

Perceptions of School Principals on the School Counselor Role

Caitlin Joanna Rose

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Counselor Education

Nancy E. Bodenhorn, Chair
Laura B. Farmer
William J. Glenn
Laura E. Welfare

February 4, 2019
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Principal, Administrator, Perception, School Counselor, ASCA, RAMP

Perceptions of School Principals on the School Counselor Role

Caitlin Joanna Rose

ABSTRACT

Throughout the past century, many changes in the conceptualization of the role of the school counselor have occurred. Although most states endorse a national model developed through the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), not all school and district personnel have changed their views of the school counselor role to the most current conceptualization, and there is a gap in the current literature regarding how school principals perceive the school counseling role. The purpose of this study was to examine principals' perceptions of what roles they believe the counselor serves and their perception of the importance of school counselors' roles at elementary and secondary levels, as well as to examine if the Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) designation in a school influences principal perception.

The ASCA model was used as the theoretical framework and the survey instrument was based on ASCA's appropriate and inappropriate list of school counseling activities. Perceptions of the importance of the counseling activities and perceptions of the extent to which the activities were actually being completed in school counseling programs were examined. The following research questions guided the study:

1. Are there differences in principals' perceptions of the school counseling role at the elementary and secondary school levels?
2. What are principals' current perceptions of the importance of school counseling roles?
3. What are principals' current perceptions of what roles the counselor is actually serving?

4. Are school counselors in RAMP designated schools perceived differently by principals than school counselors in non-RAMP schools?

There were three main findings. The first is that significant differences were found when comparing elementary and secondary principal perceptions. Secondary principals overall ranked all counseling activities, both appropriate and inappropriate, significantly higher in the categories of importance and actually completed; however, there were similarities in ratings between groups. The second is that appropriate activities were rated significantly higher than inappropriate activities by principals overall as well as the elementary principal group and secondary principal group. The third is that no significant differences were found overall in RAMP as compared to non-RAMP school principal perceptions. Discussion includes reviewing specific activities where perceptions differed; how these results fit with previous research; and implications for policy and practice, future research, and higher education.

Perceptions of School Principals on the School Counselor Role

Caitlin Joanna Rose

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Throughout the past century, many changes in the conceptualization of the role of the school counselor have occurred. Although most states endorse a national model developed through the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), not all school and district personnel have changed their views of the school counselor role to the most current conceptualization. The focus of this study was to gather current information on principal perceptions of appropriate and inappropriate school counselor activities based on the ASCA model. Differences were examined in principal perceptions at the elementary and secondary levels, and between appropriate and inappropriate activities to see if principals ranked appropriate activities more highly. Differences were also examined in schools with Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) designation and schools without RAMP designation. Results showed differences in perception between elementary and secondary principals, with secondary principals rating all counseling activities significantly higher than elementary school principals, although there were similarities in ratings between groups. Appropriate activities were rated significantly higher than inappropriate activities by principals overall as well as the elementary principal group and secondary principal group. There were no significant differences overall in RAMP versus non-RAMP school principal perceptions. Discussion includes reviewing specific activities where perceptions differed; how these results fit with previous research; and implications for policy and practice, future research, and higher education.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, Keith R. Rose, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my committee chair, Dr. Nancy Bodenhorn, for all of your support, guidance, and wisdom in advising me through this process. I could not have asked for a better advisor! I would also like to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. William Glenn, Dr. Laura Welfare, Dr. Laura Farmer and Dr. Carrie Sanders. Dr. Sanders stood in during my prospectus while Dr. Farmer was on leave. You all provided me with excellent suggestions and feedback to improve my writing, research, and paper overall. Thank you for taking the time to work with me and guide me through this process.

I would also like to acknowledge members of my family for supporting me through this process: my husband John and stepdaughter Bella, for understanding when I was working on this paper for what seemed like forever; my sweet little son John Keith (JK) for being a perfect baby; my sister Candace for supporting me always, providing technical support and spending hours helping me with formatting, and her husband Chris for supporting me always as well; my dear friend Kristin who is like family to me, who helped me through this process by going through it first and being a wonderful friend always; and my amazing and generous mother Susan, whom I would not have been able to do this without, for a variety of reasons.

Table of Contents

	Page #
Abstract (Academic)	ii
Abstract (General Audience)	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	x
List of Tables	xi
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	5
<i>Research questions</i>	5
Definition of Terms	6
Assumptions	8
Limitations	9
Chapter II: Review of the literature	10
The ASCA National Model	13
RAMP Designation	16
Theoretical Framework	17
Empirical Support for the ASCA Model and RAMP Designation	18
Implications for the School Counselor Role	20

Review of Related Studies	22
Summary	35
Chapter III: Methods and Procedures.....	37
Research Instrument	37
Participants	42
Data	44
Summary	46
Chapter IV: Results.....	47
Preliminary and Descriptive Data Analysis	47
Primary Analysis	50
<i>Research Question 1</i>	51
<i>Research Question 2</i>	53
<i>Research Question 3</i>	63
<i>Research Question 4</i>	73
Summary	77
Chapter V: Discussion.....	78
Summary and Interpretation of Findings	79
Incorporation of Current Findings with Past Findings	89
Limitations of Current Study	94
Implications for Policy and Practice	96
Implications for Higher Education	98
Implications for Future Research	100
Conclusion	102

References	103
Appendices	
Appendix A: Administrator Questionnaire	109
Appendix B: Request for Permission to use Use the Administrator Questionnaire	111
Appendix C: Request for Permission to Modify the Administrator Questionnaire	112
Appendix D: Panel of Experts Invitation	113
Appendix E: Administrator Questionnaire- Revised	115
Appendix F: Invitation Email to Participants	119
Appendix G: Informed Consent for Participants	120
Appendix H: Follow-up Email Reminder	121
Appendix I: Qualtrics iQ Score for Surveys	122
Appendix J: Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Importance by School Level	123
Appendix K: Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Actual Engagement by School Level	126
Appendix L: Means and Standard Deviations of Importance and Actual Engagement by RAMP Status	129

List of Figures

Figure	Title	Page #
1	ASCA Model	14

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page #
1	Revised Counseling Activity Questions in the Administrator Questionnaire	40
2	Sample Descriptives	48
3	Means and Standard Deviations of Aggregate Scores by School Level	51
4	Tasks Ranked by Importance (All)	53
5	Tasks Ranked by Importance (Elementary)	55
6	Tasks Ranked By Importance (Secondary)	56
7	Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (All)	58
8	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (All)	58
9	Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Elementary)	59
10	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Elementary)	60
11	Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Secondary)	61
12	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Secondary)	62
13	Means and Standard Deviations of Importance for Appropriate and Inappropriate Tasks	63
14	Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (All)	64
15	Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Elementary)	65
16	Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Secondary)	66
17	Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (All)	68
18	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (All)	68
19	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Elementary)	69

20	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Elementary)	70
21	Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Secondary)	71
22	Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Secondary)	72
23	Means and Standard Deviations of Appropriate and Inappropriate Actual Tasks	73
24	Means and Standard Deviations of Principal Perceptions by RAMP status	74
25	Means and Standard of Perceived Importance and Actual Engagement by RAMP and non-RAMP	75

Chapter I

Introduction

The school counseling profession has experienced many changes in implementation of the school counselor role. Over the past century, the school counselor has moved from a narrow role to provide specific services to specific students, to a comprehensive, developmental guidance specialist who identifies first as an educator and is necessary within the schools to help increase student achievement. This move has been necessary in a time of high stakes testing, budget cuts, and accountability for all professionals who work in a school setting. Unfortunately, some school counseling professionals have been reduced or replaced by other professionals including social workers or other mental health professionals, because not all school counseling programs are making the transition to demonstrate accountability (Roberts, Coursol & Morotti, 1997; Zalaquette & Chatters, 2012). Stakeholders not familiar with the purpose of the school counselor may view the role as “consisting primarily of administrative duties, career counseling, and testing” (Davis & Garrett, 1998, p. 54). Principals, administrators, and other leaders in the schools may not be aware of what counselors are trained to do in schools and what they can accomplish with students if they are unencumbered and free of additional, non-related or administrative duties. In many cases, school principals continue to assign non-counseling related duties to school counselors (Luewerke, Walker & Shi, 2009).

The way that principals perceive the role of the counselor is essential to what school counselors can accomplish in their roles. Research has shown that school principals are critical in developing and maintaining a successful program as well as successful school counselors (Zalaquett, 2005). In order to address the ambiguity of the school counseling role, the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), the school counseling national professional

organization, published the initial National Model in 2003. The ASCA model consists of guidelines and standards considered best practices for school counseling departments across the country. Not all school districts and schools are using or promoting the ASCA model or standards. However, there has been a large increase in adoption of the model since the initial development (Dodson, 2009; Martin, Carey, & Decoster, 2009). The ASCA Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP), was also developed in 2003. Since that time, hundreds of schools across the nation have become RAMP designated schools. Research demonstrates that the ASCA model and RAMP designation make a significant difference in student achievement and other educational outcomes (Whiston & Quinby, 2009; Wilkerson, Perusse, & Hughes, 2013; Martin & Carey, 2014). Accountability is a critical component of the national model. School counselors are encouraged to answer the question, “How are students different as a result of the school counseling program?” (ASCA, 2012, p. 99).

It is important to note that although hundreds of schools have become RAMP designated schools and many districts promote the ASCA model, in the larger picture of education, the number of schools with current RAMP designation or who have been RAMP designated in the past is extremely small. According to the Institute of Educational Sciences, there were 98,175 public schools in the United States in the 2014-15 school year (Institute of Educational Sciences, 2018). The number of schools that have achieved RAMP designated since the program's inception is 669 as of 2017 according to ASCA (J. Cook, personal communication, Feb. 17, 2017). RAMP designation is something that although considered best practice by ASCA, has yet to become typical practice nationally. ASCA alignment, however, is becoming more common, and as ASCA alignment increases, RAMP designation should increase as well. There have been approximately 160 school districts since October 2015 that have offered training on the ASCA

model to school counselors (J. Walsh, personal communication, Nov. 13, 2018). Therefore, it is important to study the impact of RAMP designation now since it is growing, to see if it is making the difference that it is intended to make.

Statement of the Problem

Principals' perceptions of school counselors have not been well researched, particularly recently. Given that over the past several years many schools and districts have implemented the ASCA model and standards, as well as become RAMP designated schools, more research is needed to determine if the ASCA model and particularly RAMP is making a difference not just for the students, but also for counselors in the way they are viewed and treated within the schools that they work. This research is important and meaningful because it will shed light on if the ASCA model, which is considered to be the best practice in school counseling, is making a difference in terms of how school counselors and the overall profession is perceived by principals. These perceptions have a direct link to what school counselors are able to accomplish with students, since principals commonly dictate what the roles and responsibilities of school counselors will be (Armstrong, MacDonald, & Stillo, 2010).

Dodson researched the impact of RAMP designation on school administrators' perceptions of school counselors (Dodson, 2009). The author specifically examined principals' and other school leaders' perceptions of the high school counselor role in RAMP designated high schools versus in high schools that were not RAMP designated. At the time of the study, RAMP designation was relatively new, and because of the lack of clarity that has always surrounded the counselor role and the administrator perceptions, it was timely to examine the perceptions and make comparisons to see if the RAMP process was making a difference in terms of role definition for counselors and administrative support for programs. The research was done in the

ten high schools nationally that at that time were RAMP designated, and in a comparison group of non-RAMP designated high schools in the geographic area of the Rocky Mountains that had similar demographics. The survey instrument, entitled “The Administrator Questionnaire”, was developed by the author using the ASCA model’s list of appropriate and inappropriate school counselor activities, as well input from a similar questionnaire used in a past study (Miles-Hastings, 1997).

The results indicated that RAMP administrators perceived that counselors are in the classrooms delivering guidance lessons, are counseling students with discipline issues, and are interpreting student records more so than non-RAMP administrators perceive counselors to be engaging in these activities. Additionally, the RAMP administrators believed that delivering guidance lessons, counseling students with discipline issues, and providing suggestions to teachers for better management of study hall were more important activities than non-RAMP administrators believed. The above listed differences were the only significant differences found. Overall, administrators believed counselors to be working with students on academic, career, and social/emotional development, and there were similarities in the ratings between the two sets of administrators (Dodson, 2009).

Dodson (2009) recommended that further studies be conducted at the middle and elementary levels, as there were 121 RAMP designated schools at these levels in 2008 after she conducted her study. Additionally, according to data from ASCA from February 2017, there were 229 high schools that had earned the designation since RAMP’s inception (J. Cook, personal communication, February 17, 2017). Since the 2009 study, shift has happened in the profession, but we do not have an understanding of how principals currently view the role of the school counselor, given the changes that have occurred.

Purpose of the Study

Due to a lack of recent and updated information on principals' perceptions of school counselor roles, a replication and expansion of Dodson's 2009 study would be timely, given that many more schools and districts have begun to use the national model and have become RAMP designated, and the ASCA model is in its fourteenth year of implementation. Research is needed not just on perceptions of school counselors at the high school level as Dodson researched, but also on principals' perceptions of school counselors at both secondary and elementary levels. This study would survey only principals, as other leaders in the schools may not be involved with supervision of school counseling departments and assignment of duties.

The purpose of this study is to examine principals' perceptions of what roles they believe the counselor serves and their perception of the importance of school counselors' roles at elementary and secondary levels, as well as to examine if RAMP designation in a school influences principal perception.

Research Questions

The proposed research questions are:

5. Are there differences in principals' perceptions of the school counseling role at the elementary and secondary school levels?
6. What are principals' current perceptions of the importance of school counseling roles?
7. What are principals' current perceptions of what roles the counselor is actually serving?
8. Are school counselors in RAMP designated schools perceived differently by principals than school counselors in non-RAMP schools?

The Administrator's Questionnaire, which Dodson (2009) used in her study, is proposed to examine current administrators' perceptions regarding the role of the counselor and to address the research questions. The Administrator's questionnaire was developed using the ASCA model's list of appropriate and inappropriate counselor activities. The ASCA National Model promotes a developmental and systemic approach to working with students and families, which has theoretical underpinnings of Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), as well as a merging of already existing school counseling models (Martin & Carey, 2014). Researching these questions using the Administrator's questionnaire would fill a gap in the recent research and would facilitate a better understanding of the most current state of the field of school counseling in terms of perceptions of the role. Understanding the current state will shed light on the needs of the field, including how to best partner with other educational professionals, especially principals and administrators; what type of advocacy is most needed at this point in time; and how the ASCA model has continued to impact the field.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for clarity in reading the study:

Administrator. A leader in an educational institution who typically holds a certification in supervision and leadership issued through the state. An administrator is responsible for supervision and evaluation of school staff, assigns duties within the school, and assists in overall management of the school in conjunction with other administrators in the school (Luewerke et al., 2009). Administrators can include principals, assistant principals, and directors of departments within schools and can also include superintendents and coordinators at the district level.

American School Counseling Association (ASCA). "ASCA supports school counselors'

efforts to help students focus on academic, career, and social/emotional development so they achieve success in school and are prepared to lead fulfilling lives as responsible members of society. ASCA provides professional development, publications and other resources, research and advocacy to professional school counselors around the globe” (ASCA, “About ASCA,” 2018, para. 1).

Counselor duties/activities. “School counselors should spend most of their time in direct service to and in contact with students. School counselors' duties are focused on the overall delivery of the total program through school counseling core curriculum, individual student planning and responsive services. A small amount of their time is devoted to indirect services called system support. Schools should eliminate or reassign certain inappropriate program tasks, if possible, so school counselors can focus on the prevention needs of their programs” (ASCA, “Role of the School Counselor,” 2018, para. 3). The national model includes a list of appropriate and inappropriate counselor activities (ASCA, 2012, p. 45)

Counselor role. “School counselors have a minimum of a master’s degree in school counseling, meet the state certification/licensure standards and abide by the laws of the state in which they are employed. They uphold the ethical and professional standards of ASCA and other applicable professional counseling associations and promote the development of the school counseling programs based on the following areas of the ASCA National Model: foundation, delivery, management, and accountability” (ASCA, “Role of the School Counselor,” 2018, para. 3).

Principal. A principal has all the qualifications of a school administrator and is ultimately responsible for running the school building and for supervision and evaluation of all staff and programs.

RAMP (Recognized ASCA model program). “Based on the “The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs,” the RAMP designation:

- Gives you the confidence that your program aligns with a nationally accepted and recognized model
- Helps you evaluate your program and identify areas for improvement
- Increases your skills and knowledge of school counseling
- Enhances your program’s efforts toward academic achievement and student success
- Identifies your school as an exemplary educational environment” (ASCA, 2012, p.147).

School Counselor. “School counselors are certified/licensed educators with the minimum of a master’s degree in school counseling and area uniquely qualified to address the developmental needs of all students through a comprehensive school counseling programs addressing the academic, career and personal/social development of all students” (ASCA, “Role of the School Counselor,” 2018, para. 1). School counselor and counselor will be used interchangeably in this paper.

Assumptions

It is assumed that the participants in the survey will answer the survey questions honestly, and provide accurate data that is useful and contributes to educational research. It is also assumed that the participants will be familiar at least to some extent with school counseling programs and have supervision over the school counseling program in their school building.

Limitations

Limitations of this study include that the schools selected to be studied will not be a random sample, because all RAMP school principals will be selected to be surveyed, and all comparison group schools will be selected in the same states as the RAMP schools. Additionally, participants may choose to not answer the survey, and the participants who do complete the survey may be the ones that have the strongest feelings on school counseling programs, either positive or negative.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Many changes have occurred in school counseling in elementary and secondary schools in the United States over the past century. The role has been influenced by what is going on at points in time in the country, what has been needed nationally, and major ideological and philosophical counseling model focus historically. The development of the ASCA standards (ASCA, 2003) and subsequently the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003) have called for a unification of practice in all schools across the country and include three areas of focus: academic, career development, and personal/social. It is important to understand how school counseling has evolved over the past century to understand the current state of affairs of school counseling within the education system.

School counseling started as vocational counseling in the early 1900s. Jesse B. Davis is considered one of the founders of school vocational and guidance programs. In 1907, he became a high school principal and worked with English teachers to begin teaching career development (Beesley & Frey, 2006). Also in the early 1900s, Frank Parsons, who is known as the "Father of Vocational Guidance", founded the Bureau of Vocational Guidance to help students learn about career opportunities and transition to work. His work led to the creation of the first school counselor positions, who were teachers that added vocational counseling duties to their teaching jobs (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The school counseling profession was slow to expand at first. As it expanded, individuals within the profession advocated for a broader approach that included focus on educational and psychological needs (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

Through the 1930s and 1940s, E.G. Williamson's directive approach to counseling was emphasized, which included setting goals, overcoming obstacles and achieving a satisfactory

lifestyle. During the 1940s, the directive approach was overshadowed by the Rogerian approach, which included non-directive, relationship oriented, and humanistic approaches, and led to the focus on a mental health model (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). During the 1950s and 1960s, the Cold War, the launch of Sputnik and passage of the National Defense Education Act created more of a demand for school counselors in a vocational role. School counselors were viewed as being able to identify and assist students into careers that would benefit the nation and keep America a competitive world force, and the focus shifted to include both vocational and mental health aspects (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). The American School Counseling Association (ASCA) was formed in 1953 as part of American Personnel and Guidance Association, which is now the American Counseling Association (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, ASCA promoted the professionalism of school counselors and advocated for the expansion of the profession, mainly due to the fact that declining K-12 student enrollment led to a reduction in force (Beesley & Frey, 2006). As a result, professional organizations including ASCA, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), and American Association of Counseling and Development (AACD) focused efforts on developing a strategic plan to redefine and clarify the counseling profession, which led to development of the ASCA standards in 1997 (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

In the 1990s, school counseling expanded to a comprehensive developmental and preventative focus, and emphasized cultural competence. Leaders within the field continued advocating for change and reform, due to the changing nature of the role, differences in practices in schools nationally, and lack of agreement among professional school counselors on what the vital functions of school counselors should be (Zagelbaum, Kruczek, Alexander, & Crethar, 2014). In 1996, The Education Trust held focus groups with various school counseling

stakeholders to begin the reform process (Education Trust, 1996). Both problems and solutions were identified for the field as well as school counseling training programs. Based on the results of the Education Trust focus groups and research, professionals and leaders within the field debated if the focus of the profession should be academic in nature, working with all students to help them succeed, or should focus more on mental health of students (Zagelbaum, et al., 2014). The direction that was taken was referred to as a “new vision” known as the Education Trust National Initiative for Transforming School Counseling (House & Hayes, 2002).

The “new vision” focused on academic achievement and success measured by the numbers of students completing high school prepared to choose from a variety of post-secondary options. The school counselor role according to the “new vision” was to advocate for educational opportunities for all students, and specifically for children from low socioeconomic statuses, and minority children. Due to these initiatives described, the profession shifted in emphasis from direct services with a small caseload to systemic change for all students. However, some leaders in the field continued to advocate for a counseling and mental health model (Zagelbaum et al., 2014).

The Education Trust also partnered with the National Center for Transforming School Counseling (TSC), in order to give school counseling professionals and stakeholders input into the discussion (Zagelbaum, et al., 2014). In addition, ASCA developed the National Model in 2003 to provide a framework for school counseling practices, and to attempt to unite the field. The ASCA National Model was a response to and aligned with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, a federal law that specified the creation of a national program to raise academic achievement for all students, by closing the achievement gap that exists between socially and/or economically disadvantaged students and students with more advantages (U.S Department of

Education, 2001). In addition, this model addressed the concerns of the Education Trust and TSC.

