

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

WILLIAM JOHN MITZEL for the DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Name) (Degree)
in GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING presented on 3 April 1973
(Major) (Date)

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE COUNSELOR AS SEEN BY SELECTED
COUNSELOR EDUCATORS, COUNSELORS, PRINCIPALS, AND COUNSELOR
TRAINEES IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Abstract Approval: Redacted for privacy

Dr. Glenn E. Clark

This study examined the opinions of selected counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and certified full-time counselors in the State of Oregon. The object of the study was to discover if differences in perception exist in group comparisons of the role and function of the secondary school counselor.

The review of the literature clearly shows that groups like those involved in this study continue to view the role and function of the counselor quite differently. Counselor educators have been accused of being too idealistic and out-of-touch with the realities of role and function as performed by the secondary school counselor. Administrators are often accused of not understanding what the role and function of the counselor should be but never-the-less they still continue to evaluate his efforts and his program. Counselors are often accused of adding to the confusion by not making their role clear and by frequently volunteering for tasks related to administration or similar inappropriate activities even though they do not associate these tasks with the professional role and function of the counselor. Counselors-in-training see their roles as being quite distinct from those of teachers.

The samples included eighteen (18) counselor educators, fifty-two (52) counselors-in-training, one hundred and five (105) principals and one hundred and fifty-five (155) counselors.

An original instrument was designed to measure the role of the counselor as perceived by these four groups. A questionnaire format was selected and a seven point Likert type scale used to measure differences in attitude in relationship to certain specific aspects of role and function. The majority of the items used in the questionnaire were taken from the 1967 revision of the ASCA "Statement of Policy".

One-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparisons were the statistics used in analyzing the data relative to the six hypotheses. In addition, the "t" test was used to investigate differences between counselor educators and their students, and a chi-square contingency table was constructed to facilitate analysis of four rank order terms. The .05 level of significance was selected for testing the significance of the hypotheses.

The null hypotheses examined were:

1. There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor educators and certified counselors in the field. (Rejected)
2. There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and principals. (Rejected)
3. There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and their students. (Accepted)

4. There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors in the field. (Accepted)
5. There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors-in-training. (Rejected)
6. There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training. (Rejected)

Significant differences in opinions were found to exist between four of the six group comparisons made. No differences were found to exist between counselor educators and their students; and principals and counselors. Recommendations include the need for further investigation of the results of this study via item analysis and the establishment of in-service education programs. Recommended research includes further investigation of the views of counselors on the job versus counselors-in-training; and a detailed study of how much time the counselor in Oregon devotes to the various counseling tasks encountered during the normal school day.

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF
THE COUNSELOR AS SEEN BY SELECTED
COUNSELOR EDUCATORS, COUNSELORS, PRINCIPALS,
AND COUNSELOR TRAINEES IN THE
STATE OF OREGON

by

WILLIAM JOHN MITZEL

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

June 1973

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Glenn E. Clark, Director of Educational Foundations
in charge of major

Redacted for privacy

Dean of School of Education

Redacted for privacy

Dean of the Graduate School

Date thesis is presented 3 April 1973

Typed by Mary Syhlman for WILLIAM JOHN MITZEL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Glenn E. Clark for his counsel, encouragement, patience and understanding throughout the doctoral study. His friendship is highly valued and I am deeply thankful for his dedication to the counseling program and graduate studies at Oregon State University.

The writer also wishes to express special thanks to Dr. Anna Meeks for her support and counsel throughout the doctorate program. She has served as a model and I shall always consider myself fortunate and richer for having known her.

Grateful acknowledgment is also expressed to Dr. Denis Baron, Dr. Alan Sugawara and Dr. Milt Valentine for their time, support and encouragement throughout my doctoral study. Their help and suggestions, in the preparation of this thesis as well as other matters, is much appreciated.

For their friendship, encouragement, interest and help throughout this thesis and my doctoral study, I wish to thank Gary Bradon, Tom Brisson, Sheldon Meyer, Larry Petry, Jack Phillips and Charles Wiley.

A very special thanks to my wife Barbara, for her sacrifices, encouragement, love and understanding during the many months of my doctorate program.

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Analysis of Variance of the Perception of the Role and Function of the Secondary School Counselor in the State of Oregon	51
2 Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparisons	53
3 Viewpoints between Counselor Educators and Their Students	55
4 (a) The Value of Chi-Square for Rank Items Thirty-Eight Through Forty-One (b) Chi-Square Value of the Contingency Table for Item Thirty-Nine (c) Chi-Square Value of the Contingency Table for Item Forty (d) Chi-Square Value of the Contingency Table for Item Forty-One	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Need for the Study	4
Statement of the Problem	7
Definition of Terms	8
Limitations of the Study	9
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Introduction	12
Conflicts, Expectations, and Demands Related to Role and Function	14
Divergent Views of Counselor Role and Function	16
The Responsibility for Clarification of Role and Function	20
Counselor Educators Perceptions and Responsibilities	25
Determinants and Determiners of Counselor Role and Function	28
Views of What the Role and Function of the Coun- senor Should Be	30
Summary	35
III METHODS AND PROCEDURES	38
Introduction	38
Developing the Instrument	39
Composition of the Sample	42
Procedure	43
Treatment of the Data	45
Hypotheses to be Tested	47
Summary	48
IV FINDINGS	
Introduction	50
Analysis Procedure	50
Hypothesis One	52
Hypothesis Two	52
Hypothesis Three	54
Hypothesis Four	54
Hypothesis Five	56
Hypothesis Six	56
Analysis of Rank Order Items	57
Summary	59

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
V	
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS	61
Discussion	63
Recommendations	70
Recommended Further Research	71
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 74
 APPENDICES	 77

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE
COUNSELOR AS SEEN BY SELECTED COUNSELOR
EDUCATORS, COUNSELORS, PRINCIPALS, AND
COUNSELOR TRAINEES IN THE STATE OF OREGON

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, new studies have been conducted concerning the role and function of the counselor as viewed by students, parents, teachers, principals, psychologists, and counselor educators (Baum, 1971; Smith, 1971; Vanderpan, 1970). These studies have pointed out that disagreement and confusion in role definition continue to exist even though considerable concern was expressed some twenty years ago regarding this definition (Hoffman, 1959; Purcell, 1957; Tooker, 1957; Wendorf, 1955). In spite of efforts by professional organizations, (Peters, 1971) no consensus of the role and function of the counselor has emerged. Some of the variations may be due to differences in the experience and educational background of those who are counselors and others who have attempted to define the role of the counselor.

Other variations may be due to definitions and semantic difficulties. The definition of counseling and guidance is frequently applied according to the views of the user. Shertzer and Stone (1968), after reviewing many definitions, define counseling as an "interaction process which facilitates meaningful understanding of self and environment and results in the establishment and/or clarification of goals and values for future behavior" (p. 26). Meeks (1968) defines guidance as a "systematic approach to more effective education through the active involvement of the child in his own educational process" (p. 11). For

the purpose of this study, Shertzer and Stones' (1968) definition of the term counseling will be used as a point of reference. For guidance, Meeks' (1968) statement will be used as a point of reference.

Goldman (1972, p. 560) states that "counselors in schools and colleges, and even agencies to some extent, have never before felt more confused and ambivalent about their roles." The counselor is called upon to do many things by many people. Stefflre (1956, p. 346) has called the role of the counselor a "many spendored thing."

Professional organizations as well as leaders in the field continue to be concerned about the role and function of the counselor. Donald L. Peters (1971) Past-President of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has stated:

...We find ourselves in a variety of settings across the country. Some of us have reasonable opportunities to perform as professional school counselors; some have impossible loads. Some are primarily assigned to counsel students; some have so many administrative and miscellaneous chores that counseling becomes that which is permitted after everything else is done. Clearly, some counselors who are doing valiant jobs in different situations are not given due credit for their accomplishments but, instead, are made the scapegoats for things that do not get done. The attainment of a realistic professional identity remains a central concern for us as individuals and as an association. (p. 306)

The conflict concerning the role and function of the counselor came into focus in the latter part of the 1950's. Studies analyzing the work of the school counselor (Hoffman, 1959; Purcell, 1957; Tooker, 1957; Wendorf, 1955) found evidence that the counselor was involved in a multitude of role and function activities. The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) initiated a study in 1962 which was designed to

involve counselors at the local level in the process of identifying their role. In 1964, ASCA issued a policy statement concerning role and function. Carmical and Calvin (1970) referred to the process used by ASCA in adopting the policy statement when they write:

... The ASCA Policy Statement (1964) became a reality only after five years of study and debate. The research or positions of Arbuckle (1961), Hill (1964), Hoyt (1961), Knapp and Denny (1961), Peters (1962), Peters and Hansen (1969), Schmidt (1962), Swann (1963), Warman (1960), and Wrenn (1962), as well as many other sincere educators, contributed to the thinking and conclusions of the ASCA committee that conducted the long-range study of counselor role and function. (p. 280)

The basic objective of the ASCA study (Loughary & Fitzgerald, 1963) was to produce a policy statement which applied to all secondary school counselors. Approximately 9,000 counselors from 40 of the 50 states participated in local groups preparing material for the study. In addition to the 40 expected state reports, 270 local reports were received. The study resulted in a number of specific recommended counselor functions which served as a source of many of the statements in the instrument used in this study. A revision of the 1964 study was published by ASCA in 1967 (see Appendix A).

Carmichal and Calvin (1970) point out that the debate concerning role and function was not ended by the policy statement. They write:

... Although the decade of the 60's has attempted to solidify role and function in answer to questions raised in the 50's, contemporary studies fail to produce conclusive, experimental, or theoretical constructs of the counselor's role and function that could be accepted as significant or operationally unified. (p. 281)

Purpose of the Study

The effectiveness of the secondary school counselor is lessened and confusion results when a conflict in role perception exists. Areas of disagreement between those responsible for training counselors for certification, their products, and counselors in the field along with the people with whom the counselors work, should be identified. If such confusion and disagreement does exist, training programs may need to be modified and/or definitive education initiated in order that counselors may function effectively in an atmosphere of cooperative endeavor and understanding.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the opinions of selected professional persons and students graduating from counselor education programs to see if differences exist in their perception of what the secondary school counselor does. The study has as its object clarification of the role of the secondary school counselor as seen by counselor educators, counselors in training, principals, and certified counselors in the schools.

Need for the Study

Disagreements concerning counselor role and function exist among intraprofessional as well as interprofessional educators. Some counselor educators stress the psychotherapeutic aspects of counseling (Arbuckle, 1972). Others stress an opposite point of view and see the role of the counselor primarily in terms of career guidance activities (Ginzberg, 1972). Some counselor educators as well as counselors see the role and function of the counselor in terms of creating an environ-

ment which facilitate change (Blocher, 1966; Baker and Cramer, 1972). Counselors in training feel the counselor should not be involved in conducting case studies (Riese and Stoner, 1969). Teachers have viewed the counselor's role more realistically in terms of the ASCA study than counselors did (Hubbard, 1970). Principals have a major role in the determination of counselor role and function but some suspicion exists that they do not have adequate knowledge of what the role should be (Carroll, 1968; Dunlop, 1968). The review of the literature in Chapter II will point out further disagreements between and among intraprofessionals and interprofessionals in education. These disagreements emphasize a need for clarification of role and function.

The Oregon State Department of Education, state counselor training institutions and state professional organizations are in the process of initiating and implementing competency based programs. Evaluating the effectiveness of these competency based programs will be a necessary follow-up procedure. In order to reach workable agreement concerning the establishment of competencies, differences in role perception must be identified.

Studies have been made in various parts of the United States and on various levels of education, concerning the role of the counselor as perceived by administrators, and counselors (Vanderpan, 1970; Baum, 1971). In some of the states little research related to the possible differences in perception of the role of the counselor as perceived by counselors, principals, and counselor educators has been done. Oregon is one of these states. The investigator was able to find only two studies which included the views of students about to complete their

training, with intentions of entering the field of secondary school counseling.

The assumption that professional preparation is the basis for evaluation of counselors, or that certification implies continuing confidence appears unwise. If a competency based program is introduced, it should reflect the goals of those responsible for counselor preparation in the state.

A better understanding of the role and function of secondary school counselors should be helpful to a counselor's self determination in performing his duties, and in knowing what information would be helpful in assisting his co-workers to know about his job. A better definition and understanding of role should also provide the school administrator with knowledge of what he should expect of the counselor. An administrator's understanding of role is also a necessary prerequisite to formulating policy as to what the counselor should do to be most effective in his particular school and to avoid useless and unnecessary overlapping of duties with other members of the staff. In addition, clarification of the role of the counselor as viewed by the counselor educator, principal, and counselor may facilitate communication between these three groups of professionals and a better trained and prepared counselor may result.

Perhaps more communication between all concerned would do much to solve the problem. An examination of the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators compared to those of principals and counselors, who perform that role, may reveal significant differences which could result in improvement in communication between the three.

Administrators could well be delighted to examine at some depth in what ways in which counselors can be most helpful in the educational process. This study could help bring certain perceptions and misperception into better focus. The beliefs of the national professional organization(s) and those of counselor educators can be studied in perspective. Each particular discipline represented in the study can gain insight into the beliefs of those with and for whom they work which hopefully will result in growth for all concerned. Finally, perhaps the Oregon State Department of Education could use the information as an aid in the establishment of a competency based program.

Statement of the Problem

This study was undertaken to identify disagreements, which may exist in perceptions of the role of the secondary school counselor. Samples or populations represented in the study included the following groups:

1. Counselor Educators
2. Counselors in Training
3. Principals of Secondary Schools
4. Certified Secondary School Counselors

In order to accomplish an analysis of role perception as seen by the sample or populations involved in this study, an original instrument was constructed. After the instrument was constructed a detailed validation procedure followed.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions are applicable.

1. Counselor - Those individuals who are assigned full-time to guidance and counseling activities in a public secondary school in the state of Oregon and who are in possession of a basic or standard certificate in counseling issued by the Oregon State Department of Education.
2. Administrator - Principals of those public secondary schools in the state of Oregon who have on their staff at least one full-time counselor with a basic or standard certificate in counseling as described in item one above.
3. Counselor Educator - Individuals involved in counselor training programs for recommendation for a basic or standard certificate in the state of Oregon at the time of this study.
4. Counselors-in-training - Students in their last quarter of counselor education prior to being recommended for certification as a counselor in the secondary school in the state of Oregon.
5. Role - The stated expectations for behavior connected with the position of secondary school counselor.
6. Function - The activities assigned to the role of the secondary school counselor. For the purpose of this

study role refers to purpose while function refers to process.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations are recognized in this study.

1. The study is limited to the state of Oregon and to the professional educators listed in numbers two through five below.
2. The study is limited to selected full-time practicing public secondary school counselors during the 1972-73 school year who are in possession of a basic or standard certificate in counseling as listed by the Oregon State Department of Education in September, 1972.
3. The study is limited to selected principals in public secondary schools in the state of Oregon during the 1972-73 school year whose staff includes at least one full-time certified counselor as described in item two above.
4. The study is limited to counselor educators teaching one-half time or more in graduate counselor education programs during May of 1972 at Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Portland State University and the University of Oregon.
5. The study is limited to students in their final quarter of counselor education prior to completing the institu-

tional requirements for recommendation for a basic or standard certificate in counseling in the state of Oregon. The four institutions charged with the responsibility of training counselors in the state of Oregon are Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon, and the students included in this study were in attendance at one of these institutions in May of 1972.

6. This study is limited to the aspects of the role and function of the secondary school counselor covered by the items found in the instrument used to gather the data.
7. Questionnaires contained inherent limitations because of the differences in the interpretations made by those responding.
8. This study is limited by the very nature of the task (i.e., definition of role and function and how it is perceived from various points of view - then trying to bring these in focus for the purpose of comparing how role and function are perceived.).
9. This study is limited to the choice of procedure selected for the dissemination and collection of the data.
10. This study is limited to the procedure followed in the development of the instrument.

11. In order to focus on contemporary aspects of the problem, the review of the literature is limited (with five exceptions) to the relevant literature in English for the years 1968-1973.
12. Reported and interpreted results are limited by the statistical measurements used. Those statistics are one-way analysis of variance, the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison and the "t" test, and a chi-square contingency table.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The conflict which exists concerning the role and function of the secondary school counselor is evident in the review of the literature. Not only do administrators, teachers, parents, and students have diverse and varied perceptions, but counselors themselves are not in accord (Riese & Stoner, 1969).

