

**Factors That Influence Pre-Service Administrators' Views of
Appropriate School Counselor Duties**

Kimberly L. Mason

University of New Orleans

Dilani M. Perera-Diltz

Cleveland State University

Abstract

This study surveyed pre-service administrative internship students ($N = 61$) at an urban Midwestern state university to explore factors that influence duties assigned to school counselors at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Results indicated variation in duties assigned by pre-service administrators based on school building level.

Significant relationships were present between duties assigned to school counselors and methods of learning about the duties by pre-administrators, as well as duties assigned and the pre-service administrator's personal experience with school counseling services. Specifically, all methods of learning and personal experience influenced duties recommended for high school counselors; and field service experience and an inability to pinpoint how learning occurred were influential in duty assignment at the middle school level. Implications for school counselors and counselor educators are provided.

Factors That Influence Pre-Service Administrators' Views of Appropriate School Counselor Duties

An opportunity exists to develop the knowledge needed to assign appropriate duties to school counselors in graduate education programs for pre-service administrators (i.e., principals-in-training). Pre-service administrators' training on the duties of the school counselor appears to vary. Some researchers (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Beale & McCay, 2001; Fitch et al., 2001; Lieberman, 2004; Louis, Jones & Barajas, 2001) assert that a majority of administrator preparation programs do not routinely provide knowledge about school counselor training, and most administrators learn about the school counselor duties solely through field experience. Other administrators rely on personal experience with their school counselors from when they were in school (Coy, 1999). As a result, "Each principal must invent a counseling department and function with the most minimal guidance and expertise" (Louis et al., 2001, p. 64). At times, principals make decisions on school counselor duties based on work demands, which supersedes any educational training (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005). Thus, "Many principals do not fully understand how the school counselor can contribute to student achievement, to school improvement, and to a positive school climate" (Kaplan & Evans, 1995, p. 34).

Principals typically assign duties to school counselors (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Loesch & Ritchie, 2009; Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, Milde, Leitner, & Skelton, 2006), and many of them assign duties different than those endorsed by the school counseling profession (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Lampe, 1985; Loesch & Ritchie, 2009; Monteiro-Leitner et al. 2006; Murray, 1995; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, &

Jones, 2004). Often, school counselors work in districts where their duties are assigned, supervised, and evaluated by principals who do not have a counseling background and/or who have not been trained on the duties of the school counselor (Beale & McCay, 2001; Borders, 2002; Fitch Newby, Ballestero, & Marshall, 2001; Ponec & Brock, 2000). Additionally, many principals are inundated by excessive work demands and tend to use school counselors wherever they need personnel, mainly to perform administrative or clerical duties rather than endorsed duties by the counseling profession (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Loesch & Ritchie, 2009; Ponec & Brock, 2000; Ribak-Rosenthal, 1994) such as guidance, advisement, crisis response, and system support (American School Counseling Association [ASCA], 2005).

Principal's perceptions and hence the assignment of duties for a school counselor has an influence on the duties and profession of school counseling. Engaging in duties assigned by principals, which are outside of school counseling training, have contributed to school counselors' job dissatisfaction (Lieberman, 2004; O'Connor, 2002), job loss (Fitch et al., 2001; Sutton & Fall, 1995), and burnout (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006). At times, due to budget cuts, school counselors without an appropriately defined role within a school system have been the first to lose their jobs, because of administrators' perception of school counselors as non-essential personnel (Loesch & Ritchie, 2009; Vail, 2005). Administrators also have openly criticized and questioned the value of counselor positions (Stone & Clark, 2001). On the contrary, principal support has been identified to contribute to job satisfaction in school counselors (O'Connor, 2002). Thus, the principals' knowledge and assignment of duties for school counselors

are central to job satisfaction of school counselors and the establishment of school counseling.

