



Western Connecticut State University
WestCollections: digitalcommons@wcsu

Education Dissertations

Department of Education & Educational
Psychology


Spring 5-2008

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS WITH RESPECT TO THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AS THEY IMPLEMENT THE NEW YORK STATE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING MODEL

Deborah Hardy

Western Connecticut State University, drhardy384@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.wcsu.edu/educationdis>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hardy, Deborah, "PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS WITH RESPECT TO THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AS THEY IMPLEMENT THE NEW YORK STATE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING MODEL" (2008). *Education Dissertations*. 4.
<https://repository.wcsu.edu/educationdis/4>

This Dissertation is brought to you via free, open access by the Department of Education & Educational Psychology and by WestCollections: digitalcommons@wcsu, the institutional repository of Western Connecticut State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education Dissertations by an authorized administrator of WestCollections: digitalcommons@wcsu. For more information, please contact ir@wcsu.edu.

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
WITH RESPECT TO THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AS THEY
IMPLEMENT THE NEW YORK STATE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL
COUNSELING MODEL

Deborah Hardy

EdM., Bank Street College, 2003
MSEd., Long Island University, 1993

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership

in the

Department of Education and Educational Psychology

At

Western Connecticut State University

2008

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
WITH RESPECT TO THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AS THEY IMPLEMENT
THE NEW YORK STATE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING MODEL

Deborah Hardy, Ed.D.

Western Connecticut State University

ABSTRACT

The proposed study examined the perceptions of school counselors and administrators towards the New York State School Counseling Model. The study focused on (a) actual and preferred counselor activities to provide direction on how school counselors are defining their practice and (b) counselors' and administrators' perceptions of how the New York State Comprehensive Model is implemented into school counseling practice.

A sample of the New York State school counselor population (n = 900) was invited to participate in a survey in obtaining quantitative data. *The School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* and an adapted New York State version of the *Readiness Survey* were sent to participants by mail. A matching sample of high school administrators was sent the *Readiness Survey* to ascertain their perceptions of the New York Comprehensive Model.

A multiple regression and a two-group MANOVA or Hotelling's T^2 were conducted as methods in data analysis in this research. Results indicated a significant correlation for preferred school counseling activity subscales of curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance when the independent variable of readiness was entered as a block. Furthermore, results indicated a

significant correlation for preferred school counseling activity subscales of counseling and consultation when each independent variable, readiness components and actual activities were entered as a block. Results of the MANOVA indicated that community support, leadership, staff time, and district resources showed a significant multivariate impact between school administrators and school counselors.

Copyright by

Deborah Hardy, Ed.D.

2008

iii



*School of Professional Studies
Department of Education and Educational Psychology
Doctor of Education in Instructional Leadership*

Doctor of Education Dissertation

Perceptions of School Counselors and School Administrators with Respect to the Roles of School Counselors as They Implement the New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model

Presented by

Deborah Hardy

<u>Marcia A. B. Delcourt, PhD</u> Primary Advisor	<u>Marcia A. B. Delcourt</u> Signature	<u>4/12/08</u> Date
<u>Aram Aslanian, PhD</u> Secondary Advisor	<u>A. Aslanian</u> Signature	<u>4/12/08</u> Date
<u>Jim Butterworth, PhD</u> Secondary Advisor	<u>J. Butterworth</u> Signature	<u>4/12/08</u> Date

2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This journey would have been impossible without the efforts and patience of Dr. Marcia Delcourt. Her advice kept my work in focus, and her belief in my professional investigation kept me motivated. Dr. Delcourt's professionalism and understanding assisted me in striving to succeed. Words cannot express how much I appreciated your inspiration and guidance. I also wanted to thank Dr. Aram Aslanian for his confidence in me as the first school counselor to complete the Western Connecticut University Doctoral Program. His friendship, advice and knowledge are an encouragement. A special thanks to Dr. Jim Butterworth who is a believer in the effectiveness of school counselors in New York State, and a champion for educators. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Karen Burke for her kind words of support throughout the many sessions prior to engaging in this dissertation. Her belief in the members of the program maintained us engaged.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my best friend, and partner Celso, obrigada pelo seu apoio, paciência e carinho. I wanted to thank my parents, Jack and Barbara, as well as their spouses, Ron and Tessie, for always believing in me. An immense gratitude goes to my entire family who listened, guided, and cheered for me throughout this journey. I would also like to dedicate this work to my grandmother, Bess, who always dreamed of having a “doctor” in the family, and must be smiling from up above. Most of all, I wanted to thank all of my friends in Cohort 1 who kept me going with their friendship, and laughs.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	i
Copyright	iii
Approval Page	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Dedication	vi
Table of Tables	xi
Chapter One: Introduction and Identification of Topic	1
Statement of Problem	2
Rationale	3
Definition of Terms	4
Related Literature	5
Definition of Role	5
A Comprehensive Model as a Framework for New York State	8
Change Theory	9
Methodology	11
Research Questions	11
Hypothesis	12
Participants	12
Instrumentation	13

Procedure	14
Research Design	15
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature	16
History of School Counselor in the United States	17
The Beginning of School Counseling	18
21 st Century School Counselor	20
Creation of the ASCA National Model to Transform School Counseling	22
The American School Counselor Association National Standards in School Counseling	23
Components of the National Comprehensive School Counseling Model	26
Development of the New York State Comprehensive Model for School Counseling	28
Certification Requirements for School Counselors in New York State	28
School Counselor and Educational Reform	31
School Counselor and Systems Thinking	31
School Counselors Advocating for Systems Change	35
Responsibilities of School Counselors	36
School Counselor Activities	37
Non-Guidance Activities	39
Readiness to Implement School Counselor Responsibilities	41