As indicated in Chapter I, as far back as the late 1950's writers in the literature were concerned that counselors were not performing tasks they were being prepared to perform. The problem of role and function is still with us today. As Koch (1972, p. 173) puts it, "the trouble with counseling is that counselors do not counsel." Kock (1972) continues:

... There are numerous well established counseling mispractices, so well stamped in that counselors can no longer discriminate what they do from what they should be doing. (p. 173)

Kock (1972) states that some of these mispractices include clerical administrative, registrar, disciplinary and other related non-counseling tasks. With this multitude of tasks assigned to the counselor it is sometimes difficult to demonstrate valid counseling outcomes. Koch did not define what counseling is.

Arbuckle (1970) highlights the problem when he asks:

... Is the counselor to be a highly educated specialist whose primary function is centered in the human relationship, with individuals and with groups, and is determined on the basis of professional evidence, or is he to

be a broad generalist, not too distinguishable from other school personnel, whose functions are determined by the needs of the particular school system, as seen by those who operate the system? (p. 327)

Smith (1971) in his study showed that:

... Counselors' duties seldom appear to be clear cut; they are frequently dependent upon the community, the school administrators, the faculty and the counselor himself. (p. 17)

Obtaining a multitude of views concerning the results of the confusion surrounding the role of the counselor is not difficult. Generally, wide agreement exists that the role needs to be clarified. Dilley (1972) states that:

Widespread dissatisfaction with professional counselors and the services they provide is manifested in scathing attacks by women's lib proponents, minority group spokesman, revolutionary lay counselors, and disenchanted professionals, and in the proliferation of people oriented rap centers. (p. 6)

That this dissent is so wide spread at such a crucial time in our society, is indeed unfortunate. Koch (1972) states this clearly when he writes:

... This dissent is especially perplexing considering the complex issues with which students are faced, such as student unrest, drug abuse, race relations, inability to communicate, etc. (p. 4)

In a recent editorial from the American Personnel and Guidance Journal, Leo Goldman (1972) does not place the blame on counselors. Goldman (1972) puts it strongly when he writes:

... We have done counselors a terrible disservice - we in the universities, in the professional associations, and in the state education departments. We overwhelm practicing counselors with impossibly long

and disparate lists of duties and, to make matters worse, give them training that is hardly adequate for any of the roles they might play. Then we throw them into the arena to fight for their lives amidst conflicting demands and threats from all directions. (p. 560)

Goldman (1972) goes on to say:

... It is any wonder that practicing counselors who are usually pretty much alone in the arena, get the feeling that they are satisfying no one, not even themselves? They read their journals and attend their conferences, but receive little save criticism, either for doing the wrong things or not doing the right things - wrong or right according to the writer or speaker at the moment. (p. 560)

Smith (1971) writes that conflict concerning role and function centers around the types of duties counselors can or should perform.

Smith (1971) concludes the following:

... The major disagreements tend to center around the extent to which the school counselor can or should perform functions frequently expected by the teacher, administrator and school psychologist. It appears that the involved professionals expect a line to be drawn between their functions, each having quite distinct functions. (p. 5)

Conflicts, Expectations and Demands Related to Role and Function

A wide area of disagreement concerning role and function exists among professional educators. Some of the conflicts and demands, as well as expectations, made by educators complicate counselor role and function.

Rank (1972) states that the power needed to establish identity is not concentrated in any single area. He writes:

... The power needed to establish identity diluted and dissipated among the public schools, public social agencies, and their administrators,

counselor educators who have ignored the principles of development of professions, and a body of confused and marginally prepared counselors. (p. 6)

Hubbard (1970) conducted a study comparing the ideal and actual roles of the secondary school counselor as perceived by graduate students and professors of school administration, counseling, and teaching. The instrument used was the Counselor Attitude Inventory. Hubbard (1970) reports that:

.... When ranked to determine consistency with the ASCA documents (statement of policy), teaching groups generally viewed the actual role as more consistent while counseling groups clearly indicated that they viewed the ideal role as more consistent. (p. 182)

Hubbard (1970) also believes that several conclusions are justified:

1. There is no generally accepted definition of the role of the secondary school counselor.
2. The perceptions of graduate students and professors of counseling are more consistent with the ASCA "Statement" and "Guidelines" concerning the ideal role than are the perceptions of graduate students and professors of school administration and teaching.
3. A great chasm exists between educators as to what secondary school counselors should be doing.
4. Graduate students and professors within a given area of professional activity have similar perceptions of the actual and ideal roles of the secondary school counselor. (p. 182)

Heath (1970) feels the teacher who has become a counselor frequently reverts to role aspects associated with teaching because he has been ineffectively trained. Heath (1970) writes:

... In short, the chronic dilemma concerning the counseling function of the guidance specialist revolves around an amorphous image transmitted from the top clashing with pragmatic interests

of an administrative directorate. Indifferent education at the college level encourages the guidance practitioner to capitulate on the job, falling back on practices closer to those associated with teaching rather than counseling. He thus fails in two important areas by not adequately serving his public or profession. (p. 130)

Counselors themselves have expressed dismay concerning the disparity of their role and function. Maragakes (1971) writes:

... Counselors' efforts to establish professional identity are meeting with more success but have been hampered by a blurring of roles. Our educational background and counseling functions have common areas with those of school psychologists; we are drawn from the ranks of teachers; we are sometimes grouped with administrators, but we are not administrators. We are sometimes critically assailed for practices which are beyond our scope. (p. 311)

Arbuckle (1968) points out that counselors disagree with views of professional organizations. According to Arbuckle (1968):

... When the counselors are observed in operation they apparently disagree with the positions taken by their various professional bodies such as American Personnel & Guidance Association (APGA), Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), and American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (p. 341)

Divergent Views of Counselor Role and Function

Peters (1971) points out the conflict in demands made upon the counselor by professionals directly involved with counselor services. These professionals often expect divergent services from the school counselor. Services which, according to Peters (1971, p. 306), "must be adequate, or else the counselor is simply not doing his job." Peters (1971) recorded these views:

... Counselor trainees shame school counselors for not featuring the more introspective techniques and for not spending more time in face-to-face or group counseling activities.

College registrars, financial aids officers, and recruiting agents make extensive demands, requiring clerical tasks and forcing counselors into judgemental roles that make confidential relationships with counselors next to impossible.

Teachers want help with needs as viewed in the classroom. They want help with problem students, as such. More than a few suggest that counselors should take care of any and all "guidance", thereby freeing teachers to teach without disruptive influences. Some see all aspects of standardized testing and course registration as strictly the work of counselors, work that somehow should be accomplished without any slowdown of serving the problems they bring to counselors.

Vocational education specialists call for more attention to the non-college bound ...

Psychiatrists and other mental health specialists validly require help ranging from individual case work, to curriculum changes ...

Ministers and religious leaders want counselors to guide youngsters toward moral behavior. (p. 306)

Arbuckle (1970) feels that there are basically two points of view concerning the function of the school counselor. According to him, these are:

One sees the counselor as not too different, either in training or attitude, from the teacher or administrator. His functions are varied and geared to the needs of the school -- as perceived by the teachers and administrators but not necessarily by the children, the community, or the theorists. The other point of view sees the counselor as having a discrete and definable function, quite different from that of the teacher or administrator, and therefore requiring a different kind of person and a different kind of professional education.

Such an individual's function would be determined primarily by what empirical research says about the needs of the children in the community. The former point of view would be held by most school personnel and by some counselor educators, the latter by most counselor educators and some school personnel. (p. 328)

Arbuckle (1972) believes the counselor role is that of helping the individual through psychotherapeutic techniques. He states this portion very clearly.

It would be eminently reasonable for counselors to accept as their professional responsibility the functions of the psychological counselor, who works primarily with individuals or small groups of individuals. His task is therapeutic and preventive, helping individuals to attain a higher level of individual freedom, dignity, and pride in self. Thus, these individuals become contributing rather than destructive members of their society. (p. 789)

Ginzberg (1972) takes the opposite point of view. He believes that the role of the counselor should be strongly oriented towards 'career guidance' services. Ginzberg (1972) believes that what is needed is quality career guidance and that the counselor must abandon psychotherapeutic techniques and concentrate on helping the individual discover pathways to the world of work. He feels that the current emphasis on psychological development has harmed the status of the counselor.

Ginzberg (1972) makes his point clear when he states:

... In the fifties, the profession adopted a psychological development approach. The whole person - his attitudes, feelings, and aspirations became the center of concern. The guidance counselor, in effect, became a kind of therapist. No longer was his chief concern primarily a vocational one. The net effect of this change has been that today guidance has an exaggerated and unrealizable ambition:

To add significantly to human happiness in what, for most clients, amounts to only a few hours of counseling. (p. 3)

In an article pertaining to the many views held by professionals concerning the role and function of the counselor, Arbuckle (1970) cites comments and then raises issue questions:

... These comments reflect all too clearly the continuing divergence as to the place, the function, and the person of the counselor in the schools, and the argument goes on between counselors, between counselor educators, and between counselors and counselor educators. Is the counselor to be a highly educated specialist whose primary function is centered in the human relationship with individuals and with groups, and is determined on the basis of professional evidence, or is he to be a broad generalist, not too distinguishable from other school personnel, whose functions are determined by the needs of the particular school system, as seen by those who operate the system? (p. 327)

Kehas and Morse (1971) explored the preceptions in role change from teacher to counselor. Their study pinpoints specific areas of role conflict as seen by counselors who once were classroom teachers. The comments obtained from counselors in interviews conducted by Kehas and Morse (1971) include the following:

... Perceptions obtained from interviews indicated intra-role conflict through such phrases as 'everyone wanted something different,' 'teachers get excited when students are out of class,' 'parents want to know what I am doing (with students),' 'if I work with parents, students don't like this,' 'counseling is a kind of mongrel.' The new counselor perceives bewildering, diverse, and often contradictory expectations upon him in his struggle for role definition. (p. 203)

Dickinson (1970) feels that it is important for counselors to set definite goals in order to define their educational objectives. He

(1970) writes:

... A serious problem for the counselor is demonstrating that guidance objectives are but part of the general educational objectives. All school personnel be they principal, teachers, or counselors, are employed by a school district to achieve certain educational objectives ... counselors must turn their attention to setting goals if we are to remain a major force in education. This is going to be a difficult task and we must begin now. (p. 14)

The Responsibility for Clarification of Role and Function

If divergency concerning role and function exists, perhaps someone must bear the responsibility for clarification of role and function. Professional educators are in disagreement.

Some studies, such as that of Smith (1971), place part of the blame for role and function disparity upon the counselors themselves.

Smith (1971) writes:

.... Most studies concerned with assessing the opinion of school professionals as to the role of the school counselor have found that there is a need for the counselor to know his role, communicate his role accurately to other school personnel and function within the limits he has prescribed for himself. (p. 5)

Martin (1972) supports this view. He places much blame for role and function confusion directly upon counselors themselves because of what he sees as a general feeling of apathy and lack of effort to clarify role functions. Martin (1972) writes:

... It is a sad commentary on school guidance services that the public's view of the guidance function within schools is so often incomplete. However, aren't we, the school counselors, perhaps the true villains who have helped bring

about such a distorted view of guidance and the subsequent community outbursts? Are we not all too often apathetic? All too frequently the counselor at the local level has made little or no effort to clarify his role to his administrators and school board members, to other counselors, to parents, to the community in general, to pupils, and to teachers. (p. 141)

Thorsen (1972) in a recent speech to the Oregon Personnel and Guidance Association, encouraged counselors to make an effort to communicate with people who are making decisions about counselors. According to Thorsen (1972):

... As a profession and as individual counselors we have been spending too much time talking to ourselves. Meanwhile, a whole host of other people, non-counselor types, are going around making decisions that affect us and affect our jobs. And lately, those decisions haven't been overly complimentary. What I am suggesting to you is that we are going to have to learn to talk with people who are not in our profession. People who are not in the counseling field. I'm talking about all those people out there who don't know much about us and yet who are asked - required - to decide things on our behalf. (p. 2)

Regardless of the concern expressed by counselor educators (Arbuckle, 1970) they themselves have frequently been criticized for not making role and function clear (Peters, 1971). Riese and Stoner (1969) place much responsibility for role and function clarification upon the counselor educator. According to them:

... It is incumbent upon counselor educators to identify as clearly as possible the functions of school counselors and to establish - as properly as possible - a realistic concept of the counselor's role. In fact, a part of every professional's training should have as its purpose the crystallization of functions and role to be played by a member of that profession. To the extent that the functions and role are internalized by the aspiring counselor, to the extent will he find himself comfortable in the

school system and feel confident in the role he has to play. (p. 126)

Other counselor educators feel that it is the duty of the counselor to make certain that his role and function are clear to fellow educators. Ratigan (1972) states that:

... The school counselor who fails to brief the administration on what he should do and what he should not do soon finds his responsibilities defined for him, generally in an unhappy fashion for the success of the counseling program and for the counselor's autonomy. However, if he is competently trained and skillful in action, administrators will tend to give him a free hand, consult with him about school policy and public relations, and weigh his opinions heavily. (p. 312)

Ratigan (1972) goes on to say that:

... Because school counseling is regarded as a step toward the administrative level, the counselor may be seen by some faculty members as a 'mouse training to be a rat', but teachers who have received the services of an adequate counselor are prone to look on him as a welcome assistant in various areas of school work and a handy man to have around in an emergency. (p. 312)

Shertzer and Stone (1970) also believe the counselor should assert himself in terms of defining his own role. They feel the counselor should avoid attempting to become what pupils, teachers, parents and administrators expect him to be. In identifying his own role and function, the counselor should consider his educational training and experience, his personal philosophy, and the setting in which he works. Shertzer and Stone (1970) put it very strongly when they point out:

... The true professional knows not only who he should be but also what he is. And, knowing these two things, the professional knows where he stands in his progress toward what he should ultimately be. All too many counselors invest their energy in

arguing what they should be without stopping to look at what they are both personally and professionally. It is incumbent upon each counselor to understand clearly what he is now so that he may compare his image to the stated ideal when it becomes available. The counselor who waits upon an externally supplied solution to his questions, "Who am I?" and "What do I do?" does a disservice to himself and to the profession. (p. 163)

Others, such as Schmieding (1969) also believe that clarification of role and function is the responsibility of the counselor himself.

Schmieding (1969) states:

... It seems desirable for the counselor to be able to spell out exactly what he sees his role and function to be in a particular setting and to communicate this unequivocally to the administration. If the administration sees fit to use the counselor in ways contrary to the proper counseling, it is mandatory and almost imperative that the counselor seek employment elsewhere. (p. 15)

Aubrey (1972) feels that counselor educators must take responsibility for defining role and function to principals and superintendents. He believes that:

... Instead of pushing for self-determination in this area, through such activities as articles in school administration journals, attendance at school administration conferences, and visits to schools, counselor educators have left school counselors to their own devices without university support. (p. 21)

Aubrey puts it even more strongly when he states:

... Worse yet, counselor educators have not prepared counselors for the battles they face in carrying out programs they have been exposed to in graduate training. No one told them about the myriad clerical and humdrum tasks the school administrators push their way. No one walked them through the arguments raised by principals and administrators when they are assigned to lunchrooms,

hall patrol, study halls, covering for absent teachers, and so on. No one spoke of how change in this area might be accomplished. No one exposed them to remedies or solutions to this problem. (p. 21)

A study by Riese and Stoner (1969) involved a total of 229 students at the University of Montana. Twelve percent of the students involved in the study were in graduate guidance and counseling courses and were close to completion of their master's degree. Other groups included students taking their first course in guidance and students who had completed student teaching but had not as yet had a course in guidance. Seventy statements of functions were submitted to the three groups and they were asked to rate the extent to which each function was needed in the school and who they felt should perform each of the functions. The respondents in all three groups were in general agreement that there was a need for schools to provide for each of the seventy functions listed in the rating scale. Counselors-in-training felt the counselor should not be involved in discipline and that this was a function of the principal. Counselors-in-training also felt that other school personnel should be responsible for conducting case studies of pupils presenting special learning, adjustment, or family and environmental problems. As a result of the study, Riese and Stoner (1969) made three recommendations:

1. The counselor should have the administration spell out the functions of the counselor's position.
2. Teacher-counselor meetings should be held periodically for the purpose of discussing role and attempting to arrive at some consensus concerning functions.