The ASCA National Model

The ASCA National Model was based on the National Standards for School Counseling Programs ASCA developed in 1997 (ASCA, 2003). These standards delineated the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students were expected to acquire in academic, career, and personal/social domains as a result of participating in a comprehensive school counseling program. In 2003, the comprehensive, developmental model was published. The most recent version was published in 2012 (ASCA, 2012) and is depicted in figure 1. The ASCA model calls for school counseling programs to be comprehensive, meaning the program functions as an integral part of the school; developmental, meaning the program is organized from a lifespan perspective; and proactive and preventative instead of reactive. The model also focuses on four different areas: foundation, delivery, management and accountability (ASCA, 2012).

Figure 1



The foundation of an ASCA aligned program includes the program focus, which is made up of a vision statement, a mission statement, and program goals. The program focus also includes the student and professional competencies vital to the school, selected by school counselors who crosswalk state and district standards with ASCA standards using data from previous years to identify what areas of focus are needed (ASCA, 2012).

The program delivery is accomplished through four different components, which include the guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services and system support. Some examples of activities included in the delivery of the program include structured guidance lessons in the classroom or in groups; individual academic, career, and personal planning; responsive services including individual and small group counseling; consultation, risk assessment, and referrals; and system support including administrative tasks, professional development, curriculum development, and program evaluation (ASCA, 2012).

Management of the program includes a focus on planning using data and calendars, annual agreements with administrators, assessing use of time, developing lesson and action plans, and gaining feedback with stakeholders through advisory council meetings.

Accountability includes analyzing data in order to determine what has worked, and making changes as needed to the overall program (ASCA, 2012).

The ASCA model also emphasizes that school counselors should implement the model with leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change as major themes to keep in mind. Counselors should focus their skills and knowledge to help lessen the achievement gap, reduce barriers to success, advocate for equity for all students, sensitize the entire school community to multicultural issues, ensure materials are not biased, and strive to understand how students interpret their environments. Ultimately, all school counseling functions should be focused on learning and student growth (ASCA, 2012).

Since the development of the initial ASCA standards in 1997 and the model in 2003, there have been updates including revisions of the model and changes in the standards in order to address feedback, streamline the model, and continue the focus on and support of a systemic, developmental model. In 2004, the ASCA Code of Ethics was revised to address equity issues including closing achievement and opportunity gaps, and ensuring all students had the opportunity utilize a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program. The most recent Code of Ethics was published in 2016 (ASCA, 2016). Additionally, in 2008, ASCA released competencies for school counselors focused on assisting school counseling programs to effectively implement school counseling programs based on the ASCA Model (ASCA, 2008).

The most recent version of the ASCA National Standards, Mindsets and Behaviors, was updated in 2015, in order to align with common core curriculum standards, which all but seven

states have adopted (ASCA, 2015). The states that have not adopted the common core curriculum will need to crosswalk state and districts standards with mindset and behavior standards in order to align as closely as possible with the new standards.

RAMP Designation

According to ASCA (2018), RAMP designation is a way to showcase the school counseling program in a school. The RAMP application process is a way to capture the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program. In order to apply for RAMP status, a school should have a program in place for a year in order to collect needed data for the application process. The application is online and templates are provided and must be used. The online application contains 12 application components that fall under the ASCA model's four areas of focus: Foundation, Delivery, Management, and Accountability. The first 11 components are: "Vision Statement, Mission Statement, School Counseling Program Goals, ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors for Student Success, Annual Agreement, Advisory Council, Calendars, School Counseling Core Curriculum: Results Report, Small-Group Responsive Services, Closing the Gap Results Report, and Program Evaluation Reflection" (ASCA, Application Process, para.4). A 300-750 word narrative must accompany the first 11 components to explain the component in depth in addition to providing the documentation that the component was completed. The last component, the program reflection, can be submitted in a 500-1500 word essay or a video or audio file of three-five minutes (ASCA, 2018).

RAMP applications are scored using a rubric which is available online. Each component is given a value from three to six points. The maximum number of points that an application can receive is 59 points, and schools must earn 54 points to pass. Review committees for the applications are made up of professional school counselors and assignments to which will review

which applications are completed randomly, and all decisions are final. RAMP designation is only valid for five school years, and after that time, schools must re-apply to maintain their RAMP designation (ASCA, 2018).

Theoretical Framework

The ASCA National Model promotes a developmental and systemic approach to working with students and families. The ASCA model calls for school counseling programs to be comprehensive, meaning the program functions as an integral part of the school; developmental, meaning the program is organized from a lifespan perspective; and proactive and preventative instead of reactive. The model is complex and contains several components within four related subsystems: foundation, delivery, management and accountability systems. ASCA developed the model by merging elements of existing models. The primary underpinnings of the systemic approach are based on the Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Ecological systems theory presumes that interactions between the individual and his/her environments shapes human development, and that in order to affect change for an individual, the individual's environmental systems must be considered and addressed. Additional underpinnings of the model (ASCA, 2012) are Gysbers and Henderson (2000), Johnson and Johnson (2001), and Myrick (2003).

Gysbers and Henderson (2000) discuss the four phases of developing a comprehensive guidance program, which include planning, designing, implementing, and evaluating. These four areas are similar to the four main components of the ASCA model- foundation, delivery, management, and accountability. The authors also focus on guiding counselors through the steps necessary to make the transition to a comprehensive, developmental guidance program and

present a model program based on the concept of life career development (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000).

Johnson and Johnson (2001) describe a systems approach to building a results-based program. The program elements they propose, which are similar to the ASCA model components listed under foundation, delivery, management, and accountability, include: mission statement, philosophy, conceptual model of guidance, goals, competencies, management (data) system, results agreement, needs assessment, results plan, monitoring system, advisory council, master calendar of events, and glossary (Johnson and Johnson, 2001).

Myrick (2003) presents a framework for counselors and identifies skills and experiences that are necessary for students to acquire to become successful. These skills and experiences identified are similar to the standards and competencies that the ASCA model endorses. Additionally, influences from Transforming School Counseling Initiative (Martin, 2002), the Education Trust (1996), No Child Left Behind (2001), and evidence-based school counseling (Dimmitt, Carey, & Hatch, 2007) that focused on data-driven practices and accountability, were incorporated into the model during its development (Martin & Carey, 2014). As a result, the ASCA National Model does not advocate a single approach or theory; instead, it represents a combination of evidence-based and research-based theories and practices that have been and continue to be applied as best practices in school counseling programs.

Empirical Support for the ASCA Model and RAMP Designation

Because the ASCA model is still relatively new to the field, and given the recent changes and continual updates, it is important to understand how the adoption of the national model by schools across the country has impacted the school counseling field over the past decade and a half and to discuss empirical support for the model.

In a national study, Martin et al. (2009) found that more states are endorsing and implementing comprehensive, developmentally-based counseling programs. Twenty-four states had adopted such model in 1998, and by 2008, the number of states adopting such models had grown to 44. This suggests that the ASCA national model has influenced the work occurring at the state level. In addition, Whiston and Quinby (2009) looked at the effectiveness of several school counseling interventions, not only individual counseling, group counseling, and achievement interventions. The authors found students performed significantly better in the areas of discipline, problem solving, and increasing career knowledge if they received a counseling intervention. They also found that interventions in academic areas were significant as well, and the most effective interventions were group interventions. These two studies support that schools using a comprehensive, data-driven counseling model display increased student achievement and better outcomes in career and personal/social areas (Martin et. al, 2009; Whiston & Quinby, 2009).

Two other statewide evaluations of school counseling programs also found that positive outcomes increased with the higher the alignment with the ASCA model. In a study of schools in the state of Nebraska, Carey, Harrington, Martin, and Hoffman (2012) found that schools that had counseling programs with delivery systems aligned with ASCA practices had lower suspension and discipline incident levels, higher math and reading scores, and higher attendance. In a similar study conducted in Utah, Carey, Harrington, Martin, and Stevens (2012) found that the higher the alignment of school counseling programs to a programmatic focus advocated by the ASCA model, the higher the average ACT score of students and the number of students taking the ACT. The results of these statewide studies suggest that schools implementing a delivery model focus have increased student engagement, fewer disciplinary problems and

higher student achievement, and schools implementing a programmatic focus have both increased achievement and more interest in college (Martin & Carey, 2014).

RAMP research has also shown that RAMP designation makes a difference in student achievement. In terms of looking at effectiveness of the programs that have adopted the model, Wilkerson et. al. (2013) studied Indiana schools using the ASCA national model and found that RAMP designated schools had significantly better achievement outcomes for students, in English/Language Arts and Math, at the elementary level. The authors recommended more research was needed at the middle and high school levels to see if RAMP designation impacted achievement in secondary levels.

Implications for the School Counselor Role

Since professionals within the school counseling field have had a challenging time agreeing on areas of focus within the profession, other educational professionals have been left confused and unsure as to what the role of the school counselor should be. Unfortunately, the evolution of school counseling is not well known to other educational professionals, including principals and administrators (Beesley & Frey, 2006). Despite increased usage and evidence of effectiveness of the national model in the research, there continues to be disagreement and ambiguity regarding the duties of the school counselor. There is evidence that principals are still asking counselors to perform duties and responsibilities that are not endorsed by ASCA, despite states adopting ASCA guidelines (Leuwerke et al., 2009). Counselors and principals do not receive the same training and do not overlap in terms of learning about each other's roles and perspectives while learning the essential roles and functions of the job during courses in college and graduate school (Armstrong et al., 2010). In addition, although districts may endorse the national model, ASCA standards and ASCA aligned programs, districts may only train school

counselors on implementation, and principals may not be informed of what the school counselor is supposed to be doing. It is important that school counselors are advocates for the profession and educate principals and other school stakeholders on what their role is, however, there are different factors that could prevent school counselors from convincing administrators if this is the main mode of communication about the role, including communication skills of the counselor and administrator, advocacy skills of the counselor, receptiveness of the principal, and factors out of anyone's control (Clemens, Shipp, & Kimbel, 2011). Principals many times have the discretion to do what is needed in the building, and if staffing is comprised, or the principal simply does not agree to assignments of mainly counseling-related tasks, school counselors may not be left with much choice but to do what is assigned.

Perceptions of principals and counselors regarding counselors' specific activities, professional roles, and use of time have been studied over the past two decades. Certain studies showed patterns that principals perceived school counselors were engaging or should be engaging in activities that are non-counselor related (Leuwerke, et al., 2009). Kirchner and Stechfield (2005) found that principals commonly named registration, testing, discipline, record keeping, and working with the special education program as important school counselor tasks. In 2004, Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan and Jones conducted a survey of elementary and secondary principals, and found that elementary principals believed counselors should be involved in test administration, record keeping, and additional duties, and that 80% of the secondary principals believed student registration, test administration, and maintenance of student records were appropriate school counselor activities. Additionally, Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, Milde, Leitner and Skelton (2006) conducted surveys of principals and school counselors which focused on perceptions of school counselors' time spent in various activities. Principals believed that

school counselors needed more time for working with individual education plans, organizing tests, and performing bus, lunch, or recess duty, as compared with counselor perceptions.

Principals' responses indicated that providing individual counseling to students and attending professional development were not ranked as highly important activities.

Despite research that shows that principals are lacking information or appreciation for the updated role of the school counselor, there is also indication in the research that the ASCA national standards and model have impacted administrator perceptions of school counselors. It is important to remember when reviewing the research that the effects of transition to a new framework in a profession can take time. According to VanZandt and Hayslip (2001), adoption of a developmental program may take six years.

Review of Related Studies

Over the past two decades, studies have been conducted that focused on investigating the perception of principals and administrators regarding the role of school counselors, which have lent support to ASCA positively impacting administrator perceptions of schools counseling. It is important to review this empirical literature in order to understand the ways that administrator perceptions have been studied and why, what has been found, and what has been recommended in terms of further research.

In a study entitled "Chief School Administrator Perceptions of Professional School Counselors on Measures of Employability in Minnesota" (Roberts et al., 1997), the authors surveyed the 392 school district "chief school administrators", generally referring to superintendents, on their attitudes regarding school counselor employability in the state of Minnesota. The study was initiated because of budget cutbacks and school counselors being replaced by other professionals, namely social workers, who were less expensive to hire due to

needing less educational requirements to be hired. Administrators had also been observed to have given social workers school counselor duties, despite state rules, which placed school counselors at a disadvantage in the job market. In order to assess the situation, this study was designed to measure superintendents' impressions of the training, skills level, and overall usefulness of school counselors in Minnesota public and private schools, since these individuals were in a position to make decisions regarding hiring school counselors in their districts. The authors were specifically interested in comparing attitudes toward hiring of school counselors versus social workers. The overarching goal of the study was to help address any misperceptions about the facts of hiring school counselors, and to inform Minnesota counselor education institutions so that they could work to correct these issues, particularly to assist future graduates of counselor education institutions (Roberts et al., 1997).

The authors designed a 19-question survey and mailed it to each district in the state, for the superintendent, or chief school officer, to complete. Because the survey was developed by the authors, there was no statistical information available indicating the validity or reliability of the instrument. The survey was designed to be completed in no more than 20 minutes, and the researchers after a second mailing were able to get 82% of the surveys returned, although 16 of those surveys were not used due to lack of appropriate or complete responses. The data was analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively because surveys were turned back with a large amount of information, however the article only contained information on the quantitative data analysis (Roberts, et al., 1997).

The results of the study were divided into two parts: characteristics of the school districts and respondents, and chief school administrator perceptions of the professional school counselor. Within the first part, 76% of the respondents were superintendents and the rest were designees,

including principals and other administrators. Ninety-nine percent of the districts that responded were public schools, and nearly 90% of the school districts indicated employment of a school counselor at some level (Roberts et al., 1997).

The second part of the results analyzed the chief school administrator perceptions of school counselors. The majority cited reasons that impacted the employment of more school counselors to be due to financial reasons at the state and local level (92.4% and 82.5%). Only a small percent, 7.8 % of respondents, reported lacking knowledge about the role of the school counselor or reported a lack of belief in the skill of school counselors. The majority (78.2%) of chief school administrators believed that professional school counselors provided a valuable service that was commensurate with what they were paid. The majority (90%) also understood that there were differences between the role of the school counselor and social worker, and 57.4% versus 42.6% would prefer to hire a school counselor over a school social worker if finances were not an issue. In questions that focused on understanding of the primary function of the school counselor in three domains- prevention, intervention, and remediation, 73.8% of respondents chose prevention as the highest ranked function, with intervention and remediation second and third, respectively (Roberts, et al., 1997).

The takeaways from the study were that the majority of chief school administrators thought highly of school counselors, and that financial issues appeared to be a major reason affecting employability. Only a small percentage (7.8%) of chief school administrators indicated that they would not hire school counselors because of a lack of belief in their skill. This study was conducted in 1997, and at that time, the majority of administrators were able to identify that prevention should be the main focus of a program versus intervention and remediation (Roberts et al., 1997). This is in line with the ASCA standards and model, which had not yet been

published at the time of the study. Since this research was only conducted in one state, the authors recommend that replications be done in other states. The study is also broad in nature and because the survey was designed by the authors who were looking for specific information, there were not detailed questions included on the perceptions of the counselor role or its effectiveness, other than which aspect is most important: prevention, intervention, or remediation. However, results are important because the information is helpful in identifying overall administrator attitudes and beliefs towards school counselors (Roberts, et al., 1997).

Amatea and Clark (2005) conducted a study which looked at how administrators perceived the school counselors in their school buildings. The authors state that they were attempting to fill a gap in the literature regarding school counseling leadership positions. Despite school counselors being portrayed as leaders in the school counseling literature, that portrayal is not apparent in the school administration literature. The authors used grounded theory as a theoretical framework for their study. Grounded theory is described as a “qualitative methodology that focuses on the meanings of social phenomenon from the perspective of symbolic interactionist theory, a theory that posits that individuals construct meanings for phenomena based on their interpretations of interactions they have with each other” (Amatea and Clark, 2005, p.17). Data were gathered over a two-year period, from 26 public school administrators from three different school districts from the Southeastern United States. The participants were employed at various K-12 levels. Data were gathered in individual interviews conducted by graduate counseling students. The interview protocol contained questions on the background data about the administrators and their schools, and questions on “Perceptions of School Life and Expectations Concerning School Counselor.” The questions focused on the following areas: significant challenges at the school, types of skills the school counselor

possesses, use of time by school counselor, appropriateness according to the administrator regarding the use of time, communication with the school counselor, and suggestions for school counselors in training and counselor education programs.

Data were analyzed by two different researchers. Each researcher read and analyzed each interview summary on their own, identifying critical points and a list of emergent themes. They then compared lists and identified the common themes that matched. The authors note that “scientific rigor was established through the application of procedures for establishing the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the study findings” (Amatea & Clark, 2005, p.18).

The researchers identified four different school counselor role conceptualizations by the administrators: the innovative school leader, the collaborative case consultant, the responsive direct service provider, and the administrative team player. Most of the participants (approximately 65%) viewed their school counselors as either case consultants or direct service providers, meaning they saw counselors as mainly responding to the needs of students, parents, and staff as they arose. Twelve percent of the administrators, which was the smallest percentage in the study, viewed school counselors in the innovative school leader role, which meant that they saw school counselors as necessary to implement whole school programs and contribute to systemic change. The innovative school leader role is the role that emerged that is most closely aligned with the ASCA national model (Amatea & Clark, 2005).

Although this study focused on a small sample of administrators from one area of the country therefore making it not widely generalizable, the important implications include school counselors and counselor educators needing to take a more proactive role in helping to reflect a stronger leadership role, since school administrators have limited chances to learn about the way

the role has been re-conceptualized by ASCA to reflect a whole-school focus and leadership role (Amatea & Clark, 2005). Additionally, since the study was published in 2005, it is important to keep in mind that the ASCA model was newly developed and just starting to be implemented nationally.

In another study from 2005, Zalaquette examined the perceptions of principals regarding elementary school counselors' role and functions. The researchers drew a sample of 1,110 of the 1,660 elementary school principals in the state of Florida, working from a list provided by the Florida Department of Education, and received 500 surveys back. The research instrument, entitled the "2002 Florida Principals' Survey", was modified from the Florida School Counselors' Survey from 2000. The 140-item questionnaire was adapted to assess principals' perceptions of counselors' roles and functions. The questionnaire contained four different sections. The first part contained questions on demographic information of the school; the second part contained questions regarding principals' satisfaction with counselors performance, using a Likert scale as a rating; the third part contained questions regarding school counselor participation in the Florida state tests of accountability, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test; the fourth part listed nineteen different roles of the counselors to which the administrators responded on a Likert scale how much of school counselor time was spent on each activity. No statistical information was given regarding the reliability and validity of the instruments (Zalaquette, 2005).

The results of the study showed overall satisfaction with the school counselor role by elementary principals. Ninety-two percent reported "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the job performance. Only 7.7% reported being dissatisfied. More than 70% strongly agreed or

agreed that school counselors had an impact on academic achievement, and 89.9% strongly agreed or agreed on the impact of the school counselor on behavior and mental health.

Seventy-three percent rated school counselors as effective with the students with which they worked, and 92.1% strongly agreed or agreed that school counselors contributed to a positive school climate (Zalaquette, 2005).

In terms of duties counselors perform, 41% of the counselors were reported to coordinate the state tests, and 32% were involved in some capacity. Only 25% of counselors were not involved in state testing. The majority of principals (69%) felt that it would be helpful for the counselor to have a temporary testing coordinator. In terms of use of time, "principals believed that counselors should spend more time on the following duties: individual counseling, small-group counseling, classroom guidance, consulting with parents, crisis counseling, consulting with teachers, coordinating community services, and academic advising and career counseling" (Zalaquette, 2005, p. 454). Principals believed counselors should do less coordinating of intervention services meeting and state tests (Zalaquette, 2005).

There were also questions in the survey on implementation of ASCA. In terms of ASCA standards, 27.8 % believed implementing the standards would help counselors focus on their job duties. The largest group of principals, 33.9%, were unsure, and 27.4 % were unaware of the ASCA standards (Zalaquette, 2005).

Although much of what the principals reported was positive, and the principals overall had a good grasp of what counselors should be spending their time on according to the ASCA model, almost one-third of the principals were not familiar with the model, and it was reported that counselors continue to be involved in activities that are not supported by the model. Scheduling and participating in disciplinary functions, and coordinating testing are reported to

take up much time, although principals want counselors to spend less time in these roles, and the ASCA model does not support these roles. Principals also did not think that implementation of the national model would change anything (Zalaquette, 2005), which begs the question, what would?

Limitations of this study include that it was conducted only in the state of Florida with elementary principals. The author recommends a national study to gain a broader perspective in different states about the perceptions of principals regarding school counselors. Given the limitations, the results are encouraging, as they indicate that principals and school counselors have agreement on what school counselors should be doing with their time, however, at the time of the study, the status quo had continued (Zalaquette, 2005). Given that the national model was new at the time, it would be important to see how the ASCA model may have had an impact on counselors being able to perform preferred activities, despite about a third of the principals believing otherwise.

Zalaquette and Chatters (2012) administered the same survey to middle school principals in a research article that was published in 2012, however, the data used in that study was archived and was from 2005. The results with the group of middle school principals were nearly identical to the results from the study on elementary principals, with similar findings in each of the areas reported (Zalaquette & Chatters, 2012). This makes sense given that the surveys were administered during the same year, in the state of Florida. The same limitations and recommendations were made. It is interesting to note, though, the high degree of agreement between elementary and middle school principals during this time frame.