School Counselor Characteristics	42
District Conditions	44
School Counseling Program Support	45
Summary	47
Chapter Three: Methodology	49
Research Design	51
Participants	51
Sample Selection	53
Instrumentation	54
School Counseling Activity Rating Scale	54
Readiness Survey	57
Data Collection	60
Survey Responses	61
Online Survey Procedure	65
Survey Completion Procedure	66
Data Analysis	67
Statement of Ethics and Confidentiality	68
Chapter Four: Analysis of Data	69
Description of the data	70

Data Preparation	71
Outliers and Data Normality	72
Analysis of the Data	77
School Counselors' Activities and Readiness to Implement the New York State Model	77
Summary	112
Chapter Five: Summary and Conclusion	113
Overview of the Study	113
Results and Findings	116
Research Question 1: Results and Conclusions	116
Research Question 2: Results and Conclusions	121
Implications	125
Suggestions for Future Research	129
Limitations of the Study	130
Summary	132
References	134
Appendixes	140
Appendix A: School Personnel Responses for Readiness Survey	141
Appendix B: Subscale Definition for SCARS and Readiness Survey	148
Appendix C: School Counselor Consent Form	153
Appendix D: School Administrator Consent Form	157
Appendix E: Human Subject Review Form	161

Table of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Scope of School Counseling Work	22
Table 2: ASCA National Standard	24
Table 3: Components of the ASCA National Model	27
Table 4: Part 100.2 Commissioners Regulations	29
Table 5: School Counseling Actual Activities	38
Table 6: School Counseling Actual Non-guidance Activities	40
Table 7: Public Schools in New York State	50
Table 8: Public Schools in New York State	53
Table 9: SCARS for Actual Activities Reported by School Counselors	74
Table 10: SCARS for Preferred Activities Reported by School Counselors	75
Table 11: Readiness Survey Reported by School Counselors and School Administrators	76

Table of Tables

	Page
Table 12: Demographics of School Counselors	79
Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for Survey Variables	80
Table 14: Intercorrelation Matrix Between School Counselor Activities and School Counselors' Readiness	83
Table 15: Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Counseling Activities	89
Table 16: Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Consultation Activities	92
Table 17: Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Curriculum Activities	95
Table 18: Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Coordination Activities	98
Table 19: Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Non-guidance Activities	101
Table 20: Demographics of School Personnel	104
Table 21: Descriptive Statistics for Readiness Survey Variables by School Personnel	105

Table of Tables

	Page
Table 22: Box's Test of Equality	107
Table 23: Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	107
Table 24: Two-Group Multivariate Tests	108
Table 25: Levene's Test of Homogeneity	109
Table 26: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects	111

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS WITH
RESPECT TO THE ROLES OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AS THEY IMPLEMENT THE
NEW YORK STATE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL COUNSELING MODEL

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In 2005, the New York State School Counselor Association authored a framework for school counselors in the state utilizing the National Model for School Counseling Programs as the basis for its document. The National Model for School Counseling Programs guides states, districts and individual schools in designing, developing, implementing and evaluating a comprehensive, developmental and systematic school counseling program (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2003, p.2). The goal of the state framework is to provide school counselors with a guideline for integrating a comprehensive school counseling program into each district that is aligned with state standards.

School counselors continue to effectively contribute to the changes that are impacting students in our schools. New York State school counselors apply their professional knowledge and skills to best serve every student so that all students will achieve success in their academics, their personal-social growth, and in their career planning pursuits. School counselors work in collaboration with school district leaders, teachers, student support personnel, and community stakeholders to promote the New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model. The purpose of a comprehensive model is to ensure that guidance programs reach all students, that guidance efforts reach all children, that guidance be a program with specific content, and that guidance programs are judged by measurable results (Gysbers, 1997).

The collaboration of New York State school counselors with superintendents, principals, and local boards of education requires that stakeholders understand the self study of the current school counseling programs, support the program through different delivery systems, and maintain an accountability system that demonstrates effectiveness. Each school building and district can personalize the program according to the needs it identifies through process data, thereby defining the role of the professional school counselor as an integral part of the educational system as opposed to a supplemental program.

Statement of the Problem

The New York State School Counselor Association and the American School Counselor Association have been working to change the perceptions of professional school counselors from its historical guidance perspective to a comprehensive developmental model (Lambie & Williamson, Broughton & Hobson, 2003). Currently, both administrators and professional school counselors have different perceptions of professional counselors' roles in the school environment. The change of practice has created role ambiguity allowing the definition of school counselors' tasks to be established by constituents and stakeholders rather than by the professional school counselor themselves.

Even though a professional framework has been developed, school counselors have not yet shifted from a traditional role of school counseling to a systemic and developmental service delivery model program. The problem for New York State is the ambiguous role definition of actual practice for school counselors since New York State school counselors' responsibilities are defined by the local school district administration instead of the components of the New York State Model. In addition, a second problem is the understanding by school personnel of the school district's conditions and their readiness towards the implementation of the New York

State Model. As a result, school counselors are perceived as providing an ancillary service rather than a program that is an integral part of the learning community.

Rationale

The New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model cannot be established without the cooperation and understanding of school counselors and administrators regarding changes in the profession. The New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model promotes systemic change, advocacy and collaboration in role definition.