3. Counselor educators should attempt to develop a realistic view of the counselor's role and functions at the counselor preparation level. (pp. 129-130)

Carmical and Calvin (1970) feel that great progress concerning clarification of counselor role and function is being made. They state this clearly when they write:

The mythical school counselor in this study is not a clerk, an administrator, a teacher, or a disciplinarian. The years of effort toward the professionalization of counseling appears to have been fruitful as indicated by the responses of the participants in this study. Since these counselors have identified functions that likely were stressed in their counselor education programs, these graduated students appear to believe that they should be spending their time in performing counseling functions. These counselors and others like them have within their grasp the opportunity to determine their role, and function -- in fact, the issue will be settled only by the practicing counselors themselves. (p. 285)

Counselor Educator's Perceptions and Responsibilities

Aubrey (1972) feels role and function disparity is partially the result of the limited scope of many counselor education programs. He writes:

Is it possible for counselor educators to stop turning out disciples, and instead, professionally trained school counselors? In interview after interview with prospective candidates for school counseling openings, the numerous virtues of Rogers, Krumboltz, May, Adler, Glasser, Arbuckle, and so on are frequently presented as proof of counselor intent. However, does allegiance and commitment to one individual or school really prepare a counselor for the philosophic and pragmatic give-and-take of his profession (Van Hoose, 1970)? Must one honor a single view of counseling in order to operate in the schools

(Osipow & Walsh, 1970; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967)? Are we so divided and insecure as professionals that only one method or technique can be employed with counselees (Traux, 1970)? Is a commitment to a closed system the best preparation for an open and pluralistic society? (p. 23)

A study by Frick (1971) further indicated a need for counselor educators to become more closely identified with the realities of the counselor's world of work. Frick (1972) reported that:

... Although counselors hold the view that much of their work has been of some value, they feel their general preparation as being quite diverse from the preparation to perform the present counselor role. There is an apparent need for counselor educators to keep abreast with the counselor role as it exists in the public school situation and to work closely with counselors in making curriculum revisions in counselor preparation compatible with counselor role. (p. 14)

Aubrey (1972) offers some recommendations concerning the elimination of what he views as the gap between counselor training programs and school realities. Some of these include:

Counselor educators should begin looking at the word educator in their title. Certainly such men as John Dewey and Carl Rogers would have little difficulty in speaking of the philosophy and directionality of education and guidance. For many counselor educators (see any recent guidance or counseling journal) the word education is foreign or employed very seldom. Little attempt has been made by counselor educators to reconcile and clarify the objectives of guidance and education (Katz, 1969). That which has been attempted has too often occurred on a far removed philosophical level. The time has come when education and counseling must be translated into action oriented programs involving counselors and teachers.

Finally, a plea goes out for counselor educators to spend more time in school and community settings and less time in universities. School and community settings are where the action is and where help is needed. If schools are looked on as simply a convenient place to farm out practicum students, counselor educators are making a big mistake. Schools need help in supervising these practicum students and also in retraining their own staffs. If they do not receive this assistance from counselor educators, they will be forced to look elsewhere for these services. This would be a tragedy and an admission by each that they cannot work together for common ends. This need not happen. (p. 23)

Hubbard (1970) feels counselor educators must pay more attention to the responsibility for clarifying role and function of all professional educators. He writes:

... Graduate schools of education must promote greater understanding of the role of the secondary school counselor among those in training for positions in school administration, secondary school counseling, and teaching. To accomplish this, greater cooperation is necessary among those training persons in these areas of professional activity. (p. 281)

Herr (1969), in a study concerning role perception of the counselor as perceived by state supervisors of guidance, felt that counselor education programs are not tuned into the ASCA Statement of Policy relative to secondary school functions. He concluded the following:

... Perhaps, the most important inference to be drawn from these data is that counselor education programs have not yet been attuned or been made responsive to the ASCA Statement of Policy relative to secondary school counselor functions and the guidelines for implementation of such policy. Because of the nature of the data and the variability of responses among ACES regions, it is clear that this generalization is not true of all counselor education programs, but it is true of counselor education in the collective sense. (p. 255)

Determinants and Determiners of Counselor Role and Function

Variation from school to school in perceptions of role and function is in part determined by the contingencies of the situation. In the counseling relationship, what the counselor should do, as defined by a supervisor or program, and what he actually does may not be uniform.

A review of the literature indicates that probably the two most powerful influences in the determination of the role and function of the counselor are the principal and the secondary school counselor himself. Aubrey (1972) supports this view:

... Probably the major constraint in achieving guidance and counseling objectives in any school stems from the power position of school administrators and the lack of autonomy for guidance programs (Kehas, 1965). In most schools counselors and directors of guidance simply have no muscle for implementing guidance programs and procedures most beneficial to students (Humes and Lavitt, 1971).
(p. 18)

Arbuckle (1970) feels that counselor educators generally feel that the role of the counselor is quite discrete and different from that of the teacher or administrator. He thinks the counselor should have some voice in determining what his role and function will be. Arbuckle (1970) stresses that this view has been held by others. He concludes:

The current literature reflects this pattern as it has for the past several decades. Patterson (1969), for example, stated that, "as a professional person, the counselor is, or should be, able to have some influence in determining the nature of his job. He must not allow his duties to be dictated by others aware of the needs children have for close personal relationships." Gelatt (1969), a director of guidance says that "... guidance, or counseling, or pupil personnel, or whatever it is called in the schools,

is there for the purpose of helping the schools achieve their objectives." Gelatt does add that if the counselor doesn't like the school's objectives he should do something to change them, but can the counselor be committed to both at the same time? (p. 327)

Just what the principal's role is in the determination of role and function has received much attention. Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer (1969) feel the principal has the primary responsibility for guidance in that he determines what the program will be:

... If the school director of guidance can be looked upon as the 'quarterback' of the guidance team, then the principal is the coach of the team. He doesn't play all the positions, but his is the ultimate responsibility if the team fails. He, therefore, oversees the performance of each team member and leads for improvement in the total team effort. (p. 349)

The fact that the principal of the school is often the sole assessor of counselor competency also creates problems. Dunlop (1968) referred to this when he wrote:

... The competence of school counselors is traditionally assessed by administrators, who also determine which qualified and unqualified applicants will be admitted to practice and which will be retained, and pass various other judgments about guidance services and the persons who perform them. It is postulated that the public and professional interests would be better served were these judgments made by skilled counselors. (p. 655)

One principal in Oregon was recently quoted as saying "No one is going to tell me what person to hire as a counselor in my school."

It follows then, that if the administrator serves as the evaluator of the counselor and the program, he should have adequate working knowledge of what the role and function of the counselor is. Some concern about the administrators knowledge of the role and function of the

counselor has been expressed. Carroll (1968) writes:

... Administrators are not always aware of what the role of the counselor should be -- plan field trips, collect money, and make bus arrangements, master schedule assistance, football games, school dances, walking corridors ... Obviously the administrator does not resent his guidance personnel; he simply does not know what their functions are. (p. 21)

Humes, (1970) feels that the only solution to role discrepancy lies in what he calls an "urgent need for administrative overhaul of guidance services." Humes (1970) believes that the counselor should no longer be under the control of the school principal. Humes (1970) recorded these ideas:

... The time has come to realize beyond titular euphemism, that a counselor is not a 'guidance teacher' and that he no longer belongs in a line relationship with the building principal. Since the onset of school guidance, it has been assumed that the counselor should report to the building principal as does most everyone else in the school. In recent years this has deterred counselor professionalization for line authority bestows power to control and direct. It is my contention that a school principal who has been trained as a teacher and who regards school operations in an instructional light is no longer professionally qualified to direct, supervise, or judge the merits of a counseling or guidance program. (p. 87)

Views of What the Role and Function of the Counselor Should Be

Some studies have indicated how various groups of educators view the role and function of the counselor. Some areas of agreement as well as some evidence of disagreement are evident. Some studies indicate that disagreement concerning role and function is not as diverse as some of the previous literature indicates (Vanderpan, 1970).

Vanderpan (1970) conducted a study concerned with counselor perception of role and function. He found that:

... Counselors perceived their ideal role as: counseling for educational planning, adjustment to school, develops and carries out testing program, talks to parents to obtain information about pupils, counsels for vocational problem solving, interviews teachers to obtain information about pupils, counsels for academic planning, collects and files information, plans and conducts school guidance services, and counsels for problem solving. (p. 108)

Stintzi and Hutcheon (1972) found that the counselor viewed his role as an advisor precariously balanced in a mid-position. Their study indicated that the counselor felt he could not be an administrator and counselor at the same time, that the counselor could not be a disciplinarian, that the counselor should be active in the community and that he should be active in scheduling, individual planning and learning, and programs and special placement.

The findings of a study by Carmical and Calvin (1970) indicate that the counselor views his role as follows:

1. Counseling per se is being viewed as a primary function of the counselors' role, rather than as a process by which to convey guidance principles as traditionally thought.
2. The transmission of information as well as the authoritatively constructed role of guidance is seen as relegated to a lesser position than presupposed.
3. Administrative tasks, teaching academic courses, job placement, and record keeping are negatively viewed.
4. While counselors feel they should be concerned with the counseling process, it is interesting to note that the concept of counseling students with personal problems is ranked 22nd and tends

to be closer to a secondary level function rather than a primary one. Of further interest, counseling functions associated with pupils concerning military duty and those of dealing with staff are ranked 41.5. (p. 284)

Vanderpan (1970) in a study concerning role and function of the counselor as perceived by the counselor and secondary school principal reported that:

... Principals and counselors agree identically upon the four most important items describing the counseling area of the guidance service; counselors for educational planning, counsels for academic planning, counsels for vocational problem solving; and counsels for adjustment to school. They also indicated identical items as being the least appropriate in the area designated for counseling. These were: counsels only "problem students", counsels only those students who come voluntarily, and counsels with parental groups with common problems. (p. 110)

A study by Maser (1971) supports the view that administrators and counselors share similar perceptions of the counselor's function. Maser (1971) writes:

... The results of this study strongly indicate that secondary counselors, administrators, and teachers share similar perceptions of the counselor's functions. Further, agreement on counselor functions exist between junior and senior high school respondents, respondents of the same level, and respondents of different disciplines. Stated disagreements in perceptions of counselor function appear to arise from the necessity of counselors performing duties outside the counseling paradigm. These duties may (and usually do) include many non-counseling functions resembling those of administrators, attendance officers, secretaries, and clerks. (p. 372)

A study by Stintzi and Hutcheon (1972) also found similarities in role perception of the counselor as viewed by counselors and administrators. Stintzi and Hutcheon (1972) concluded the following:

... Analysis of the findings indicate general agreement among counselors, students, and administrators as to what the role of the counselor should be. None is all inclusive, but a synthesis of the viewpoints could develop a common role acceptable to each group. (pp. 330-331)

The above writers identified specific aspects of the counselor's role as viewed by the administrator. Some of the aspects as identified in the study were:

1. (The counselor) should be in a remote position from the administrator.
2. (The counselor) has as a prime function student counseling, individual and group.
3. (The counselor) should be available to talk to parents.
4. (The counselor) should be active in individual planning and learning programs for special placement.
5. (The counselor) should maintain informal, as well as formal, student contact.
6. (The counselor) should consult with teachers.
(p. 330)

Some counselor educators think the counselor should become more involved in community activities (Blocher, 1966). They believe the counselor must involve himself in the total environment of the student and act as an agent for change (Baker and Cramer, 1972). The idea of a counselor acting as an agent for change was considered as early as 1966, when Blocher pointed out that counselors do not exist in a vacuum. Blocher (1966) felt that the counselor must take some responsibility for creating an environment which is dedicated to the facilitation of human development. Blocher (1966) stated this clearly when he wrote:

... The counselor is committed to the creation of an environment within which human development is facilitated and stimulated rather than retarded and stagnated. The developmental counselor is interested in modifying environmental situations both within and without the institutional settings in which he operates. He intervenes in ways that make it possible for clients to relate themselves to the environment and react to it in maximally growth-producing fashions. (p. 116)

Blocher felt that the role of the counselor extends beyond the walls of the school. Blocher (1966) wrote:

... The most significant intervention of the counselor may well be to change the social situation in school or family or community so that his client may relate to it in more positive and growth inducing ways. (p. 121)

Baker and Cramer (1972) explored the current emphasis from some quarters towards making the counselor assume the role of agent for change. They wrote:

... Among those writers who have called upon counselors to become agents for change are Ciavarella and Dolittle (1970), Rousseve (1968), and Shaw (1968). It is apparent in this sampling from the literature that counselors are being called upon to reevaluate and to change their methods while involving themselves in the environment, and in the problems of their counselees. (p. 662)

Baker and Cramer (1972) believe that if the professional does indeed want counselors to become agents for change, then what is required is more than verbal support or printed guidelines. They put this clearly when they conclude:

... Accomplishing this task requires a commitment from the profession and its leadership to become change agents themselves. If the leadership of the profession cannot show real evidence of change-agent behavior and the ability to support individual members, they should discontinue their encouragement of the activist, change-agent model for practitioners in the field. (p. 664)

In an editorial, George M. Gazda (1972) current president of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) discussed the future role of counselors. Gazda (1972) believes that the counselor of the immediate future will spend as much time in the community as he does in school. According to Gazda (1972, p. 1) "the counselor (in the community) will teach and counsel parents about child management and will assist them to secure special services for their children from the school and community." Gazda (1972) continues:

... The counselor of the immediate future will be a generalist in functions and an activist in attitude and commitment. He will need a keen understanding of child growth and development (physical, psychological, social, educational, and vocational developmental stages and tasks), will need to be an expert in applied learning and group dynamics, and will need to be knowledgeable in potential strategies to produce behavioral or social changes. The school counselor will be obligated to involve himself in the school curriculum to ensure that course offerings, evaluation procedures, content-process emphasis, etc., provide skill acquisition for all students. (p. 1)

Summary

A review of the literature clearly shows that the groups like those involved in this study sometimes view the role and function of the counselor quite differently. Many solutions are suggested but no real solution to the problem has been found. Counselor educators are accused of being too idealistic and out-of-touch with the realities of the role and function as performed by the secondary school counselor. Administrators are often accused of not understanding what the role and function of the counselor should be but never-the-less they still presume to evaluate his efforts and his program. Counselors are often accused

of adding to the confusion by their failure to make their role and function clear to the teachers and educators of their schools and by frequently volunteering for tasks related to administration or similar inappropriate activities even though they do not associate these tasks with the proper role and function of the counselor. Counselors-in-training generally reflect the views of their professors but these views are not always in agreement with those held by administrators and teachers in training.

Peters (1971) sees value in most criticisms when he writes:

... Yet, through it all, it is important to note that most criticisms are really calls for more of what school counselors have represented themselves to offer, and to be. Most (counselors) continue to make such significant contributions and provide such genuine help that the call is for more of what school counselors have to offer and not less.
(p. 308)

In the end result, counselors are many things to many people since their role and function must be flexible enough to meet the need of clients. Shertzer and Stone (1968) summarize this view when they state:

... The majority of counselees expect counseling to produce personal solutions for them. Those in stressful situations anticipate that counseling will bring relief. Those who are vacillating over a decision expect counseling to result in a choice. Those who perceive themselves as personally unpopular expect counseling to lead to their being popular. Those who are lonely expect solace and the discovery of ways to interact meaningfully with others. Those who want to go to college view counseling as guaranteeing them admission, scholarship, or financial aid. Those who are about to fail, either in school or in other ventures, expect failure to turn to success as a result of counseling. Those who seek employment counseling expect quick placement, job satisfaction, easy promotion. (p. 96)

This review of the literature was designed to explore the opinions of counselor educators, counselors in the field, principals, and counselors-in-training concerning the role and function of the secondary school counselor. An effort was made to structure the review to show that disagreements concerning role existed both among and within some of these four groups. The review shows that no clear cut consensus of opinion of the role and function of the counselor has emerged, even though much thought has been given to the problem. In addition, the review points out that in spite of the obvious differences in role function which do exist or are believed to exist, some areas of agreement are found between groups such as principals and counselors.