In a 2006 mixed methods study, Beesley and Frey conducted a national survey of 303 principals regarding their perceptions of school counselor roles and satisfaction with school

counseling services. The authors note that a national survey of this type had not been conducted in many years and thus, aimed to elicit feedback on satisfaction overall and also with specific services provided in school counseling programs, as well as what principals believe the major roles of school counselors are, and principals' suggestions for school counseling services (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

The authors reviewed the literature and found no existing validated instruments to measure principal's perception of school counselor roles and satisfaction with services. Therefore, they designed their own instrument based on information from existing research, information from ASCA about the school counselor role, the ASCA national model, and the Transforming Schools Initiative. A panel of three certified principals reviewed the survey to provide additional feedback and confirm face validity. Their revisions were incorporated into the final version (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

The final survey was made up of 28 items. The first part consisted of demographic information questions, and the second part consisted of overall satisfaction ratings in a Likert scale format. The satisfaction with counseling items internal consistency reliability was a .91. There was a question regarding if the school counselor that the participants worked with had teaching experience before becoming a school counselor, and another question on whether the participants had professional development around the school counseling role. Finally, two open ended questions were asked about what the principals thought to be the main roles of school counselors, and ideas to improve school counseling services. The principals, half elementary and half secondary, were selected randomly using two national principal association listservs and were invited to take the online survey. The authors received 303 surveys back, which is a return rate of approximately 61% (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

Results using frequencies and percentages indicated that principals were generally satisfied with school counseling services. Seventy-three percent of principals reported being somewhat to very satisfied with the counseling services in their schools, while 27% were somewhat to very dissatisfied. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to look at the differences in levels, and the results indicated elementary school principals were significantly more satisfied with services than middle school or high school principals. Satisfaction was also reported in several areas of service delivery, including classroom guidance, individual and group counseling, consultation and program coordination. No difference was found in satisfaction levels between counselors with and without teaching experience. The authors posited that elementary counselors may have had higher ratings of satisfaction because it may be easier to deliver a comprehensive program in an elementary setting as compared to a middle or high school setting (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

In terms of the open-ended questions results, principals indicated that they understood the roles that are appropriate for school counselors, including “counseling and guidance, coordination, consultation, accountability, assessment, advocacy, and leadership as well as the need to minimize non-counseling duties and reduce counselor ratios” (Beesley & Frey, 2006, p.17). These results echo the results of Roberts et al. (1997), Zalaquette (2005), and Zalaquette and Chatters (2012). Although principals reported satisfaction with school counseling services, they also indicated areas of improvement for programs including evaluation and accountability, outreach to the community and public relations, education programs for parents, and awareness of multicultural issues and diversity (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

Strengths of the study include a rate of return of 61%, although perhaps those with the strongest feelings regarding counseling programs decided to take the time to respond to the

survey. In addition, the process for selecting an instrument and questions to include was thorough, compared to the other studies reviewed, due to the multiple models used to create the instrument as well as the panel of certified principals who gave feedback on the instrument which was then used to revise it before the final version was created (Beesley & Frey, 2006). A limitation is that the instrument provides only speculative results, since it is descriptive in nature. The authors suggest further research include national qualitative studies with principals and school counselors that specifically look at counseling program effectiveness and that gather suggestions on how educators can better collaborate to implement comprehensive models of school counseling (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

In a study from 2009, Dodson specifically examined administrative perceptions of the high school counselor role in RAMP designated high schools versus in high schools that were not RAMP designated. At the time of the study, RAMP designation was relatively new and it was timely to research the impact it was making. The researcher surveyed principals in high schools that were RAMP designated as of 2006, and used a comparison group of high schools from the Rocky Mountain region of the United States that were not RAMP designated. At the time, there were only ten RAMP high schools, which included one private school, one magnet school, and eight large comprehensive, public high schools. Non-RAMP high schools were chosen based on the similarity in demographics to the RAMP-designated high schools, and included 16 comprehensive high schools, two private high schools and two magnet high schools. The survey instrument, entitled "The Administrator Questionnaire", was developed by the author using the ASCA model as well as input from a similar questionnaire used in a past study (Miles-Hastings, 1997). The questionnaire contained 35 appropriate and inappropriate counselor duties that the administrators ranked on a Likert scale, for both importance and if the counselor actually

performed the role in their schools. Demographic questions about the school and questions about the nature of the counseling programs were also included in the survey.

One hundred and thirty-two questionnaires were distributed, and 60 administrators (19 from RAMP schools and 41 from non-RAMP schools) completed and returned the questionnaire. The author only analyzed the data from the rankings of the 15 appropriate counseling activities, and this analysis revealed that there were differences in administrators' perceptions of the school counselor role in the RAMP versus non-RAMP programs, on both the importance of the role and the perception that the counselor actually performed the role. RAMP administrators indicated individual student academic program planning, working with students to provide small and large group counseling activities, and interpreting student records as the top three most important activities. Non-RAMP administrators indicated individual student academic program planning, assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems, and working with students to provide small and large group counseling activities as the top three most important activities. In terms of actually performing the role, RAMP administrators highest three activities were interpreting student records, individual student academic program planning, and advocating for students at individual education plan meetings, student study teams, and school attendance review boards. Non-RAMP administrators highest three activities were individual student academic program planning, interpreting student records, and assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems (Dodson, 2009).

When looking at the statistically significant differences between RAMP and non-RAMP schools, three roles had a significant difference at the 95% confidence interval for equality of means in both perceptions of importance of role, and in perceptions of the counselor actually

having completed the role. In terms of importance of roles, collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, counseling students who have disciplinary problems, and providing teachers with suggestions for better management of study hall were rated significantly higher in the RAMP schools. In terms of perception of if the counselor carried out the role, collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons, counseling students who have disciplinary problems, and interpreting student records were rated significantly higher in the RAMP schools (Dodson, 2009).

The results indicate that RAMP administrators perceive that counselors are in the classrooms delivering guidance lessons, are counseling students with discipline issues, and are interpreting student records more so than non-RAMP administrators perceive counselors to be engaging in these activities. Additionally, the RAMP administrators believed that delivering guidance lessons, counseling students with discipline issues, and providing suggestions to teachers for better management of study hall were important activities for a counselor more so than the non-RAMP administrators did. Other than those statistically significant differences, all administrators perceived counselors to work in the academic, personal and social, and career development areas with students, and there were similarities in the ratings between the two sets of administrators (Dodson, 2009). This could be due to the possibility that the schools that were not RAMP certified had implemented aspects of ASCA. It could also be due to the possibility that the full transition to the model had not yet been made, even by administrators at RAMP schools.

Limitations of the study include that there was only a small number of RAMP certified high schools in the nation that could be studied, which led to selection of non-RAMP schools that matched the characteristics of the RAMP schools. Therefore, no random selection of schools

was done, and all of the schools certified in RAMP at the time were included in the study, which the author noted affects internal validity. Only schools from the Rocky Mountain region were included in the study for the non-RAMP schools, as a convenience sample, which means that the perceptions of the administrators may not be generalizable to other areas of the country.

Other limitations are that the study only looked at high schools, so the results may not be generalizable to middle and elementary schools (Dodson, 2009). The author also focused only on the analysis of the perceptions of the appropriate roles of the counselor. Including an analysis on the inappropriate roles or using the highest ratings from the overall survey data could have provided more information about the perceptions at the time.

Summary

As is shown in the review of related studies, research has not been conducted on principals' perceptions of school counselors in several years, and given that many more schools and districts have adopted the ASCA national model and received RAMP designation, research is needed on principals' perceptions to understand how the national model and RAMP have made a difference. Most of the studies reviewed were conducted when the national model was new and had not yet had sufficient time to impact the field. As noted, it takes at least six years for a program to be fully implemented (VanZandt & Hayslip, 2001). Recommendations from four of the studies reviewed indicated that further studies should focus nationally as opposed to studying one area of the country to see if the trends in one area are seen across the country (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Roberts et. al, 1997, Zalaquette, 2005; Zalaquette & Chatters, 2012). Another recommendation was to examine if there are currently differences in perceptions at the elementary level versus the secondary levels, as differences have been shown in some past studies (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

School principals' perceptions of school counselors are extremely important because principals significantly influence and frame the roles and responsibilities of school counselors within their particular schools. When principals support school counselors performing duties that are appropriate and aligned with ASCA recommendations, school counselors are able to more efficiently and effectively do their jobs to impact students, as evidenced by ASCA aligned and RAMP schools having greater achievement amongst students as well as more positive perceptions of appropriate counselor related duties (Dodson, 2009; Martin et al., 2009; Martin & Carey, 2014; Wilkerson et. al., 2013). Principals also have influence in other ways beyond the assignments of tasks, including hiring, supervising, and evaluating school counselors. Because principals many times have the final say in the duties that school counselors perform, their perception of what the school counselor's role should be influences what these duties will be, and is vitally important to the standardization of the school counseling profession.

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

This chapter will provide the methodologies used for this study, the sample approach, and procedures for collecting and analyzing data. The purpose of this study is to examine principals' perceptions of what roles they believe the counselor serves and their perception of the importance of school counselors' roles at elementary and secondary levels, as well as to examine if RAMP designation in a school influences principal perception.

The following questions will guide this study:

1. Are there differences in principals' perceptions of the school counseling role at the elementary and secondary school levels?
2. What are principals' current perceptions of the importance of school counseling roles?
3. What are principals' current perceptions of what roles the school counselor is actually serving?
4. Are school counselors in RAMP designated schools perceived differently by principals than school counselors in non-RAMP schools?

Research Instrument

The research instrument proposed in this study is the Administrator Questionnaire (See Appendix A). Dr. Tammy Dodson, the creator of the instrument, granted permission for it to be used in this study (T. Dodson, personal communication, December 4, 2017) and modified for the purposes of this study (T. Dodson, personal communication, March 21, 2018). Documentation of the permission to use and modify the instrument can be viewed in Appendices B and C. Dodson designed the instrument using the ASCA National Model's (2005) list of appropriate and

inappropriate activities, and a similar instrument used in another study (Miles-Hastings, 1997).

The Administrator Questionnaire contains 35 Likert-scale statements to assess perceptions in two categories: the importance of the school counselor activities, and if school counselors actually complete the activities. For the importance category, ratings are completed on a 5-point Likert scale: 1 means that the role is not important, 2 means that the role is minimally important, 3 means that the role is somewhat important, 4 means that the role is important, and 5 means that the role is very important. For the actually completed category, ratings are also completed on a 5 point Likert scale: 1 means the role is not performed at all, 2 means that the role is performed once or twice a year, 3 means that the role is performed occasionally, 4 means that the role is performed often, and 5 means that the role is performed regularly.

There are 15 appropriate activities as designated by ASCA included in the questionnaire, although one statement is repeated twice, for a total of 14 appropriate activities. The 14 appropriate activities are: does individual student academic program planning; interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement testing; counsels students who are tardy or absent; counsels students who have disciplinary problems (listed twice); counsels students as to appropriate dress; collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons; disaggregates data; analyzes grade point averages in relationship to achievement; advocates for students at individual education plan meetings, student study teams, and school attendance review boards; works with students to provide small and large group counseling activities; assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems; ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations; interprets student records; and provides teachers with suggestions for better management of study hall.

There are 20 inappropriate activities included in the questionnaire. These inappropriate activities are: does data entry; prepares school attendance review boards; prepares individual education plans; works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode; assists with duties in the principal's office; monitors the cafeteria; registers all new students; supervises after-school activities; performs clerical record keeping; assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent; counsels athletes on mental imagery; supervises study hall; makes home visits to students in trouble; computes grade point averages; coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; designs the master schedule; signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent; performs disciplinary actions; recruits students for clubs and activities; and sends students home who are not appropriately dressed.

There are also two open ended questions included after the first 35 items. The first is "From your viewpoint as an administrator, are there duties or roles your counselor(s) perform that are not included above? If so, what are they?" The second is "Due to your students' needs, what school counselor roles are considered to be most critical in your school?" There is a space to provide additional comments, and the last part of the questionnaire asks about the school counseling program characteristics and demographic information about the person filling out the survey.

The wording in the survey is focused toward the secondary level and in order to make the questions applicable for the elementary level, the researcher altered some language in certain questions. Some questions were also revised in order to more accurately reflect ASCA's current list of appropriate and inappropriate counselor activities (ASCA, 2012). The questions regarding counseling activities that were changed and the reasons why are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Revised Counseling Activity Questions in the Administrator Questionnaire

Changes to Administrator Questionnaire	Original Question	Revised Question	Reason for Revision
Question 14	Disaggregates data	Analyzes disaggregated data	Revised to align with ASCA's most current appropriate/inappropriate activity list
Question 16	Analyzes grade point averages in relationship to achievement	Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	Revised to make the question more applicable to elementary counselors
Question 22	Supervises study hall	Supervises study hall/recess	Revised to make the question more applicable to elementary counselors
Question 24	Makes home visits to students in trouble	Regularly visits students' homes	Revised to avoid ambiguity because in certain cases and places a home visit could be an appropriate duty; however, it was on ASCA's inappropriate list
Question 25	Computes grade point averages	Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	Revised to make the question more applicable to elementary counselors
Question 27	Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	Original question was a duplicate of Question 9, an appropriate duty; added additional question that is an appropriate duty for school counselors about working individually with students
Question 32	Provides teachers with suggestions for better management of study hall	Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management	Revised to align with ASCA's most current appropriate/inappropriate counselor activity list

Additionally, the following changes were made: the three open-ended questions were removed because they are not necessary for the purposes of this study; all counseling program questions except the question on if the school is a RAMP designated school were removed because they are not necessary for the purposes of this study; the category of “unsure” will be added to the question about if the school is or is not a RAMP school; and a question was added that asks if the school has an ASCA-aligned counseling program. Additionally, the school

demographic information was included although in the questions asking about the administrator filling out the survey, the term “administrator” was changed to “principal”; a “prefer not to answer” was added to the question on gender; a question on school level (elementary or secondary) was included; and finally, the question on public or private school was taken out since this survey will focus on public schools.

No information regarding reliability and validity is available on the Administrator Questionnaire (Dodson, 2009). The revisions made were to ensure that the questions were appropriate and relevant according to ASCA’s most current information, as well as generalizable to both elementary and secondary counselors. In order to establish face validity, a panel of experts in the field of school counseling was asked to review the Administrator Questionnaire-Revised before it was sent to principals to ensure that the questions asked were appropriate, understandable, and applicable. The invitation to participate in the panel of experts review board can be viewed in Appendix D. The panel of experts consisted of five school counseling professionals: one school district counseling supervisor, one high school counseling director, two professors in counselor education, and one retired high school counseling director and professor in counselor education. Three of the members of the panel of experts responded with feedback. The survey was revised yet again based on feedback from the panel of experts and the changes are listed below.

In the survey directions, the researcher removed "1 indicates the role is" in explaining the Likert scale and added 1 = role is, etc. for all the Likert scale numbers. In survey question 4, the researcher changed individual academic plans to Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) to make the term more understandable since that is the language used in special education guidelines. In survey question 6, the researcher changed wording to "takes daily student

attendance" as that is more of an inappropriate role than "prepares attendance review boards" and attendance review boards is not a widely used term. In question 19, the researcher changed "school attendance review boards" to "truancy meetings" to make it more understandable as to what kind of meeting was being held. In question 20, the researcher changed wording to "counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports" from "counsels student athletes on mental imagery" to make the question more understandable in general. In question 40, "other" was added as an option for gender. In question 47, the researcher added examples of types of specialty schools to add clarity to the question, which were technology focus, arts focus, and vocational. The finalized version of Administrator Questionnaire-Revised can be viewed in Appendix E.

Participants

The participants in the study were the principals of the RAMP schools, and a comparison group of principals from non-RAMP schools. Although related studies included other administrators besides principals, it was thought that surveying principals would lend consistency because not all administrators are responsible for school counseling programs. Principals are ultimately responsible for all departments in a school, even if they do not directly supervise them; therefore, their perceptions are applicable even if they do not directly supervise a school counseling program.

Qualtrics was used to set up and distribute the Administrator Questionnaire-Revised. One URL link was sent to the RAMP school principals, and a second URL link was sent to the non-RAMP school principals. A brief explanation of the survey was provided in the email, and informed consent was provided through Qualtrics before the survey was taken. The email that

was sent to participants as well as the informed consent provided can be viewed in Appendices F and G.

The RAMP school principals' email addresses were obtained from school websites. As of June 2018, there were 240 schools listed on ASCA's website as RAMP designated schools (ASCA, 2018). All public school principals were sent surveys, unless their email address was not available online, since the rate of surveys returned could potentially be low. There were a small number of RAMP designated private schools which were not included, because private schools have different standards than public schools and it would be difficult to make comparisons between the groups if private schools were included. There were 217 survey invitations sent, because some email addresses could not be located and some surveys were returned as undeliverable.

A comparison group of public schools was chosen using the website educationbug.org, (Education Bug, 2018), which lists all public schools in each state in the country. The comparison group consisted of matching schools that are in the same state as the RAMP schools. Each comparison group school was matched by state and by level: elementary, middle, or high school. Middle and high schools were considered the secondary school group. Email addresses were obtained from school websites. If the principal's email address was not available online, another school was chosen that did have the principal's email available. The researcher chose schools to survey that were not in the same school districts as RAMP schools. There were 228 surveys sent. The reason that the sample sizes were different was because some of the principals' email addresses were returned as undeliverable and some of the RAMP principal's email addresses could not be located. Out of the 445 survey invitations sent, 281 were sent to secondary principals and 164 were sent to elementary principals.

Two follow-up reminders were sent between the initial invitations and the deadline. The follow-up email wording can be viewed in Appendix H. Dillman's suggestions for survey guidelines (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009) was used to ensure that the survey follows best practice guidelines for internet and online surveys. The survey received an iQ rating of "good" on Qualtrics. The rating can be viewed in Appendix I.

Data

Data analysis was based on the methods used in Dodson's (2009) study. Dodson used mean scores to conduct t-tests, and compare if there were significant differences between RAMP and non-RAMP high schools in the Likert Scale ratings of the fifteen appropriate activities in the survey. Dodson also rank ordered the appropriate activities from most to least important and included the top three highest rated activities in each category. The rank was based on the sum of the Likert scale ratings, with the activity with the lowest number being the least important and the highest number being the most important. The top three highest rated activities in each category were listed and compared for both RAMP and non-RAMP schools. This author conducted further analyses to expand upon Dodson's original study.

To address the first research question, "Are there differences in principals' perceptions at the elementary and secondary school level?", mean scores were calculated for both the appropriate and inappropriate questions in each of the two categories of questions, importance of activities and activities actually being completed, for both elementary school and secondary schools. A series of independent sample t-tests were used to look for significant differences among the elementary and secondary group means in each category, importance and actual for the groups of appropriate and inappropriate activities. Since there were significant differences found, the groups were separated for further analysis in the later research questions. To further

evaluate potential differences between elementary and secondary scores, a series of t-tests were conducted on individual items of ranked importance and ranked perceived actual completion.

To address research questions two and three, “What are principals’ current perceptions of the importance of school counseling roles?”, and “What are principals’ current perception of what roles the counselor is actually serving?”, a ranking from highest mean rating to lowest mean rating of all activities in both categories of perception of actually performed and perception of importance were included for all of the activities, and for both categories appropriate and inappropriate activities. Since there were significant differences found, the results were reported out by overall principal perception and also by elementary and secondary principal perception. In addition, to explore potential differences in importance of appropriate and inappropriate tasks, a paired samples t-test was conducted to evaluate if there were significant differences in perceptions of importance and actually completed tasks.

A variation on Dodson’s (2009) original methodology was used to address research question four, “Are school counselors in RAMP designated schools perceived differently by principals’ than counselors in non-RAMP schools?” To test this question, a series of independent samples t-tests were computed to assess for between group (RAMP vs. non-RAMP) on all perception scores. To explore for differences on an individual level, a series of between subjects t tests were computed to compare differences between perceived importance and perceived actual engagement in tasks as ranked by RAMP and non-RAMP principals. The top three highest ranked activities from the questions in each category, importance and actual, were also included and discussed, for the groups of RAMP and non-RAMP principals.

Summary

The information discussed in the last three chapters of this paper demonstrates a gap in the literature regarding what we know about principals' perceptions of the school counseling role, thus, this area required further examination. This researcher surveyed principals using the Administrator Questionnaire-Revised (Dodson, 2009), in order to obtain current information that will shed light on how the ASCA model and RAMP designation have impacted the field of school counseling; how school counselors can work most effectively with administrators and principals; and what type of advocacy is needed at this point in time in the school counseling profession.

Chapter IV

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine principals' perceptions of what roles they believe the counselor serves and their perceptions of the importance of school counselors' roles at elementary and secondary levels, as well as to examine if RAMP designation in a school influences principal perceptions. Attitudes were assessed with regard to how important a principal values a particular task, and how much they perceive school counselors actually engage in that task. This chapter will outline the statistical findings from the current study, starting with an overview of the data cleaning and preparation process, followed by the specific testing of the research questions.