No longer can school counselors just be satisfied with feeling good at the end of the day, but they also must be able to articulate how their work, the program's work, is connected to student success (Kuranz, 2003). The purpose of this study was to examine actual and preferred school counselor practice as well as perceptions of school counselors and administrators towards a comprehensive school counseling model in New York State. By utilizing the New York State Comprehensive Model as the foundation of this study, this researcher obtained a better understanding of the actual role of the school counselor, and the school personnel perceptions of current conditions for implementing the New York State Model into their local school districts.

Evidence of each school counselor's tasks and school personnel perception regarding the implementation of the State Model provided stakeholders with data that defined the activities of school counselors; this data could be used to determine changes in training programs at the higher education sector, and also provide a review of state certification for the profession. Results provided additional support to the New York State Education Department as well as school district administrators in aligning a comprehensive school counseling program as the framework for the guidance plan regulations.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions apply to this study:

1. *Readiness* is the condition of being “prepared mentally or physically for some experience or action.” (Webster’s College Dictionary, p. 704). *The ASCA Readiness Survey* (Carey, 2005) further defines the term as “the identification of the extent to which a school district is prepared to implement the comprehensive model and to identify program areas that will need to be addressed to ensure successful implementation” (Carey, 2005, p. 306). Seven specific readiness indicators are identified in this survey: community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staffing/time use, school counselors’ beliefs and attitudes, and district resources.
2. An *activity* is “an educational procedure designed to stimulate learning by firsthand experience” (Webster’s College Dictionary, p. 9). *The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* (Scarborough, 2005) defines activity in two categories: actual and preferred. *The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* further explains both types of activity “as process data required to analyze the important aspects of school counselor practice and effectiveness” (Scarborough, 2005, p. 276).
3. *Preferred* is “to put in a higher position or rank” (Webster’s College Dictionary, p. 665).
4. *Actual* is defined as “existing in act and not merely potentially” (Webster’s College Dictionary, p. 10).
5. A *comprehensive model* is “the mechanism with which school counselors and school counseling teams will design, coordinate, implement, manage and evaluate their programs for students' success. It provides a framework for the program components, the school counselor's role in implementation; and the underlying philosophies of leadership,

advocacy, and systemic change” (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2003, p.165).

6. *A learning organization* is defined by Peter Senge as places "where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning to see the whole together." (Senge, 2006, p.330).
7. *Systems Thinking* is “a conceptual framework, a body of knowledge and tools that has been developed to make full patterns clearer and to help us see how to change them effectively” (Senge, 2006, p. 7).
8. *Personal Mastery* is defined as “the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience and seeing reality objectively” (Senge, 2006, p.14).
9. *Mental Model* as defined by Peter Senge are “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or images that influence how we understand the world and take action” (Senge, 2006, p. 8).

Related Literature

Definition of Role

Throughout history, the role of the professional school counselor has evolved with every decade. During the early 20th century, school counselors focused on providing students with vocational guidance, assessment and academic placement. In the middle of the century, providing personal and social counseling services while supporting students with holistic development became the role of school counselors. In the most recent phase, special education services, parent-teacher consultation, and coordination of student academic programs were

integrated (Gysbers & Henderson, 2002) into the school counselor's set of responsibilities. Continuous change in the role of school counselors over the years has caused school counselors to struggle with a common definition of practice.

The evolution of role definition has developed from traditional school counselors who were service-driven to provide assistance related to classroom schedules, job preparation, and college guidance to a contemporary role that is driven by data usage. In the contemporary role, school counselors utilized professional national standards to obtain competencies for student outcome, collaborated with teachers on classroom lesson plans, and presented instructional strategies to teachers to support student success.

School counselors have not taken control of defining their role and have allowed administrators to continue to define tasks at the local school district level. In fact, Sears and Coy (1991) stated, "School counselors appear to be reluctant or unable to convince principals that they should perform the duties for which they have been trained" (Sears & Coy, 1991, p. 3). School administrators have defined the role of the school counselor through non-guidance activities such as master schedule builders, testing coordinators, detention room supervisors, and clerical staff members. School administrators also defined school counselors as providers of individual counseling services to students regarding academic and college placement and a liaison to the family. While these perspectives are not those held by school counselors, conflict is created in role definition for school counselors.

Lambie and Williamson (2004) stated that this role ambiguity exists when (a) an individual lacks information about his or her work role, (b) there is lack of clarity about their work objectives with the role, or (c) there is lack of understanding about peer expectations of the scope and responsibility of the job (Lambie & Williamson, 2004, p.124). Burnham and Jackson

(2000) studied the role of professional school counselors comparing actual and prescribed tasks. They concluded that too often school counselors were involved in non-counseling related activities including multiple clerical tasks, testing coordination, attendance records, record keeping, and bus duties. School counselors have not been able to concretely provide a clear definition of what they should be doing nor to apply the contemporary aspects to their jobs.

“What do school counselors do?” is a constant question. To eliminate the ambiguity of role definition, school counselors needed to provide process data describing their practice and its effectiveness. Gysbers and Henderson (1997) stated, “the purpose of evaluation is to provide data to make decisions about the structure and impact of the program as well as the professional personnel involved” (Gysbers & Henderson, 1997, p. 263). Research supported the importance of providing school counselor interventions in the areas of consultation, coordination, counseling, and curriculum (Scarborough, 2005). By providing the information on counseling tasks, school counselors contribute to student success in the achievement of essential competencies as described in the National Model for School Counseling Programs of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2003).