The review of the literature also reveals the desirability of an instrument designed to measure the role and function of the counselor as perceived by counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and counselors. The literature included an analysis of the ASCA "Statement of Policy". The ASCA study which lead to the "Statement of Policy" was the most complete and thorough study the writer was able to find. For this reason the specific role functions described in the "Statement of Policy" were used as a base to construct an instrument to be used in this study.

The review of the literature also points out that semantic problems exist in the terminology used by both interprofessionals and intraprofessionals. Frequently the same word is given different meaning or tone. At times negation is utilized as a method of definition. Frequently a term is used to uphold one point of view and no consideration is given to opposing views and obvious contradictions in terminology.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

As indicated in the literature, the role of the counselor is perceived differently by counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and counselors. This study will analyze the reactions of the above groups to a series of statements developed for this investigation. The instrument to be used in this study was designed to examine counselor role perceptions in the State of Oregon.

The review of the literature indicated that the ASCA study which lead to the 1967 "Statement of Policy" appeared to be the most thorough and complete study available in the area of counselor role. Since this study has as it's objective the clarification of the role of the counselor and since the ASCA "Statement of Policy" made specific references to what the role of the counselor should be, the ASCA "Statement of Policy" was used as the model.

The categories of counseling role and function specified by the ASCA "Statement of Policy" as revised in 1967, included the following:

1. Planning and Development of the Guidance Program
2. Pupil Appraisal
3. Referral Work
4. Parent Help
5. Local Research
6. Professional Environment
7. Counseling

8. Education and Occupational Planning
9. Placement
10. Staff Consulting
11. Public Relations

Under each of these eleven categories of counseling role and function, the ASCA "Statement of Policy" lists specific role and function characteristics.

Developing the Instrument

The purpose of this study was to analyze the differences in responses by counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and counselors concerning role and function of the secondary school counselor. A questionnaire format was selected and the instrument was developed to analyze the differences in attitude relative to certain specific aspects of counselor role and function.

A seven point Likert type scale was developed to provide a forced choice on a continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A seven point scale rather than the usual five point scale was used to provide a wider range of choice. More options would hopefully result in individuals feeling more comfortable with the range of choices and therefore would encourage them to respond in a direction away from the neutral response. The choices of the seven point scale were:

1. Strongly Agree (SA)
2. Agree (A)
3. Mildly Agree (MA)
4. Undecided (U)

5. Mildly Disagree (MD)
6. Disagree (D)
7. Strongly Disagree (SD)

Thirty-seven items were selected from the ASCA "Statement of Policy" for use in the questionnaire. Of the thirty-seven items, not less than three were selected from each of the eleven categories previously mentioned in this chapter. Four additional items were selected from three of the categories resulting in a total of thirty-seven. Another nineteen items based on a review of the literature were added to the questionnaire. These additional nineteen items represented an attempt to include areas of concern as expressed by a validating group of readers.

To increase the face validity of the instrument, a group consisting of one faculty member from Education Foundations and Specialties at Oregon State University, two doctorate candidates in guidance and counseling and two doctorate candidates in education at Oregon State University assisted in refining the items, making changes and revisions where necessary to eliminate redundancy, deleting insignificant items, and improving clarity of the items. As a result some items were eliminated and major changes in the questionnaire were made.

Following this procedure, another faculty member from Education Foundations and Specialties and a faculty member from secondary education were selected to judge face validity. They were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Following the response of these two final judges, each was interviewed and asked to comment on items concerning clarity, redundancy, vagueness, and significance to the purpose of the study. Some changes in wording were made following the interviews.

The revised instrument was then given to a pilot study group consisting of three faculty members of the School of Education at Oregon State University, three doctorate candidates in the School of Education at Oregon State University, and three members of the guidance and counseling consultant staff of the Oregon State Department of Education. Members of this pilot study group were asked to review the instrument and respond to each item. Following this procedure, some items were restated and one item was eliminated. The result was an instrument composed of forty-one items (see Appendix A). A change in the structure of the last page of the questionnaire was also made. The respondent was asked to rank the choices provided in the final four items of the questionnaire in order of importance, assigning one to the most important item, two to the next in importance, and so forth. No further changes or revisions of the instrument were made.

After being refined by the foregoing procedures, the instrument was administered on 2 May, 1972 to fifteen elementary guidance and counseling graduate students and twenty-seven students in Educational Psychology at Oregon State University to obtain a reliability coefficient using the test-retest method. On 30 May, 1972 the same two groups of students were once again asked to respond to the questionnaire. The results were tabulated and a test-retest reliability coefficient of .72 was obtained. The formula used to determine the correlation coefficient was:

$$r = \frac{\sum XY/n - (\bar{X})(\bar{Y})}{s_x s_y}$$

The investigator feels the time interval between the first and second administration of the questionnaire was sufficient to eliminate the recall factor. The period of four weeks was considered short enough to minimize attitudinal change.

Composition of the Sample

All counselor educators at Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Portland State University and the University of Oregon teaching one-half time or more during May of 1972 in graduate programs leading to counselor certification were included in the study. Each counselor educator was contacted personally and his cooperation was solicited and received.

All counselors-in-training attending Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon during the month of May, 1972 were included in this study. Each counselor trainee was contacted during a class period and asked to respond to the questionnaire. Only counselors-in-training in their final quarter of counselor education prior to being recommended for certification were included in the sample.

The counselor sample for this study was taken from a list of counselors in the State of Oregon compiled by the Oregon State Department of Education in September of 1972. Only certified full-time counselors whose names appeared on the counselor list were included in the study. In order to achieve a sample geographically as evenly distributed as possible, no more than two full-time certified school counselors were selected from any high school in the State of Oregon.

In cases where more than two certified full-time counselors were on the staff of a high school, a lottery method was used for selecting counselors to be included in the sample. This was accomplished by assigning each counselor in the high school a number identifying the individual, and having an OSU staff secretary draw two numbers from a paper box. By using this procedure of modified random sampling, a total of 176 counselors out of a total population of 269 certified counselors were selected to participate in the study.

Once these counselors were identified, a list of their principals was compiled. The names of the principals were obtained from the 1971-1972 Oregon School-Community College Directory published by the Oregon State Department of Education. A total of 119 principals were included in the sample.

Procedure

During the first week of May, 1972, one staff member from counselor education in each of the four institutions participating in the study was contacted. These four counselor educators were asked to participate in the dissemination and collection of the questionnaires at their own institutions. Each counselor educator assisting in the dissemination and collection of the questionnaires was given the following material:

1. An instruction sheet which listed a short description of the purpose of the study, the method to be used in distribution of the questionnaire, designated time span during which the questionnaire was to be administered, and information concerning the procedure to be

followed in returning the completed questionnaire to the writer (see Appendix A).

2. A sufficient quantity of questionnaires for all counselor educators and counselors-in-training in their institution. The questionnaires were coded to make it possible to identify the respondent as being either a counselor educator or a counselor-in-training.

Each counselor educator assisting in the dissemination and collection of the data was encouraged to include in the survey counselor educators employed .50 time or more as well as counselors-in-training in their final quarter of the counselor education program.

During the week of May 22 through May 26, 1972, the counselor educators assisting in the dissemination and collection of the data were asked to distribute the questionnaire to all counselor educators on their staffs. They explained the purpose and procedure of the study to each staff member by reading the previously furnished typed statement. Each staff member assisting in the dissemination and collection of the data then distributed the questionnaire to all selected students during a class period. The purpose and procedure sheet was read to the students who were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were then collected and the material was forwarded to the investigator by mail. As a result of this procedure, the entire staff and student population defined in Chapter I took part in the study.

On November 16, 1972, a copy of the questionnaire, a data sheet and a letter of explanation were forwarded via mail to all counselors and principals previously selected to take part in the survey (see Appendix C). On 30 November, 1972, a list of all those who had responded was compiled. A follow-up letter and a second questionnaire and data sheet were sent on December 2, 1972 to all who had failed to respond to the initial letter (see Appendix C). A total of eighty-nine (89%) percent of the principals contacted responded to the questionnaire. Ninety percent (90%) of the counselors contacted responded to the questionnaire. The results were then assembled for statistical treatment.

Treatment of the Data

To facilitate the analysis of the data, a number value was assigned to each possible choice on the seven point Likert type scale. Values were assigned in ascending orders as follows:

Strongly Agree (SA)	= 1 point
Agree (A)	= 2 points
Mildly Agree (MA)	= 3 points
Undecided (U)	= 4 points
Mildly Disagree (MD)	= 5 points
Disagree (D)	= 6 points
Strongly Disagree (SD)	= 7 points

Since the last page of the questionnaire consisted of rank order items, the number value assigned to each item by the respondent was used to facilitate analysis.

Items on the questionnaire were designed so that "Strongly Agree" or "Strongly Disagree" on the Likert scale, signified a stance considered positively or negatively by the ASCA "Statement of Policy". Of the items taken from the ASCA statement, approximately sixty percent (60%) were stated positively. The remainder were stated negatively. This structured the questionnaire to prevent all positive statements from occurring, thereby eliminating the possibility of presenting a trend which the respondents could follow.

In order to speed the statistical analysis, an electronic computer was used as the tool of calculation. One fortran computer programming card was key-punched for each questionnaire. The first two columns of each card identified the population or sample the card belongs to. The remaining columns were used to record the response for each item on the questionnaire. Each card was verified to assure accuracy.

One-way analysis of variance was the statistic selected to measure significant differences at the .05 level of significance among the four groups involved in the study. The Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison was used to test for significant differences at the .05 level for all contrasts. This method was used because the sample sizes in each of the four groups are different. The Scheffe method is also insensitive to violations of the assumptions of normality and of equality of variance (Scheffe, 1959).

The formula for the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison is as follows:

$$\left| \bar{\psi} - \hat{\bar{\psi}} \right| \leq S\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{\psi}}$$

If the absolute value of $\Psi - \hat{\Psi}$ is less than or equal to $S\hat{\sigma}_{\Psi}$, then there is no significant difference in comparisons. Otherwise, significant differences exist.

In addition to these two statistics, the "t" test was used to determine significant differences at the .05 level for hypothesis three (H_{03}). A chi-square contingency table was made to show comparisons for rank order items thirty-eight through forty-one of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was analyzed a total of six times in order to discover differences for the following comparisons:

1. Counselor educators and certified counselors.
2. Counselor educators and principals.
3. Counselor educators and their own students.
4. Principals and counselors.
5. Principals and counselors-in-training.
6. Counselors and counselors-in-training.

Hypothesis to be tested

Each of the hypotheses is stated in the null form for the purpose of developing statistical tests of significance. The statistical tests used as a basis for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses were one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison. In addition to these two statistical measures, the "t" test was used to determine significant differences between counselor educators and their students. In all cases, significant differences were determined at the .05 level of significance.

- Ho₁: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and certified counselors in the field.
- Ho₂: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and principals.
- Ho₃: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and their students.
- Ho₄: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors in the field.
- Ho₅: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors in training.
- Ho₆: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors in training.

Summary

An original instrument was designed to measure the role of the counselor as perceived by counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and counselors in the State of Oregon. The 1967 revision of the ASCA "Statement of Policy" was used as a model for the instrument.

A questionnaire format was selected and a seven point Likert type scale was utilized to measure differences in attitude in relationship to certain specific aspects of role and function. The majority of the items used in the questionnaire were taken from the 1967 revision of the ASCA "Statement of Policy".

During May of 1972, the questionnaire was administered to selected counselor educators and counselors-in-training from Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Portland State University, and the

University of Oregon. In November of 1972, the questionnaire was mailed to selected counselors and principals in the State of Oregon. A follow-up letter containing another questionnaire was forwarded during the month of December, 1972 to those who failed to respond to the initial letter.

The following statistics were the criterion used for acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses. One-way analysis of variance was used to distinguish significant differences among the populations. The Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison was used for judging all contrasts. In addition to these two statistics, the "t" test was used to determine significant differences between counselor educators and their students. A chi-square contingency table was made for items thirty-eight through forty-one of the questionnaire.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This study was conducted for the purpose of investigating the opinions of selected professional persons and students graduating from counselor education programs to see if differences existed in their perception of what the secondary school counselor does. The study had as its objective the examination of the role and function of the secondary school counselor as seen by counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and counselors in the schools. A questionnaire was designed to measure differences in attitude of these four groups.

This chapter presents the analyses of the data obtained through the statistical procedures followed. Differences which exist between each of the four groups included in the study are determined. Each of the six hypotheses is considered separately. The chapter also includes an analysis of a Chi-square contingency table for responses to items thirty-eight through forty-one of the questionnaire by the four groups involved in the study.

Analysis Procedure

For the purpose of statistical analysis, all hypotheses were stated in the null form. One-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparisons were the statistics used in analyzing the data relative to the six hypotheses. In addition to these two statistics, the "t" test was used to investigate the differences in viewpoint between

counselor educators and their students (H_{03}). The .05 level of significance was selected for testing the significance of the hypotheses.

The analyses, utilizing the sum as the representation of the viewpoint of the four groups, is seen in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 3.

TABLE 1. Analysis of Variance of the Perception of the Role and Function of the Secondary School Counselor in the State of Oregon.

<u>Source of Variation</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Population	3	64621.834	21540.6112	53.9955*
Error	326	130052.363	398.9336	
Total	329	194674.197		

The F value of 53.9955 in Table 1 indicates the significant differences among the four groups; counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and counselors in the field. For further investigation, the Scheffe method was used for multiple comparisons. Eighteen (18) counselor educators took part in the study. The counselors-in-training sample included in this study was fifty-two (52). One hundred and five (105) principals and one hundred fifty-five (155) counselors responded to the questionnaire. The multiple comparisons are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 includes a comparison of the total counselor education sample against the total counselor-in-training sample and does not apply to hypothesis three (H_{03}). Hypothesis three (H_{03}) deals specifically with counselor educators and their own students from each of the four educational institutions taking part in this study (see Table 3). The comparison between these two composite group samples is included in this table (Table 2) to point out a particular aspect of the data which is

referred to during the description of the analysis of hypothesis three.

Hypothesis One

H_{01} : There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and certified counselors in the field.

The evidence is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and certified counselors in the field is analyzed in Table 2. The mean difference is 44.81 and the Scheffe range is 14.23. The difference minus the range and the difference plus the range does not include zero. Therefore there is a significant difference in role and function perception between counselor educators and counselors in the field, and the null hypothesis H_{01} is rejected.

Hypothesis Two

H_{02} : There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and principals.

The evidence is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. Table 2 analyzes the difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and principals. The mean difference is 47.56 and the Scheffe range is 13.89. The difference minus the range and the difference plus the range does not include zero. Therefore, the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparisons shows that there is a significant difference in role and function perception between the two groups compared in this hypothesis. The null hypothesis H_{02} is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 2. Scheffe - Method of Multiple Comparisons

Population - - -	Counselor Educators	Counselors-in- Training	Counselors - - -	Principals - - -
Means	171.7222	154.3462	126.9097	124.1619
	Population Contrast	Mean Difference	Scheffe's Range	
Ho ₁	Counselor Educators vs. Counselors	44.8125	14.2305 *	
Ho ₂	Counselor Educators vs. Principals	47.5603	13.8905 *	
Ho ₄	Principals vs. Counselors	-2.7478	7.0506 ns	
Ho ₅	Principals vs. Counselors- in-training	30.1843	8.9395 *	
Ho ₆	Counselors vs. Counselors- in-training	27.4365	9.4591 *	
+	All counselor educators vs. all counselors- in-training	17.3760	15.2549 *	

Note: * indicates significant differences at the .05 level of significance
 ns indicates no significant differences at the .05 level of significance
 + refers to comparison between all counselor educators and all counselors-in-training and does not represent the contrast referred to in Ho₃.

Hypothesis Three

Ho₃: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and their students.

The evidence is insufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The differences in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and their students is analyzed in Table 3. None of the four campus groups has significant "t" value (Table 3a). By further study of the standard error and the mean of each of the campus groups in Table 3b and Table 3c, we see that even though all four counselor educator groups have higher values than their students, the standard errors are so large that they tend to be non-significant due to the small sample sizes. If all four groups are pooled together (Table 1 and Table 2), there is a significant difference between the educators and students. The null hypothesis Ho₃ must be upheld at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis Four

Ho₄: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors in the field.