The role and duties of the school counselor have been an issue almost since the inception of the school counseling profession (Fitch et al., 2001; Murray, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Scarborough, 2002; Sears & Granello, 2002). Some of these identity struggles stem from the variety of endorsed duties (i.e., individual and group counseling, consultation, classroom guidance, assessment) and non-endorsed duties (i.e., scheduling, testing, record keeping, filing paperwork) assigned and performed while employed in different school systems (Ponec & Brock, 2000) and school buildings (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008). Recently, the school counselor's role has been defined within the context of a comprehensive developmental counseling program (ASCA, 2005; Borders & Drury, 1992; Gerler, 1992). Within this developmental paradigm, ASCA created a National Model with guidelines and standards to facilitate defining a uniform role and endorsed duties for school counselors and to establish the profession as an integral part of the school system (ASCA, 2005). However, 27% of principals are unfamiliar with the existence of such guidelines and standards (Zalaquett, 2005).

The literature offers possible reasons for continued assignment of ASCA (2005) non-endorsed duties to school counselors by some administrators. Principals and school counselors have distinct sets of skills and responsibilities that benefit the school (Niebuhr, Niebuhr, & Cleveland, 1999; Studer & Allton, 1996). These different backgrounds, perspectives, and training could be the real source of conflict in defining school counselors' role and appropriate duties (Kaplan, 1995; Studer & Allton, 1996). All too often school counselors only get to utilize the knowledge and skills learned from

their training if their administrators endorse it (Zalaquett, 2005). In one study (Amatea & Clark, 2005), a middle school administrator stated that, "They [school counselors] should chip in and help out with extra duties like coaching or volunteering to substitute teach when necessary" (p. 20). Therefore, the discrepancy in appropriate duties for school counselors may reside in the training received by principals.

Purpose of the Study

An emerging body of literature has begun to investigate future principals' perceptions of the school counselor's duties (Chata & Loesch, 2007; Fitch et al., 2001) in an attempt to identify and possibly rectify any preconceived notion and lack of education regarding the school counseling profession that may influence future assignment of duties to school counselors. Fitch and colleagues (2001) concluded that future administrators held many misperceptions pertaining to the duties of the school counselor. Conversely, Chata and Loesch (2007) concluded that principals-in-training were able to differentiate ASCA endorsed and non-endorsed duties for school counselors. Thus, the current study hypothesized that pre-service administrators (i.e., principals-in-training), hold well-formed views on appropriate duties for school counselors prior to becoming a principal based on their experiences. More specifically, this study examined the perceptions of pre-service administrators with regard to: (a) duties they believed appropriate for school counselors at the three school building levels; (b) the method of learning the duties of the school counselor and its influence related to the duties they recommend for school counselors; and (c) their personal experience with school counseling services at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study included 61 pre-service administrators officially enrolled (i.e., degree seeking) in a master's-level educational administration program at an urban Midwestern state university. These students were in the last year of their educational administration program. Participants were gathered from three different educational administration internship classes. Of the 61 participants, 39.34% ($n = 24$) were male and 60.66% ($n = 37$) were female. Participants' age categories included 27.87% ($n = 17$) between 20 and 29 years, 47.54% ($n = 29$) between 30 and 39 years, 18.03% ($n = 11$) between 40 and 49 years, and 6.56% ($n = 4$) between 50 and 59 years. The majority of the sample (78.69%, $n = 48$) identified themselves as White and 21.31% ($n = 13$) as Black (not of Hispanic Origin). The school setting in which the participants interned included 29.51% ($n = 18$) at the elementary level, 13.12% ($n = 8$) at the middle school or junior high school level, 40.98% ($n = 25$) at the high school level, 9.84% ($n = 6$) at the kindergarten through 12th grade level, and 1.64% ($n = 1$) at the middle and high school level. Some (4.92%, $n = 3$) participants indicated this question as not applicable to them. From the 61 participants, 16.40% ($n = 10$) had been teaching for 1 to 5 years, 59% ($n = 36$) for 6 to 10 years, 21.30% ($n = 13$) for 11 to 20 years, and 3.3% ($n = 2$) for 21 years and beyond. Due to the method of gathering data, it is difficult to determine the characteristics of those who opted not to participate in this study.

