	.2585	.175
			4	.3800	.5101	1.000
		4	1	.4762	.4847	1.000
			2	.1897	.5052	1.000
			3	-.3800	.5101	1.000
Q33	Bonferroni	1	2	.4126	.1862	.170
			3	.2443	.1969	1.000
			4	.9643	.4424	.186
		2	1	-.4126	.1862	.170
			3	-.1683	.2359	1.000
			4	.5517	.4610	1.000
		3	1	-.2443	.1969	1.000
			2	.1683	.2359	1.000
			4	.7200	.4655	.745
		4	1	-.9643	.4424	.186
			2	-.5517	.4610	1.000
			3	-.7200	.4655	.745

Appendix I

Means for Years of Administrative Experience

Means for Years of Administrative Experience

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q1	1 - 5	40	3.9500	1.0610
	6 - 10	40	3.8750	1.0424
	11 - 15	31	4.0968	.8309
	16 or more	31	4.0968	.9436
Q2	1 - 5	40	4.7000	.5164
	6 - 10	40	4.7250	.5057
	11 - 15	31	4.6129	.6672
	16 or more	31	4.7097	.5287
Q3	1 - 5	40	4.5250	.7157
	6 - 10	40	4.5500	.5970
	11 - 15	31	4.4516	.7676
	16 or more	31	4.4194	.6720
Q4	1 - 5	40	4.2500	.8397
	6 - 10	40	4.2250	.6197
	11 - 15	31	4.1935	.9805
	16 or more	31	4.1290	.8848
Q5	1 - 5	40	4.6000	.5905
	6 - 10	40	4.5500	.7494
	11 - 15	31	4.7097	.6925
	16 or more	31	4.7097	.5287

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q6	1 - 5	40	4.6000	.5905
	6 - 10	40	4.5750	.5943
	11 - 15	31	4.8065	.4016
	16 or more	31	4.5806	.6720
Q7	1 - 5	40	4.8500	.4267
	6 - 10	40	4.7250	.5986
	11 - 15	31	4.8065	.4774
	16 or more	31	4.8065	.4774
Q8	1 - 5	40	4.6000	.6325
	6 - 10	40	4.6500	.5796
	11 - 15	31	4.6129	.6152
	16 or more	31	4.5484	.6752
Q9	1 - 5	40	4.7000	.4641
	6 - 10	40	4.5750	.5495
	11 - 15	31	4.7097	.6426
	16 or more	31	4.4839	.6768
Q10	1 - 5	40	4.1000	.8412
	6 - 10	40	4.1000	.9282
	11 - 15	31	4.2903	.9016
	16 or more	31	4.2903	.5884
Q11	1 - 5	40	4.6250	.6675
	6 - 10	40	4.7750	.4229
	11 - 15	31	4.7742	.4250
	16 or more	31	4.7419	.5143

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q12	1 - 5	40	4.7250	.6400
	6 - 10	40	4.8750	.4043
	11 - 15	31	4.9355	.2497
	16 or more	31	4.7742	.4973
Q13	1 - 5	40	4.4500	.6775
	6 - 10	40	4.5750	.6360
	11 - 15	31	4.7097	.4614
	16 or more	31	4.4839	.7244
Q14	1 - 5	40	4.3000	.7910
	6 - 10	40	4.5250	.6400
	11 - 15	31	4.2581	.8152
	16 or more	31	4.6452	.5507
Q15	1 - 5	40	4.3250	.6155
	6 - 10	40	4.3250	.7642
	11 - 15	31	4.3871	.7606
	16 or more	31	4.4194	.6720
Q16	1 - 5	40	4.2250	.6975
	6 - 10	40	4.2500	.7071
	11 - 15	31	4.2903	.6925
	16 or more	31	4.4839	.6768
Q17	1 - 5	40	4.4750	.6400
	6 - 10	40	4.2500	.7425
	11 - 15	31	4.4516	.6752
	16 or more	31	4.5161	.6768

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q18	1 - 5	40	4.7750	.5305
	6 - 10	40	4.9000	.3038
	11 - 15	31	4.9032	.3005
	16 or more	31	4.8710	.3408
Q19	1 - 5	40	4.3750	.6279
	6 - 10	40	4.5250	.5986
	11 - 15	31	4.3548	.7978
	16 or more	31	4.4194	.6720
Q20	1 - 5	40	4.1250	.8825
	6 - 10	40	4.0750	.8590
	11 - 15	31	4.0323	.8750
	16 or more	31	4.2903	.7829
Q21	1 - 5	40	4.2750	.7506
	6 - 10	40	4.2250	.6975
	11 - 15	31	4.3548	.7094
	16 or more	31	4.5161	.5699
Q22	1 - 5	40	4.4750	.6789
	6 - 10	40	4.3750	.5401
	11 - 15	31	4.6129	.5584
	16 or more	31	4.4839	.5699
Q23	1 - 5	40	4.6250	.5401
	6 - 10	40	4.4500	.6775
	11 - 15	31	4.3871	.7606
	16 or more	31	4.5161	.7690