The evidence is insufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The differences in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors in the field is analyzed in Table 2. The mean difference is -2.75 and the Scheffe range is 7.05. The difference minus the range and the difference plus the range does include zero. This contrast registered the only negative mean difference of all groups compared. The Scheffe method shows that no significant difference exists between the role perception of the counselor as viewed by principals and

TABLE 3. Viewpoints between Counselor Educators and Their Students

(a) Unpaired "t" test of each Counselor Education Department

<u>Group</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>"t" value</u>	
Oregon State University	12	0.8696	ns
Oregon College of Education	6	1.3204	ns
Portland State University	32	0.4404	ns
University of Oregon	10	0.4635	ns
Note: ns indicates no significant differences at the .05 level of significance			

(b) The Standard Errors of each Counselor Education Department

<u>Group</u>	<u>Educator</u>	<u>no.</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>no.</u>
Oregon State University	13.3832	3	7.2196	13
Oregon College of Education	5.0442	3	5.0060	5
Portland State University	4.0927	4	3.0716	30
University of Oregon	11.5538	8	13.0032	4

(c) The Mean of Each Group

<u>Group</u>	<u>Educator</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Oregon State University	174.67	160.38	14.29
Oregon College of Education	159.67	149.60	10.07
Portland State University	153.50	149.70	3.80
University of Oregon	184.25	175.50	8.75

counselors in the schools. Therefore, the null hypothesis H_{04} is accepted at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis Five

H_{05} : There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors-in-training.

The evidence is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. Table 2 shows that the mean difference is 30.18 and the Scheffe range is 8.94. The difference minus the range and the difference plus the range does not include zero. The Scheffe method therefore shows that there is a significant difference in role and function as viewed by principals and counselors-in-training. The null hypothesis H_{05} is rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis Six

H_{06} : There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training.

The evidence is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis. The comparison of the differences in role perception of the counselor as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training is analyzed in Table 2. The mean difference is 27.44 and the Scheffe range is 9.46. The difference minus the range and the difference plus the range does not include zero. The Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison indicates that there is a significant difference in role perception between the two groups compared in this hypothesis. The null hypothesis H_{06} is therefore rejected.

Analysis of Rank Order Items

An analysis of items thirty-eight through forty-one of the questionnaire, utilizing a chi-square contingency table, is shown in Table 4a. The table shows there were no significant differences between group comparisons for item number thirty-eight. This item is concerned with the role of therapy in counseling. Items thirty-nine through forty-one did register some significant differences in group comparisons (Table 4a).

Significant differences for item thirty-nine can be seen in Table 4b. The table shows that significant differences for this item, which is concerned with the counselor's role in discipline, do not exist between counselor educators and students or between counselor educators and counselors in the field. There is also no significant difference in views held by counselors-in-training and principals. In all other comparisons, there are significant differences at the .05 level.

Table 4c shows significant differences for item forty. This item is concerned with persons with whom the counselor shares confidential information. The table shows that significant differences exist between the views held by counselors-in-training and principals as well as between principals and counselors in the field. No other significant differences in group comparisons were found.

In Table 4d, comparisons are made concerning item forty-one, which deals with the counselor's role in testing. This table shows that significant differences exist in comparisons between counselor educators and principals; counselors-in-training and principals; counselors-in-training and counselors in the field; and principals and

TABLE 4.

(a) The Value of Chi-square for Rank Items Thirty -Eight through Forty- One

Items	The Value of Chi-square	df	Tabulated Chi-square at .05
38	8.32 ns	9	16.92
39	49.27 *	9	16.92
40	30.90 *	12	21.03
41	32.47 *	12	21.03

(b) Chi-square Value of the Contingency Table for Item Thirty-Nine

	Counselors- In-Training	Principals	Counselors	
Counselor Educators	1.61 ns	8.88 *	2.69 ns	
Counselors- In-Training		2.43 ns	10.90 *	$\chi^2_{.05,3} = 7.81$
Principals			8.36 *	

(c) Chi-square Value of the Contingency Table for Item Forty

	Counselors- In-Training	Principals	Counselors	
Counselor Educators	4.90 ns	1.20 ns	4.78 ns	
Counselors- In-Training		11.97 *	1.58 ns	$\chi^2_{.05,4} = 9.45$
Principals			19.64 *	

(D) Chi-square Value of the Contingency Table for Item Forty-one

	Counselors- In-Training	Principals	Counselors	
Counselor Educators	1.61 ns	8.75 *	2.69 ns	
Counselors- In-Training		16.86 *	10.90 *	$\chi^2_{.05,4} = 9.45$
Principals			28.36 *	

counselors in the field. No other significant differences were found among the comparisons made.

Summary

One-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparisons were the statistics utilized in analyzing six hypotheses in this chapter. The "t" test was also used in the case of hypothesis three (H_{o3}). All of the hypotheses, with the exception of hypothesis three (H_{o3}) and hypothesis four (H_{o4}), were rejected since significant differences were found to exist between the group comparisons made. Hypotheses three (H_{o3}) and four (H_{o4}) were not rejected because there were no significant findings at the .05 level of significance. However, on analyzing the differences of role perception between counselor educators as a group from all four institutions, and counselors-in-training from all four institutions, significant differences did exist. The analysis was made on the basis of responses to items one through thirty-seven of the instrument used and designed to estimate differences in perceptions of role and functions of counselors. In addition, rank items thirty-eight through forty-one on the questionnaire were analyzed using chi-square. No differences existed among the four groups included in the study for item thirty-eight, which deals with the role of therapy in counseling. Differences do exist when comparisons are made for items thirty-nine through forty-one. Item thirty-nine deals with the counselor's role in discipline. Forty deals with the sharing of confidential information and forty-one deals with the counselor's role in testing. The .05 level of significance was selected

for testing for significance.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the opinions of selected counselor educators, counselors-in-training, principals, and certified full-time counselors in the State of Oregon. The object of the study was to discover if differences in perception exist in group comparisons of the role and function of the secondary school counselors. The samples included:

1. Eighteen (18) counselor educators.
2. Fifty-two (52) counselors-in-training.
3. One hundred and five (105) principals.
4. One hundred and fifty-five (155) counselors.

A forty-one (41) item questionnaire was constructed to survey counselor role perception as seen by the four groups involved in the study and to analyze the differences in perception of these four groups relative to certain specific aspects of role and function. A seven point Likert scale was used to record a choice on a continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Twenty-three (23) items were based on the 1967 revision of the ASCA "Statement of Policy". Additional items included in the questionnaire were based on a review of the literature in an attempt to include current issues of concern in the field of counseling. Face validity was established by submitting the questionnaire to selected professionals. A number of items were deleted or changed based upon recommendations from the persons involved until consensus established a recommended instrument.

During May of 1972, the instrument was administered to counselor educators and counselors-in-training from the four institutions previously mentioned. In November, 1972, the instrument was mailed to selected principals and counselors in the State of Oregon. A follow-up letter was mailed in December, 1972 to those who failed to respond to the original letter. Eighty-nine (89%) percent of the principals contacted responded to the questionnaire. Ninety percent (90%) of all counselors contacted responded. The results were then assembled for statistical analysis.

A one-way analysis of variance and the Scheffe Method of Multiple Comparison were used. The "t" test was used to determine differences for comparisons between counselor educators and their students. A chi-square contingency table was used to determine significant differences for the last four rank order items of the questionnaire. In all cases, the opinions of the groups were tested for significant differences at the .05 level.

All of the hypotheses, with the exception of hypothesis three (H_{o3}), which is concerned with the comparison of views between counselor educators and their students, and hypothesis four (H_{o4}), which deals with comparisons of opinions of principals and counselors in the field, were rejected. Hypothesis three (H_{o3}) and hypothesis four (H_{o4}) were accepted because there were no significant differences. In comparisons made for the rank order items thirty-eight through forty-one, significant differences were found to exist for each item except item thirty-eight which deals with the role of therapy in counseling. Item thirty-nine is concerned with the counselor's role in discipline and

significant differences were found to exist in views held by all counselor educators and all students; counselor educators and counselors in the field; and counselors-in-training and principals. Item forty pertains to the sharing of confidential information. Significant differences were found to exist for this item between counselors-in-training and principals as well as between principals and counselors in the field. The counselor's role in testing is the subject of item forty-one. For this item, significant differences were found to exist in comparisons between opinions of counselor educators and principals; counselors-in-training and principals; counselors-in-training and counselors in the field; and between principals and counselors in the field. No other significant differences were found to exist among the comparisons made for these four rank order items.

Discussion

The first hypothesis explored was: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and certified counselors in the field. (Rejected)

The rejection of this hypothesis seems to reinforce the writer's opinion that responsibility for clarification of the role of the counselor may rest principally with counselor educators and counselors in the field. If one accepts this point of view, then agreement between these two groups is necessary. The study suggests that a lack of communication or at least of agreement between these two groups exists. This fact may be the key to much of the confusion which prevails concerning the role and function of the counselor. When role definitions

vary considerably the chances of misunderstanding and conflict might reasonably be expected to be greater than in situations where similar definitions are shared.

Differences between the opinions of counselor educators and counselors in the field might be minimized if counselor educators could spend more time in the field in order to become more aware of current demands made upon counselors by school districts. Perhaps it would be helpful to consult with counselors in the field as well as other educators when training programs are modified.

The findings of this study give credence to the findings and opinions cited in the literature. Peters (1971) felt that counselor educators think counselors do not spend enough time in one-to-one or group counseling activities. Counselors have been accused of not setting definite goals and of allowing other school personnel to define their role for them (Dickinson, 1970). Counselor educators have been accused of being out of touch with reality (Frick, 1972).

The second hypothesis explored was: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators and principals. (Rejected)

In light of the rejection of this hypothesis, in addition to the views cited in the literature, certain inferences may be made. Perhaps counselor educators should do more to acquaint graduate students and professors in school administration as well as principals with the role and function of the secondary school counselor. If a distinction is to be drawn between the functions of the counselor and those of other educators, then some agreement concerning the nature of the dis-

tion should be arrived at by those training counselors and those responsible for administration of school services. If Oregon adopts a competency based evaluation and accountability system for counselors, some workable understandings and agreements seem necessary. Perhaps, in the establishment of competencies, principals should have input since the principal frequently makes judgments as to the effectiveness of the counselor and the counseling program. Clarification of the role and function of the counselor might be part of the task of administrators along with counselor educators and counselors in the field. Variance in perception of the counselor role may affect not only the counselor but also his student clients. Differences may be related to hiring practices, budget considerations, and in approaches to discipline and sharing confidential information.

The findings and opinions cited in the review of the literature support the rejection of this hypothesis. Hubbard (1970) stated that administrators might not be aware of what the role of the counselor should be. Smith (1971) found that disagreements tend to center around the extent to which the counselor can or should perform duties frequently identified as belonging to teachers and other professionals. Another aspect which may affect counselor role and function can be inferred from the study of Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958). They found that differences in the understanding of the superintendent role by the incumbent himself and by members of the school board are likely to be translated in terms of budget.

The third hypothesis explored was: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselor educators

and their students. (Accepted)

A large standard error exists in this area due to small sample sizes in each of the institutions surveyed. This fact influenced the acceptance of this hypothesis. However, when comparisons were made between all counselor educators and the counselors-in-training irrespective of educational institutions, significant differences were found to exist. If the views of students did not differ from those of their professors, and if the four institutions responsible for counselor education in the State of Oregon shared the same philosophy, agreement would exist. However, perhaps the four institutions do not fully share the same philosophy or approach to counselor education. In addition, it may be that all students do not agree with the views held by all of their professors, nor do all professors agree with each other within as well as among institutions. This view is probably supported by the fact that difficulty is experienced among counselor educators in Oregon in reaching agreement concerning the establishment of competencies for a competency based evaluation and accountability system. Further, if responses by counselor educators within each institution are compared, it becomes apparent that wide disagreement does exist within departments. This seems to support Arbuckle's view (1968) as quoted below. One might then be able to infer that disagreement does exist between counselor educators and their students and, given a large enough sample size, perhaps significant differences would have been found. This can only be inferred since present evidence is not sufficient to support the hypothesis.

The literature offers little to explain the lack of substantial evidence concerning differences between counselor educators and their students. Arbuckle (1968) stated that differences may exist among counselor educators within institutions. If one accepts Arbuckle's views, then perhaps part of the large standard error found to exist in this area is related to disagreements within as well as between institutions.

The fourth hypothesis explored was: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors in the field. (Accepted)

Some inferences can be made on the basis of the acceptance of this hypothesis. Since the study examined the role and function of the counselor in terms of what the counselor is doing as opposed to what he should be doing, and if the principal is indeed one of the primary if not the most important determiner of role, then perhaps one could reasonably expect no significant differences to occur. The fact that some counselors view the role of the counselor as a stepping stone to administration, may stimulate them to follow the role defined for them in order to better their chances for promotion. Other counselors might feel that job security is more important than attempting to correct what they know to be deviations from the professional role and function of the counselor. For whatever reasons, the results of this study suggest that agreement does exist between these two groups concerning role and function.

The literature reveals several studies which support this finding (Maser, 1971; Stintzi and Hutcheon, 1972; Vanderpan, 1970). The fact that no significant differences were found for this hypothesis is also supported by Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer (1969) whose findings indicate that the principal is the determiner of counselor role. Ratigan (1972) found that the counselor frequently failed to brief the administration on areas of his expertise and training, and consequently found himself assigned to duties which were in conflict with what he believed his role should be. Ratigan (1972) also suggested that in some instances, counseling is regarded as a step towards the administrative level.

The fifth hypothesis explored was: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors-in-training. (Rejected)

Some conclusions can be drawn because of the rejection of this hypothesis. Counselors-in-training sometimes feel that counselor education programs reflect an unrealistic view of the counselors role and function (Riese and Stoner, 1969). Perhaps counselors-in-training possess an unrealistic or idealistic view of counselor role and function. The writer believes that this is the case. Furthermore, if the principal is the dominant person in the determination of the counselors role and function, as is suggested in the literature (Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer, 1969) and referred to by hypothesis four of this study, then counselors-in-training or administrators will have to adjust their views of the role and function in order to establish a workable relationship. Regardless, it seems apparent that some

dialogue between counselors-in-training and principals would be helpful in facilitating communication and clarifying counselor role.

The writer was able to find very little literature related to the role and function of the counselor as viewed by principals and counselors-in-training. The literature does refer to the problems encountered by new counselors when they enter the profession (Goldman, 1972). These problems are frequently related to what the new counselor views as a role function in conflict with that normally performed by the counselor (Goldman, 1972). More research in this area seems necessary.

The sixth hypothesis explored was: There is no significant difference in the role of the counselor as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training. (Rejected)

Several factors could contribute to differences in role as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training. Many certified counselors in the field achieved their certification several years ago when professional training was less advanced. Other certified counselors received their certification through a "grandfather clause" based upon teacher training rather than counselor training. The writer believes that these factors have a significant effect on differences in counselor role as perceived by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training.

As was true in the comparison of the opinions of school principals and counselors-in-training, apparently little has been written about role perception of the counselor as perceived by counselors-in-training and counselors in the field. Riese and Stoner (1969) found that graduate students in guidance see their roles as being quite different from those

of teachers. Heath (1970) found that classroom teachers frequently revert to role aspects associated with teaching after they have functioned as counselors following counselor training. This last finding is particularly interesting since two years of teaching experience is a normal requirement prior to certification in counseling. The writer believes that practicum programs provide an excellent setting for needed research concerning role perception between counselors-in-training and counselors in the field.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented on the basis of information gained from this study.

1. The investigation of the perceptions of the role and function of the counselor by the four groups involved in this study should be continued. An item analysis of the results of this study might be helpful in determining specific areas of disagreement thereby providing information concerning which areas require clarification. The necessity to state each item as a hypothesis makes this task impractical at the present time.
2. The results of this study point out that disagreement concerning the perception of the role and function of the counselor exists between four of the six group comparisons made. Since the State of Oregon is currently attempting to establish competency based evaluation and

accountability programs for counselors, and since such wide disagreement seems to exist, there appears to be a need for close cooperation and involvement between the four groups in this study in reaching a workable agreement concerning the establishment of competencies.

3. This study points out that disagreement concerning role and function continues to exist in spite of some opinions to the contrary. As was pointed out in the review of the literature, this disagreement has been prevalent since the mid-fifties.

If the profession is to establish a much needed identity, then more direct action of an innovative nature is required by all concerned. This may include more involvement in establishing relationships with legislatures and higher level administrators. Little evidence exists at the present time which indicates that these kind of relationships have been previously attempted, at least within the State of Oregon.