Instrument

We developed the survey instrument. An expert panel of educational administration faculty reviewed the survey for format and clarity. Changes were made

based upon their suggestions. There were three main questions that were pertinent to school counselor duties which are provided under the purpose of this study. Question one was an open-ended question that inquired about what duties were appropriate for school counselors to perform at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The second question inquired about how pre-service administrators learned what duties school counselors engaged in using a forced choice ranking scale (e.g., own experience as a student in k-12 schooling, practicum/internship [field experience], classroom instruction, speculation/guess, and not sure [inability to pinpoint the exact method of learning]). Participants were able to check all that applied. The third question inquired about their personal experience related to school counseling services in the three school building levels using a 5-point Likert-Type scale (1 = none, 2 = useless, 3 = somewhat useful, 4 = useful, and 5 = very useful). In addition, participant demographics were gathered (i.e., age, gender, ethnicity, current employment, and the number of years teaching).

Procedure

Upon Institutional Review Board approval from the second author's university, we gained permission from the instructors in the educational administration program to disseminate the survey in three of their internship classes. After informing the students that there were no rewards or consequences for participation in this study, the survey was distributed to all students. The students were instructed to complete the survey only if they provided consent to the research and to complete it anonymously without providing any personal information that could be identified. All students were instructed to place the survey in an envelope provided to them when returning the surveys to the

researchers. The data from the completed surveys were analyzed for this study. Significant findings are described below.

Results

The descriptive results of this study are presented below followed by results of chi square test for independence on possible relationships among the research variables.

To analyze the qualitative data gathered from the first research question ($n = 61$) on appropriate duties for school counselors at each building level, we independently identified the primary patterns in the data (Patton, 2002). Data were then classified according to their commonalities and were combined or refined in order to better manage the data. Through content analysis, the data were placed in categories based on the ASCA (2005) endorsed delivery systems component duties. The duties that were not within ASCA endorsed duties were categorized as non-endorsed duties (i.e., scheduling, testing, record keeping, filing paperwork) (see Table 1). From the 142 duties listed at the elementary level, 80.28% were endorsed and 19.72% were non-endorsed; from the 188 duties listed at the middle school level, 71.81% were endorsed and 29.20% were non-endorsed; and from the 250 duties listed at the high school level, 65.20% were endorsed and 34.80% were non-endorsed.

A total of 98.4% ($n = 59$) participants answered the second question inquiring about the method of learning on appropriate duties for school counselors. Out of the five choices, 72.1 % ($n = 44$) concluded on appropriate duties through personal experience, 27.9% ($n = 17$) learned through practicum and internship experiences, 57.4% ($n = 35$) learned from classroom instruction, 29.5% ($n = 18$) speculated or guessed on duties,

Table 1

Categories and Number of Duties Assigned for at Each Educational Level

	ASCA Endorsed			ASCA Non-Endorsed		
	Elem.	Middle	High	Elem.	Middle	High
Delivery System Components	(114)*	(135)*	(163)*	(28)*	(53)*	(87)*
Individual Student Planning						
Career/College Planning	2	15	76	0	0	0
Educational Assistance (i.e. scheduling, paperwork)	5	15	3	8	37	54
Testing	3	2	0	19	13	30
Guidance Curriculum and Responsive Services						
Counseling	58	57	51	0	0	0
Psychoeducational	16	10	0	0	0	0
System Support						
Special Education Support	8	9	11	0	0	0
Remedial/Prevention Programming	8	7	8	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	14	20	14	1	3	3

*Represents the total number of endorsed and non-endorsed duties.

and 4.9% ($n = 3$) were unsure or unable to pinpoint the exact method of learning such duties. Two participants (3.3%) did not respond. Because participants were asked to check all responses that applied to how they learned about the duties to assign school counselors, the total frequencies and percentage of categories may exceed 100%.

At the elementary school level ($n = 58$), 8.2% ($n = 5$) pre-service administrators described having had very useful personal interactions with their school counseling services and 6.6% ($n = 4$) described having had useful personal interactions with their school counseling services. Additionally, 18% ($n = 11$) described having somewhat

useful personal interactions, and another 8.2% ($n = 5$) described not having useful personal interactions with their school counseling services. Lastly, 54.1% ($n = 33$) described having no personal interactions with their school counseling services and 4.9% ($n = 3$) did not respond to the question.