The American School Counselor Association advocates professional roles and standards of practice for school counselors and ascertains that professional school counselors engage in preventive, developmental, and systemic approaches to counseling (American School Counselor Association, 2002). They work within the educational system to support teachers, students, and families to enhance academic, personal/social and college/career areas. The evolving formation of professional school counselors was defined by the American School Counselor Association (2004) in the professional literature as the following:

Professional school counselors are certified/licensed professionals with a master's degree or higher in school counseling or the substantial equivalent. Professional school counselors deliver a comprehensive school counseling program encouraging all students' academic, career and personal/social development and help all students in maximizing student achievement. (p. 23)

A Comprehensive Model as a Framework for New York State

Prior to creation of the New York State framework, the American School Counselor Association established the *National Standards for School Counseling* (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) with identified competencies for student outcomes as a basis of practice. The components of the National Model for school counseling programs include the foundation, service delivery, management, and accountability of school counselors. The ASCA National Model (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2003) developed this national framework so that school counseling would be seen as a developmental program with a structured delivery system to serve all students.

School counselors in New York State needed a framework to transition to new roles and programs. The ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003) served as the blueprint for The New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model (New York State School Counselor Association [NYSSCA], 2005). The New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model provided the knowledge and tools to help school district administrators and school counselors examine their current school counseling practices and services and to align them with the ASCA National Standards, the ASCA National Model, and the standards of the New York State Department of Education (NYSSCA, 2005).

To understand successful transition to a comprehensive school counseling program in New York State, it is necessary to have the identification of essential conditions for implementation of the State Model. The use of the *Readiness Survey* (Poynton, 2006), a self-assessment developed by the University of Massachusetts Center for School Counseling Outreach assisted in the identification of readiness for integration of the New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model (NYSSCA, 2005). The self-assessment identified the following indicators of readiness: community support, leadership, guidance and curriculum, staffing time use, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources (Carey, Harrity, & Dimmitt, 2005). The use of the self-assessment leads to further identification of problems and effectiveness of the New York State Model, and practice for school counselors.

Focusing on New York State, it is important to understand the current practice of school counselors and the factors indicating readiness to integrate the contemporary program model to assist all students. When school counseling is conceptualized and implemented by school counselors as a program, the school counselor and the State Model become integral parts of education.

Change Theory

Learning Organizations. The State Model is a powerful approach to the organization and management of school counseling programs and is linked to standards-based educational reform (Carey et al., 2005). By definition, learning organizations are “organizations where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together” (Senge, 2006, p. 330).

Learning organization theory encompasses three individual areas which include systems thinking, personal mastery, and mental models. The essence of the learning organization theory is a conceptual framework, a body of knowledge, and tools that allow individuals to see interrelationships and processes of change (Senge, 2006). Senge further defined the framework as mental models that are generalizations and assumptions that influence how one takes action.

Peter Senge cited an example of students making course changes in schools and how this process impacted school counselors who then must add students to oversubscribed classes creating system conflict. By using learning organization theory school counselors, administrators and teachers worked collaboratively to contribute to student and school success, Senge explained (1994). In this manner, the use of learning organization theory created a collegial environment and an advisory support system for the school counseling program.

The learning organization theory supports the management system of the comprehensive guidance model as a team approach to problem solving. “This management system incorporates the school counselor, the organizational process, and the tools to ensure that the school counseling program is organized, concrete, and reflective of the school’s needs” (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2003, p. 166). The comprehensive model was the tool and mental model in this study that provided a conceptual framework leading to the building of relationships that support effectiveness of the program. Team learning involved eliminating the erroneous perceptions about school counselors’ practice and building the capacity of thinking as a group which determined practice of shared vision, fostering genuine commitment to the profession.

Methodology

Research Questions

The study examined the following research questions:

1. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - a. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - b. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - c. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

- d. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - e. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
2. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York State Comprehensive Model into their districts?

Hypothesis

1. School counselors' readiness to implement the State Model will significantly explain the variation among the scores for preferred practice of school counselors after the influence of actual practice variables are accounted for.

2. School counselors will have significantly higher perceptions than administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York State Comprehensive Model.

Participants

Potential participants were 900 school counselors who are active members of the New York State School Counseling Association. School counselors participated in the *School*

Counseling Activity Rating Scale (N = 136) and in the *Readiness Survey* (N = 273). School counselors were representative of urban, suburban and rural schools in New York State.

School counselor contact information was obtained with permission from the New York State School Counselor Association. Twenty participants were considered “other” which included the title of coordinator of school counseling and liaison of guidance services.

A stratified matching sample of high school administrators (N = 600) was invited to participate. School administrators (N = 98) participated in the *Readiness Survey* only. Administrators were also representative of urban, suburban and rural school districts throughout New York State.

Instrumentation

The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale. This scale was developed by Janna L. Scarborough, Ph.D., NCC, NCSC, ACS, Assistant Professor, and School Counseling Program Coordinator, Counseling & Human Services Syracuse University. Permission from the developer was granted to utilize the instrument.

Scarborough developed the *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* by establishing a list of work activities that reflected the job of school counselors (Scarborough, 2005). Task statements were created that reflected the activities under the four major interventions described in the National Model for School Counseling Program (ASCA, 2003). Items described activities in: counseling (individual and group), consultation, coordination, curriculum (classroom lessons), and other duties (clerical tasks).

The *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* used a response format in which school counselors were asked how often an activity was performed. The frequencies of actual and

preferred activity were on a 5-point rating scale numbered 1-5 and defined as: (1) never do this; (2) rarely do this; (3) occasionally do this; (4) frequently do this; and (5) routinely do this.