Recommended Further Research

1. The results of this study seem to warrant further research concerning role and function as viewed by counselor educators and their own students. Comparisons between these two groups did not

reveal significant differences possibly because the standard error was too great, and the sample sizes too small.

2. Further research needs to be conducted to determine just how the counselor in the State of Oregon spends his time during the average counseling day. A breakdown of how much time the average counselor devotes to the various tasks that make up the counseling day would provide counselor educators as well as students with insight concerning what is actually happening in the field. The results may point out a need for in-service education, in addition to providing counselors-in-training with a realistic view of on-going practices. Counselor educators could use the information to help students in preparing for the task of revising on-going practices if necessary.
3. There appears to be a need for further research concerning the differences in counselor role and function as viewed by counselors in the field and counselors-in-training. This could be accomplished by measuring perceptions held by each of these two groups at the beginning and end of a field practicum experience involving both. Counselors in the field who have a direct supervisory relationship with counselors-in-training could compose one group.

Their perceptions of counselor role could be measured at the beginning as well as at the end of their supervisee's field experience. The supervisees could constitute the second group and also take a pre and post test. If a change did occur, the perceptions of each group both before and after the practicum experience could be examined to determine which of the two, if either, disagrees with the counselor role as outlined by the 1967 revision of the ASCA "Statement of Policy".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Personnel and Guidance Association. Statement of Policy for secondary school counselors and guidelines for implementation of the ASCA statement of policy for secondary school counselors. Rev. ed. 1967. Documents resulting from the ASCA counselor study. Copyright 1967 by the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Washington, D. C. 1967, 11 p.
- Arbuckle, Dugal S. A question of counselor function and responsibility. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 47:341-345. 1968.
- Arbuckle, Dugal S. Does the school really need counselors? *The School Counselor* 17:325-330. 1970.
- Arbuckle, Dugal S. "The Counselor: Who? What?", *Personnel & Guidance Journal*, Vol. 50, #10, June, 72 (P. 785-790).
- Argyris, Chris. Organization of a bank. New Haven. Yale Labor-Management Center. 1954.
- Aubrey, Roger F. And never the twain shall meet: counselor training and school realities. *The School Counselor* 20:18-23. 1972.
- Baker, Stanley B. and Stanley H. Cramer. "Counselor or Change Agent: Support from the Profession." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* Vol. 50 #8, April, 1972 (pp. 661-665).
- Baum, Shirley Wankey. A study of secondary school counselor, administrator, and teacher perceptions of the counselor role. Doctoral dissertation. Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1971. 167 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
- Blocher, Donald H. Developmental counseling. New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1966. 250 p.
- Carmical, LaVerne and Leland R. Calvin. Functions selected by school counselors. *The School Counselor* 17:280-285. 1970.
- Carroll, M. R. Potpourri for education. *The School Counselor* 16:21-23. 1968.
- Dickinson, D. J. Improving guidance with behavior objectives. *California Personnel and Guidance Association Journal* 1970, 2, 12-17.
- Dilley, Josiah S. Anti-shrinkthink, *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 7, March, 1972, pp. 567-572.

- Dunlop, R. S. Counselor competence: Some proposals in search of advocacy. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 46:655-660. 1968.
- Frick, Donald L. Counselors self-analysis of their training as related to their counselor role and functions. Doctoral dissertation. Fort Collins, Colorado State University, 1971. 126 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
- Gazda, George M. Message to the Association Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 1-2.
- Ginzberg, Eli. "A Critical Look at Career Guidance", *Manpower*, February, 1972. pp. 3-4.
- Goldman, Leo. One role to a customer, *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, Vol. 50, No. 7, March, 1972. p. 560.
- Gross, Neal, W. S. Mason, and A. McEachern. *Exploration In Role Analysis*. New York, Wiley & Sons. 1958.
- Heath, B. R. G. Needed a Professional Identity: Aces or Jokers? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, Winter 1970, Vol. 9, No. 2. (pp. 130-131)
- Herr, Edwin L. The perceptions of State Supervisors of Guidance of Appropriateness of Counselor Function, The Function of Counselors, and Counselor Preparation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, Summer 1969, Vol. 8, #4, pp. 241-245.
- Hoffman, A. E. An analysis of counselor sub-roles. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 6:61-67. 1959.
- Hubbard, William Curtis. The actual and ideal roles of the secondary school counselor as perceived by graduate students and professors of school administration, counseling, and teaching. Doctoral dissertation, Miami, University of Miami, 1970. 182 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
- Humes, Charles W., Jr. Solution to School Counselor Role: Administrative Change, *Counselor Education and Supervision*, Fall, 1970, Vol. 10, #1, p. 87.
- Jones, J. J., C. J. Salisbury, and R. L. Spenser. *Secondary School Administration*, New York: McGraw-Hill. 1969. 292 p.
- Kehas, Chris D. and Jane L. Morse. Perceptions in Role Change from Teacher to Counselor: Intra-Role Conflict and Motivation for Change. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, Spring, 1971, Vol. 19, #3, pp. 201-208.

- Koch, Joseph H. The trouble with counseling. The School Counselor. January, 1972. p.173.
- Loughary, John W. and Paul W. Fitzgerald. Progress report of the ASCA Counselor Study. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1963. p. 48.
- Maragakes, Helen. Counselors and identity. The School Counselor 18:311-313. 1971.
- Martin, Roger A. Counselor role promulgation: A necessary first step. The School Counselor 20:141-143. 1972.
- Maser, Arthur L. Counselor function in secondary schools. The School Counselor 18:367-372. 1971.
- Meeks, Anna R. Guidance in elementary education. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1968. 237 p.
- Peters, Donald L. Professional identity. The School Counselor 18:306-310. 1971.
- Purcell, Florence. The counselor duties - A Survey. The School Counselor. VI:35-38. 1967.
- Rank, Richard. Feedback, Caps Capsule, Winter, 1972. p. 3.
- Ratigan, William. Counseling theory and practice in the school. In: Theories of Counseling, by Stefflre, Buford and Grant, Harold W. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972. 326 p.
- Riese, Harland C. and William G. Stoner. Perception of the functions and role of the school counselor. The School Counselor 17: 126-131. 1969.
- Scheffe, Henry. The analyses of variance. New York. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1959. 477 p.
- Schmieding, O. A. Who Sets The Counselors Image? SDEA Journal, 1969. 45(1), 14-16.
- Shertzer, Bruce and Shelley C. Stone. Introduction to guidance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1970. 358 p.
- Shertzer, Bruce and Shelley C. Stone. Fundamentals of counseling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968. 637 p.
- Smith, John Mack. Discrepant views of counselor role in several New Jersey junior and senior high schools. Doctoral dissertation. New Brunswick, Rutgers University - the State University of New Jersey, 1971. 113 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)

- Stefflre, Buford. Theories of counseling. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965. 346 p.
- Stintzi, Vernon L. and William R. Hutcheon. We have a counselor problem - can you help us? The School Counselor 19:329-333. 1972.
- Thorsen, Jack. Discoveries. One of It's Own; The School Counselor. Vol. 10, #3, Dec., 1972. p. 2.
- Tooker, E. D. Counselor role: counselor training. Personnel and Guidance Journal 36:263-267. 1957.
- Vanderpan, Leslie R. A Comparison of the perceptions of the role and functions of the counselor, both actual and ideal, as perceived by the counselor, the secondary school principal, and the counselor educator in the public schools of South Dakota. Doctoral dissertation. Vermillion, University of South Dakota, 1970. 196 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
- Wendorf, R. A. Qualifications and duties of guidance counselors in Ohio high schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cleveland, Western Reserve University. 1955. 114 numb. leaves.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION
OF THE GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

The Oregon State University School of Education, Department of Counseling and Guidance, would like to discover what you think the high school counselor is doing. A scale has been prepared to enable you to circle the letter to the left of each item which most accurately describes your opinion concerning the role or function described. Four choices are as follows: (SA - strongly agree, A - agree, MA - mildly agree, U - undecided, MD mildly disagree, D - disagree, SD - strongly disagree). Please circle one of these choices for each item in the questionnaire. Finally, please circle the numbers of the seven or eight most important items. Remember, unless otherwise indicated, record your feelings concerning what you think the counselor is doing.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 1. The counselor is provided with enough school time to engage in in-service programs outside the school, conferences and professional meetings. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 2. It is my impression pupils in the school receive counseling that:
A. instructs them as to what they should do.
B. helps them make their own decisions. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 3. The counselor is personally involved with, rather than alienated from the people with whom he works. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 4. The counselor is more concerned with global rather than specific issues. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 5. The counselor is provided with a private office. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 6. The counselor is provided with adequate paid clerical assistance. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 7. The counselor is effective in assisting students in the achievement of their goals. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 8. The counselor is effective as a therapist. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 9. The counselor is free of administrative and clerical duties. |

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 10. The counselor assists the school in achieving it's goals. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 11. The counselor conducts research related to pupil needs. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 12. The counselor organizes and conducts in-service training for staff members. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 13. The counselor assists teachers in securing materials and developing procedures for a variety of classroom group guidance experiences. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 14. College courses concerning theory of counseling techniques: |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | A. lead to counselor effectiveness as a person. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | B. should not be in conflict with acceptable local school policies. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | C. cannot be applied in a majority of cases. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 15. Lack of a well stated school policy concerning counselor duties is a major cause of difficulty in communicating the counselor's role. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 16. The counselor does participate in programs of civic organizations and other community groups. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 17. The counselor does conduct follow-up studies of graduates or pupils who have withdrawn. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 18. One of the counselor's primary functions is to take a leading role in the development of the master teaching schedule. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 19. The counselor does have the ability to assist parents in developing realistic perceptions of their children's development. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 20. The counselor does have the opportunity to assist parents in developing realistic perceptions of their children's development. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 21. The counselor does plan with administrators and teachers to establish procedures for course selection by pupils. |

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 22. The counselor does help furnish pupil data to the receiving school when a pupil transfers. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 23. The counselor does assist in the educational planning of pupils who have withdrawn. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 24. The counselor does know of the availability of referral services. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 25. The counselor does counsel students with adjustment problems. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 26. The counselor does use appropriate methods to arrive at a diagnosis. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 27. During the process of pupil counseling, the counselor exceeds his (her) training limitations. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 28. The counselor impedes administrative decision making. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 29. The counselor does assume the leading role in the schools program of pupil appraisal. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 30. The counselor helps pupils learn to accept themselves. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 31. The counselor does refer pupils and parents to other service agencies when appropriate. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 32. The counselor helps students to adjust to their total environment. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 33. It is the counselors primary function to help pupils solve problems. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 34. The counselor educator should have counseling experience in a public school setting. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 35. Guidance counselors should be expected to be responsible for approximately 250 pupils per counselor. |
| <u>SA A MA U MD D SD</u> | 36. The counselor effectiveness in a school setting would be improved if:
A. more care were taken to select counselor trainees who have had full time paid work experience. |

SA A MA U MD D SD

B. The counselor had previous employment as a classroom teacher.

SA A MA U MD D SD

C. the counselor emphasized feelings rather than knowledge.

SA A MA U MD D SD

D. the principal stressed the needs of the individual over that of the group.

SA A MA U MD D SD

37. I have found the school administrator knowledgeable of the role and function of the counselor.

In the following statements, you are asked to rank the choices provided. Read all of the choices available before you respond and then number the items in ascending order, assigning 1 to the most important item, 2 to the next important, etc.

38. The role of therapy in counseling:

- A. is a prime function.
- B. is used at times.
- C. is used only in isolated extreme instances.
- D. is never used by the high school counselor.

39. The counselors role in discipline:

- A. is active. He assists in verbal punishment.
- B. is supportive. He does not administer punishment but supports all disciplinary action.
- C. is partial involvement. He is only involved as a caring, detached, student oriented individual.
- D. is no involvement. He is in no way involved with disciplinary procedures.

40. The counselor shares confidential information:

- A. with community agencies engaged in investigations of students.
- B. with the school professional staff.
- C. with parents when requested to do so.
- D. only when the contingencies of the situation demand sharing information for the physical or mental well being of the student.
- E. with no one, at anytime.

41. The counselors role in testing should be:

- ☐ A. that of selecting tests.
- ☐ B. limited to what is needed in counseling individual students.
- ☐ C. that of developing and administering the testing program.
- ☐ D. that of administering and interpreting individual diagnostic tests.
- ☐ E. limited to interpretation of test results to teachers.

Any comments you may have regarding the role and/or function of the counselor would be appreciated:

Dear Counselor Educator:

Thank you for agreeing to assist in the dissemination and collection of the data for my dissertation. During our telephone conversation of last week, I mentioned that I would supply you with additional information as soon as possible. The following sections of this letter contain particulars concerning the purpose of the study, the method to be used in distribution of the questionnaire, and the designated time span during which the data should be gathered. As soon as the data has been gathered, please forward the completed questionnaires to me via the enclosed stamped pre-addressed envelope.

Please distribute the questionnaires coded in red on the top left-hand corner to all counselor educators on your staff who are teaching one-half time (.50 FTE) or more in your graduate counselor education program at the present time. This should be accomplished during the week of 22 through 26 May, 1972. Prior to distributing the questionnaire, please read the paragraph below which is titled Instructions and Purpose of the Study, to each individual in order to insure that they understand what is being asked of them.

INSTRUCTIONS AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:

A study is being made at Oregon State University concerning the role and function of the counselor in the secondary public schools in Oregon. The purpose of this study is to obtain information by means of a questionnaire which is being sent to selected secondary school principals, selected certified full-time counselors and counselor educators as well as students in their last quarter of counselor education prior to being recommended for certification. Counselor educators and counselors-in-training from Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon are being asked to participate in the study. We would like you to respond in relationship to what you feel the counselor is doing in the public secondary school. Some questions will ask for your judgment concerning some current issues in guidance. We realize that your time is valuable. So is your opinion. Please complete this questionnaire and return it to the person who distributed it to you. Remember, we are interested in what you think the counselor is doing. Once again, thank you for your time and consideration.

The questionnaires which are coded in blue in the upper-right hand corner should be distributed to all counselors-in-training who are in their last quarter of graduate course work prior to being recommended for certification in counseling. Please gather the data during a class period sometime during the week of 22 through 26 May, 1972. Please be sure to read the paragraph above concerning the Instruction and Purpose of the Study to the students prior to handing out the questionnaires.

APPENDIX B

AMERICAN SCHOOL COUNSELOR ASSOCIATION
STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS

APPENDIX B

AMERICAN SCHOOL COUNSELOR ASSOCIATION
STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORSPREFACE

The purpose of this document is to identify and clarify the role of the secondary school counselor as perceived by the membership of the American School Counselor Association, and to commit to public record certain philosophic tenets and operational conditions entailed. School counselors recognize the evolutionary status of their profession and actively promote its growth and thereby change. They view their past development, recognize the challenge of the future, and firmly assert their distinct professional standing. That this document is not an accurate characterization of conditions as they may presently exist is recognized. The function of this ASCA Policy Statement is to describe what should be, rather than what is.

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

While secondary school counselors acknowledge the historical distinctions between educational, vocational, and personal counseling, they also recognize the limitations of such distinctions. School counselors see all counseling as concerned with the complete person and thus inevitably personal and psychological in nature.

School Counselor is a term used in this policy statement to designate a counselor working in a secondary school setting, concerned with and accepting a responsibility for assisting all pupils, and having as his major concern the developmental needs and problems of youth. Counseling is perceived as involving a dynamic relationship between counselor and counselee, and thus the school counselor accepts the responsibility of involving himself in the lives of pupils with clear and humble knowledge of the implications.

School counseling is one of several pupil personnel services, and the school counselor works within a pupil personnel framework. School counselors have much in common with counselors in non-school settings and with other pupil personnel and instructional staff members. However, significant differences do exist between school counselors and each of these groups in regard to the nature of professional responsibilities, competencies, and preparation. The school counselor claims professional identity in the fields of counseling and education. He is an integral part of the school staff, offering both special and general services from the counseling profession.