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q24	1 - 5	40	4.3500	.8022
	6 - 10	40	4.2500	.6699
	11 - 15	31	4.1935	.9099
	16 or more	31	4.3548	.7549
Q25	1 - 5	40	3.3750	1.1916
	6 - 10	40	3.6750	1.0473
	11 - 15	31	3.4516	.7676
	16 or more	31	3.6129	.9193
Q26	1 - 5	40	3.9250	.7970
	6 - 10	40	3.9500	.8458
	11 - 15	31	4.0645	.9286
	16 or more	31	3.9355	.8139
Q27	1 - 5	40	4.6750	.7642
	6 - 10	40	4.6250	.5856
	11 - 15	31	4.7742	.4250
	16 or more	31	4.8710	.4275
Q28	1 - 5	40	4.4000	.7779
	6 - 10	40	4.5000	.7161
	11 - 15	31	4.6774	.5408
	16 or more	31	4.6774	.5408
Q29	1 - 5	40	4.2250	.7334
	6 - 10	40	4.2000	.6869
	11 - 15	31	4.4194	.7648
	16 or more	31	4.2903	.6925

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q30	1 - 5	40	4.7250	.5057
	6 - 10	40	4.6750	.5723
	11 - 15	31	4.8387	.3739
	16 or more	31	4.8065	.6011
Q31	1 - 5	40	4.3250	1.0952
	6 - 10	40	4.2750	.9334
	11 - 15	31	4.0323	1.1101
	16 or more	31	4.3226	.7911
Q32	1 - 5	40	4.6500	.5796
	6 - 10	40	4.6000	.5905
	11 - 15	31	4.3871	.8437
	16 or more	31	4.4839	.6768
Q33	1 - 5	40	3.8500	1.0013
	6 - 10	40	3.7750	.8317
	11 - 15	31	3.6452	.9504
	16 or more	31	3.9677	.7063
Q34	1 - 5	40	4.7250	.5541
	6 - 10	40	4.8500	.4267
	11 - 15	31	4.6452	.7094
	16 or more	31	4.5484	.8099
Q35	1 - 5	40	4.5750	.6360
	6 - 10	40	4.5000	.7161
	11 - 15	31	4.5484	.6752
	16 or more	31	4.5161	.5699

	Experience (years)	N	Mean	Std. D
Q36	1 - 5	40	4.9000	.3789
	6 - 10	40	4.7750	.5305
	11 - 15	31	4.8387	.3739
	16 or more	31	4.7742	.4973
Q37	1 - 5	40	4.4250	.6751
	6 - 10	40	4.5000	.6405
	11 - 15	31	4.3548	1.1416
	16 or more	31	4.4839	.5699
Q38	1 - 5	40	4.6000	.5905
	6 - 10	40	4.5750	.5943
	11 - 15	31	4.4516	.8884
	16 or more	31	4.5806	.5016

Appendix J

Analysis of Variance for Years of Administrative Experience

Analysis of Variance for Years of Administrative Experience

Source	df	F	η	p
Q1	3	.433	.447	.720
Q2	3	8.309E-02	.272	.845
Q3	3	.131	.277	.842
Q4	3	9.329E-02	.136	.939
Q5	3	.228	.540	.656
Q6	3	.399	1.202	.312
Q7	3	.108	.430	.732
Q8	3	6.108E-02	.157	.925
Q9	3	.387	1.153	.330
Q10	3	.422	.606	.612
Q11	3	.195	.712	.546
Q12	3	.319	1.393	.248
Q13	3	.450	1.114	.346
Q14	3	1.130	2.246	.086
Q15	3	7.662E-02	.154	.927
Q16	3	.458	.950	.419
Q17	3	.531	1.128	.340
Q18	3	.138	.918	.434
Q19	3	.218	.484	.694
Q20	3	.404	.555	.645
Q21	3	.552	1.157	.329
Q22	3	.330	.940	.423
Q23	3	.376	.806	.492
Q24	3	.209	.341	.796