Preliminary and Descriptive Data Analysis

Prior to testing the research questions, the obtained data was evaluated to test the statistical assumptions and to determine appropriate analytical approaches. A total of 38 school principals completed the web-based survey out of 445 who were invited to participate, with an equal number of principals from RAMP schools ($n = 19$, 50%) and non-RAMP schools ($n = 19$, 50%). The return rate was 8.5%. The elementary return rate was lower than the secondary rate, however, less invitations were sent to elementary principals versus secondary principals, because more secondary schools are RAMP designated. The total number of email invitations sent was 445; 281 were classified secondary which was 63.1% of the total sample, and 164 were classified elementary which is 36.9% of the total sample. Ten elementary principals responded, 27 secondary principals responded, and one school principal from a combination level school responded, as combination level school was a choice on the survey for principal self-report of school level. Of the participants, 71.1% were from secondary principals and 26.3% were from

elementary principals, and 2.6% were from a combined school, so the response rate among secondary principals was proportionately higher than that of elementary principals.

The vast majority of principals who participated in this study identified their Ethnicity as White ($n = 27, 71.1\%$), followed by African American ($n=2, 5.3\%$), Hispanic ($n=1, 2.6\%$), and Bi-/Multi-/Other ($n=1, 2.6\%$). Seven principals did not respond to the question on Ethnicity. Further descriptions of the final sample are outlined below in Table 2.

Table 2

Sample Descriptives

	<i>n</i>	%
Group		
No RAMP	19	50
RAMP	19	50
ASCA Program		
Yes	30	78.9
No	3	7.9
Unsure	5	13.2
RAMP Program (Principal self-report)		
Yes	17	44.7
No	13	34.2
Unsure	8	21.1
Gender		
Male	20	52.6
Female	18	47.4
Ethnicity*		
White	27	71.1
African American	2	5.3
Hispanic	1	2.6
Bi-/Multi-/Other	1	2.6

Population Density*

Rural	16	42.1
Urban	7	18.4
Suburban	14	36.8
<hr/>		
Years as Principal		
	<i>N</i>	38
	Min	0
	Max	30
	<i>M</i>	9.47
	<i>SD</i>	7.17
Years at Current Position*		
	<i>N</i>	37
	Min	0
	Max	20
	<i>M</i>	6.59
	<i>SD</i>	4.56
Age*		
	<i>N</i>	31
	Min	35
	Max	63
	<i>M</i>	47.65
	<i>SD</i>	7.64
Enrollment		
	<i>N</i>	38
	Min	350
	Max	3200
	<i>M</i>	1202.50
	<i>SD</i>	888.49
Number of Counselors		
	<i>N</i>	38
	Min	1
	Max	13
	<i>M</i>	3.71
	<i>SD</i>	3.33

Note. *Frequencies not summing to 38 and percentages not summing to 100 indicate missing data

Prior to conducting the primary analyses, the data were examined to inspect the state of the obtained data. Aggregate scores were computed for principal perceptions of appropriate and

inappropriate tasks for both importance and actual performance. Examination of the kurtosis, skewness, and mean to standard deviation ratio did not indicate any violations of normality, indicating that these scores may be appropriately used in parametric analyses. Additionally, aggregate scores were computed for appropriate and inappropriate tasks for both importance and actual engagement. Observed missing data was < 5%, suggesting that the impact of missing data would not significantly impact results; as such, missing data was excluded listwise in all analyses. Fluctuations in sample size across analyses reflect missing data. One elementary principal did not complete the part of the survey that ranked the activities in terms of actual performance. One secondary principal did not answer two questions on the survey. For comparisons by school level (i.e., secondary vs. elementary), the one principal's responses from the combined level school were excluded.

The overall sample size ($N = 38$) was sufficient to conduct between group comparisons at one level (i.e., outcomes by school type, outcomes by RAMP status); however, when exploring the possibility of factorial comparisons, there was insufficient sample to yield adequate power for these analyses to be meaningful. Similarly, additional analyses could not be conducted comparing high school data to other school levels (i.e., elementary, secondary). As such, the current study was limited to only between group comparisons. To further account for limited sample size, multivariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests could not be conducted, and independent and paired sample t -tests for simple comparisons were used as alternatives.

Primary Analysis

In order to assess the research questions, a variety of statistical methods were utilized. The following sections outline the statistical procedures utilized and results for each of the

research questions. Corresponding tabular data is also included to summarize significant and non-significant findings.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 aimed at assessing differences in principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role between elementary and secondary school levels. To test this question, a series of independent samples *t*-tests were computed to assess for between group (elementary vs. secondary) on all perception scores. There were four categories of responses: Appropriate Importance, Inappropriate Importance, Appropriate Actual, and Inappropriate Actual. Appropriate Importance are the overall scores for the activities considered appropriate counseling activities on the research instrument in the category of how important principals perceive these activities. Inappropriate Importance are the overall scores for the activities considered inappropriate on the research instrument and in the category of how important principals perceive these activities. Appropriate Actual are the overall scores for the activities considered appropriate on the research instrument and in the category of to what extent principals believe the activity is actually completed. Inappropriate actual are the overall scores for the activities considered inappropriate on the research instrument and in the category of to what extent principals believe the activity is actually completed. A summary of these analyses is outlined below in Table 3.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Aggregate Scores by School Level

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Appropriate Importance				-2.83	.007
Elementary	10	3.18	.53		
Secondary	27	3.75	.52		

Appropriate Actual				-2.82	.008
Elementary	9	2.72	.39		
Secondary	27	3.38	.67		
Inappropriate Importance				-3.52	.001
Elementary	10	1.81	.21		
Secondary	27	2.35	.46		
Inappropriate Actual				-2.91	.006
Elementary	9	1.71	.11		
Secondary	27	2.34	.64		

As shown, there were significant differences across all group comparisons, since all *p* values were less than 0.05. Consistently, principals from secondary schools reported higher levels of importance and tasks actually done, including both appropriate and inappropriate tasks.

To further evaluate potential differences between elementary and secondary scores, a series of *t*-tests were conducted on individual items of ranked importance. These analyses should be interpreted as exploratory due to concerns of unequal sample size and potential risk of a Type II error. A summary of these findings is outlined in Appendix J. Principals from secondary schools described the following tasks as being more important compared to elementary school principals: individual student academic program planning, interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests, analyzing disaggregated data, analyzing GPA in relation to achievement, ensuring records are maintained per regulation, interpreting student records, data entry, preparing IEPs, registering new students, counseling athletes, computing GPA and honor roll data, coordinating and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests, and designing the master schedule.

To further evaluate potential differences between elementary and secondary scores, a series of *t*-tests were conducted on individual items of ranked actual performance. These analyses should be interpreted as exploratory due to concerns of unequal sample size and

potential risk of a Type II error. A summary of these findings is outlined in Appendix K.

Principals from secondary schools ranked counselors as frequently performing the following tasks more compared to ratings from elementary school principals: recruiting students for clubs and activities, designing the master schedule, coordinate and administer cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests, compute GPA for honor roll, counsel student athletes, perform clerical record keeping, registers all new students, data entry, preparing IEPs, interprets student record data, analyzes disaggregate data, and doing individual academic planning. Elementary school principals saw counselors as engaging in more small and large group counseling than secondary principals.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 aimed at exploring which tasks school principals view as being most important. Principals ranked activities on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5 (1 = role is not important, 2 = role is minimally important, 3 = role is somewhat important, 4 = role is important, and 5 = the role is very important). To explore this research questions, descriptive statistics, including the mean, were used to rank order tasks based on highest level of importance. A summary of these scores is outlined below. To better examine the differing perceptions of importance, descriptive statistics ranked by highest to lowest were conducted for all tasks, separated by appropriate and inappropriate tasks, and separated by appropriate and inappropriate for elementary and secondary schools separately. Results can be viewed in Table 4 below.

Table 4

Tasks Ranked by Importance (All)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.66	.53
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.50	.76

Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.26	1.03
Individual student academic program planning	4.22	1.03
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.84	1.03
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.71	1.01
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.61	1.08
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.50	1.01
Interprets student records	3.50	1.20
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.50	1.33
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	3.47	.98
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	3.42	1.15
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.39	1.03
Analyzes disaggregated data	3.03	1.26
Registers all new students	3.00	1.56
Data entry	2.82	1.11
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.68	1.47
Regularly visits students' homes	2.63	1.08
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.53	1.13
Designs the master schedule	2.53	1.50
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.39	1.24
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.24	1.36
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.24	1.10
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.18	1.31
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.13	1.04
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.08	1.02
Performs clerical record keeping	2.05	.93
Supervises after school activities	1.55	.83
Performs disciplinary actions	1.47	.83
Monitors the cafeteria	1.47	.80
Supervises study hall/recess	1.45	.76
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.42	.79
Takes daily student attendance	1.39	.72
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.24	.68
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.11	.51

The highest ranked tasks in terms of importance were working with students individually when students experience school challenges, assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems, and working with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities. The lowest ranked tasks in terms of importance were taking

daily student attendance, signing excuses for students who are tardy or absent, and sending students home who are not appropriately dressed. General trends suggested that principals ranked appropriate tasks higher than inappropriate tasks. To examine potential differences in patterns, the overall ranks of importance were computed separately for elementary and secondary principals. Results can be viewed in Table 5 and Table 6 below.

Table 5

Tasks Ranked by Importance (Elementary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.70	.68
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.50	.53
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.50	.71
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.80	.92
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.70	.95
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.70	.95
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	3.50	1.18
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.50	.97
Individual student academic program planning	3.00	.94
Regularly visits students' homes	2.80	1.14
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.70	1.16
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.70	.82
Interprets student records	2.60	1.43
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	2.60	1.58
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	2.40	.97
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.30	.82
Analyzes disaggregated data	2.30	1.16
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.20	1.03
Data entry	2.20	1.14
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.00	.94
Recruits students for clubs and activities	1.80	.79
Performs clerical record keeping	1.70	.68
Performs disciplinary actions	1.60	.84

Registers all new students	1.60	1.08
Takes daily student attendance	1.50	.71
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	1.50	.53
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	1.40	.52
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	1.40	.70
Supervises after school activities	1.40	.52
Supervises study hall/recess	1.20	.42
Monitors the cafeteria	1.20	.42
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.10	.32
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.10	.32
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.00	.00
Designs the master schedule	1.00	.00

As shown above, the highest ranked important tasks for elementary school principals were working with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities, working with students individually when students experience school challenges, and assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems. Of note, elementary principals consistently noted that the following tasks were not at all important: sending students home for inappropriate dress and designing the master schedule.

Table 6

Tasks Ranked by Importance (Secondary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.70	.54
Individual student academic program planning	4.69	.62
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.48	.80
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.07	1.11
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.93	.96
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.89	1.09
Interprets student records	3.85	.95
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.81	1.04
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	3.78	1.01
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.70	.95

Registers all new students	3.59	1.34
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.52	1.12
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.44	1.01
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	3.44	.93
Analyzes disaggregated data	3.37	1.15
Designs the master schedule	3.15	1.35
Data entry	3.07	1.04
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.96	1.58
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.67	1.30
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.59	1.45
Regularly visits students' homes	2.56	1.09
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.52	1.37
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.44	1.16
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.33	1.07
Performs clerical record keeping	2.22	.97
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.22	1.16
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.07	1.14
Supervises after school activities	1.63	.93
Monitors the cafeteria	1.56	.89
Supervises study hall/recess	1.56	.85
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.56	.89
Performs disciplinary actions	1.41	.84
Takes daily student attendance	1.37	.74
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.30	.78
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.15	.60

For secondary principals, the top three ranked tasks of importance were: working with students individually when students experience school challenges, individual student academic program planning, and assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems. The lowest ranked tasks of importance were signing excuses for tardiness and sending students home for inappropriate dress. Examination of importance for appropriate tasks is outlined below in Table 7.

Table 7

Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (All)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.66	.53
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.50	.76
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.26	1.03
Individual student academic program planning	4.22	1.03
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.84	1.03
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.71	1.01
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.61	1.08
Interprets student records	3.50	1.20
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.50	1.33
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	3.47	.98
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	3.42	1.15
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.39	1.03
Analyzes disaggregated data	3.03	1.26
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.53	1.13
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.24	1.10

As shown, principals ranked working with students individually as the most important task of the school counselor. Other top rated tasks included assisting the principal in identifying and resolving student issues and needs, working with students to provide group counseling, and to monitor student program planning. The least important appropriate task noted was counseling students on appropriate dress. Table 8 lists the inappropriate tasks ranked by importance.

Table 8

Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (All)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.50	1.01
Registers all new students	3.00	1.56
Data entry	2.82	1.11
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.68	1.47
Regularly visits students' homes	2.63	1.08

Designs the master schedule	2.53	1.50
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.39	1.24
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.24	1.36
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.18	1.31
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.13	1.04
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.08	1.02
Performs clerical record keeping	2.05	.93
Supervises after school activities	1.55	.83
Performs disciplinary actions	1.47	.83
Monitors the cafeteria	1.47	.80
Supervises study hall/recess	1.45	.76
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.42	.79
Takes daily student attendance	1.39	.72
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.24	.68
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.11	.51

The top rated inappropriate task was working with students in a therapeutic, clinical role. Other top inappropriate tasks noted included registering students, data entry, and coordinating and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests. The least important inappropriate task was sending students home for inappropriate dress.

To further evaluate this research question and to explore possible differences in importance by elementary and secondary schools, descriptive analysis was also conducted separately for each school level. A summary of the ranged importance of elementary school principal perceptions and secondary school principal perceptions are outlined in Table 9, Table 10, Table 11 and Table 12.

Table 9

Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Elementary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.70	.68
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.50	.53
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.50	.71

Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.70	.95
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.70	.95
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	3.50	1.18
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.50	.97
Individual student academic program planning	3.00	.94
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.70	1.16
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.70	.82
Interprets student records	2.60	1.43
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	2.60	1.58
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	2.40	.97
Analyzes disaggregated data	2.30	1.16
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.20	1.03

Elementary principals noted that working with students in small and large group counseling was the most important appropriate tasks. The least important appropriate task noted was counseling students about appropriate dress.

Table 10

Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Elementary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.80	.92
Regularly visits students' homes	2.80	1.14
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.30	.82
Data entry	2.20	1.14
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.00	.94
Recruits students for clubs and activities	1.80	.79
Performs clerical record keeping	1.70	.68
Performs disciplinary actions	1.60	.84
Registers all new students	1.60	1.08
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	1.50	.53
Takes daily student attendance	1.50	.71
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	1.40	.52
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	1.40	.70
Supervises after school activities	1.40	.52
Supervises study hall/recess	1.20	.42
Monitors the cafeteria	1.20	.42
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.10	.32

Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.10	.32
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.00	.00
Designs the master schedule	1.00	.00

Elementary school principals described working in a clinical role as the most important inappropriate task. Sending students home for inappropriate dress was the least important ranked inappropriate task. Designing the master schedule was also deemed the least important for elementary principals.

Table 11

Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Secondary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.70	.54
Individual student academic program planning	4.69	.62
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.48	.80
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.07	1.11
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.93	.96
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.89	1.09
Interprets student records	3.85	.95
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.81	1.04
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	3.78	1.01
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.70	.95
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.52	1.12
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	3.44	.93
Analyzes disaggregated data	3.37	1.15
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.44	1.16
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.22	1.16

For secondary school principals, the highest ranked appropriate tasks included working with students individually when they have problems, individual academic program planning, and assisting the principal in identifying and resolving student issues. The least important appropriate task was rated as counseling students about inappropriate dress.

Table 12

Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Importance (Secondary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Registers all new students	3.59	1.34
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.44	1.01
Designs the master schedule	3.15	1.35
Data entry	3.07	1.04
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.96	1.58
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.67	1.30
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.59	1.45
Regularly visits students' homes	2.56	1.09
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.52	1.37
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.33	1.07
Performs clerical record keeping	2.22	.97
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.07	1.14
Supervises after school activities	1.63	.93
Monitors the cafeteria	1.56	.89
Supervises study hall/recess	1.56	.85
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.56	.89
Performs disciplinary actions	1.41	.84
Takes daily student attendance	1.37	.74
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.30	.78
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.15	.60

For secondary school principals, the most important ranked inappropriate task was registering new students, followed by providing clinical services. The least important inappropriate task ranked was sending students home for inappropriate dress.

Lastly, to explore potential differences in importance of appropriate and inappropriate tasks, a paired samples *t*-test was conducted. Results indicated a significant difference in reported importance between appropriate and inappropriate tasks, $t(37) = 18.93, p < .001$.

Principals ranked appropriate tasks as significant more important ($M = 3.59, SD = .57$) compared

to inappropriate tasks ($M = 2.19, SD = .48$). These analyses were further conducted separately for elementary and secondary schools, which yielded a similar pattern; see Table 13 below.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of Importance for Appropriate and Inappropriate Tasks

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
All				18.93	< .001
Appropriate	38	3.59	.57		
Inappropriate	38	2.19	.48		
Elementary				10.76	< .001
Appropriate	10	3.18	.17		
Inappropriate	10	1.81	.07		
Secondary				15.03	< .001
Appropriate	27	3.75	.10		
Inappropriate	27	2.35	.09		

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 aimed at exploring which tasks school principals perceive school counselors as actually doing. Principals ranked these activities on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = role is not performed at all, 2 = role is performed once or twice a year, 3 = the role is performed occasionally, 4 = role is performed often, and 5 = role is performed regularly).

To explore this research questions, descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviations, were used to rank order tasks based on highest level of importance. These analyses were conducted for all tasks (combined appropriate and inappropriate), as well as run separately by appropriate and inappropriate tasks. A summary of these findings is outlined below in Table 14.

Table 14

Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (All)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.43	.93
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.08	.83
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	3.95	1.35
Does individual student academic program planning	3.89	1.45
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.57	1.07
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.49	1.10
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.35	1.09
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.32	1.23
Interprets student records	3.27	1.33
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.11	1.43
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	2.89	1.02
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.86	1.36
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	2.86	1.44
Registers all new students	2.81	1.75
Does data entry	2.81	1.33
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.70	1.49
Analyzes disaggregated data	2.68	1.36
Designs the master schedule	2.54	1.50
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.32	1.51
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.30	1.27
Assists with duties in the principal's office	2.30	1.24
Performs clerical record keeping	2.24	1.32
Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.24	1.26
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.19	1.29
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	1.97	1.26
Regularly visits students' homes	1.95	1.08
Monitors the cafeteria	1.78	1.27
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	1.78	1.00
Supervises after school activities	1.70	1.08
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.59	1.01
Supervises study hall/recess	1.49	1.19
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.46	.93
Performs disciplinary actions	1.38	.95
Takes daily student attendance	1.22	.71
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.19	.81

The top three ranked tasks that principals' perceived were actually completed by school counselors were working with students individually when students experience school challenges, assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems, and working with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities. Of note, this pattern was similar to that observed for what principals had ranked as important. Overall, there was a tendency observed to rank appropriate tasks as higher than inappropriate. A summary of appropriate tasks ranked by elementary school principals is outlined below in Table 15.

Table 15

Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Elementary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.78	.44
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.44	.73
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.22	.83
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	4.00	.87
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	4.00	.87
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.44	1.13
Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.89	1.54
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	2.89	1.36
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	2.89	1.17
Assists with duties in the principal's office	2.78	.83
Interprets student records	2.22	1.09
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.22	1.09
Regularly visits students' homes	2.11	1.17
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	2.00	1.32
Does data entry	2.00	1.23
Analyzes disaggregated data	1.78	1.09
Does individual student academic program planning	1.78	.97
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1.78	.67
Monitors the cafeteria	1.78	1.30
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	1.67	.87
Recruits students for clubs and activities	1.56	.53
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.56	.73
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	1.44	.88

Registers all new students	1.44	1.33
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.33	.71
Performs clerical record keeping	1.33	.50
Performs disciplinary actions	1.22	.67
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	1.22	.67
Supervises after school activities	1.22	.44
Supervises study hall/recess	1.11	.33
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	1.11	.33
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.00	.00
Designs the master schedule	1.00	.00
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	1.00	.00
Takes daily student attendance	1.00	.00

Elementary school principals noted that school counselors actually perform the following tasks the most: working with students in small and large group counseling, working individually with students who experience school challenges, and assisting the principal in identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems. For elementary principals, they do not perceive counselors engaging in the following tasks at all: sending students home for inappropriate dress code, designing master schedules, counsel student athletes, and taking attendance. A summary of appropriate tasks ranked by secondary school principals is outlined below in Table 16.

Table 16

Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Secondary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Does individual student academic program planning	4.62	.70
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.41	1.01
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.00	.83
Interprets student records	3.63	1.25
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	3.63	1.45
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.56	1.22
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.48	1.09
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.44	1.19
Registers all new students	3.33	1.62

Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	3.30	1.30
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.30	1.14
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.26	1.06
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.11	1.40
Does data entry	3.11	1.28
Designs the master schedule	3.11	1.37
Analyzes disaggregated data	3.04	1.29
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.04	1.58
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	2.89	1.01
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.74	1.53
Performs clerical record keeping	2.59	1.37
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.59	1.34
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.33	1.30
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.30	1.35
Assists with duties in the principal's office	2.15	1.35
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.04	1.06
Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.00	1.11
Regularly visits students' homes	1.85	1.06
Supervises after school activities	1.85	1.20
Monitors the cafeteria	1.78	1.31
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.70	1.10
Supervises study hall/recess	1.63	1.36
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.44	1.01
Performs disciplinary actions	1.44	1.05
Takes daily student attendance	1.30	.82
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.26	.94

Secondary school principals perceived counselors as engaging in the following tasks the most: individual academic programming, working with students individual when experiencing problems, and assisting the principal in identifying and resolving student issues and needs. The lowest ranked tasks were performing disciplinary actions, taking attendance, and sending students home for inappropriate dress. Tasks further separated by appropriate and inappropriate activities are outlined below in Table 17 and Table 18.