PROFESSIONAL RATIONALE

Human development and maturity are sought with the help of one's family, the school, and society in general. As a member of the school staff the school counselor believes that instruction and instructional-type experiences are not in themselves sufficient for achieving the school-based educational and personal development necessary for each individual in our democratic society. Because of the nature of adolescence, the pressures to conform, the attitudes of many adults toward adolescents, and the inevitable evaluative aspects of various relationships the pupil experiences -- whether with adults or peers -- the adolescent seldom has an opportunity to view himself clearly, honestly, and without need to protect and defend himself.

The counselor is dedicated to the idea that most pupils will enhance and enrich their personal development and self-fulfillment by means of making more intelligent decisions if given the opportunity to experience an accepting, non-evaluating relationship in which one is helped to better understand himself, the environment he perceives, and the relationship between these. Counseling is essentially such a relationship. The school counselor views himself as the person on the school staff with the professional competencies, behavioral science understandings, philosophical orientation, and position within the school necessary to provide such help to pupils.

The school counselor is not, nor presumably shall he ever be, bound to accept any one philosophy regarding himself and the society and world in which he lives. There are certain philosophical tenets, however, held by all professional school counselors, and consistent with many philosophical positions. These tenets are concerned with the counselor's perception of the pupil, school, society, and himself; they provide the foundation for whatever operational frame of reference he employs.

THE PUPIL

1. Each pupil is a unique individual. His behavior is purposeful and represents his attempt to develop in society as he perceives it.
2. Each pupil has a right to acceptance as a human being, regardless of the nature and results of his behavior, beliefs, and inherent characteristics.
3. Each pupil has a right to individual self-development and self-fulfillment. The extent and nature of self-fulfillment is directly a function of the extent to which the individual possesses real and informed personal freedom.

4. Each pupil has a right to self-direction as well as responsibility for making decisions and living with the consequences of these decisions.

THE SCHOOL

1. The school in a democracy has as its basic purpose the education and development of all pupils for individual fulfillment.
2. The primary method of the school is group instruction. The school counselor contributes to the school's attempt to educate all children by providing services which directly support instruction and those responsible for it. The school counselor also contributes to the total psychosocial development of pupils by providing direct non-instructional services to them.
3. Because the school is a democratic institution using group objectives and methods, and because learning, maturing, and self-realization are inevitably individual processes, a paradox or conflict for the student is implicit within our educational structure. Therefore, the school counselor recognizes such conflict as a natural part of the educative process in a democracy and sees the mediation of this conflict as a very important part of his role.

SOCIETY

1. Change and the potential for change are inherent in a democratic society. Thus, the individual who is to live with personal satisfaction and who is to achieve self-fulfillment in a democratic society must understand not only the nature of his changing society, but also the various methods by which he as an individual can best adapt to change and best adapt change to himself.
2. A democratic society provides a great many resources and opportunities for development to individuals during their life span. Each individual needs the competence to distinguish and select those resources and opportunities most appropriate for him.
3. The strength and health of a democratic society is ultimately dependent upon the contributions each of its members makes to others. If in a democratic society each individual is to be free to decide for himself the contributions he will attempt to make, then it is essential that each individual have substantial self-understanding and personal perspective on which he can base his decisions.

SELF

1. The school counselor assists others to develop according to their values in a democratic society of which the counselor is also a member. The counselor attempts to recognize clearly his own values and needs, and strives effectively to distinguish them from those of his counselees.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The school counselor assumes a variety of responsibilities of roles within the context of educational systems. These can be viewed from several perspectives and consequently can be stated in various terms. The membership of the American School Counselor Association presumes that the professional identity of a school counselor must derive from the unique social service which it is his role to perform within the context of educational purpose and structure. Therefore, the perspective used here in outlining the school counselor's various roles is that of the pupil needs which he serves. Some of these needs involve direct services to the pupil, while others are met by services provided to teachers, parents, and the general community. The school counselor has the responsibility to --

1. Assist each pupil to meet the need to understand himself in relation to the social and psychological world in which he lives. This implies helping each pupil to understand his aptitudes, interests, attitudes, abilities, opportunities for self-fulfillment, and the interrelationships among these.
2. Assist each pupil to meet the need of accepting (defined as being able to behave consistent with) his aptitudes, interests, attitudes, abilities, and opportunities for self-fulfillment.
3. Assist each pupil to meet the need to develop personal decision-making competency. Included is the responsibility of assuring that the pupil's opportunities for self-understanding and self-fulfillment are not restricted by the group consideration and processes inherent in schools.
4. Assist all members of the school staff to understand the importance of the individual pupil and to provide information, material, and consultative assistance aimed at supporting their efforts to understand pupils.
5. Determine the influence of the school program on pupil educational and psycho-social development, and to convey such information to other staff members.

6. Inform other staff members of significant changes in the school and non-school environments which have implications for instruction, the psycho-social well-being of pupils, and to participate in related program development.
7. Assist parents to understand the developmental progress of their child, his needs, and environmental opportunities, for purposes of increasing their ability to contribute to their child's development.
8. Interpret to the community the importance of consideration for the individual and the contribution of the school counseling program to that end.
9. Promote in the community non-school opportunities necessary for pupil development.
10. Use and/or promote community resources designed to meet unusual or extreme needs of pupils which are beyond the responsibility of the school.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

The school counselor views counseling *per se* as the basic and most important help he offers to pupils. In addition to counseling, he provides other pupil personnel services, including appraising pupils, consulting with teachers and parents, working with community and other resource agencies, conducting local research, and assuming in program development efforts with other pupil personnel workers. In order to perform these services adequately the school counselor needs to have certain understandings within the behavioral and applied sciences, as well as a number of professional competencies. The school counselor needs to --

1. Understand the processes which characterize individual educational and psycho-social development within our culture.
2. Understand the purpose, potential, and limitation of mass education in his society, and the implications for counseling programs.
3. Understand the basis for and characteristics of the philosophical and psychological conflicts which stem from the interaction of pupils, teachers, and administrators within the context of the school.
4. Understand the teaching relationship as experienced by teachers.

5. Understand counseling theory and procedures which will enable him to counsel effectively with pupils within relatively short-term circumstances.
6. Have sufficient understanding of educational and psychological measurement to enable him to plan for and implement pupil appraisal programs and procedures, and to interpret and use resulting appraisal data with maximum efficiency and meaning.
7. Have knowledge and skills which will permit him to capitalize upon group procedures whenever appropriate and possible.
8. Have a broad knowledge of educational and vocational trends and information resources adequate to assure that pupils can obtain sufficient information regarding educational-vocational and psycho-social opportunities.
9. Have a working knowledge of resources and opportunities for help available to pupils with special problems.
10. Have a knowledge of other pupil personnel services sufficient to allow him to maximize coordination and co-operation between his efforts and those of other pupil personnel service specialist.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

There is no single best program for developing the school counselor competencies listed above. Counselor education programs vary in nature from institution to institution, and will continue to vary as counselor educators and supervisors experiment with new methods and procedures in their attempts to develop increasingly stronger programs. The school counselor endorses and strongly encourages the continued search for improved preparation programs. Thus, he views the professional preparation criteria listed below as appropriate at this time, realizing that changes in knowledge and conditions will inevitably result in criteria modifications.

1. School counselor education is graduate education and should result in the counselor receiving as a minimum (a) a master's degree in counseling from an accredited institution, and (b) appropriate professional certification as a counselor from the state in which he is employed.

2. It is conceivable and reasonable that more than one level of certification can exist. It is conceivable and reasonable that more than one level of professional preparation and certification should exist. The two-year program of graduate study for counselors, including supervised counseling and pupil personnel services experiences in a school setting, is recognized as a desirable goal.
3. School counselor certification should represent legal professional status in a state and should have as one requirement the endorsement of the counselor education program in which the counselor obtained his preparation.
4. School counselor education programs should include the following components:
 - a. A core of professional study consisting of the following elements: (1) developmental and educational psychology, (2) counseling theory and procedure, (3) educational and psychological appraisal, (4) group theory and procedures, (5) the psychology and sociology of work and vocational development, (6) the functions and methodology of research, and (7) the legal and professional ethics of counseling and education.
 - b. Provision for developing a background in the humanities and the social, behavioral, and biological sciences according to the particular needs and developmental status of each counselor candidate. School counselor candidates lacking a broad under-graduate background in the physical and natural sciences, the behavioral sciences, and the humanities should correct such deficiencies in addition, rather than in lieu of, the graduate-level education referred to here.
 - c. Supervised experiences such as laboratory, practicum, and internship work.
 - d. Provision for developing a working understanding and appreciation of the school's curriculum and the psychological and sociological climate of in-school learning situations.
5. School counselor education programs should continue to develop and refine selection procedures reflecting the philosophical ideas stated earlier and be consistent with the intellectual and emotional prerequisites implied in the counselor competencies listed.

6. School counselor education programs should be systematic, yet planned individually in regard to each candidate's particular background and needs.
7. School counselor education does not terminate with the completion of a formal program, but continues throughout the career of the counselor. Therefore, counselors have a responsibility to plan, implement, and participate in in-service and other post-certification programs and study designed to maintain and promote professional competency.

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The contributions of the school counselor to pupils, school, and society are dependent upon the existence of an environment consistent with his responsibilities. Such an environment includes both psychological and material conditions of work.

Psychological conditions of work refers essentially to a climate within which the school counselor has freedom to exercise his competencies on a professional level. Characteristics of this psychological environment include favorable interpersonal relations among the school staff, a permissive atmosphere within the counseling program, and forward-looking administrative and personnel policies. Physical conditions of work include appropriate clerical and secretarial assistance, office facilities and equipment, and guidance materials of various kinds. The following are the principal characteristics of a psychological and physical environment which will assist the school counselor in fulfilling his professional responsibilities.

1. The school counselor's communication with pupils and parents must be considered confidential. In matters of communication and ethics, the counselor accepts as his guide the ETHICAL STANDARDS of the American Personnel and Guidance Association.
2. The counselor should be free from teaching, administrative, and clerical assignments which would interfere with fulfilling his professional responsibilities as a counselor.
3. School organization should reflect the distinct roles of the counselor by providing high-level administrative representation, separate budgetary consideration, appropriate opportunities for in-service education and and research, and program evaluation. Professional supervision and co-ordination with other pupil personnel services are essential to the counselor's total effectiveness.

4. The counselor should have sufficient opportunities to participate in program planning and curriculum development and other school development efforts. Avenues of communication should exist so that school counselors may interpret their efforts and programs to pupils, teachers, administrators, and parents. In addition the counselor should have the freedom and responsibility to apprise administrators if and when the school program is insensitive to the individuality of pupils.
5. The school counselor should have physical facilities appropriate to his work, including a private counseling room, storage facility for pupil records and guidance information, and pupil waiting area.
6. The school counselor should have paid clerical assistance and equipment consistent with his particular assigned responsibilities and existing technology.
7. Provisions should exist which enable the counselor to initiate and have systematic counseling and conference appointments with pupils during school hours without interfering with the planned work of teachers. The number of pupils for whom a counselor is responsible should be realistic and consistent with his unique responsibilities.
8. Definite criteria, consistent with this policy statement, should be used as a basis for counselor selection. The counselor should be employed in a full-time counseling position. Often, employment should extend beyond the school year.

These conditions can be developed and maintained only through the joint efforts of counselors and school administrators. The school administrator assists the counselor to facilitate total counseling and guidance services within a school through his understanding, support and leadership.

SUMMARY

The professional identity of a school counselor must derive from the unique social contribution which is his role within the context of educational purpose and structure. The perspective used by the American School Counselor Association in outlining the role of the school counselor is that of the pupil needs which he serves. Some of these needs involve direct services to pupils, while others are met by services provided to the school staff, parents and the general community. In brief, these needs consist of --

- A. The need for the pupil to understand and accept himself, develop personal decision-making competencies, and formulate and implement plans for his further development.
- B. The need for the school staff to understand the importance of the individual pupil and for assistance in making appropriate educational provisions for his development.
- C. The needs of teachers and parents for information regarding the development of individuals and groups of pupils.
- D. The need for various kinds of assistance from non-school sources for some pupils.

The counselor implements his responsibilities for meeting these needs by employing his professional competencies in two areas:

(1) counseling, and (2) related guidance services.

Counseling is concerned with promoting the pupil's self-understanding and self-acceptance, facilitating personal decision-making and planning, and the resolving of special problems. Counseling can be characterized as a confidential, accepting, non-evaluative, permissive, face-to-face relationship, in which the counselor uses his professional knowledge and competencies to assist the pupil to resolve better those problems and issues which he would normally resolve less satisfaction without counseling assistance. The responsibility for decisions and plans in counseling rests primarily with the pupil, with due respect for his level of maturity.

Related Guidance Services include:

Pupil Appraisal, in which the counselor obtains, analyzes, and interprets information regarding pupil aptitudes, achievement, interests, and attitudes for use by pupils, parents, and school staff members.

Teacher Consultation, in which the counselor assists teachers to better understand and plan for the educational and psycho-social development of pupils.

Parent Conferences, in which the counselor helps parents better understand and accept the pupil, and to explore opportunities and resources for the pupil's growth and development.

Research, in which the counselor makes a continuing effort to delineate the needs of pupils and the effect of the school program on pupil development.

Liaison, in which counselor co-ordinates the needs of pupils with other school pupil personnel services and non-school resources.

While at various times and to varying degrees, other staff members are concerned with some of these pupil needs and professional functions, only the school counselor derives his professional purpose, preparation, and performance from them. Only the school counselor defines his role as one of serving these pupil needs through these professional functions.

AMERICAN SCHOOL COUNSELOR ASSOCIATION

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ASCA
STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORSINTRODUCTION

Two of the six major sections of the ASCA POLICY STATEMENT are devoted to counselor functions and related conditions. These two sections, viz, Professional Responsibilities and Professional Environment, provide an operational foundation for the day-to-day work of the school counselor. The purpose of this document is to provide specific operational guidelines for implementing the Professional Responsibilities and Professional Environment sections of the ASCA Policy Statement.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The school counselor functions in a number of specialized areas in the course of meeting his professional responsibilities. Within each of these areas there are identifiable patterns of functions which are characteristically performed by many school counselors. Numerous factors determine the breadth of the counselor's functions and the emphasis he must give. Among these factors are the personal characteristics and developmental level of the pupils in his school and to whom he is assigned, the nature and values of the community, the scope of the school curriculum, the extent of active participation in guidance services by teachers, and school and community resources. Organization and administration of the individual school, the professional environment, and assignment of responsibilities among school counselors within a school also contribute to varying emphasis of functions by counselors. In some schools with a large staff of school counselors, a director may exercise the requisite leadership, handle most administrative details, and be involved in planning and developing guidance services and the total school program. In other schools, however, the school counselor himself must exercise all of those functions.

The school counselor's primary role is counseling. He assumes other roles such as consultant, resource person, researcher, etc., and educator, but only as those roles support the primary role of the counselor. The following basic and distinct functions of the school counselor in specialized areas are intended as guidelines for the development of effective counseling programs and for the professional development of individual school counselors. The effective school counselor will show initiative in finding new ways to carry out his professional responsibilities in his changing environment and should not, therefore, view the functions listed as restrictive.

1. *Planning and Development of the Guidance Program.*
An effective guidance program in a school results from cooperative effort of the entire staff in planning and developing the program. Parents, pupils, and community agencies and organizations can also contribute toward these efforts. It is essential that the objectives of the program and procedures for meeting those objectives be clearly formulated.

In planning and development of the guidance program, the school counselor --

- a. Assists in defining objectives of the program.
 - b. Identifies the guidance needs of pupils.
 - c. Assists in developing plans of action.
 - d. Coordinates various aspects of the program in a meaningful sequence of guidance services.
 - e. Assists in continued guidance program planning and curriculum development.
 - f. Evaluates the program and assists other members of the school staff in evaluating their contributions to guidance services.
2. *Counseling.* It is essential that the majority of a school counselor's time be devoted to individual or small-group counseling. In a counseling relationship the counselor --
 - a. Assists the pupil to understand and accept himself as an individual. Hereby making it possible for the pupil to express and develop an awareness of his own ideas, feelings, values, and needs.
 - b. Furnishes personal and environmental information to the pupil, as required, regarding his plans, choices, or problems.
 - c. Seeks to develop in the pupil a greater ability to cope with and solve problems and an increased competence in making decisions and plans for which he and his parents are responsible.
 3. *Pupil Appraisal.* The school counselor assumes the roles of leader and consultant in the school's program of pupil appraisal. In pupil appraisal the school counselor --
 - a. Coordinates the accumulation of meaningful information concerning pupils through such means as conferences with pupils and parents, standardized test scores, academic records, anecdotal records, personal data forms, records of past experiences, inventories, and rating scales.