At the middle school level ($n = 61$), none of the pre-service administrators described their personal interactions with their school counseling services as very useful or useful, 82% ($n = 50$) described somewhat useful personal interactions with their school counseling services, and another 14.8% ($n = 9$) described their personal interactions with their school counseling services as not useful. Lastly, 1.6% ($n = 1$) described having no personal interactions with their school counseling services and 1.6% ($n = 1$) did not respond to the question.

At the high school level ($n = 61$), 32.8% ($n = 20$) pre-service administrators described having very useful personal interactions with their school counseling services and 31.1% ($n = 19$) described having useful personal interactions with their school counseling services. Additionally, 23% ($n = 14$) described having somewhat useful personal interactions with their school counseling services, and another 11.5% ($n = 7$) described not having useful personal interactions with their school counseling services. Lastly, 1.6% ($n = 1$) described not having any personal interactions with their school counseling services.

Chi-square tests for independence (see Tables 2 & 3) were conducted to evaluate if there were any significant relationships between any of the above reported variables (i.e., method of learning about duties, personal experience with school

Table 2

Chi-Square Results for Method of Learning and the Duties Assigned to School Counselors at Each Educational Level

Method of Learning	Duties Assigned at Each Building Level		
	Elementary	Middle	High
All Methods of Learning	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 103.50, p=.52$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 146.26, p=.05^*$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 169.94, p=.002^*$
Personal Experience	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 57.99, p=.33$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 69.89, p=.257$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 63.56, p=.003^*$
Field Experience	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 62.15, p=.61$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 95.58, p=.01^*$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 117.40, p=.002^*$
Classroom Experience	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 41.31, p=.50$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 48.27, p=.23$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 69.72, p=.02^*$
Guessing	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 58.32, p=.32$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 71.10, p=.06$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 162.88, p=.000^*$
Inability to Pinpoint the Method of Learning	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 91.05, p=.48$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 132.63, p=.03^*$	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 148.34, p=.003^*$

Note: * = $p < .05$

Table 3

Chi-Square Results for Experience with School Counseling Service and the Duties Assigned at Each Educational Level

Duties Assigned at Each Building Level	School Counseling Services
Elementary	$\chi^2(1, N = 58) = 25.50, p=.38$
Middle	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 29.60, p=.38$
High	$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 42.30, p=.01^*$

Note: * = $p < .05$

counseling services). Only the relationships significant at an α level of .05 or better are reported below.

Statistically significant relationships were found between the method of learning about the duties of school counselors and the duties recommended for school counselors at the middle and high school level (see Table 2). At the middle school level, field service experience [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 95.58, p < .01$], Cramér's $V = .75$, and inability to pinpoint the method of learning [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 132.63, p < .03$], Cramér's $V = .53$ influenced the total number of duties (endorsed and non-endorsed combined) recommended for middle school counselors. When the duties were divided into endorsed and non-endorsed duties, there were no significant differences among all methods of learning and the endorsed duties recommended for middle school counselors. However, a significant difference was found between classroom experience and the non-endorsed duties recommended. According to Cohen (1992)'s rubric, the Cramér's V values provided with each result corresponds to a large effect size, indicating a strong relationship between the two variables.

At the high school level, participants indicated all forms of learning to be significant with personal experience with school counseling [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 63.56, p < .003$], Cramér's $V = .49$, field service experience [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 117.40, p < .002$], Cramér's $V = .62$, classroom instruction [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 69.72, p < .02$], Cramér's $V = .58$, guessing [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 162.88, p < .000$], Cramér's $V = .68$, and inability to pinpoint the method of learning [$\chi^2(1, N = 61) = 148.34, p < .003$], Cramér's $V = .57$ influencing the total number of duties (endorsed and non-endorsed combined) recommended for high school counselors. Classroom instruction was more influential than field experience and

guessing in recommending all duties for high school counselors. Field experience and inability to pinpoint the method of learning were the least likely methods that influenced all duties recommended. Additionally, when the duties were divided into endorsed and non-endorsed duties, there were no significant differences among all methods of learning and the endorsed and non-endorsed duties recommended for high school counselors. According to Cohen (1992)'s rubric, the Cramér's V values provided with each result corresponds to a large effect size, indicating a strong relationship between the two variables.