Source	df	F	η	p
Q25	3	.735	.718	.543
Q26	3	.136	.190	.903
Q27	3	.412	1.208	.309
Q28	3	.669	1.509	.215
Q29	3	.326	.631	.596
Q30	3	.197	.720	.542
Q31	3	.627	.634	.594
Q32	3	.483	1.079	.360
Q33	3	.576	.734	.533
Q34	3	.576	1.476	.224
Q35	3	4.320E-02	.101	.959
Q36	3	.137	.670	.572
Q37	3	.145	.243	.867
Q38	3	.149	.352	.788

Appendix K

Comments from Part 3 of Questionnaire

Comments from Part 3 of Questionnaire

In Part 3 of the Professional School Counselors' Competencies' questionnaire, school administrators were asked to list additional competencies they would consider important if hiring a school counselor. The 64 separate statements were clustered into the similar categories that are listed below.

Personal traits

1. True love and compassion for children
2. Inviting–supportive friend of children–one that they will trust and seek assistance
3. Willingness to be generous with their time
4. Compassion must be evident
5. Professionalism. Personality. Confidence. Poise
6. Warm, caring, and compassionate–a vested interest in the children
7. Strong personal skills
8. Character attributes (honesty, confidentiality, integrity)
9. Student-focused (advocate for the right things)
10. Willing to spend additional time/extra effort for kids
11. It's a big job! The other essential attribute is a genuine commitment to and affection for the children. Counselors w/o empathy are not very effective & (related to #11) run out of energy
12. One who shows compassion for students and lets them know they can count on them in any situation
13. The 38 listed are all expected competencies. Being a self-starter is

the key! (From traits of professional ed.)

14. Flexible
15. Flexibility
16. Flexible
17. Initiative
18. Conscientious
19. Thorough

Specific counseling topics

1. Knowledge of the PSSA and the grading process involved in the PSSA examinations
2. Knowledge of other achievement testing programs
3. Really - Interpret data from PSSA to assist in driving instruction
4. Experience in data driven decision making
5. Ability to disseminate standardized test data
6. Knowledge of state standards and benchmarks and the ability to interpret this test data to impact curriculum revision/change.
7. Ability to read, analyze, understand, plan and implement data to enhance student learning.
8. Knowledge and administration of standardized test
9. Ability to know & understand testing/assessment procedures (i.e. PSSA/ Terra Novas/Developmental Tests . . .)
10. Organization skills – test coordinating
11. That they be able to assist with the group of SAT and PSSA tests,

and be responsible for counting, distributing and collecting/packaging these tests

12. Prepare and organize standardized (state and national) tests/assessments
13. Ability to deal with child abuse (from counseling org. and issues)
14. Conflict resolution strategies. Bully issues (from counseling org. & issues)

Counseling organizations

1. Member of the American School Counseling Association
2. Understanding of the ASCA model based on data

Interpersonal Skills

1. Ability to get along with colleagues
2. Exceptional communication skills
3. Communication skills, communication skills
4. This person needs to be able to collaborate with teachers, administration and families
5. The ability to work with a wide variety of clients, who often have conflicting goals, in multi-tasks situations
6. #36 needs to go beyond consultation to real collaboration. In my experience, the issues are many & complex and require a high level of teamwork to even make a dent!

General platitudes

1. Knowledge of district policies and procedures

2. Experience!!
3. Continuing education
4. Leadership Initiative Creativity
5. Knowledge of middle school concept & “teaming component”
6. Needs excellent time management & organization skills
7. Software use
8. Technology skills - word, excel, etc.

Administrators added fifteen additional competencies that are actually inconsistent, or even contradictory to the school counselor’s role and responsibility according to the American School Counseling Association.

1. Scheduling/grading
2. Knowledge of scheduling and ability to design and implement
3. Student scheduling procedures
4. Ability to schedule
5. Complete knowledge/understanding/ability to develop a master schedule from beginning to end
6. To be able at times to act as an extension of the administrative team
7. Leadership to handle the “quasi-administrative” that counselors often assume
8. Knowledge and application of various discipline theories with students
9. The ability to conduct inservice trainings to school, community, etc.

in areas of discipline

10. Knowledge–IDEA
11. Learning support–IEP knowledge. How to manage 504s for students
12. Special education laws and procedures
13. Knowledge of laws concerning attendance issues (truancy)
14. Coordinate school-wide programs i.e. attendance improvement
15. Knowledge of our attendance policies in school and the court system. Ex. CYF, foster parents, attendance issues