- b. Coordinates the organization and maintenance of confidential files of pupil data.
 - c. Interprets pupil information to pupils, parents, teachers, administrators, and others professionally concerned with the pupil.
 - d. Identifies pupils with special abilities or needs.
 - e. Takes advantage of available data-processing equipment for facilitating the processing and transmission of pupil data.
4. *Educational and Occupational Planning.* In efforts to provide pupils and parents with an understanding of the pupil as an individual in relation to educational and occupational opportunities for his optimal growth and development and to promote self-direction of the pupil, the counselor --
- a. Assists the pupil and his parents in relating the pupil's interests, aptitudes, and abilities to current and future educational and occupational opportunities and requirements, long-range educational plans and choices.
 - b. Collects and disseminates to pupils and parents information concerning careers, opportunities for further education and training, and school curricular offerings. These activities should be provided through a carefully planned sequence and may include group and individual sessions with pupils and parents, special programs, provision of up-to-date educational and occupational files readily accessible to pupils, bulletin boards, guidance newsletters, and visits by pupils to educational institutions and business and industry.
 - c. Assists pupils and parents in understanding procedures for making applications and planning for making applications and planning for financing the pupil's educational goals beyond high school.
 - d. Consults with school administrators and members of the school faculty relative to the curricular offerings which will meet the abilities, interests, and needs of the pupils.
 - e. Assists in the educational and occupational planning of pupils who have withdrawn or who have been graduated from the school.
5. *Referral work.* The counselor has a major responsibility in making and coordinating referrals to both other specialists in pupil personnel services and public and private agencies in the community. Recognizing his own limitations to provide total service, the counselor --

- a. Assists pupils and parents who need such services to be aware of and to accept referral to other specialists in pupil personnel services and community agencies.
 - b. Maintains a close working relationship in referrals to other specialists in pupil personnel services.
 - c. Identifies pupils with special needs which require the services of referral sources.
 - d. Identifies community referral agencies and their services.
 - e. Assists in the development of referral procedures and in the maintenance of liaison and cooperative working relationships with community resources.
 - f. Provides a follow-up referral of agency recommendations to help the pupil and/or his family work through the problems.
 - g. Encourages the development and/or extension of community agencies for handling pupil referrals.
6. *Placement.* The counselor's role in providing placement services for individual pupils involves assisting them in making appropriate choices of school subjects and courses of study and in making transitions from one school level to another, one school to another, and from school to employment. Placement thereby involves the informational services of educational and occupational planning, pupil appraisal, and counseling assistance appropriate to the pupil's choices and progress in school subjects, extracurricular and community activities, and employment. In addition to these other types of assistance which aid effective placement, the counselor --
- a. Helps pupils and parents to make a long-range plan of study for the high school years and assumes responsibility for periodic review and revision of such plans according to need as shown by such factors as changes in the curriculum, pupil appraisal data, school achievement, the pupil's maturity, and new goals.
 - b. Plans with administrators and teachers (1) to provide appropriate classroom placement for pupils with special abilities or disabilities and (2) to establish procedures for course selection by pupils and grouping of pupils.
 - c. Help furnish pupil data to the receiving school when a pupil transfers, obtains pupil data for new pupils and gives individual pupil data to educational and training institutions, prospective employers, and employment agencies.

- d. Assists in giving pupils and parents an understanding of procedures for making applications and financial plans for attending educational or training institutions and for making application for employment.
 - e. Confers with admissions personnel and personnel directors and visits educational and training institutions as well as businesses and industries applicable to pupils in his school.
7. *Parent Help.* The counselor holds conferences with parents and acts as a resource person on the growth and development of their children. Through individual or group conferences the counselor --
- a. Interprets the guidance and counseling services of the school.
 - b. Assists parents in developing realistic perceptions of their children's aptitudes, abilities, interests, attitudes, and development as related to educational and occupational planning, school progress, and personal-social development.
 - c. Provides parents with information about school policies and procedures, school course offerings, educational and occupational opportunities and requirements, and resources that can contribute to the fullest development of their children.
8. *Staff Consulting.* The school counselor works closely with members of the administrative and teaching staffs to the end that all of the school's resources are directed toward meeting the needs of individual pupils. In staff consulting the counselor --
- a. Shares appropriate individual pupil data with staff members, with due regard to confidentiality.
 - b. Helps teachers to identify pupils with special needs or problems and keeps teachers informed of developments concerning individual pupils which might have a bearing upon the classroom situation.
 - c. Participates in in-service training programs, staff meetings, and case conferences through which he discusses his own role, interprets a child-centered point of view, and encourages effective use of pupil data in teaching activities and guidance services given by teachers.
 - d. Assists teachers to secure materials and develop procedures for a variety of classroom group guidance experiences.

- e. Provides materials and information concerning such matters as the characteristics and needs of the pupil population, pupil post-school behavior, and employment trends for use in curriculum study and revision.

9. *Local Research.* Research in guidance is concerned with the study of pupil needs and how well school services and activities are meeting those needs. The school counselor plays a role of leadership in determining the need for research, conducting or cooperating in research studies, and discussing research findings with members of the school staff.

The counselor conducts or cooperates with others in conducting studies in areas such as the following:

- a. Follow-up of graduates or pupils who have withdrawn.
- b. Relationship of scholastic aptitude and achievement to selection of courses of study, class placement, and post-high school education and occupational placement.
- c. Characteristics, as well as educational and guidance needs of the pupils.
- d. The use of records and pupil personnel data.
- e. Occupational trends in the community.
- f. Evaluation of the school's counseling and guidance services.

10. *Public Relations.* The school counselor has a responsibility for interpreting counseling and guidance services of the school to members of the school staff, parents, and the community. All of his services in the guidance and counseling program have potential public relations value. In discharging his responsibility in public relations, the school counselor may --

- a. Participate in programs of civic organizations and other community groups.
- b. Prepare or furnish information for articles in school and community publications.
- c. Assist in programs for presentation by radio or television.

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The contributions of the school counselor to pupil, school, and society are dependent upon the existence of an environment consistent with his responsibilities. Such an environment includes both psychological and physical conditions of work. Desirable psychological and physical conditions of work can be developed and maintained only through the joint efforts of administrators and counselors. The school administrator assists the counselor to facilitate total counseling and guidance services within a school through his understanding support and leadership.

Psychological conditions of work are concerned with the interpersonal relationships within the school, a permissive atmosphere within the program of guidance and counseling, administrative and personnel policies, and a climate within which the school counselor has freedom to exercise his skills on a professional level. Physical aspects include office facilities, equipment and materials. The following are the principal considerations in providing a psychological and physical environment which will assist in fulfilling the professional responsibilities of the school counselor.

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

The school counselor should be employed in a full-time counseling position. In order to meet the needs of pupils it is often desirable to employ a counselor for a period extending beyond the regular school year. The salary paid should be commensurate with this extended contract year and the school counselor's advanced level of professional training. Additional contract time enables the counselor to pursue his regular responsibilities as well as special projects related to overall improvement of the school program.

The individual being considered for appointment as a school counselor should have demonstrated his ability to work effectively with pupils, parents, other professional persons on a school staff, and representatives from the community. In school systems employing a director or supervisor of guidance or counseling this person should have a joint responsibility with the school administrator for the selection of school counselors.

COUNSELING LOAD AND ASSIGNMENT

The school counselor should devote no less than 50 per cent of assigned time in counseling with individual pupils or small groups of pupils. In order to accomplish this objective and to enable the counselor to give reasonably prompt attention to all pupils, the assigned pupil load should approximate 250 pupils to one full-time school counselor. Local conditions and the nature of the school organization can necessitate ratios significantly less or greater than this. Effective discharge of his responsibilities is dependent upon the school counselor

being free from functioning as an administrative assistant and from such other intrusive duties as substitute teaching, disciplinary action and routine clerical tasks. For his fullest contribution to the educational and guidance process, the counselor should have a time schedule which will enable him to grow professionally and permit him to pursue the less pressuring aspects of his responsibilities such as research, evaluation, and visits and conferences outside of the school building.

The school counselor can most effectively fulfill his responsibilities when there is provision at both the local and state level for leadership and coordination by a supervisor professionally trained and certified in guidance and counseling. Coordination of the counselor's work with that of other professional persons in pupil personnel services, such as school psychologists, school social workers, and school nurses, is essential.

COMMUNICATION AND STAFF PARTICIPATION

Information and a permissive atmosphere serve to motivate pupils to seek counseling appropriate to their needs and development. Avenues of communication must exist so that the school counselor can interpret and inquire about the counseling and guidance program and his role in it not only with pupils, but also with teachers, administrators, parents, and the community. Recognizing that participation in guidance services by other members of the school staff is essential, provision should be made for the school counselor to help furnish the staff with (1) both initial and follow-up information on individual pupils, and (2) information and materials to encourage activities of the staff in guidance services.

The counselor should have the responsibility of informing administrators when the school program is insensitive to the individuality of pupils.

ACCESSIBILITY

Provisions should exist which enable the counselor to initiate and have systematic counseling or conference appointments and group activities with pupils during school hours without interfering with the planned work of teachers. It is essential as well that the counselor work directly with other pupil personnel specialists, teachers, parents, and representatives of community and other resource agencies.

ETHICAL STANDARDS

General policies and principles should exist within a school which permit a school counselor to satisfy the employing school's requirements as well as meet the counselor's responsibility to himself, his profession, the persons he serves, and the public through close adherence to the Ethical Standards of the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The school counselor's counseling relationship with pupils and parents and information resulting therefrom must be considered confidential. Decisions regarding disclosure of information obtained in counseling interviews rest with the initiator except as provided for in the statement on Ethical Standards of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Other confidential information should also be handled in accordance with the principles set forth in that statement.

OUT-OF-BUILDING ACTIVITIES

The counselor should have freedom of movement outside of his school building in order to carry out his professional responsibilities with feeder and receiving schools, to visit educational and training institutions, to confer with representatives of community agencies and civic organizations, to visit local business and industrial establishments, and to attend professional conferences and meetings.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

School counselors should have released time and resources for continued professional growth through carefully planned programs of in-service education. Provisions should also be made for in-service education in guidance services, pupil development, and pupil needs for other members of the school staff.

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

In order that the school counselor might fulfill his responsibilities in research and evaluate his own effectiveness, an atmosphere of flexibility and growth accompanied by astute planning should exist within a school. This atmosphere and planning should recognize (1) the stimulus to professional growth as well as service to pupils through experimentation with varied methods, materials, and use of personnel, and (2) the value of accepting better alternatives for accomplishing tasks.

BUDGET

Although many costs of guidance programs are incorporated in the total school budget, certain considerations important for building and maintaining the school's program of guidance and counseling make a separate annual budget desirable. Aspects of the program to be incorporated in the separate budget include costs of professional and clerical personnel, equipment and materials, standardsized tests and related services, printed guidance material, printing costs, and supplies. Travel allowance should be made to counselors attending state and national conferences and workshops concerned with the counselor's professional advancement in guidance, counseling, and the total school program. An allowance should also be given for local travel associated with the counselor's professional responsibilities.

SPACE AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Counseling suites should be easily accessible to persons seeking the services of school counselors. Through its design the counseling suite should clearly indicate that it is a separate unit. Consideration should be given to locating the suite in an area relatively free from noise and confusion. A pupil records section affording privacy for records of both current and former pupils should be readily accessible and should provide working space for both school counselors and other members of the school staff. Display cases and bulletin boards in various areas of the school should be assigned to school counselors.

The counseling suite should provide the following:

1. An individual office for each school counselor. Each office should have visual and auditory privacy, appropriate furnishings to accommodate at least three persons other than the counselor; furnishings to meet the counselor's professional needs, a telephone, and adequate lighting, heating, and ventilation.
2. A waiting room separate from the administrative waiting room providing space for (a) pupils to use reference and informational materials; (b) parents, employers, and representatives from community agencies to wait for counselors; (c) clerical services and reception; (d) general files of counselors; (e) reference and informational materials on occupations, educational opportunities, and personal-social development; (f) bulletin board and display area.
3. Storage space and files for guidance material and equipment, to include safeguards for protecting standardized tests and confidential materials.
4. A conference room or group guidance room for case conferences, staff meetings, group testing, group counseling, and other related guidance activities.

CLERICAL AND SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE

Because of the confidential nature of his work the school counselor should have adequate non-pupil, paid clerical and secretarial assistance. In addition to their technical skills, clerks and secretaries who deal directly with pupils and parents should have the ability to convey the desirable permissive atmosphere and acceptance of individuals, to exercise a high degree of ethics, and to be able to use sound judgment in handling unexpected situations.

EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS

Special equipment should be provided for the school counselor consistent with his assigned responsibilities and existing technology. A school counselor's responsibilities frequently include the need of equipment for dictating, photocopying, duplicating, calculating, data processing, and audio-visual usage. Required materials include current career and educational references and pamphlets, brochures on personal-social adjustment, standardized tests, and other devices for individual appraisal. Provision should also be made for carefully designed individual pupil records and other specialized guidance forms. The counselor should share in the design of pupil record and guidance forms and assist in planning procedures for their most effective use.

ASCA STUDY ON COUNSELOR ROLE AND FUNCTION

National and Regional Co-Chairmen

National Co-Chairmen: Paul W. Fitzgerald, John W. Loughary
New England Regional Co-Chairmen: Henry Isaksen, Robert Morgan
North Atlantic Regional Co-Chairmen: Alfred Stiller,
George Murphy
Southern Regional Co-Chairmen: Fred W. Hoffman, David Walthall
North Central Regional Co-Chairmen: James Winfrey,
Kenneth Johnson
Rocky Mountains Regional Co-Chairmen: Gerald Ulrich,
Jack Reeves
Western Regional Co-Chairmen: Gordon Dudley, Dale Burklund

NATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

National Co-Chairman, All Regional Co-Chairmen:

Calvert W. Bouman, George O. McClary, Willis E. Dugan,
Loren Benson, Gilbert D. Moore, Maurine E. Rosch, Bert
L. Sharp, Arthur A. Hitchcock, Robert W. Stoughton,
Thomas Christensen, James E. Woods, Reverend James F.
Moymhan, S.J., and Robert Frank.

APPENDIX C

November 16, 1972

Dear Principal,

A study is being made at Oregon State University concerning the role and function of the counselor in the secondary public schools in the state of Oregon.

It is the purpose of the study to obtain information by means of a questionnaire which is being sent to all secondary school principals and selected, certified counselors in their schools. The questionnaire has already been administered to all master's candidates in counseling during the 1971-72 academic year and to counselor educators at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and Oregon College of Education.

I realize your time is valuable. So is your opinion. Therefore, the enclosed questionnaire has been made as convenient as possible. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to us as soon as possible. A pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

We would like you to respond in relationship to what you feel the counselor is doing this current year. If you have any questions, please call me collect at my home phone. My number is 752-6297.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

William J. Mitzel

December 2, 1972

Dear

Approximately two weeks ago you were asked to be part of a study being made at Oregon State University.

We have not heard from you concerning the questionnaire which was sent to you at that time. Possibly it did not reach you, or these letters will pass in the mail. However, we would definitely like to hear from you.

Therefore, another questionnaire is being enclosed for your convenience. Your time is valuable but could you take a few moments to complete this according to directions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

If you have already sent a return, I thank you and you may disregard this letter.

Sincerely yours,

William J. Mitzel

APPENDIX D

Chi-square Contingency Table
for Rank Items
Thirty-eight through Forty-one

Rank order 1 frequency.

Item 38

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>
Counselor Educators	3	9	3	2
Counselors-in-training	5	24	12	7
Principals	8	44	23	26
Counselors	14	75	36	20

Item 39

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>
Counselor Educators	1	1	11	5
Counselors-in-training	1	5	26	20
Principals	1	40	45	18
Counselors	3	17	106	25

Item 40

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
Counselor Educators	0	1	0	15	1
Counselors-in-training	1	3	0	40	6
Principals	1	19	12	67	7
Counselors	1	12	2	114	18

Item 41

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>
Counselor Educators	3	8	3	2	2
Counselors-in-training	1	25	10	9	6
Principals	4	24	46	27	5
Counselors	6	57	47	34	4