A statistically significant relationship was found between pre-service administrators' personal experience with school counseling services they received at the high school level and the duties recommended for high school counselors, [$\chi^2 (1, N = 61) = 42.30, p < .05$], Cramér's $V = .59$ (see Table 3). According to Cohen (1992)'s rubric, the Cramér's V value correspond to a large effect size, indicating a strong relationship between the two variables.

Discussion

This study surveyed 61 pre-service administrators to determine if they held well-formed views on appropriate duties for school counselors prior to becoming a principal based on their experiences. We found that pre-service administrators' views on duties appropriate for school counselors included both school counselor profession endorsed and non-endorsed duties, with more endorsed duties assigned to each school building level (See results). Our results suggested that the method of learning the duties of the school counselor may influence duties they recommend for school counselors. Most pre-service administrators in our sample learned about school counselors' duties

through personal school counseling experiences. Finally, pre-service administrators' personal experience with school counseling services at the high school level appears to influence their assignment of duties for high school counselors although classroom instruction appears to be able to triumph over personal experience.

The results of this study support some previously conducted research and refute others. Our results suggest that majority of pre-service administrators are knowledgeable about ASCA endorsed duties for school counselors, lending support to Chata and Loesch's (2007) conclusions that principals were able to identify over 50% of profession-endorsed duties. Our results also indicated that these pre-service administrators did not endorse enhancing students' academic development as a duty befitting school counselors at any educational level, supporting similar finding by Chata and Loesch, and Studer and Allton (1996) that indicated principals lack the knowledge on how school counselors can provide programming to increase student potential and achievement.

Furthermore, our results support research (Hardesty & Dillard, 1994; Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006) that suggested principals still favor career related activities to be mainly conducted at the high school level as opposed to middle and elementary levels. However, this finding is in contrast to views in the school counseling literature (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Newman & Newman, 2009) calling to implement career development at all educational levels in order to foster equity and access in career choice. Moreover, our findings are in contrast to Amatea and Clark (2005) who suggested that administrators at the high school level endorsed the responsive direct service provider role of the school counselor more frequently than at the middle and

elementary school level. The pre-service administrators in our study indicated that school counselors, across all educational levels, should engage in responsive services.

Additionally, variation in possible assignment of duties by pre-service administrators across school building levels exists (see Table 1). More than half of the sample indicated it is appropriate for high school counselors to engage in testing and scheduling, compared to middle and elementary school counselors. This finding is similar to that of Monteiro-Leitner et al. (2006) and Perera-Diltz and Mason (2008) findings which indicated that more high school counselors engaged in test administration and individual planning (i.e., individual advisement) in contrast to their elementary and middle school counterparts, who spent more time in classroom guidance curricula (i.e., classroom instruction and group activities) and other non-endorsed duties (i.e., lunch and bus duty). A noteworthy finding is that bus and lunch duty, which was indicated by almost 40% of elementary and middle school counselors in Perera-Diltz and Mason's national study, were not endorsed as duties for school counselors at these levels by the pre-service administrators in this study. A possible explanation for this difference in what school counselors actually do and what pre-administrators plan to have school counselors do is that staff shortages, budget cuts, and/or lack of funds may lead principals to assign these non-endorsed duties to school counselors (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Vail, 2005) rather than the lack of knowledge on appropriate duties to assign.