Table 17

Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (All)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.43	.93
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.08	.83
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	3.95	1.35
Does individual student academic program planning	3.89	1.45
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.49	1.10
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.35	1.09
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.32	1.23
Interprets student records	3.27	1.33
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.11	1.43
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	2.89	1.02
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.86	1.36
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	2.86	1.44
Analyzes disaggregated data	2.68	1.36
Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.24	1.26
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.19	1.29

The top rated appropriate task actually completed was working with students who experience school challenges, followed by assisting the principal in identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems. The lowest rated appropriate task actually completed was counseling students about appropriate dress.

Table 18

Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (All)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.50	1.01
Registers all new students	3.00	1.56
Data entry	2.82	1.11
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.68	1.47
Regularly visits students' homes	2.63	1.08
Designs the master schedule	2.53	1.50
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.39	1.24

Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.24	1.36
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.18	1.31
Assists with duties in the principals office	2.13	1.04
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.08	1.02
Performs clerical record keeping	2.05	.93
Supervises after school activities	1.55	.83
Performs disciplinary actions	1.47	.83
Monitors the cafeteria	1.47	.80
Supervises study hall/recess	1.45	.76
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.42	.79
Takes daily student attendance	1.39	.72
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.24	.68
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.11	.51

For all principals, the highest ranked inappropriate tasks actually completed was working in a clinical role with students. Other top-rated inappropriate tasks actually being done by school counselors included data entry, registering students, and coordinating and administering cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests. The lowest ranked inappropriate task actually done by school counselors was sending students home for inappropriate dress.

To evaluate potential differences in perceptions by school level, mean frequency rankings of actually performed activities were split by school type. Mean rankings for elementary school principals are outlined below in Table 19 and Table 20.

Table 19

Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Elementary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	4.78	.44
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.44	.73
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.22	.83
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	4.00	.87
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.44	1.13
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.89	1.54

Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	2.89	1.36
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	2.89	1.17
Interprets student records	2.22	1.09
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	2.22	1.09
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	2.00	1.32
Analyzes disaggregated data	1.78	1.09
Does individual student academic program planning	1.78	.97
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	1.67	.87
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	1.44	.88

Elementary school principals ranked providing small and large-group counseling activities as the most frequent task actually completed. The least frequently reported appropriate task noted was analyzing grades in relation to achievement.

Table 20

Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Elementary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	4.00	.87
Assists with duties in the principal's office	2.78	.83
Regularly visits students' homes	2.11	1.17
Does data entry	2.00	1.23
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1.78	.67
Monitors the cafeteria	1.78	1.30
Recruits students for clubs and activities	1.56	.53
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.56	.73
Registers all new students	1.44	1.33
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.33	.71
Performs clerical record keeping	1.33	.50
Performs disciplinary actions	1.22	.67
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	1.22	.67
Supervises after school activities	1.22	.44
Supervises study hall/recess	1.11	.33
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	1.11	.33
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.00	.00
Designs the master schedule	1.00	.00
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	1.00	.00

Takes daily student attendance	1.00	.00
--------------------------------	------	-----

Elementary school principals rated working with students in a clinical capacity as the most frequently engaged in inappropriate tasks. The following tasks were all ranked as not being engaged in at all: supervising study hall, taking attendance, counseling student athletes, designing the master schedule, and sending students home for inappropriate dress. Mean rankings for secondary school principals are outlined below in Table 21 and Table 22.

Table 21

Appropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Secondary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Does individual student academic program planning	4.62	.70
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges	4.41	1.01
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	4.00	.83
Interprets student records	3.63	1.25
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	3.63	1.45
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations	3.56	1.22
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings	3.44	1.19
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	3.30	1.30
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	3.30	1.14
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	3.26	1.06
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.11	1.40
Analyzes disaggregated data	3.04	1.29
Counsels students who are tardy or absent	2.89	1.01
Counsels students as to appropriate dress	2.30	1.35
Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management	2.00	1.11

For secondary school principals, the top ranked appropriate tasks actually engaged in was individual academic planning, following by working with students who experience school challenges. The lowest ranked actually performed appropriate task was counseling students

about tardiness, absences, inappropriate dress, and providing teachers with suggestion for effective classroom management.

Table 22

Inappropriate Tasks Ranked by Actual Performance (Secondary)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	3.48	1.09
Registers all new students	3.33	1.62
Does data entry	3.11	1.28
Designs the master schedule	3.11	1.37
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	3.04	1.58
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	2.74	1.53
Performs clerical record keeping	2.59	1.37
Recruits students for clubs and activities	2.59	1.34
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports	2.33	1.30
Assists with duties in the principal's office	2.15	1.35
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	2.04	1.06
Regularly visits students' homes	1.85	1.06
Supervises after school activities	1.85	1.20
Monitors the cafeteria	1.78	1.31
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1.70	1.10
Supervises study hall/recess	1.63	1.36
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1.44	1.01
Performs disciplinary actions	1.44	1.05
Takes daily student attendance	1.30	.82
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1.26	.94

For secondary school principals, the top ranked inappropriate task actually performed, as perceived by the principal, was working in a clinical role with students, followed by registering new students. The lowest ranked inappropriate tasks noted to be performed, as perceived by secondary school principals, was sending students home for inappropriate dress.

Lastly, to explore potential differences in perceptions of actual tasks engagement by appropriate and inappropriate tasks, a paired samples *t*-test was conducted. Results indicated a

significant difference in reported importance between appropriate and inappropriate tasks, $t(36) = 11.60, p < .001$. Principals reported that counselors actually engage in appropriate tasks more frequently ($M = 3.22, SD = .66$) compared to inappropriate tasks ($M = 2.17, SD = .62$). These analyses were further conducted separately for elementary and secondary schools, which yielded a similar pattern; see Table 23 below.

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations of Appropriate and Inappropriate Actual Tasks

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
All				11.6	< .001
Appropriate	37	3.22	.66		
Inappropriate	37	2.17	.62		
Elementary				6.97	< .001
Appropriate	9	2.72	.39		
Inappropriate	9	1.71	.11		
Secondary				9.31	< .001
Appropriate	27	3.38	.67		
Inappropriate	27	2.34	.64		

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 aimed at assessing differences in principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role between RAMP and non-RAMP school levels. To test this question, a series of independent samples *t*-tests were computed to assess for between group (RAMP vs. non-RAMP) on all perception scores. There were four categories of responses: Appropriate

Importance, Inappropriate Importance, Appropriate Actual, and Inappropriate Actual. A summary of these analyses is outlined below in Table 24.

Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations of Principal Perceptions by RAMP Status

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
Appropriate Importance				-.77	.449
Non RAMP	19	3.52	.50		
RAMP	19	3.66	.64		
Appropriate Actual				-.13	.897
Non RAMP	19	3.21	.66		
RAMP	18	3.24	.69		
Inappropriate Importance				.22	.825
Non RAMP	19	2.21	.46		
RAMP	19	2.17	.51		
Inappropriate Actual				1.17	.252
Non RAMP	19	2.28	.70		
RAMP	18	2.05	.51		

As shown above, there were no significant differences between RAMP and non-RAMP schools, all *p values* > .05, suggesting typical attitudes towards appropriate and inappropriate tasks, regardless of RAMP status. Out of the RAMP group, there were 13 secondary principals, 5 elementary principals and 1 combination school principal who responded. Out of the non-RAMP group, there were 14 secondary principals and 5 elementary principals. Although the RAMP and non-RAMP group have similar breakdowns in terms of elementary and secondary responses, there may have been an interaction effect between school level and RAMP outcomes, but this could not be tested due to sample size. Additionally, while the limited sample size does

raise some concerns of low power; evaluation of the means and standard deviations of scores suggested no difference across groups.

To explore for differences on an individual level, a series of between subjects *t* tests were computed to compare differences between reported importance and perceived actual engagement in tasks as ranked by RAMP and non-RAMP principals. A summary of the significant differences is shown below in Table 25. A summary of all of the findings is shown in Appendix L. Principals from RAMP schools reported higher levels of importance for monitoring the cafeteria and collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons. On the contrary, principals from non-RAMP schools reported higher levels of importance for designing the master schedule. Regarding actual tasks completed, non-RAMP principals reported higher levels of designing the master schedule and interpreting student records.

Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Importance and Actual Engagement by RAMP and non-RAMP

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>
Monitors the cafeteria (Imp)				-2.13	.042
Non-RAMP	19	1.21	.54		
RAMP	19	1.74	.93		
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (Imp)				-2.34	.025
Non-RAMP	19	3.47	1.07		
RAMP	19	4.21	.86		
Designs the master schedule (Imp)				2.28	.029
Non-RAMP	19	3.05	1.51		
RAMP	19	2.00	1.33		
Designs the master schedule (Act)					

Non-RAMP	19	3.11	1.66	2.55	.016
RAMP	18	1.94	1.06		
Interprets student records (Act)				2.33	.026
Non-RAMP	19	3.74	1.28		
RAMP	18	2.78	1.22		

Note. Only significant findings reported

To further evaluate the perceptions of principals from RAMP schools, the top three ranked tasks of importance and actual performance were evaluated. In terms of importance, RAMP principals noted the following to be most important: working with students who experience school problems on an individual basis, provide small and large group counseling, and assisting the the school principal in identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems. In terms of tasks actually completed, RAMP principals ranked the following as most frequent: working with students individually when they experience school problems, working with students to provide small and large group counseling, and doing individual student academic program planning.

The top three ranked tasks of importance and actual performance were reviewed to evaluate principal perceptions of non-RAMP school principals to compared RAMP school principal perceptions. In terms of importance, non-RAMP principals noted the following to be most important: assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems; working with students who experience school problems on an individual basis, and doing individual academic planning. In terms of tasks actually completed, non-RAMP principals ranked working individually with students that experience school challenges, assisting the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, and interpreting student records as the top three activities. Comparing these top three activities serves to reinforce the

pattern of similarities in rankings between RAMP and non-RAMP principals, since many are overlapping.

Summary

This chapter outlined the statistical findings of the current study. Results indicated that secondary school principals had higher ratings of importance and actual performance of both appropriate and inappropriate tasks compared to elementary school principals. There were no differences noted for RAMP versus non-RAMP schools in overall mean ratings. In addition, principals overall and split by elementary and secondary levels rated appropriate activities significantly more important and actually completed than inappropriate activities. The following chapter will review these results, and practical implications will be discussed with regard to implications for policy, practice, and future research.

Chapter V

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine principals' perceptions of what roles they believe the counselor serves and their perception of the importance of school counselors' roles at elementary and secondary levels, as well as to examine if RAMP designation in a school influences principal perception. This research is important to the field of school counseling because there is a lack of recent and updated information on principals' perceptions of school counselor roles, given that many more schools and districts have begun to use the national model and have become RAMP designated, and the ASCA model is in its fourteenth year of implementation. Research was also needed on perceptions of school counselors at both secondary and elementary levels.

In this study, principals rated a list of 35 appropriate and inappropriate counseling activities on the Administrator Questionnaire- Revised (Dodson, 2009) on a Likert-type scale. These activities were based on the appropriate and inappropriate list of activities for school counselors according to the ASCA model (ASCA, 2012). Results indicate that there were significant differences between elementary principal perceptions and secondary principal perceptions, and there were not significant differences found between RAMP and non-RAMP principals' perceptions. The ratings were also rank ordered by mean score to determine the most important to least important activities in categories of importance and actually completed, and reported out overall as well as separated by elementary and secondary level. Additionally, it was found that principals as a group rated the group of appropriate activities significantly higher as compared to the inappropriate activities in both categories of importance and actually completed.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: summary and interpretation of findings, incorporation of current findings with past findings, limitations of the current study, implications for policy and practice, implications for higher education, and implications for future research.

Summary and Interpretation of Findings

Research question one was as follows: “Are there differences in principals’ perceptions of the school counseling role at the elementary and secondary school levels?”. It was found that there were differences in principal perceptions of counselor duties at the elementary and secondary level in comparing overall mean scores. Overall, secondary principals rated the mean scores of all activities higher regardless of appropriate or inappropriate category, and importance or actual completion category. Because the difference between the groups was significant, secondary and elementary groups will be reported out separately for research questions two and three. In addition, the individual activities below, separated by appropriate and inappropriate category and importance and actual completion, were found to be significantly different.

In terms of appropriate activities, secondary school principals reported higher importance compared to elementary schools of the following: individual student academic planning; interpreting cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; analyzing disaggregated data; analyzing GPA, ensuring records are maintained per policy; and interprets student records. Secondary school principals reported higher actual completion compared to elementary schools of the following: individual student academic planning; analyzes disaggregated data; analyzes student GPA in relation to achievement; ensures records are maintained per policy; and interprets student records.

These above listed activities, although appropriate according to ASCA, are more applicable to secondary schools and generally do not focus on working directly with students, with the exception of individual student academic planning. Most of these activities focus more on the indirect services aspects of the job, and secondary school counselors tend to have more administrative duties than elementary school counseling because the academic planning and college and career planning become more relevant considering development of the students (School-Counselor.org, 2018).

In terms of inappropriate activities, secondary school principals reported higher importance compared to elementary schools of the following: data entry; prepares IEPs; registers all new students; counsels student athletes; computes GPA; coordinates and administers achievement test; and designs master schedule. Secondary school principals reported higher actual completion compared to elementary schools of the following: data entry; prepares IEPs; registers all new students; performs clerical record keeping; counsels student athletes; coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; designs master schedule; recruits students for clubs; and computes GPA. The one activity elementary principals ranked higher than secondary principals, in the actually completed category, was “works with students to provide small and large group counseling activities”, which is an appropriate activity.

The higher ratings of all activities overall by secondary principals makes sense in light of the fact that secondary schools tend to have lower counselor to student ratios, and generally more counselors as part of the program (Carrell & Carell, 2006). In addition, counseling as a profession began in the secondary schools. Only since the 1960s have districts added school counselors to elementary schools (ASCA, 2012, p. vii). The secondary school counseling position has more history and therefore principals may consider the role more needed in a school.

In addition, secondary school principals may have more difficulty shifting expectations since they considered several inappropriate activities significantly more important and thought counselors completed these more than did elementary principals. Elementary principals found counselors to be engaging in small and large group counseling more, which makes sense at the elementary level, since there are less administrative tasks to be completed and considering the developmental level of the students (School-Counselor.org, 2018).

Research question two, “What are principals’ current perceptions of the importance of school counseling roles?”, is a rank order list of the activities deemed most important to least important, and was separated out by elementary and secondary since overall significant differences were found between elementary and secondary principals. In addition, analyses were conducted to see if appropriate activities as a group were ranked significantly higher than inappropriate activities as a group.

For the elementary group, the following activities according to the mean ratings were deemed somewhat to very important and had an overall mean rating of 3 (somewhat important) or above, and are listed from highest overall mean to lowest overall mean: works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities; assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems; works with students individually when students experience school challenges; works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode; counsels students who have disciplinary problems; collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons; counsels students who are tardy or absent; advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meeting; individual academic program planning.

All of these activities with the exception of “works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode” are considered appropriate activities for school counselors. Because

counselors do work with students individually although are not “therapists”, it is possible that the question may have been misinterpreted by the principals as a question asking about individual school counseling work with students vs. providing therapy. It is also possible that principals believe that counselors should be working therapeutically with students and that it is important to the role.

The appropriate activities that were given an overall mean rating below the level of “somewhat important” for elementary principals are: provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management; interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations; interprets student records; analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement; analyzes disaggregated data; and counsels students as to appropriate dress.

Considered appropriate by ASCA, the majority of these activities fall within the indirect services of the delivery component of the ASCA model, and might not be as recognized by the elementary principals. In addition, all other activities ranked below a 3 overall mean score are considered inappropriate activities, which is in line with the ASCA model.

For the secondary group, the following activities according to the mean ratings were deemed somewhat to very important and had an overall mean rating of 3 or above, ranked highest overall mean to lowest overall mean: works with students individually when students experience school challenges; individual student academic program planning; assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems; works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities; ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations; collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons; interprets student records; advocates for students at IEPs, student study

teams, and truancy meetings; analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement; interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; registers all new students; counsels students who have disciplinary problems; counsels students who are tardy or absent; works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode; analyzes disaggregated data; designs the master schedule; and data entry.

Out of these 17 activities, the first 10 are appropriate activities for school counselors and focus on working with students, teachers and the principal, and in an appropriate manner in regards to student records. The four inappropriate activities ranked highly are registers new students, works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode, designs the master schedule, and data entry. In terms of registering new students, data entry and designs the master schedule, in many secondary schools, the school registrar is part of the counseling department, and counselors meet with students after a student is registered to assign a schedule and introduce him/her to the school (ASCA, 2012, p.17). Completing data entry may go along with entering schedules into the computer system. In many secondary schools, counselors are responsible for the student schedules, as it relates to academic planning for students, and this could be why “designs master schedule” is ranked as important (ASCA, 2012, p. 17).

In terms of “works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode”, this question could have been misinterpreted as individual school counseling work with a student as it was also ranked highly by elementary school principals. It is also possible that principals believe this role to be important, since this result was also seen in the elementary principals’ responses.

The remaining activities received less than a 3 overall mean ranking, and are listed from highest overall mean to lowest overall mean: coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and

achievement tests; recruits students for clubs and activities; computes grade point averages/honor roll data; regularly visits students' homes; counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports; provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management; prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs); counsels students as to appropriate dress; performs clerical record keeping; assists with duties in the principal's office; supervises after school activities; monitors the cafeteria; assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent; supervises study hall/recess; performs disciplinary actions; takes daily student attendance; signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent; sends students home who are not appropriately dressed.

All of these duties are inappropriate and according to the ASCA model should be given lower ratings, with the exception of "counsels students as to appropriate dress" and "provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management." Counseling students as to appropriate dress is a counseling activity that is appropriate according to ASCA but is one that has not been highly ranked as important by either secondary or elementary principals, perhaps because it is something that could seem judgmental, or not applicable to the majority of students. Providing teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management, also an appropriate activity, was not highly rated as important by elementary or secondary principals either, although it was ranked higher by elementary principals. This could be due to the fact that counselors may not be viewed by principals as having expertise related to instruction in the classroom, or it is simply not considered one of the most important aspects of the role. Although counselors receive training through programs on behavior management for students, counselors are more likely to consult with teachers involving individual student behavior, versus full classroom management as the wording suggests. Lastly, it was found that all appropriate tasks were ranked significantly

more highly than inappropriate tasks, in terms of importance, according to all principals overall as well as separated out by elementary and secondary levels.

Research question three, “What are principals’ current perception of what roles the counselor is actually serving?”, is a rank order and was separated out by elementary and secondary since overall significant differences were found between elementary and secondary principals. In addition, analyses were conducted to see if appropriate activities as a group were ranked significantly higher than inappropriate activities as a group.

For the elementary group, the following activities according to the mean ratings were deemed performed regularly to performed occasionally and had an overall rating of 3 (performed occasionally) or above, highest overall mean to lowest overall mean: works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities; works with students individually when students experience school challenges; assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems; counsels students who have disciplinary problems; works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode; collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons.

These are all appropriate activities according to ASCA with the exception of working with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode. According to elementary principals, not only is this an activity that is believed to be important, but also one that is actually performed. The actual activities that received a mean rating of 3 or higher are similar to the importance activities and the following appropriate actually completed activities overlap: works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities; works with students individually when students experience school challenges; assists the school principal with

identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems; counsels students who have disciplinary problems; and collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons.

The activities that received less than a 3 overall mean ranking, meaning that the activity is performed below occasionally, and performed once or twice a year to not at all, were inappropriate with the exception of: provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management; advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings; counsels students who are tardy or absent; interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests; ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations; interprets student records; analyzes grade/grade point averages in relationship to achievement; analyzes disaggregated data; counsels students to as to appropriate dress.

These activities which are appropriate according to ASCA guidelines, but are ranked below “performed occasionally”, are similar to what elementary principals report in question two regarding importance of these activities, and could be explained because the majority are indirect services to students and may not be as recognized by elementary principals. Overall, importance of activities and actually performed activities are rated similarly. In addition, the bottom 12 ranked activities in this category for actual completion are all in the inappropriate activity category.

For the secondary group, the activities that had a mean rating of 3 or above were all appropriate activities with the exception of: works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode; registers all new students; does data entry; designs the master schedule; coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests. These activities are the same activities found in the importance category with a mean score of 3 and above in research question two with one addition of coordinating and administering cognitive, aptitude, and

achievement tests. In secondary schools especially, counselors may serve as testing coordinators (ASCA, 2012, p. 17), which is inappropriate. It is important to note that secondary principals also believe, like elementary principals, that not only is “working with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode” important, but that it is also an activity that is actually completed.

The remaining activities which received less than a 3 overall rating are all inappropriate with the exception of “counsels students who are tardy or absent”, “counsels students as to appropriate dress”, and “provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management.” These results are in line with the results from question 2 on importance, with the addition of “counsels students who are tardy or absent.” The majority of activities on this list, however, should be ranked below the other activities according to best practices, and is in line with the ASCA model. Additionally, it was found that all appropriate tasks were ranked more highly than inappropriate tasks, in terms of actual completion, according to all principals overall as well as elementary and secondary principals.