Readiness Survey. The *Readiness Survey* (Carey et al., 2005) was developed to help school counselors and administrators assess their district's readiness to implement the *American School Counselor Association National Model* (ASCA, 2003), and to determine areas that will need to be addressed to successfully implement the ASCA National Model as well as the state versions of the National Model (Poynton, 2005).

The *Readiness Survey* (Carey et al., 2005) was composed of seven indicator areas including community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staffing time and use, school counselor's beliefs and attitudes, school counselor's skills, and district resources. The survey uses a 3-point rating scale as defined by (1) like my district; (2) somewhat like my district; (3) not like my district. Validity and reliability of the instrument was obtained by the University of Massachusetts National Outreach Center for School Counseling.

Procedure

The following procedures were undertaken to conduct this study.

Contacting School Counselors. The author contacted the New York State School Counselor Association and requested in writing its permission to utilize the current membership database for research (N = 900). A letter of consent and instructions was mailed with each of the active school counselors in the New York State School Counselor Association database.

Participants were given an identification number and were thanked in advance.

Contacting School Administrators. The New York State Education Department was contacted in writing requesting the address labels of high school administrators in the same school district as the school counselors surveyed. A letter of consent and instructions was mailed

to participants with an addressed stamped envelope to be returned to a professor at Western Connecticut State University. The results were compiled electronically by the University of Massachusetts National Center for School Counseling Outreach.

Research Design and Analysis

This study employed a quantitative methodology that included a multiple correlation design for research question one and a causal comparative design with no treatment to respond to research question two. There were no control groups for either design.

In the first research question asked, a multiple correlation design was utilized to analyze to what extent and in what manner can variation in the preferred reported performance of school counselors from *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale*, be accounted for by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities from the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale*. A multiple regression obtained the degree of relationship between variables.

In the second research question, a multivariate analysis of variance test (MANOVA) was utilized to analyze the significant difference between the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York State Comprehensive Model in their districts. This researcher utilized the post test only design with no treatment. The *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 13.0* (Nie, 1968) was utilized for the analyses of both research questions.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will include the following sections: (a) the history of school counseling in the United States, (b) the development of the New York State Comprehensive Model for School Counseling, (c) the perspective of the school counselor and educational reform, (d) the explanation of systems change theory, (e) the responsibilities of school counselors, and (f) the explanation of school counselors and the implementation of New York State School Counseling Model, to be referred as the State Model in this document.

First, a historical perspective will be presented to provide an overview of the role of the school counselor as well as the creation of the American School Counselor ASCA National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) defined by the three school counseling program domains: academic, personal/social, and career. The work of the Education Trust on Transforming School Counseling (Education Trust, 1997) will be cited to show the change of school counseling practice.

In addition, this section will provide insight into how the American School Counselor Association National Model, to be referred as the ASCA Model, was created. The ASCA National Model will be explained through four components including foundation, management, delivery, and accountability of school counseling programs.

Second, progress in defining the role of the school counselor in New York State as well as the state's adaptation of the ASCA National Model will be described. The review will also provide the current New York State school counselor certification requirements as a background for applying the criteria indicative of school counselor preparedness in New York State.

Third, the chapter will present an overview of school counselors' participation in educational reform. The section will discuss the degree of integration school counselors have as members of their learning communities.

Fourth, this section will present an overview of the need for school counselors to take leadership in advocating for systems change. A systems thinking perspective is presented to support the need for this study.

Finally, a review of research will present school counselors' responsibilities. In utilizing the areas of preferred activities as delineated by the national and State Model in the areas of counseling, coordination, consultation and curriculum, actual activities in local districts will be reviewed to present current trends. Additionally, an explanation of non-guidance activities will ascertain how school counselors' responsibilities are determined by local districts.

The literature review will not be presenting topics related to school counselor effectiveness. Studies in effectiveness of school counseling have measured identified outcomes of comprehensive programs such as student academic improvement or social adjustments. This study does not research the effectiveness and accountability of school counselors in New York State.

Most researchers note that studies in the field of school counseling are descriptive rather than experimental. Whiston and Sexton (1998) concluded in their review of school counseling outcome research that school counselors need to increase their interest in researching activities to produce substantial empirical studies. Therefore the literature finds the same results.

History of School Counselor in the United States

The definition of the role of the school counselor has been evolving for many years from career exploration to a multi faceted school orientation program. Harold Munson (1971)

indicated that this comprehensive view of guidance was a reflection of the flexibility of the profession to respond to societal change and to the changing needs of the individuals in it. At the same time, Ryan and Zeran (1978) suggested that guidance and counseling suffered from a lack of systematic theory to guide the practical applications of services. How then did the profession of school counseling evolve from career services to a school based developmental model?

The Beginning of School Counseling

The definition of school counselors began with Frank Parsons and the founding of the Vocational Bureau of Boston in 1908 (Erford, 2003). He set the foundation for school counselors as helping students connect to careers. Parsons emphasized that school counselors would assist students by understanding their abilities, interests and limitations. School counselors would guide students in gaining knowledge of the world and combining the information about themselves with that of the working world (NYSSCA, 2005).

With vocation as the main focus for school counselors' responsibilities, the National Vocational Guidance Association was formed in 1913 and became the guiding organization until 1952 when the American Personnel and Guidance Association was organized. At that time other tasks began to influence the nature of guidance and school counseling as a profession.