Method of learning about duties appropriate for school counselors had an impact on possible assignment of all duties in the future. Our results suggested that majority of pre-service administrators learned the duties of the school counselor through personal

experience (72.1%) and guessing (27.9%). This finding supports Coy (1999) and Kirchner's and Setchfield's (2005) assertion that principals assign duties based on their own experience with school counselors when they were in school despite being educated about the school counselor's role. Assigning school counselor duties based upon personal experience or guessing could lead to continual assignment of and performance evaluation based on duties not endorsed by the counseling profession. Conversely, many pre-service administrators also learned the duties of school counselors through classroom instruction (57.4%), and when field experience was included as a form of instruction, the number of pre-service administrators who learned about school counselor duties through their program of study increased to 65%, a finding that refutes Amatea and Clark (2005). Perhaps during their field experiences, many of these pre-service administrators were able to consult and work with current school counselors and their interns. Hence, it is possible they were able to take their knowledge (i.e., personal experience and guessing) of school counselor duties, develop an understanding what school counselors do (classroom instruction), apply it to real life school situations (field experiences), analyze each situation, and generate possible solutions (Bloom, 1956). This process of learning and discovery is a likely explanation for the high number of appropriate duties assigned to school counselors at all levels.

When separating the total duties assigned to middle and high school counselors into endorsed and non-endorsed duties and comparing them to the different methods of learning our findings suggest that the different methods of learning did not influence the number of endorsed and non-endorsed duties recommended for high school counselors and the endorsed duties recommended for middle school counseling. However,

classroom experience influenced the non-endorsed duties pre-service administrators recommended for middle school counselors. It is reasonable to assume that the instructors for the educational administration courses may lack the knowledge needed to teach future administrators on the appropriate, endorsed duties recommended by ASCA (2005). This lack of knowledge could be contributed to the lack of clarity and confusion on the role of the school counselor, which has been a problem in the educational field for years (Paisley & McMahon, 2001; Scarborough, 2002; Sears & Granello, 2002). For example, given that many administration instructors no longer work as an administrator in a school and have been out of the school system for some time, along with the recent implementation of the ASCA National Model perhaps they have not been exposed to the appropriate role of the school counselor due to their limited interaction with new school counseling graduates. Thus, they may focus on the scheduling and testing (non-endorsed duties as defined by ASCA aspect performed by school counselors because in their role as principal they assigned them these duties (e.g., Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Lampe, 1985; Loesch & Ritchie, 2009; Monteiro-Leitner et al. 2006; Murray, 1995; Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004).

Pre-service administrators' personal interactions with their school counseling services had an impact on duties assigned to school counselors at various levels. For instance, pre-service administrators' assigned career related duties to high school counselors. High school counseling services include valuable college and career information that impacts post secondary opportunities for high school students. Traditionally, high school counselors advise students on course selection (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008) to prepare for college. In addition, counselors at this level help students

complete college applications and secure funding (Erford, 2007; Fitch et al., 2001; Lockhart & Keys, 1998). It is reasonable to assume that these pre-service administrators received such useful services from their high school counselors and recommend such career duties endorsed by the school counseling profession to high school counselors. Similarly, since a substantial number of pre-service administrators indicated scheduling ($n = 57$) and testing ($n = 32$) as appropriate duties for high school counselors, it is possible that during these pre-service administrators high school years school counselors engaged in scheduling and testing and therefore, using personal experience, they continue to assign such non-endorsed duties to school counselors which limits school counselors in utilizing the skills in which they were trained.

Implications

Although many of these pre-service administrators recommended duties that were ASCA (2005) endorsed, many also recommend duties that are inappropriate for the skills and abilities of professional school counselors. First, it may be necessary for school counselors to be more visible to administrators. For instance, 51% of elementary pre-service administrator participants and 26.2% of middle school pre-service administrators indicated a lack of involvement with their school counselors during internship. This indicates a possible need for school counselors, especially at the elementary and middle school levels, to be visible and involved with pre-service administrators in their field placements. In addition, when interacting with either current or future principals, school counselors may want to stress the three domains (i.e., academic, career, and personal social foci) of school counselor program planning. Better understanding of school counseling may lead to more appropriate assignment of

duties. Next, results indicated that having a positive experience with school counseling services do contribute to future administrators' assignment of appropriate duties to school counselors. Therefore, being mindful that today we service future administrators, school counselors at all levels should provide services to all students that meet their academic, career, and personal/social needs. Third, results suggested room for improvement in training at the pre-service education level on the duties appropriate for school counselors. Because school counselors and school principals are trained separately and have few opportunities to interact and learn each others' role, it is imperative that counselor educators collaborate with educational administration educators to develop a partnership where both school counselors-in-training and principals-in-training can interact and become educated on each other 's role prior to becoming employed in their respective professions. By forming such an alliance in educating our future administrators may help secure more appropriate duty assignment for school counselors.