It is worthwhile to note that some of the activities that appear on the research instrument come directly from ASCA’s (2012, p. 45) list of appropriate and inappropriate school counselor activities and may have been added to provide a counterpoint of difference between expectations. For example, “counseling students as to appropriate dress” is not something that principals believe is important or is performed regularly in the current study, and although it is an appropriate activity, it is not an activity that would necessarily be done regularly or deemed highly important to the role according to counselors, either. However, when considering “sending students home for inappropriate dress”, it is more appropriate in comparison. To the same end, “counseling students who are tardy or absent” and “signing excuse notes for students who are tardy or absent” provide a similar counterpoint.

Research question four is as follows: “Are school counselors in RAMP designated schools perceived differently by principals than school counselors in non-RAMP schools?”. Overall, RAMP principals and non-RAMP principals were not significantly different in their perceptions. The differences for specific variables are listed below according to appropriate/inappropriate category.

In terms of appropriate activities, RAMP school principals reported higher importance compared to non-RAMP schools of the following: collaborating with teachers to present guidance on curriculum. Non-RAMP school principals reported higher actual completion compared to RAMP schools of the following: interprets student records. In terms of inappropriate activities, RAMP school principals reported higher importance compared to non-RAMP schools of the following: monitoring the cafeteria. Non-RAMP school principals reported higher importance compared to RAMP schools of the following: designing the master schedule. Non-RAMP school principals reported higher actual completion compared to RAMP schools of the following: designing the master schedule.

For the inappropriate activity “monitoring the cafeteria” RAMP school principals found this activity to be significantly more important than non-RAMP principals, which is surprising, considering it is an inappropriate activity according to ASCA. One potential explanation is that RAMP principals may have interpreted the question to mean that the counselor is visible and around the school. However, this is an unexpected result that simply does not fit with the rest of the results, and it is important to note that the mean score by the RAMP principals was still low overall ($m=1.71$), meaning that it was rated between not important to minimally important. Furthermore, the significance rate was $p = .042$, which is not a strong significance level.

For the inappropriate activity “designing the master schedule” non-RAMP school principals found this activity to be significantly more important and also actually completed significantly more than RAMP principals. Since this is an inappropriate duty according to ASCA, and is not part of the RAMP process, this result is what would be expected. It is also important to note that the master schedule is generally only completed once or twice per year, but it may be adjusted as needed through the year and updated.

The above listed variables were the only ones that were found significantly different between RAMP and non-RAMP principals. It is important to keep in mind that there were not overall significant differences found between RAMP and non-RAMP principals in their ratings of activities in importance and actual completion, and many of the rankings are in line with what the ASCA model promotes. Perhaps the ASCA model has made impact on the field, and even principals in schools that are not RAMP designated are becoming more aware of appropriate and inappropriate activities for school counselors. RAMP designation is not necessary in order for principals to have perceptions that are aligned with ASCA. Because ASCA is expanding and doing more trainings in school districts each year (J. Walsh, personal communication, Nov. 13, 2018) perhaps the best practices which are endorsed by ASCA are becoming more commonplace and recognized in school counseling programs.

Incorporation of Current Findings with Past Findings

Perceptions of principals and counselors regarding counselor activities, roles, and use of time have been studied over the past two decades, although updated information is necessary given that ASCA is now in its fourteenth year of implementation and studies have not been conducted in some time (Dodson, 2009). Over the past two decades, certain studies showed patterns that principals perceived school counselors were engaging or should be engaging in

activities that are non-counselor related (Leuwerke, et al., 2009), and other studies found support for the ASCA national model concepts.

In 2004, Perusse, et. al. conducted a survey of elementary and secondary principals, and found that elementary principals believed counselors should be involved in test administration, record keeping, and additional duties, and that 80% of the secondary principals believed student registration, test administration, and maintenance of student records were appropriate school counselor activities. Kirchner and Stechfield (2005) found that principals commonly named registration, testing, discipline, record keeping, and working with the special education program as important school counselor tasks. Monteiro-Leitner, et. al. (2006) conducted surveys of principals and school counselors which focused on perceptions of school counselors' time spent in various activities. Principals believed that school counselors needed more time for working with individual education plans, organizing tests, and performing bus, lunch, or recess duty, and individual counseling for students and attending professional development were not ranked as highly important activities.

However, studies have been conducted that have shown support for the ASCA standards and model and best practices in school counseling. A study from 1997 (Roberts et. al.) found that chief administrators, mostly superintendents, in schools from Minnesota valued school counselors and recognized that prevention was a major aspect of the role. Zalaquette (2005) conducted a study with elementary school principals in Florida and found that ninety-two percent were very satisfied or satisfied with school counselor job performance, and the majority "believed that counselors should spend more time on the following duties: individual counseling, small group counseling, classroom guidance, consulting with parents, crisis counseling, consulting with teachers, coordinating community services, and academic advising and career

counseling, as opposed to coordinating meetings and state tests” (Zalaquette, 2005, p.454).

Similar results were found by Zalaquette and Chatters (2012) with data from 2005 with middle school principals in Florida. Beesley and Frey (2006) found in a national study of principals that the majority reported being very satisfied to satisfied with the counseling services of “classroom guidance, individual and group counseling, consultation and program coordination” (Beesley & Frey, 2006, p.16) Elementary principals reported higher satisfaction levels as compared to middle and high school principals, but results indicated overall that principals were aware of appropriate roles for counselors, including “counseling and guidance, coordination, consultation, accountability, assessment, advocacy, and leadership as well as the need to minimize non-counseling duties and reduce counselor ratios” (Beesley & Frey, 2006, p.17)

In the current study, differences were found overall in ratings of elementary and secondary principals, with secondary principals rating importance and actual completion of counseling activities overall more highly than elementary principals. These results differ from the one found in the Beesley and Frey study, which found that elementary principals rated counseling programs more highly. In addition, Zalaquette’s studies (Zalaquette 2005; Zalaquette & Chatters, 2012) found that elementary, middle, and high school principals had a high degree of alignment. The research in the current study indicates differences in perceptions of importance of counseling activities and that they are actually being completed, with secondary principals ranking all activities overall more highly than elementary principals. However, in terms of activities, principals ranked administrative tasks that are not connected to the counseling programs the lowest in both secondary and elementary, in importance of activities and activities actually completed. Principals overall also ranked most highly working with students individually when experiencing school challenges, helping the principal resolve student needs

and challenges, and working with students in small and large group activities all to be important and actually happening.

Dodson's 2009 study of high school administrators indicated that RAMP administrators perceived that counselors are collaborating with teachers to deliver guidance lessons, are counseling students with discipline issues, and are interpreting student records more so than non-RAMP administrators perceive counselors to be engaging in these activities. Additionally, the RAMP administrators believed that delivering guidance lessons, counseling students with discipline issues, and providing suggestions to teachers for better management of study hall were important activities for a counselor more so than the non-RAMP administrators did. All administrators perceived counselors to work in the academic, personal and social, and career development areas with students, and there were similarities in the ratings between the two sets of administrators (Dodson, 2009).

In the current study there was not a large enough return to examine only the high school results and compare them to Dodson's (2009) results, and there was not enough of a return to look at overall categories of elementary and secondary by RAMP status. However, results of the overall principal sample indicated that in terms of appropriate activities, non-RAMP school principals reported higher actual completion compared to RAMP schools of the following: interpreting student records. This was the opposite of what was found in Dodson's results. RAMP principals reported higher importance compared to non-RAMP schools of the following: collaborating with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons. This result was consistent with Dodson's result. Dodson did not review inappropriate activities to examine if there were differences between RAMP and non-RAMP principals. These comparisons which show

inconsistent alignment may indicate that RAMP status of a school does not necessarily influence principal perceptions as this point in time.

In terms of support of appropriate activities according to ASCA, the results of the current study fit solidly with the studies that have found support for the ASCA model and aspects of the ASCA model, particularly because principals overall rated the group of appropriate activities significantly more highly than the group of inappropriate activities in both categories of importance and actually completed. The consistently most highly rated activities, when looked at according to overall level as well as elementary and secondary levels, and in the categories of importance and actual, were: works with students individually when experiencing school challenges, assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems, and works with students to provide small and large group counseling activities. This trio of activities appeared as the top three highest rated activities for the overall principal group for both importance and actual categories. The same three activities appeared as the top three tasks for importance and actual in the elementary group. The secondary principal group also rated these activities at the top of this list as well, but “individual academic planning” appeared in the top three for importance and actual categories, which makes sense given the developmental level of high school students and the need for post-secondary planning. These activities that are highest rated are supported by the ASCA model as appropriate tasks and firmly fit into the delivery component of the ASCA model as direct services to students. It is encouraging that principals ranked these important activities and direct service areas the most highly.

The one inappropriate task that appeared at the top of the list and was highly rated was “working with one student at a time in therapeutic, clinical mode.” Although this activity is

inappropriate according to ASCA, principals overall and both elementary and secondary levels ranked it highly and above any other inappropriate activity for both importance and actual categories. Principals may have misunderstood that the question was about providing therapy to students, which is not an appropriate role. However, this may be an area in which further education for principals is needed. On the other hand, this indicates that principals believe individual work with students is important and should be occurring, and could be a strength and advocacy point for school counselors to advocate for themselves about what kinds of services are most important. Further discussion on this point is included in the “Implications for Future Research” section later in this chapter.

Limitations of Current Study

This study examined perceptions nationally, at different levels in the K-12 continuum, and updated this area of research after the ASCA model has been implemented for fourteen years. Although the current study was considered a national study since 445 principal participants were invited from 36 states, only 38 total participants responded to the survey, which is a response rate of 8.5%. This could have been due to the fact that principals ignored the survey and reminders, had other pressing issues going on, or were hesitant to participate for different reasons, even though the researcher ensured confidentiality through the informed consent. Timing may have also been a factor as the survey was sent in the beginning of August and was open on Qualtrics for 60 days. Generally, that is a busy time for school principals who are preparing to begin the school year and this may have impacted the return rate as well. The low response rate limits the generalizability of the findings.

The states that were surveyed were states in which there were RAMP designated schools only, and comparison schools were picked from these same states. As there were only 38

respondents, the generalizability is limited since the response group was small, so the results should be interpreted with caution about the meaning to the school counseling field as a whole. In addition, 71.1% of the group was white, with 27 respondents identifying as white. Only two respondents identified as black, which was 5.3% of the sample, one respondent identified as Hispanic, which was 2.6% of the sample, and one identified as multi racial/other, also 2.6% of the sample. Seven participants declined to answer. According to the United States Department of Education (2016), in the 2012 school year, 80% of principals were white, 10% were black and 7% were Hispanic. These percentages of race from the current study are similar to the racial breakdown of the profession, but these results should still be interpreted with caution for principals of races and ethnicities other than white, since they are a much smaller part of the sample.

Another limitation is that half of the respondents were principals in RAMP schools, which is not representative of a national sample of schools. Although there were no significant differences found between the RAMP principals and the non-RAMP principals, the fact that half of the respondents were not representative of a national sample additionally further limits the generalizability.

A final limitation is the wording on the research instrument used in this study. Based on the Administrator Questionnaire (Dodson, 2009) and ASCA's list of appropriate and inappropriate counseling activities (ASCA, 2012, p. 45) a few of the activities on the list appear to have been added to demonstrate a difference in expectations. For example, "counsels students on appropriate dress" is an appropriate activity, but it is not an activity that was ranked highly by principals in this study. However, an activity on the inappropriate list is "sends students home for inappropriate dress", which is clearly inappropriate. Some of the wording could be

considered contrived to demonstrate the difference in expectations. Other examples include “analyzes disaggregated data” versus “data entry”; “counsels students with disciplinary problems” versus “performs disciplinary actions”; “analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement” versus “computes grade point averages/honor roll data”; and “counsels students who are tardy or absent” versus “signing excuse notes for students who are tardy or absent.” The list of activities was not designed to include all activities that a school counselor might perform, but rather to move the profession from one set of expectations to another in general.

Implications for Policy and Practice

This study has had favorable results for the perception of importance and actual school counseling happening that aligns with the ASCA model. The results indicate that ASCA should continue to work in implementation of the national model nationally and with outreach to districts. According to ASCA, approximately 80 new districts each year are partnering with ASCA for trainings for the school counselors and other faculty and staff (J. Walsh, personal communication, Nov. 13, 2018). ASCA provides national conferences and state-affiliated school counseling associations provide annual conferences. In addition, districts should be offering incentives for attending these types of conferences which lead to professional development around best practices and an increase in knowledge of most current conceptualizations of the school counseling role.

It is also important for districts to have supervisors and liaisons at the district level to support counselors (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). In that regard, principals who may not understand the role of the school counselor can be held accountable to the extent possible so that appropriate duties are assigned and also perhaps receive professional development around what

school counseling should entail to continue the positive trend. School counselors should stay on top of best practices in the field and engage in advocacy efforts also to the continue the positive trend since currently most principals learn about the role of school counseling on the job (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Beesley & Frey, 2006).

Additionally, school counselors should be delivering data driven programs, so that they can demonstrate that what they are doing makes a difference for students and how their programs are impacting students. Based on the information found in this study, it appears that principals who were studied do have a good idea of what is important and what should be accomplished in a counseling program, so counselors should be ready to document and show how they are deciding how to spend their time and how they are accomplishing tasks that are important to principals. RAMP may not be necessary in order to have an effective program, but aligning to ASCA standards and being able to show the difference the program makes to the overall school is key in not just helping principals understand the importance of appropriate counseling activities, but also to show principals who are aware of what is important that the school counseling program is effective.

In terms of implications for ASCA, more differentiation in terms of elementary versus secondary school counseling may be necessary to continue to help define the profession. Given that the results of this study found significant differences between the two groups of principals, more delineation is needed within the national model to speak to how elementary and secondary activities may differ. Secondary counselors have a more administrative role in their schools, considering the developmental level of the students at the secondary grade levels and the need for post-secondary planning on students' behalf, which can look very different in day to day counseling activities from the elementary level. This difference was evident in examining the

rating scale results on the survey. Further clarification and perhaps an exploration of two different models for elementary and secondary school counseling levels may be appropriate.

Results of the study also suggest that the RAMP process should be reviewed by ASCA as to determine the effectiveness within schools as compared to ASCA alignment, given the results of this study. In addition to this study not finding any overall significant differences between RAMP and non-RAMP schools in terms of principal perception on importance of activities and activities actually being completed, RAMP is a time consuming and extensive process that may take away from counselors spending time with students and fulfilling duties as needed. In schools with less resources including counselors, it may be difficult to find the allocations to complete such a process, which could mean that the RAMP process becomes more attainable for districts with the most resources, which would be against the core tenets of the equity ASCA aims to bring to schools across the nation. In this study, 12 of the 19 non-RAMP principals reported ASCA alignment, meaning the majority of principals in the non-RAMP group perceive that their program conforms with the ASCA national model. It may be that ASCA alignment is more important to focus on than focusing on a national designation, especially considering the RAMP process and all that it entails.

Implications for Higher Education

This study provides helpful information for Counselor Educators to understand the newest trends in how principals view counseling activities according to what is important and what is not, and what is actually being completed and not being completed. Principals in this current study find appropriate activities according to ASCA to be more important and completed significantly more. Also, the activities that are deemed the most important and completed the most often are activities that are providing direct services to students and are contained in the

Delivery model of the ASCA model (ASCA, 2012, p. 84-87). This information may be useful to Counselor Educators who train school counselors and can help school counselors strategize about advocacy. Advocacy might not be as challenging if school counselors are able to approach principals with the mindset that principals appear to understand the role of counselor and want counselors to be providing direct services and working directly with students. Capitalizing on this information may help school counselors prioritize duties and perhaps re-balance duties that are not as in line with ASCA recommendations, while at the same time gaining support of the principal and administration.

In terms of higher education and preparation for school administrators, it would make sense to include information about the counselor role into higher education programs, because currently administrator preparatory programs do not regularly provide knowledge about the counselor role. Typically, most administrators learn about the counselor role through firsthand experience (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Beesley & Frey, 2006). Although according to the current study, progress does appear to have been made in principals understanding what school counseling is supposed to be and should look like, perhaps a training on the ASCA model and role of school counselors could be included as part of Educational Leadership programs and could help continue the positive trend. Training would be helpful particularly given the wording in the language that ASCA uses around appropriate and inappropriate activities for a counselor, and to help distinguish differences in secondary and elementary school roles more clearly.

If both Counselor Educator programs and Educational Leadership programs included aspects of information found in this study as well as further information about roles of both counselors and principals, it could make the role of advocacy less stressful, could help school

counselors focus on the things that are most important about the role, and ultimately benefit students by improving programs.

Implications for Future Research

Since only a limited number of participants responded in the current study, with a response rate of 8.5%, further research is warranted to continue answering the research questions posed in this study. With more participants, generalizability would increase, and also more advanced statistical analyses could be conducted. Timing of the survey is something that also should be considered and planned for to the extent possible, in order to survey principals at less busy times of the school year.

In terms of future research for ASCA and RAMP, there were two principals in the sample who responded “no” to the question on if their school was RAMP-designated, even though their schools were RAMP-designated. One of the principals was a first year principal, but the other had four years of experience in his/her particular building. Out of non-RAMP principals, all reported either “no” or “unsure” to the RAMP question. In terms of ASCA, RAMP principals reported that their school has an ASCA-aligned program, except for one principal who reported “unsure.” Out of non-RAMP principals, 12 reported an ASCA-aligned program, four were unsure and three said “no.” In considering this information, a future research implication could be to examine if awareness of the status of RAMP or ASCA-alignment impacts perceptions, which would best be measured by a mixed methods study to see if principals are aware of the status, and then a qualitative follow up to see if they understand the difference.

It is also recommended that additional studies with more diversity be conducted. Although the sample in the current study approximately matched the racial demographics of principals in the nation, a very small number in the current study were races other than

Caucasian. It would be important to explore how perceptions of principals could differ based on racial and ethnic backgrounds. Additional qualitative studies are also recommended to further explore unique attitudes and experiences of principals, and why they may have the perceptions they have, to give more insight into the thought processes behind rating school counseling activities. It would also be interesting to explore training and education on principal perceptions and attitudes regarding the school counseling role.

A final recommendation is to explore what principals believe regarding school counselors working with students in a therapeutic, clinical mode. According to ASCA, "Counseling is planned and goal-focused, and it is short-term in nature. School counselors do not provide therapy or long-term counseling in schools to address psychological disorders" (ASCA, 2012, p. 86). However, the inappropriate activity "working with students individually in a therapeutic, clinical mode" was ranked highly by the overall principal group and by both the elementary and secondary principal groups. Further research is necessary to ascertain if these results were unique to this study, a misinterpretation of the question, or if principals do believe that counselors should be and are working with students in a therapeutic manner. According to ASCA in regards to what is appropriate for school counselors, "School counselors provide counseling sessions in individual or small group settings to help students overcome issues impeding achievement or success. The counseling process helps students identify problems, causes, alternatives and possible consequences so that they can make decisions and take appropriate actions. However, school counselors are prepared to recognize and respond to student mental health crises and needs and to address these barriers to student success by offering education, prevention and crisis and short-term intervention until the student is connected with available community resources. When students require long term counseling or therapy, school counselors make referrals to

appropriate community resources” (ASCA, 2012, p. 86). It is possible that principals may not have been able to distinguish the difference between the role that is appropriate for school counselors versus the role of providing therapy, particularly given how the question was worded in the survey. Further exploration on this topic could lead to implications for principal training and education around how school counselors should be involved in providing individual counseling to students.

Conclusion

There are a few important and meaningful outcomes from this study. One is that secondary and elementary principals view counselors differently in regards to importance and their perceptions of activities actually being completed, with secondary principals ranking counseling duties overall as significantly more important and significantly more engaged in than elementary principals. This makes sense in the context of the history of school counseling with school counseling beginning as a secondary profession. However, there are similarities in ratings of counselor activities in looking at elementary and secondary ratings of activities, both important and actually performed, and principals overall as well as split by elementary and secondary ranked activities that are appropriate according to ASCA standards higher than inappropriate activities. In regards to RAMP, there were no significant differences found overall between RAMP and non-RAMP principals, and there were similarities in mean ratings between the two groups, indicating that RAMP designation does not make a difference to principal perception.

References

- Amatea, E.S., & Clark, M. (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(1), 16-27.
- American School Counseling Association. (2018). *About ASCA*. Retrieved from: <http://www.schoolcounselor.org>
- American School Counseling Association. (2018). *Application Process*. Retrieved from: [https://www.schoolcounselor.org/school-counselors/recognized-asca-model-program-\(ramp\)/application-process](https://www.schoolcounselor.org/school-counselors/recognized-asca-model-program-(ramp)/application-process)
- American School Counseling Association. (2018). *The Role of the School Counselor*. Retrieved from: <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/administrators/role-of-the-school-counselor>
- American School Counselor Association. (2018). *The Role of the School Counselor*. Retrieved from: <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/CareersRoles/RoleStatement.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2016). ASCA ethical standards. *Alexandria, VA: Author*.
- American School Counselor Association. (2015). ASCA mindsets and behaviors for student success. *Alexandria, VA: Author*.
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). American School Counselor Association.
- American School Counselor Association. (2005). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nd ed.). American School Counselor Association.
- American School Counselor Association. (2003). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (1st ed.). American School Counselor Association.