The new term of "educational guidance" was used by Truman Kelley in 1953 at Columbia University to describe the role of school counselors in terms of aiding students in their choices of studies (NYSSCA, 2005). School counselors had two functions: to help students review realistic job opportunities, and select appropriate courses that lead them towards their career selection.

The National Defense Education Act (1958) added new tasks to the evolution of the school counseling profession. With the increased focus by the United States to meet the

international challenges of mathematics and science fields as they related to the space race, the 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA, 1958) provided funds to increase the number of school counselors who had expertise in the college admissions process. In addition, school counselors assisted each student in overcoming learning barriers that prevented them from achieving academic success.

In past decades, the term “service” was used to describe the school counselors’ work which was identified as orientation, assessment, information, counseling, and placement (Gysbers & Lapan, 2003). As a result, guidance was seen as an ancillary school service with a focus on the job responsibilities of the counselor, not on the overall goals of the school counseling program (Gysbers & Lapan, 2003).

Another reorientation of the profession came in the 1970’s with a renewed interest in the developmental school counseling approach (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). With a changed perspective of school counseling to a developmental model, school counselors began receiving more training in psychological and personal/social topics related to students across age levels. The Educational Act for All Handicapped Children of 1975 expanded the school counselors’ role into special education (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Additional legislation in the 1980’s further developed the role of the school counselor. The publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 by the National Commission of Excellence in Education incorporated testing and accountability as components of the school counselors’ activities (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). As a result, the 1980’s was the beginning of translating the concept of a developmental model into practical school counseling programs (Gysbers, 2001).

Three program models emerged during this decade. The first model focused on provision of programs for all students, as well as the need for an integrated approach involving all school personnel (Gysbers, 2001). The second comprehensive school counseling model described the school counseling program as a pupil service program that included a set of standards for which students would become successful in school, as well as in the transition to higher education or employment (Gysbers, 2001).

Finally, Gysbers and Moore in 1981 presented a comprehensive model that emphasized an organizational structure with program components, and resources for its implementation (Gysbers, 2001). This last model identified school counselors' time allocation in the program components of guidance curriculum, individual counseling, responsive services, and system support (Gysbers, 2001).

This change in role required schools to look at the necessity of incorporating school counseling positions at the elementary and middle school levels, in addition to reinforcing the responsibilities of school counselors in the secondary schools. The Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act of 1995, which was reauthorized in 1999, supported school counseling in the shift from a vocational program only to a model that incorporated a developmental concept approach to service delivery (Erford, 2003).

21st Century School Counselor

In 1990, The Education Trust (Education Trust, 1990) was established by the American Association for Higher Education as a special project to encourage colleges and universities to support K-12 reform efforts. The Education Trust created the National Center for Transforming School Counseling in an effort to work with higher education institutions, school counseling

associations, and state education departments on the new perspectives of the role of school counselors in being change agents as well as essential members integral to school reform.

The Education Trust, in its publication entitled *Redefining School Counseling* (Education Trust, 2002), identified that school counselors, as leaders in their schools, should connect their program to the mission of the school as well as advocate for policies and practices that support student success (The Education Trust, 2002). The Education Trust identified the role of school counselors as listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Scope of School Counseling Work

1. Leadership:

Connecting the counseling program to the academic mission of schools and challenging the status quo. Forming relationships with students and adults in the school and community to support all students' academic success.

2. Advocacy :

Advocating removing systemic barriers that prevent all students from succeeding. Advocating for policies and practices that promote academic success for all students.

3. Teaming and Collaboration:

Using counseling skills with all stakeholders to mobilize human and financial resources to support high standards for all students.

Table 1 (continued)

Scope of School Counseling Work

4. Counseling:

Using counseling skills to assist students in overcoming social, personal, and academic barriers.

5. Assessment and Use of Data :

Using a wide range of data to assess student needs, establish measurable goals, and measure the results of initiatives designed to improve students' academic success. Using data is a proven way of insuring accountability for school counseling programs

Education Trust, 2003

As part of this reform movement, the American School Counselor Association established a commitment to a professional role definition utilizing three major areas of school counseling: academic, career, and personal/social (ASCA, 1997). The American School Counselor Association further stated that school counseling programs need to be developmental, systematic, and clearly defined (ASCA, 1997).

Creation of the ASCA National Model to Transform School Counseling

Johnson and Johnson (2003) suggested that educators should not be defining the school counselors' responsibilities by asking, "what do counselors do?" (Johnson & Johnson, 2003, p.180). This question leads to the opportunity of local districts to impose a variety of tasks and services on school counselors. Johnson recommended that educators ask "Why are students different as a result of the guidance program?" (Johnson & Johnson, 2003, p.181). The focus is to assist students in gaining new knowledge and skills as a result of a comprehensive school counseling program. With the development of the American School Counselor Association

(ASCA) National Standards in School Counseling, student outcome objectives were introduced to the school counseling profession to provide direction for school counseling programs.

The American School Counselor Association National Standards in School Counseling

The national school reform initiatives assisted the American School Counseling Association in the development of the ASCA National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The ASCA National Standards were established prior to the ASCA National Model as a resource to help school counselors restructure school counseling programs (Perusse, Goodnough & Noel, 2001).

The ASCA National Standards for School Counseling created a focus for school counseling programs as well as interventions provided by school counselors. These content standards identified (a) what students should know and be able to do as a result of participating in school counseling programs, (b) the strategies that support student success, and (c) the relationship of school counseling to the educational system in the domain areas of academic development, career development, and personal/social development as presented in Table 2 (Dahir, 2004).