Limitations and Future Directions

The survey instrument, the method of data collection, and the moderate sample size may limit the applicability of the findings. First, the instrument was not piloted and such is duly noted although participants did not indicate any ambiguous or confusing items. Second, due to the method of survey distribution it is impossible to determine if the non-participants had some characteristic that would influence the findings of this research. Third, the representativeness of the sample is questionable. The sample was collected from a single university in an urban setting. Therefore, responses may not be congruent with other urban or rural environments which limit the applicability of the

findings. Similarly, although the sample represented both genders, there was a larger female representation in this sample; thus, gender differences could impact the data. Although the sample was collected from a university with a diverse student body, all participants self-identified as either White (78.69%) or Black (21.31%). All of these demographic limitations may influence generalizability; hence, indicating a need for further exploration using diverse samples. Further research based on actual difference in the allocation of duties to school counselors by administrators trained and not trained on the current school counselor model is warranted to ascertain what changes in training are necessary for pre-service administrators to assign appropriate duties for school counselors. In addition, understanding the different types of information provided to pre-service administrators during their classroom instruction and field experiences may also help identify needed changes in the administrator training.

Conclusions

Literature indicates that school principals' views on the duties appropriate for a school counselor differ from that endorsed by the school counseling profession. At most schools the principal is the supervisor for school counselors and therefore determine their duties; as a consequence, many of school counselors' duties are incongruent with the counseling profession (Fitch et al., 2001; Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008). Results of this study indicate the number of endorsed duties pre-service administrators assign to school counselors at each building level varied by methods of learning the school counselors' duties and their personal experience with counseling services. These findings suggest the importance of educating pre-service administrators on the appropriate duties for school counselors at all school building levels as well as the

importance of school counselors serving all students. Currently both school counselors and administrators may be stuck in a cycle where school counselors are assigned inappropriate duties which lead them to not provide appropriate services to students, parents, and the school community. In other words, school counselors are providing services not endorsed by the school counseling profession, thus their services are not benefitting all students. This in turn influences future administrators to continually assign inappropriate services to school counselors. To break this cycle, counselor educators and educational administration educators are encouraged to work together to create a collaborative model that increases opportunities for both professions to learn each other's role in serving students. It is hoped that through this collaborative effort, pre-service administrators will be prepared to adjust their expectations, once employed as a principal, and assign school counseling profession endorsed duties to school counselors.

References

- Amatea, E. S., & Clark, M. A. (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 16-27.
- American School Counseling Association (2005). The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs. Alexandria: VA.
- American School Counseling Association (n.d.a). State school counseling mandates. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=424>
- Baggerly, J., & Osborn, D. (2006). School counselors' career satisfaction and commitment: Correlates and predictors. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 197-205.
- Beale, A. V., & McCay, E. (2001). Selecting school counselors. What administrators should look for in prospective counselors, *Clearing House, 74*, 257-261.
- Borders, L. D. (2002). School counselors in the 21st century: Personal and professional reflections. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 181-185.
- Borders, L. D., & Drury, S. M. (1992). Comprehensive school counseling. *Counseling & Development, 70*, 487-498.
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook I: The cognitive domain. New York: David McKay.
- Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). The national standards for school counseling programs. Alexandria, VA: American School Counseling Association.
- Chata, C. C., & Loesch, L. C. (2007). Future school principals' views of the roles of professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 35-41.

- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.
- Coy, D. R. (1999). The role and training of the school counselor: Background and purpose. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83, 2-8.
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (1965). *Public-Law 107-110: The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>
- Erford, B. E. (2007). *Transforming the school counseling profession* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Fitch, T., Newby, E., Ballestero, V., & Marshall, J. L. (2001). Future administrators' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41, 89-99.
- Gerler, E. R. (1992). What we know about school counseling: A reaction to Borders and Drury. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 499-502.
- Kaplan, L.S. (1995). Principles versus counselors: Resolving tensions from different practice models. *The School Counselor*, 42, 261-267.
- Kirchner, G. L. & Setchfield, M. S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education*, 126, 10-16.
- Lampe, R.E. (1985). Principals' training in counseling and development: A national survey. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 25, 44-47.
- Lieberman, (2004). Confusion regarding school counselor functions: School leadership impacts role clarity. *Education*, 12, 552-558.
- Lockhart, E. J., & Keys, S. G. (1998). The mental health counseling role of school counselors. *School Counseling*, 1, 3-6.

- Loesch, L. C., & Ritchie, M. H. (2007). *The accountable school counselor*. Austin, TX: Pro-ed.
- Louis, K. S., Jones, L. M., & Barajas, H. (2001). Districts and schools as a context for transformed counseling roles. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85, 62-72.
- Monteiro-Leitner, J., Asner-Self, K. K., Milde, C., Leitner, D. W., & Skelton, D. (2006). The role of the rural school counselor: Counselor, counselor-in-training, and principal perceptions. *Professional School Counseling*, 9, 248-251.
- Murray, B. (1995). Validating the role of the school counselor. *The School Counselor*, 43, 5-11.
- Newman, B., & Newman, P. R. (2009). *Development through life: A psychosocial approach* (10th edition). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Niebuhr, K. E., Niebuhr, R. E., & Cleveland, W. T. (1999). Principal and counselor collaboration. *Education*, 119, 674-678.
- O'Connor, P. J. (2002). Administrative support of counseling programs: Defining it and measuring it. *Journal of College Admissions*, 177, 13-19.
- Paisley, P. O., & McMahon, G. (2001). School counselors in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling*, 5, 106-115.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Perera-Diltz, D. M., & Mason, K. L. (2008). Ideal to real: Duties performed by school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling*, 6(26). Retrieved from <http://www.jsc.montana.edu/articles/v6n26.pdf>.

- Perusse, R., Goodnaugh, 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, 7*, 152-161.
- Ponec, D. L. & Brock, B. L. (2000). Relationship among elementary school counselors and principals: A unique bond. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 208-217.
- Ribak-Rosenthal, N. (1994). Reasons individuals become school administrators, school counselors, and teachers. *The School Counselor, 41*, 158-164.
- Scarborough, J. L. (2002). *Between practice and preference: Factors related to discrepancies in how school counselors spend their time*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Sears, S. J., & Granello, D. H. (2002). School counseling now and in the future: A reaction. *Professional School Counseling, 5*, 164–171.
- Shoffner, M. F., & Williamson, R. D. (2005). Engaging preservice school counselors and principals in dialogue and collaboration. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 128-140.
- Stone, C. B., & Clark, M. A. (2001). School counselors and principals: Partners in support of academic achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 85*, 46-53.
- Studer, J. R., & Allton, J. A. (1996). The professional school counselor: Supporting and understanding the role of the guidance program. *NASSP Bulletin, 80*, 53-60.
- Studer, J. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 353-359.

Sutton, J. M., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 331-336.

Vail, K. (2005). What do counselors do? *American School Board Journal, 192*(8), 24-27.

Zalaquett, C. P. (2005). Principals' perceptions of elementary school counselors' role and functions. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 451-457.

Biographical Statements

Kimberly L. Mason, Ph.D., NCC is a counselor educator and assistant professor in the Department of Educational, Leadership, Counseling, and Foundations at the University of New Orleans. Her research interests include cyberbullying, establishing best practices for school counselors and counselor educators, school counselor identity and supervision practices.

Dilani Perera-Diltz, Ph.D., PCC-s, LICDC, LSC is a counselor educator and assistant professor in the Department of Counseling, Administration, Supervision, and Adult Learning at the Cleveland State University. Her research interests include substance abuse, trauma, and school counselor issues.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kimberly L. Mason, Ph.D., NCC, 2000 Lakeshore Blvd, 174 Bicentennial Education Bldg., New Orleans, LA 70148. E-mail: kmason@uno.edu