American School Counselor Association. (2008). ASCA School Counselor Competencies.

Alexandria, VA: Author.

Armstrong, S. A., MacDonald, J. H., & Stillo, S. (2010). School Counselors and Principals:

Different Perceptions of Relationship, Leadership, and Training. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(15), n15.

Beesley, D. & Frey L.L. (2006). Principals' perceptions of school counselor roles and

satisfaction with school counseling services. *Journal of School Counseling, 4*(14), n14.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. *American*

psychologist, 34(10), 844.

Carey, J., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Hoffman, D. (2012). A statewide evaluation of the

outcomes of ASCA National Model school counseling programs in rural and suburban Nebraska high schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 100–107.

Carey, J. C., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Stevens, D. (2012). A statewide evaluation of the

outcomes of the implementation of ASCA National Model school counseling programs in high schools in Utah. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 89–99.

Carrell, S. & Carrell, S. (2006). Do Lower Student to Counselor Ratios Reduce School

Disciplinary Problems?. *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 5*(1), pp. -.

Retrieved 2 Jan. 2019, from doi:10.1515/1538-0645.1463

Clemens, E., Shipp, A., & Kimbel, T. (2011). Investigating the psychometric properties of school

counselor self-advocacy questionnaire. *Professional School Counseling, 15*(1), 34-44.

Davis, K. M., & Garrett, M. T. (1998). Bridging the gap between school counselors and teachers:

A proactive approach. *Professional School Counseling, 1*(5), 54.

- Dillman, D., Smyth, J. & Christian, L. (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*, New York: Wiley.
- Dimmitt, C., Carey, J. C., & Hatch, T. (2007). *Evidence-based school counseling: Making a difference with data-driven practices*. Corwin Press.
- Dodson, T. (2009). Advocacy and impact: A comparison of administrators' perceptions of the high school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(6), 480-487.
- Education Trust. (1996). *National initiative to transform school counseling*. [Brochure]. Washington, DC: Author.
- Education Bug (2018). *A Complete Listing of Educational Resources*. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationbug.org>
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2000). *Developing and managing your school guidance program* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2001). Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Programs: A Rich History and a Bright Future. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(4), 246.
- Gysbers & Henderson (2001). *Leading and Managing Comprehensive School Guidance Programs*. Retrieved from: <https://www.counseling.org/Resources/Library/ERIC%20Digests/2001-07.pdf>
- House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 249-256.
- Institute of Educational Sciences (2018). *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from: <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84>
- Johnson, C. D., & Johnson, S. K. (2001). *Results-based student support programs: Leadership academy workbook*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Professional Update.

- Kirchner, G. L., & Setchfield, M. S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education, 126*(1), 10.
- Lambie, G. W., & Williamson, L. L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling, 124*-131.
- Leuwerke, W., Walker, J., & Shi, Q. (2009). Informing principals: The impact of different types of information on principals' perceptions of professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(4), 263-271.
- Martin, I., Carey, J., & DeCoster, K. (2009). A national study of the current status of state school counseling models. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(5), 378-386.
- Martin, I., & Carey, J. (2014). Development of a Logic Model to Guide Evaluations of the ASCA National Model for School Counseling Programs. *Professional Counselor, 4*(5), 455-466.
- Mason, E., & McMahon, H. (2009). Leadership practices of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 107-115.
- Miles-Hastings, S. A. (1997). *Counselor and principal perceptions of middle school counselor roles in Colorado* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado).
- Monteiro-Leitner, J., Asner-Self, K., Milde, C., Leitner, D., & Skelton, D. (2006). The role of the rural school counselor: Counselor, counselor-in-training, and principal perceptions. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3), 248-251.
- Myrick, R. D. (2003). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach* (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Educational Media Corporation.
- 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 counseling initiative. *Professional School Counseling*, 152-161.
- 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(4), 280-287.
- School-Counselor.org (2018). *High School Guidance Counseling*. Retrieved from: <http://www.school-counselor.org/high-school-counseling.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved February 20, 2017 from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/legislation.html#leg>
- U.S. Department of Education (2016). *The State of Racial Diversity in the Education Workforce*. Retrieved from: <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf>
- VanZandt, Z., & Hayslip, J. (2001). *Developing Your School Counseling Program: A Handbook for Systemic Planning*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 10 Davis Dr., Belmont, CA 94002-3098.
- Whiston, S. C., & Quinby, R. F. (2009). Review of school counseling outcome research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(3), 267-272.
- Wilkerson, K., Pérusse, R., & Hughes, A. (2013). Comprehensive school counseling programs and student achievement outcomes: A comparative analysis of RAMP versus non-RAMP schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(3), 172-184.
- Zagelbaum, A., Kruczek, T., Alexander, C., & Crethar, H. (2014). Where Are We Now? An

Updated Review of the School Counseling Literature for Trends and Themes. *Journal of School Counseling*, 12(4), n4.

Zalaquette, C. P. (2005). Principals' perceptions of elementary school counselors' role and functions. *Professional School Counseling*, 451-457.

Zalaquette, C.P. & Chatters, S.J. (2012). Middle school principals' perceptions of middle school counselors' roles and functions. *American Secondary Education*, 40(2), 90-103.

Appendices

Appendix A

Administrator Questionnaire

This research study has been designed to solicit high school administrators' perceptions of the role of the high school counselor.

On the left side of the questionnaire, rate the level of importance you assign to the following counselor roles on a scale of 1 to 5. (1 indicates the role is not important, 2 indicates the role is minimally important, 3 indicates the role is somewhat important, 4 indicates the role is important, and 5 indicates the role is very important.)

On the right side of the questionnaire, rate the extent you perceive that your counselors actually perform these selected roles on a scale of 1 to 5. (1 indicates the role is not performed at all, 2 indicates the role is performed once or twice a year, 3 indicates the role is performed occasionally, 4 indicates the role is performed often, and 5 indicates the role is performed regularly.)

Importance	<i>The High School Counselor</i>	Actual
1. 1 2 3 4 5	Does individual student academic program planning	1 2 3 4 5
2. 1 2 3 4 5	Does data entry	1 2 3 4 5
3. 1 2 3 4 5	Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
4. 1 2 3 4 5	Prepares individual education plans	1 2 3 4 5
5. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
6. 1 2 3 4 5	Prepares school attendance review boards	1 2 3 4 5
7. 1 2 3 4 5	Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	1 2 3 4 5
8. 1 2 3 4 5	Assists with duties in the principal's office	1 2 3 4 5
9. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	1 2 3 4 5
10. 1 2 3 4 5	Monitors the cafeteria	1 2 3 4 5
11. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students as to appropriate dress	1 2 3 4 5
12. 1 2 3 4 5	Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	1 2 3 4 5
13. 1 2 3 4 5	Registers all new students	1 2 3 4 5
14. 1 2 3 4 5	Disaggregates data	1 2 3 4 5
15. 1 2 3 4 5	Supervises after-school activities	1 2 3 4 5
16. 1 2 3 4 5	Analyzes grade point averages in relationship to achievement	1 2 3 4 5
17. 1 2 3 4 5	Performs clerical record keeping	1 2 3 4 5
18. 1 2 3 4 5	Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1 2 3 4 5
19. 1 2 3 4 5	Advocates for students at individual education plan meetings, student study teams, and school attendance review boards	1 2 3 4 5
20. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels athletes on mental imagery	1 2 3 4 5
21. 1 2 3 4 5	Works with students to provide small- and large-group counseling activities	1 2 3 4 5
22. 1 2 3 4 5	Supervises study hall	1 2 3 4 5
23. 1 2 3 4 5	Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	1 2 3 4 5
24. 1 2 3 4 5	Makes home visits to students in trouble	1 2 3 4 5
25. 1 2 3 4 5	Computes grade point averages	1 2 3 4 5
26. 1 2 3 4 5	Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
27. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	1 2 3 4 5
28. 1 2 3 4 5	Designs the master schedule	1 2 3 4 5
29. 1 2 3 4 5	Ensures that student records are maintained as per state and federal regulations	1 2 3 4 5
30. 1 2 3 4 5	Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
31. 1 2 3 4 5	Interprets student records	1 2 3 4 5

32.	1 2 3 4 5	Provides teachers with suggestions for better management of study hall	1 2 3 4 5
33.	1 2 3 4 5	Performs disciplinary actions	1 2 3 4 5
34.	1 2 3 4 5	Recruits students for clubs and activities	1 2 3 4 5
35.	1 2 3 4 5	Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed	1 2 3 4 5
36.	From your viewpoint as an administrator, are there duties or roles your counselor(s) perform that are not included above? If so, what are they?		
37.	Due to your students' needs, what school counselor roles are considered to be most critical in your school?		
38.	Other comments:		
ABOUT YOUR COUNSELING PROGRAM:			
<i>Do you have . . .</i>		Yes	No
39.	A counseling program that has earned the RAMP designation?		_____
	If yes, how many years has this designation been held?		_____
40.	A school counseling program management agreement?		_____
41.	A school counseling calendar of events?		_____
42.	A school counseling program advisory council?		_____
43.	A yearly program evaluation to appraise the progress of the program development and goals?		_____
44.	A districtwide school counseling curriculum?		_____
45.	A schoolwide counseling curriculum?		_____
ABOUT YOU AND YOUR SCHOOL:			
46.	Years as administrator: _____		
47.	Years as administrator at current school: _____		
48.	Gender: M F		
49.	School enrollment: _____		
50.	Rural/urban/suburban setting: _____		
51.	Public/private: _____		
52.	Number of school counselors at your school: _____		
53.	If specialty school, what type? _____		

Appendix B

Request for Permission to Use the Administrator Questionnaire

https://nps-nre.philasd.org/as/scan.vm PHILADELPHIA Search Rose-Valadez, Caitlin

Mail Contacts Calendar Tasks Briefcase Preferences Search Re: Dissertation

Close Reply Reply to All Forward Archive Delete Spam Actions

Re: Dissertation research December 4, 2017 10:56 AM

From: Dodson, Tammy L
To: Caitlin Rose-Valadez

Yes, you may use my administrator questionnaire - please site accordingly. I wish you well in your research!
Tammy

Tammy Dodson, Ed.D, NCSC, NCC, LPC
School Counselor for Class of 2019 & 2021 (A-E)
Grandview High School
20500 E Arapahoe Rd
Aurora, CO 80016
720-886-6610

From: Valadez, Caitlin <crose@philasd.org>
Sent: Saturday, December 2, 2017 12:59:15 PM
To: Dodson, Tammy L
Subject: Dissertation research

Hello Dr. Dodson,
My name is Caitlin Rose-Valadez and I am a doctoral student in Counselor Education and Supervision at Virginia Tech as well as a school counselor in the School District of Philadelphia. I am currently working on my dissertation which is going to examine school principals' perceptions of the school counseling role. When doing research for my literature review, I came across your research article that was very similar to what I am interested in studying. I am particularly interested in using the Administrator Questionnaire which you developed for your study, and was hoping that you would grant me permission to use the questionnaire in my doctoral research. If you would be available to speak to me or converse via email about the study, I would be happy to tell you more about my research ideas.
Thank you and hope to hear back from you soon.

Sincerely,
Caitlin Rose-Valadez

Ms. Caitlin Rose-Valadez
School Counselor, K-5
Roosevelt Elementary School
CRose@philasd.org
215-951-4170
press 1 then 1 again to contact directly

Appendix C

Request for Permission to Modify the Administrator Questionnaire

PHILADELPHIA

Mail | Contacts | Calendar | Tasks | Briefcase | Preferences | Search | Re: Dissertation

Go to Mail | Reply | Reply to All | Forward | Archive | Delete | Spam | Actions

Re: Dissertation research March 21, 2018 12:43 PM

From: (Dodson, Tammy L)
To: Caitlin Rose-Valadez

That's fine that you modified it - do whatever you need to do to get the research you need.
Tammy

Tammy Dodson, Ed.D, NBCT, NCSC
School Counselor for Class of 2019 & 2021 (A-E)
Grandview High School
20500 E Arapahoe Rd
Aurora, CO 80016
720-886-6610

From: Rose-Valadez, Caitlin <crose@philasd.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 9:54:55 AM
To: Dodson, Tammy L
Subject: Re: Dissertation research

Hello Dr. Dodson,
Thank you for taking the time to write to me last month. I have one more question for you. In working with my advisor and my committee, it has been recommended to make some changes to the survey for the sake of the study. I re-worded some questions to fit in with current ASCA information as well as took some questions out that I do not need, like the open ended questions and some of the demographic information. My advisor, Dr. Nancy Bodenhom from Virginia Tech, said I would need to make sure you understood that I would be modifying it as well, since you had already granted me permission to use it. Do I still have your permission to use it with the changes I need to make? I will send you a copy if you would like to see it. I will of course cite appropriately as well as explain all changes in my methods section.

Thank you,
Caitlin Rose-Valadez

Appendix D

Panel of Experts Invitation

Dear School Counselor Experts and Colleagues,

I am seeking your input as a member of a “panel of experts” to review a questionnaire that I anticipate using for data collection in my doctoral research study. For the actual study, the instrument will be sent to school principals via email with a link to complete the survey online through Qualtrics. Your involvement is an important process in validating the proposed instrument and providing me with an opportunity to review my data analysis procedures.

The instrument I am planning to use is entitled the “Administrator Questionnaire-Revised.” The questionnaire is designed to assess the perception of the importance of school counseling activities as well as the belief that the activities are actually being performed by the school counselor according to principals. It is based on a questionnaire entitled “The Administrator Questionnaire” designed by Dr. Tammy Dodson. Dr. Dodson conducted a study that was published in 2009 which examined principals’ perceptions of school counseling activities using the Administrator Questionnaire. There are thirty-five school counseling activities listed. Fifteen are considered appropriate and twenty are considered inappropriate, and they are based on the American School Counseling Association’s (ASCA) list of appropriate and inappropriate school counseling activities according to the ASCA model. I revised certain questions to align with ASCA’s current list of activities and updates to the model, to ensure that the questionnaire was applicable to both elementary and secondary counselors, and to better serve the purposes of this study. I am including for your review a chart that explains which questions I revised from the original questionnaire and the reasons why. There are also demographic questions after the first 35 questions, and I revised some of those as well to better fit the purposes of the study. The Administrator Questionnaire-Revised, the chart explaining changes from the original instrument, and Dodson's Administrator Questionnaire are attached to this email.

It would be a great help to me if you would review the survey questions to ensure that they are clear and relevant. I will note next to the first 35 questions which activity is an appropriate role and which is an inappropriate role. I will also include a space to note if each activity listed is clearly appropriate or inappropriate (whichever it is designated) and also relevant at this point in time. At the end of the survey I have included a space for your feedback.

After reviewing, please send me an email at caitlr5@vt.edu to let me know if there are any recommended edits and/or corrections that need to be made and if there is anything that can be done to improve the instrument. If you would please respond by Friday, May 11th, I would greatly appreciate it. If you need any further information in order to complete your review, please let me know via email.

Thank you in advance,

Caitlin Rose-Valadez, M.Ed.

Professional School Counselor
Doctoral Candidate, Virginia Tech

Dr. Nancy Bodenhorn
Doctoral Dissertation Chair
Counselor Education Program
Virginia Tech

Appendix E

Administrator Questionnaire-Revised

The research study has been designed to solicit school principals' feedback on the role of the school counselor.

On the left side of the questionnaire, rate the level of importance you assign to the following counselor roles on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = role is not important, 2 = role is minimally important, 3 = role is somewhat important, 4 = role is important, and 5 = the role is very important).

On the right side of the questionnaire, rate the extent you perceive that your school counselors actually perform these selected roles on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = role is not performed at all, 2 = role is performed once or twice a year, 3 = the role is performed occasionally, 4 = role is performed often, and 5 = role is performed regularly).

Importance		Actual
1. 1 2 3 4 5	Individual student academic program planning	1 2 3 4 5
2. 1 2 3 4 5	Data entry	1 2 3 4 5
3. 1 2 3 4 5	Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
4. 1 2 3 4 5	Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs)	1 2 3 4 5
5. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students who are tardy or absent	1 2 3 4 5
6. 1 2 3 4 5	Takes daily student attendance	1 2 3 4 5
7. 1 2 3 4 5	Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode	1 2 3 4 5
8. 1 2 3 4 5	Assists with duties in the principal's office	1 2 3 4 5
9. 1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students who have disciplinary problems	1 2 3 4 5
10. 1 2 3 4 5	Monitors the cafeteria	1 2 3 4 5

11.	1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students as to appropriate dress	1 2 3 4 5
12.	1 2 3 4 5	Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons	1 2 3 4 5
13.	1 2 3 4 5	Registers all new students	1 2 3 4 5
14.	1 2 3 4 5	Analyzes disaggregated data	1 2 3 4 5
15.	1 2 3 4 4	Supervises after school activities	1 2 3 4 5
16.	1 2 3 4 5	Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement	1 2 3 4 5
17.	1 2 3 4 5	Performs clerical record keeping	1 2 3 4 5
18.	1 2 3 4 5	Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent	1 2 3 4 5
19.	1 2 3 4 5	Advocates for students at individual education plan meetings, student study teams, and truancy meetings	1 2 3 4 5
20.	1 2 3 4 5	Counsels students athletes on excelling in their sports	1 2 3 4 5
21.	1 2 3 4 5	Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities	1 2 3 4 5
22.	1 2 3 4 5	Supervises study hall/recess	1 2 3 4 5
23.	1 2 3 4 5	Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems	1 2 3 4 5
24.	1 2 3 4 5	Regularly visits students' homes	1 2 3 4 5
25.	1 2 3 4 5	Computes grade point averages/honor roll data	1 2 3 4 5
26.	1 2 3 4 5	Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests	1 2 3 4 5
27.	1 2 3 4 5	Works with students individually when students experience	1 2 3 4 5

school challenges

- 28. 1 2 3 4 5 Designs the master schedule 1 2 3 4 5
- 29. 1 2 3 4 5 Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations 1 2 3 4 5
- 30. 1 2 3 4 5 Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent 1 2 3 4 5
- 31. 1 2 3 4 5 Interprets student records 1 2 3 4 5
- 32. 1 2 3 4 5 Provides teachers with suggestions for effective classroom management
- 33. 1 2 3 4 5 Performs disciplinary actions 1 2 3 4 5
- 34. 1 2 3 4 5 Recruits students for clubs and activities 1 2 3 4 5
- 35. 1 2 3 4 5 Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed 1 2 3 4 5

ABOUT YOUR COUNSELING PROGRAM

- 36. Does your school counseling program endorse the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) model? ___Yes ___No ___Unsure
- 37. Do you have a counseling program that has earned the Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) designation? ___Yes ___No ___Unsure

ABOUT YOU AND YOUR SCHOOL

- 38. Years as a principal: _____
- 39. Years as principal at current school: _____
- 40. Gender ___M ___F ___Other ___Prefer Not to Answer
- 41. Race _____ Prefer not to answer
- 42. Age _____ Prefer not to answer

43. School Category: __Elementary (some combination of Pk-6)
 __Secondary (some combination of 7-12)
 __Combination (both elementary and secondary)
44. School enrollment: _____
45. Rural/Urban/Suburban setting: _____
46. Number of counselors at your school: _____
47. If specialty school, what type (e.g., technology focus, arts focus, vocational): _____

Appendix F

Invitation Email to Participate

Spring 2018

Dear School Principal,

My name is Caitlin Rose-Valadez, and I am a Professional School Counselor with The School District of Philadelphia, as well as a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech. As part of my doctoral dissertation requirements, I am conducting a national study investigating the current perceptions of school principals on the school counselor role. I am kindly requesting your participation in this study. Below you will find a link to my survey, entitled the Administrator's Questionnaire-Revised. I greatly value your participation as it will lead to important information about how school counselors are perceived by school principals currently, and the impact that the American School Counseling National Model has had on the field of school counseling.

Participation is strictly voluntary and there will not be any compensation. However, your responses will help professionals become knowledgeable of school principals' current perceptions of the school counseling role, how school counselors and school principals can better work together as partners in educational endeavors, and what type of advocacy is needed in school counseling at this time.

This online questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Specific information about you and your school will be asked, but your name does not need to be provided. This data will be anonymous, located on a secure server, and reported only in aggregate.

Agreeing to participate in this study is granting the researcher permission to use your responses for research purposes only. You can access the questionnaire at the following secure web address:

(Qualtrics link added here)

If you would prefer a paper and pencil version, please reply to this email and provide your mailing address. If you have questions regarding the study, or if you would like a summary of the results when completed, please feel free to contact me at caitlr5@vt.edu

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Caitlin Joanna Rose-Valadez, M.Ed.
Professional School Counselor
Doctoral Candidate, Virginia Tech

Dr. Nancy Bodenhorn
Doctoral Dissertation Chair
Counselor Education Program
Virginia Tech

Appendix G

Informed Consent for Participants

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Research Project: Perceptions of School Principals on the School Counselor Role

Dear School Principal,

My name is Caitlin Rose-Valadez, and I am a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech. As part of my doctoral dissertation requirements, I am conducting a study with school principals to understand the current perceptions of school principals on the school counselor role.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and your identity will remain anonymous. If you choose to participate, you have the right to refuse to answer any question(s) and/or withdraw your responses at any time. The on-line instrument takes about 10 minutes to complete and there is no cost, no compensation, and limited risk in participating. No individual responses will be reported, only the aggregate of responses.