Table 2

ASCA National Standard

Academic
Development

Standard A

Students will acquire the attitudes, knowledge and skills contributing to effective learning in school and across the life span.

Standard B

Students will complete school with the academic preparation essential to choose from a wide range of substantial post-secondary options, including college.

Standard C

Students will understand the relationship of academics to the world of work and to life at home and in the community.

Table 2 (continued)

ASCA National Standard

Career Development	Standard A	Students will acquire the skills to investigate the world of work in relation to knowledge of self and to make informed career decision.
	Standard B	Students will employ strategies to achieve future career success and satisfaction.
	Standard C	Students will understand the relationship between personal qualities, education and training and the world of work.
Personal/ Social Development	Standard A	Students will acquire the attitudes, knowledge and interpersonal skills to help them understand and respect self and others.
	Standard B	Students will make decisions, set goals and take necessary action to achieve goals.
	Standard C	Students will understand safety and survival skills.

American School Counselor Association, 1997

Dahir (2004) surveyed 1,127 members of the American School Counseling Association regarding the development of the ASCA National Standards for school counseling. Results indicated that 82% of the respondents strongly supported the development of ASCA National Standards (Dahir, 2004). In addition, two-thirds of respondents indicated that ASCA National Standards should be based on practice rather than theory. Ninety one percent of the participants indicated that ASCA National Standards would more clearly define the role of school counseling in the educational system.

Results of the ASCA National Standards research supported the fact that school counselors wanted to eliminate the confusion regarding their job responsibilities. Responses showed that the development of the ASCA National Standards would make school counseling programs an integral part of the educational system and possibly establish a more respectful practice for school counselors (Dahir, 2004).

Components of the National Comprehensive School Counseling Model

The ASCA National Standards became a basis for the development of a comprehensive school counseling program framework by the American School Counselor Association. The new comprehensive school counseling program became known as the American School Counselor Association National Model (ASCA, 2003).

The National Model supported the skills of the school counselor in establishing a preventive and systematic program for the profession. The structure of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003) is divided into different components or elements, which include: foundation, management, delivery and accountability (see Table 3). Each of these elements are essential parts of the educational system which together provide assurance that students will

receive the knowledge, attitudes, and skills they need to become successful, contributing adults (Johnson, 2003).

Table 3

Components of the American School Counselor Association National Model

1. Foundation

Beliefs and philosophy of the school counseling program

Mission statement

Domains of the ASCA National Standards for School Counseling.

2. Management System

Advisory Council to support the school counseling program.

Data to determine needs of a program.

3. Delivery System

School Guidance Curriculum

Individual Student Planning

Responsive Services

Systems Support

4. Accountability

School Counselor Performance Evaluation

Program Audit

American School Counselor Association, 2003

Development of the New York State Comprehensive Model for School Counseling

New York State created the *New York State Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Program*, which will be known as the State Model throughout the document, in alignment to the National Model (NYSSCA, 2005). The State Model follows the principles of the National Model and includes the four components known as foundation, management, delivery and accountability. The State Model supports the incorporation of the ASCA National Standards in School Counseling as knowledge skills delivered by a comprehensive school counseling program.

In addition to the alignment to the National Model through the components of the framework, “The goal of the *New York State Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Program* was to provide school counselors in the state with a role definition as well as to align school counseling to the objectives of, and the learning standards delineated by, the New York State Education Department” (p. 4).

Certification Requirements for School Counselors in New York State

The New York State Education Department provides two types of certifications for school counselors: provisional and permanent. Certification can be obtained through different pathways such as a state approved program or through individual preparation. New York State is one of just three states in the Union that does not require a master’s degree in counseling, school counseling, guidance, or a similar field for entry level certification (Morrissey & Rotunda, 2006, p. 11). This means that the New York State Education Department’s certification requirements for school counselors includes obtaining 30 graduate credits from an accredited program that contains the courses required for certification and approved by the Commissioner of Education

or an accrediting agency. These courses do not necessarily need to be acquired from the same planned program.

In addition to graduate coursework, New York requires only a supervised practicum in counseling (NYSED, 2007). The New York State Education Department offers no direction for how long such an experience must occur, what such an experience must include, or where such an experience must be completed (Morrissey & Rotunda, 2006).

The New York State Education Department does not provide guidelines for appropriate and inappropriate responsibilities for school counselors. However, the Department does provide suggested graduate coursework which includes the topics of counseling theory, diagnostic tools, vocational guidance, community resources, conflict prevention, educational psychology, and psychology of learning in addition to others (NYSED, 2007). Curriculum topics on the comprehensive school counseling program are not listed as requirement or elective courses by the New York State Education Department. The state also provides general direction in the development of a guidance plan for the local district (Table 4).

Table 4

Part 100.2 Commissioners Regulations on District Guidance Plan

1. K-6 Guidance Plan

Prepare students to participate in educational program.

Help students with attendance, academic, behavioral or adjustment problems.

Educate students concerning avoidance of child sexual abuse.

Encourage parental involvement.

Table 4 (continued)

Part 100.2 Commissioners Regulations on District Guidance Plan

2. 7-12 Guidance Plan

An annual review of each student's educational progress and career plans.

Instruction at each grade level to help students learn about various careers.

Individual or group counseling assistance to enable students to benefit from the curriculum.

New York State Education Department, 2007

The guidance plan (Table 4), as stated by the Commissioner's Regulations (NYSED, 2006) must demonstrate how the district will comply with the above stated requirements and will have program objectives that describe expectations of what students will learn from the program. Activities to accomplish the objectives and an annual assessment process are to be identified in the plan (NYSED, 2006). The New York State Education Department requires an annual review and update of the plan.