Your responses are critical in understanding the current perceptions of school principals on the school counseling role and how the American School Counseling National Model has impacted the field of school counseling; how school counselors and school principals can better work together as partners in educational endeavors, and what type of advocacy is needed in school counseling at this time.

If you have questions regarding this study, or if you would like a summary of the results, please contact me at caitlr5@vt.edu

If you agree to participate, please go on to the next page. Moving forward with the survey implies your consent.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Joanna Rose-Valadez, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate
Virginia Tech

Dr. Nancy Bodenhorn
Doctoral Dissertation Chair
Virginia Tech

Appendix H

Follow-up Email Reminder

Summer 2018

Dear School Principal,

My name is Caitlin Rose-Valadez, and I am a Professional School Counselor with The School District of Philadelphia, as well as a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech. Last month, I sent you an email inviting you to participate in a study that I am conducting. As part of my doctoral dissertation requirements, I am conducting a national study investigating the current perceptions of school principals on the school counselor role. This is a friendly reminder requesting your participation in this study. Below you will find a link to my survey, entitled the Administrator's Questionnaire-Revised. I greatly value your participation as it will lead to important information about how school counselors are perceived by school principals currently, and the impact that the American School Counseling National Model has had on the field of school counseling.

Participation is strictly voluntary and there will not be any compensation. However, your responses will help professionals become knowledgeable of school principals' current perceptions of the school counseling role, how school counselors and school principals can better work together as partners in educational endeavors, and what type of advocacy is needed in school counseling at this time.

This online questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Specific information about you and your school will be asked, but your name does not need to be provided. This data will be anonymous, located on a secure server, and reported only in aggregate.

Agreeing to participate in this study is granting the researcher permission to use your responses for research purposes only. You can access the questionnaire at the following secure web address:

(Qualtrics link added here)

If you would prefer a paper and pencil version, please reply to this email and provide your mailing address. If you have questions regarding the study, or if you would like a summary of the results when completed, please feel free to contact me at caitlr5@vt.edu

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Caitlin Joanna Rose-Valadez, M.Ed.
Professional School Counselor
Doctoral Candidate, Virginia Tech

Dr. Nancy Bodenhorn
Doctoral Dissertation Chair
Counselor Education Program
Virginia Tech

Appendix I

Qualtrics iQ Score for Surveys

Perceptions of School Principals on t... Projects Contacts Library Help

Survey Actions Distributions Data & Analysis Reports

Look & Feel Survey Flow Survey Options Tools Collaborate Preview Analyze and Publish Search

Perceptions of School Principals on the School Counselor Role-NonRAMP iQ Score: **Good** Published

SURVEY INSTRUCTION Block Options

Display This Question:

Perceptions of School Principals on t... Projects Contacts Library Hel

Survey Actions Distributions Data & Analysis Reports

Look & Feel Survey Flow Survey Options Tools Collaborate Preview Analyze and Publish Search

You are currently making edits to this survey. Changes won't be live until you publish. ×

Perceptions of School Principals on the School Counselor Role-RAMP iQ Score: **Good** Draft Version

SURVEY INSTRUCTION Block Options

Appendix J

Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Importance by School Level

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Individual student academic program planning (Imp)				-6.33	.000
Elementary	10	3.00	.94		
Secondary	26	4.69	.62		
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Imp)				-2.94	.006
Elementary	10	2.70	.82		
Secondary	27	3.70	.95		
Counsels students who are tardy or absent (Imp)				.15	.882
Elementary	10	3.50	1.18		
Secondary	27	3.44	.93		
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems (Imp)				.45	.653
Elementary	10	3.70	.95		
Secondary	27	3.52	1.12		
Counsels students as to appropriate dress (Imp)				-.05	.958
Elementary	10	2.20	1.03		
Secondary	27	2.22	1.16		
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (Imp)				-.49	.631
Elementary	10	3.70	.95		
Secondary	27	3.89	1.09		
Provides Teachers with Suggestions for Effective Classroom Management (Imp)				.60	.554
Elementary	10	2.70	1.16		
Secondary	27	2.44	1.16		
Analyzes disaggregated data (Imp)				-2.51	.017
Elementary	10	2.30	1.16		
Secondary	27	3.37	1.15		
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement (Imp)				-3.72	.001
Elementary	10	2.40	.97		
Secondary	27	3.78	1.01		
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings (Imp)				-.83	.411
Elementary	10	3.50	.97		
Secondary	27	3.81	1.04		
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities (Imp)				1.67	.104
Elementary	10	4.70	.68		
Secondary	27	4.07	1.11		

Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems (Imp)				.06	.949
Elementary	10	4.50	.71		
Secondary	27	4.48	.80		
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations (Imp)				-2.49	.029
Elementary	10	2.60	1.58		
Secondary	27	3.93	.96		
Interprets student records (Imp)				-2.57	.025
Elementary	10	2.60	1.43		
Secondary	27	3.85	.95		
Data entry (Imp)				-2.22	.033
Elementary	10	2.20	1.14		
Secondary	27	3.07	1.04		
Takes daily student attendance (Imp)				.48	.636
Elementary	10	1.50	.71		
Secondary	27	1.37	.74		
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs) (Imp)				-3.14	.004
Elementary	10	1.50	.53		
Secondary	27	2.33	1.07		
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode (Imp)				.97	.338
Elementary	10	3.80	.92		
Secondary	27	3.44	1.01		
Assists with duties in the principals office (Imp)				.57	.571
Elementary	10	2.30	.82		
Secondary	27	2.07	1.14		
Monitors the cafeteria (Imp)				-1.64	.111
Elementary	10	1.20	.42		
Secondary	27	1.56	.89		
Registers all new students (Imp)				-4.22	.000
Elementary	10	1.60	1.08		
Secondary	27	3.59	1.34		
Supervises after school activities (Imp)				-.95	.350
Elementary	10	1.40	.52		
Secondary	27	1.63	.93		
Performs clerical record keeping (Imp)				-1.56	.129
Elementary	10	1.70	.68		
Secondary	27	2.22	.97		
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent (Imp)				-1.57	.126
Elementary	10	1.10	.32		
Secondary	27	1.56	.89		

Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports (Imp)				-3.25	.003
Elementary	10	1.40	.70		
Secondary	27	2.52	1.37		
Supervises study hall/recess (Imp)				-1.69	.101
Elementary	10	1.20	.42		
Secondary	27	1.56	.85		
Regularly visits students' homes (Imp)				.60	.552
Elementary	10	2.80	1.14		
Secondary	27	2.56	1.09		
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data (Imp)				-3.69	.001
Elementary	10	1.40	.52		
Secondary	27	2.59	1.45		
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Imp)				-2.26	.032
Elementary	10	2.00	.94		
Secondary	27	2.96	1.58		
Designs the master schedule (Imp)				-8.27	.000
Elementary	10	1.00	.00		
Secondary	27	3.15	1.35		
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent (Imp)				-.77	.446
Elementary	10	1.10	.32		
Secondary	27	1.30	.78		
Performs disciplinary actions (Imp)				.62	.541
Elementary	10	1.60	.84		
Secondary	27	1.41	.84		
Recruits students for clubs and activities (Imp)				-1.97	.057
Elementary	10	1.80	.79		
Secondary	27	2.67	1.30		
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed (Imp)				-.77	.445
Elementary	10	1.00	.00		
Secondary	27	1.15	.60		
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges (Imp)				-1.02	.313
Elementary	10	4.50	.53		
Secondary	27	4.70	.54		

Appendix K

Means and Standard Deviation of Perceived Actual Engagement by School Level

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Does data entry (Act)				-2.28	.029
Elementary	9	2.00	1.23		
Secondary	27	3.11	1.28		
Takes daily student attendance (Act)				-1.87	.073
Elementary	9	1.00	.00		
Secondary	27	1.30	.82		
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs) (Act)				-4.00	.000
Elementary	9	1.11	.33		
Secondary	27	2.04	1.06		
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode (Act)				1.30	.204
Elementary	9	4.00	.87		
Secondary	27	3.48	1.09		
Does individual student academic program planning (Act)				-8.07	.000
Elementary	9	1.78	.97		
Secondary	26	4.62	.70		
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Act)				-1.74	.092
Elementary	9	2.22	1.09		
Secondary	27	3.11	1.40		
Counsels students who are tardy or absent (Act)				.00	1.000
Elementary	9	2.89	1.17		
Secondary	27	2.89	1.01		
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems (Act)				1.69	.100
Elementary	9	4.00	.87		
Secondary	27	3.30	1.14		
Counsels students as to appropriate dress (Act)				-1.30	.202
Elementary	9	1.67	.87		
Secondary	27	2.30	1.35		
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (Act)				.45	.658
Elementary	9	3.44	1.13		
Secondary	27	3.26	1.06		
Provides Teachers with Suggestions for Effective Classroom Management (Act)				1.88	.068
Elementary	9	2.89	2.89		
Secondary	27	2.00	1.11		

Analyzes disaggregated data (Act)				-2.63	.013
Elementary	9	1.78	1.09		
Secondary	27	3.04	1.29		
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement (Act)				-3.97	.000
Elementary	9	1.44	.88		
Secondary	27	3.30	1.30		
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings (Act)				-1.17	.249
Elementary	9	2.89	1.36		
Secondary	27	3.44	1.19		
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities (Act)				3.65	.001
Elementary	9	4.78	.44		
Secondary	27	3.63	1.45		
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems (Act)				.69	.493
Elementary	9	4.22	.83		
Secondary	27	4.00	.83		
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations (Act)				-3.25	.003
Elementary	9	2.00	1.32		
Secondary	27	3.56	1.22		
Interprets student records (Act)				-3.02	.005
Elementary	9	2.22	1.09		
Secondary	27	3.63	1.25		
Assists with duties in the principal's office (Act)				1.66	.112
Elementary	9	2.78	.83		
Secondary	27	2.15	1.35		
Monitors the cafeteria (Act)				.00	1.000
Elementary	9	1.78	1.30		
Secondary	27	1.78	1.31		
Registers all new students (Act)				-3.16	.003
Elementary	9	1.44	1.33		
Secondary	27	3.33	1.62		
Supervises after school activities (Act)				-1.53	.136
Elementary	9	1.22	.44		
Secondary	27	1.85	1.20		
Performs clerical record keeping (Act)				-4.05	.000
Elementary	9	1.33	.50		
Secondary	27	2.59	1.37		
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent (Act)				.30	.764
Elementary	9	1.56	.73		

Secondary	27	1.44	1.01		
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports (Act)				-5.33	.000
Elementary	9	1.00	.00		
Secondary	27	2.33	1.30		
Supervises study hall/recess (Act)				-1.82	.078
Elementary	9	1.11	.33		
Secondary	27	1.63	1.36		
Regularly visits students' homes (Act)				.62	.540
Elementary	9	2.11	1.17		
Secondary	27	1.85	1.06		
Computes grade point averages/honor roll data (Act)				-4.11	.000
Elementary	9	1.22	.67		
Secondary	27	2.74	1.53		
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Act)				-3.34	.002
Elementary	9	1.78	.67		
Secondary	27	3.04	1.58		
Designs the master schedule (Act)				-8.02	.000
Elementary	9	1.00	.00		
Secondary	27	3.11	1.37		
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent (Act)				-.94	.354
Elementary	9	1.33	.71		
Secondary	27	1.70	1.10		
Performs disciplinary actions (Act)				-.59	.557
Elementary	9	1.22	.67		
Secondary	27	1.44	1.05		
Recruits students for clubs and activities (Act)				-3.33	.002
Elementary	9	1.56	.53		
Secondary	27	2.59	1.34		
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed (Act)				-.82	.420
Elementary	9	1.00	.00		
Secondary	27	1.26	.94		
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges (Act)				.10	.920
Elementary	9	4.44	.73		
Secondary	27	4.41	1.01		

Appendix L

Means and Standard Deviations of Importance and Actual Engagement by Ramp Status

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Individual student academic program planning (Imp)				.03	.973
No Ramp	18	4.22	1.00		
Ramp	19	4.21	1.08		
Data entry (Imp)				-.14	.886
No Ramp	19	2.79	1.13		
Ramp	19	2.84	1.12		
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Imp)				1.11	.275
No Ramp	19	3.58	1.02		
Ramp	19	3.21	1.03		
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs) (Imp)				-.16	.877
No Ramp	19	2.05	1.08		
Ramp	19	2.11	.99		
Counsels students who are tardy or absent (Imp)				-1.70	.098
No Ramp	19	3.21	1.03		
Ramp	19	3.74	.87		
Takes daily student attendance (Imp)				-.67	.505
No Ramp	19	1.32	.58		
Ramp	19	1.47	.84		
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode (Imp)				1.47	.149
No Ramp	19	3.74	.87		
Ramp	19	3.26	1.10		
Assists with duties in the principals office (Imp)				-1.42	.165
No Ramp	19	1.89	1.15		
Ramp	19	2.37	.90		
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems (Imp)				-.45	.658
No Ramp	19	3.53	1.17		
Ramp	19	3.68	1.00		
Monitors the cafeteria (Imp)				-2.13	.042
No Ramp	19	1.21	.54		
Ramp	19	1.74	.93		
Counsels students as to appropriate dress (Imp)				-.44	.665
No Ramp	19	2.16	1.21		
Ramp	19	2.32	1.00		
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (Imp)				-2.34	.025

	No Ramp	19	3.47	1.07		
	Ramp	19	4.21	.86		
Registers all new students (Imp)					.83	.413
	No Ramp	19	3.21	1.48		
	Ramp	19	2.79	1.65		
Analyzes disaggregated data (Imp)					-1.43	.160
	No Ramp	19	2.74	1.37		
	Ramp	19	3.32	1.11		
Supervises after school activities (Imp)					-.19	.848
	No Ramp	19	1.53	.77		
	Ramp	19	1.58	.90		
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement (Imp)					-.28	.783
	No Ramp	19	3.37	1.17		
	Ramp	19	3.47	1.17		
Performs clerical record keeping (Imp)					-.35	.732
	No Ramp	19	2.00	1.00		
	Ramp	19	2.11	.88		
Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent (Imp)					-.41	.688
	No Ramp	19	1.37	.76		
	Ramp	19	1.47	.84		
Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings (Imp)					.16	.875
	No Ramp	19	3.74	.99		
	Ramp	19	3.68	1.06		
Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports (Imp)					.61	.544
	No Ramp	19	2.32	1.25		
	Ramp	19	2.05	1.39		
Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities (Imp)					-1.27	.213
	No Ramp	19	4.05	1.18		
	Ramp	19	4.47	.84		
Supervises study hall/recess (Imp)					-1.07	.292
	No Ramp	19	1.32	.67		
	Ramp	19	1.58	.84		
Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems (Imp)					1.99	.057
	No Ramp	19	4.74	.45		
	Ramp	19	4.26	.93		
Regularly visits students' homes (Imp)					.30	.768
	No Ramp	19	2.68	1.00		
	Ramp	19	2.58	1.17		

Computes grade point averages/honor roll data (Imp)				1.07	.291
No Ramp	19	2.47	1.47		
Ramp	19	2.00	1.25		
Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Imp)				.44	.666
No Ramp	19	2.79	1.65		
Ramp	19	2.58	1.31		
Works with students individually when students experience school challenges (Imp)				-.30	.766
No Ramp	19	4.63	.60		
Ramp	19	4.68	.48		
Designs the master schedule (Imp)				2.28	.029
No Ramp	19	3.05	1.51		
Ramp	19	2.00	1.33		
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations (Imp)				-.36	.720
No Ramp	19	3.42	1.31		
Ramp	19	3.58	1.39		
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent (Imp)				-.72	.479
No Ramp	19	1.16	.69		
Ramp	19	1.32	.67		
Interprets student records (Imp)				.40	.691
No Ramp	19	3.58	1.26		
Ramp	19	3.42	1.17		
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management (Imp)				-.57	.574
No Ramp	19	2.42	1.17		
Ramp	19	2.63	1.12		
Performs disciplinary actions (Imp)				.00	1.000
No Ramp	19	1.47	.91		
Ramp	19	1.47	.77		
Recruits students for clubs and activities (Imp)				-1.18	.245
No Ramp	19	2.16	1.17		
Ramp	19	2.63	1.30		
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed (Imp)				1.29	.215
No Ramp	19	1.21	.71		
Ramp	19	1.00	.00		
Does individual student academic program planning (Act)				-.92	.365
No Ramp	18	3.67	1.50		
Ramp	18	4.11	1.41		
Does data entry (Act)				-.10	.922
No Ramp	19	2.79	1.48		

Ramp	18	2.83	1.20		
Interprets cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Act)				.86	.395
No Ramp	19	3.05	1.47		
Ramp	18	2.67	1.24		
Prepares individualized educational plans (IEPs) (Act)				.69	.497
No Ramp	19	1.89	1.05		
Ramp	18	1.67	.97		
Counsels students who are tardy or absent (Act)				-1.63	.112
No Ramp	19	2.63	1.01		
Ramp	18	3.17	.99		
Takes daily student attendance (Act)				.87	.390
No Ramp	19	1.32	.95		
Ramp	18	1.11	.32		
Works with one student at a time in a therapeutic, clinical mode (Act)				.37	.714
No Ramp	19	3.63	1.07		
Ramp	18	3.50	1.10		
Assists with duties in the principal's office (Act)				1.16	.256
No Ramp	19	2.53	1.35		
Ramp	18	2.06	1.11		
Counsels students who have disciplinary problems (Act)				-.07	.943
No Ramp	19	3.47	1.12		
Ramp	18	3.50	1.10		
Monitors the cafeteria (Act)				-1.28	.210
No Ramp	19	1.53	1.12		
Ramp	18	2.06	1.39		
Counsels students as to appropriate dress (Act)				-.15	.882
No Ramp	19	2.16	1.43		
Ramp	18	2.22	1.17		
Collaborates with teachers to present guidance curriculum lessons (Act)				-.81	.425
No Ramp	19	3.21	1.03		
Ramp	18	3.50	1.15		
Registers all new students (Act)				.86	.394
No Ramp	19	3.05	1.75		
Ramp	18	2.56	1.76		
Analyzes disaggregated data (Act)				-.68	.499
No Ramp	19	2.53	1.50		
Ramp	18	2.83	1.20		
Supervises after school activities (Act)				.20	.846
No Ramp	19	1.74	1.10		
Ramp	18	1.67	1.09		
Analyzes grades/grade point averages in relationship to achievement (Act)				.81	.422

	No Ramp	19	3.05	1.35		
	Ramp	18	2.67	1.53		
	Performs clerical record keeping (Act)				.59	.561
	No Ramp	19	2.37	1.38		
	Ramp	18	2.11	1.28		
	Assists in teaching classes when teachers are absent (Act)				.09	.926
	No Ramp	19	1.47	1.02		
	Ramp	18	1.44	.86		
	Advocates for students at IEPs, student study teams, and truancy meetings (Act)				-.58	.569
	No Ramp	19	3.21	1.13		
	Ramp	18	3.44	1.34		
	Counsels student athletes on excelling in their sports (Act)				.92	.366
	No Ramp	19	2.16	1.21		
	Ramp	18	1.78	1.31		
	Works with students to provide small and large-group counseling activities (Act)				-1.22	.232
	No Ramp	19	3.68	1.46		
	Ramp	18	4.22	1.22		
	Supervises study hall/recess (Act)				1.04	.307
	No Ramp	19	1.68	1.38		
	Ramp	18	1.28	.96		
	Assists the school principal with identifying and resolving student issues, needs, and problems (Act)				.98	.336
	No Ramp	19	4.21	.79		
	Ramp	18	3.94	.87		
	Regularly visits students' homes (Act)				.92	.363
	No Ramp	19	2.11	1.20		
	Ramp	18	1.78	.94		
	Computes grade point averages/honor roll data (Act)				1.28	.208
	No Ramp	19	2.63	1.57		
	Ramp	18	2.00	1.41		
	Coordinates and administers cognitive, aptitude, and achievement tests (Act)				1.04	.308
	No Ramp	19	2.95	1.65		
	Ramp	18	2.44	1.29		
	Works with students individually when students experience school challenges (Act)				-.43	.673
	No Ramp	19	4.37	.76		
	Ramp	18	4.50	1.10		
	Designs the master schedule (Act)				2.55	.016
	No Ramp	19	3.11	1.66		

Ramp	18	1.94	1.06		
Ensures that student records are maintained per state and federal regulations (Act)				.22	.831
No Ramp	19	3.16	1.26		
Ramp	18	3.06	1.63		
Signs excuses for students who are tardy or absent (Act)				-.74	.463
No Ramp	19	1.47	1.12		
Ramp	18	1.72	.90		
Interprets student records (Act)				2.33	.026
No Ramp	19	3.74	1.28		
Ramp	18	2.78	1.22		
Provides teaches with suggestions for effective classroom management (Act)				-.16	.873
No Ramp	19	2.21	1.36		
Ramp	18	2.28	1.18		
Performs disciplinary actions (Act)				1.36	.188
No Ramp	19	1.58	1.22		
Ramp	18	1.17	.51		
Recruits students for clubs and activities (Act)				-.42	.675
No Ramp	19	2.21	1.27		
Ramp	18	2.39	1.29		
Sends students home who are not appropriately dressed (Act)					
No Ramp	19	1.37	1.12	1.44	.167
Ramp	18	1.00	.00		