With established general regulations for the school counseling profession, New York State school counselors have been struggling with consistent role definition that supports a developmental school counseling framework. Currently the responsibilities of school counselors are defined by local school districts which vary among locations.

The flexibility of role responsibilities has not allowed for a consistent definition. The State Model was designed to not only assist school counselors with appropriate responsibilities, but also support the New York State Education Department with the mandates of Part 100.2 of the Commissioners' Regulations along with its educational reform initiatives (NYSED, 2006).

School Counselor and Educational Reform

School Counseling and Systems Thinking

Systemic change theory is defined as a model in which a sender is interested in communicating a message to a receiver (Council on Systemic Change, 2000). The Council on Systemic Change (2000) further described change theory as the messenger being the change agent; the message being the innovation; and the receiver being the adapter to the new environment. In this study, the school counselor is the messenger who is providing a new framework, the State Model, to school administrators for the school counselors' responsibilities.

Systems thinking is a subcomponent of the systemic change theory process. For Peter Senge (2000), systems thinking is the ability to comprehend and address the whole, and to examine the interrelationship between the parts provided. For school counselors it is the process of changing how the school administrator and the school counselor perceive the school counselors' responsibilities within the school as a benefit to the learning organization.

A "learning organization", as the term is known, includes the belief in the ability of people and organizations to change and become more effective, and that change requires open communication and empowerment of community members as well as a culture of collaboration (Larsen, 1996). To understand the concept of a learning organization it is important to know that it involves individual learning. In addition, it requires individuals to make the shift from traditional organization thinking to learning organization thinking to develop the ability to think critically and creatively about the system (Larsen, 1996).

Peter Senge (2000), an expert in systemic change theory, states that all learners construct knowledge from an inner scaffolding of their individual and social experiences, emotions, will, aptitudes, beliefs, values, self-awareness, purpose and more (Senge, 2000). Systemic change

calls for attitude and beliefs that promote ongoing and continuous reflecting, rethinking, and restructuring (Saginak & Dollarhide, 2006). It involves thinking on how the system operates instead of just the system itself, as defined by a learning organization.

Brandt (2007) compared the necessary conditions of the concepts of learning organization and systemic change at the individual and school levels. Brandt (2007) identified the following components for individuals and schools to engage as learning organizations and create systemic change: (a) strategies and feedback to improve decisions; (b) knowledge construction based on members of the school; and (c) systems and subsystems sharing information to support a common vision. The role of the educational member is to continuously find ways for people to bring what they know to the environment and to find ways to stimulate the new learner, otherwise fragmentation can occur (Costa & Kallick, 1995).

Dimmitt (2003) provided an example of the value of school counseling practice that emphasized the importance of using data and collaboration in discussing educational issues. In her study Dimmitt (2003) presented the outcomes of collaboration in reviewing student failure data to identify strategies for student success.

Participants of the study included teachers, parents, students, administrators, and school counselors. All participants were from the same school district. Of the 92 teachers in the school, 83% (76) completed the surveys (Dimmitt, 2003). 152 families were invited to participate and 34% (51) responded (Dimmitt, 2003). 1365 students, representing all secondary level grades, participated in the survey (Dimmitt, 2003).

Failure was defined by the group of participants as receiving a grade of “F” in a class because of multiple factors that impact performance (Dimmitt, 2003). Such multiple factors

included, but were not limited to psychological, cultural, educational, and community aspects (Dimmitt, 2003).

Dimmitt's (2003) research utilized a survey as the instrument to obtain results for student, family, teacher, school, and pedagogical factors influencing achievement. Results from the survey indicated that many students spoke more than one language at home; that the primary uses of assessment in the schools were tests, and papers; and that student motivation were among the indicators of failure (Dimmitt, 2003).

From this study, Dimmitt (2003) showed that the collaboration of teachers, parents, administrators, students, school counselors in analyzing student failure provided a connection between all components of the educational system to improve student success. The shared information provided a direction for school personnel to develop new strategies in reducing student academic failure (Dimmitt, 2003). The discrepancies of students, teachers and parents about the reasons for failure were identified as important intervention points to reduce fragmentation in education (Dimmitt, 2003).

Senge (2000) states that fragmentation has forced people to focus on specific events to distinguish patterns of behavior in order to explain past phenomena or to predict future behavior. Once the behavior of the system is understood to be a function of the structure and of the relationships between the elements of the system, the system can be modified and observations can be made as to whether the changes made results in the desired behaviors (Larsen, 1996).

Clark and Stone (2001) described the importance of school counselor as integral members of the learning community in achieving student academic success, a desired behavior by Duval County Public Schools in Florida. The authors cited the collaboration of principals, school counselors, and the community at Duval County Public Schools as an example of systems

thinking process in providing students with information on higher education, and financial aid. The school counselors, and principal train, and place over 100 community volunteers in the high school to provide students with individual advising sessions on postsecondary education (Clark & Stone, 2001). The college process is not an isolated school counselor responsibility.

System thinking is based on the concept of alignment in which a group of scattered elements are arranged so they function as a whole, by orienting them to a common awareness of each other, their purpose, and their current reality (Senge, 2000). In achieving personal understanding of school counselors' role as determined by the National and State Model, school counselors would obtain ownership of their responsibilities, and in doing such develop new skills, as well as a comprehensive school counseling program (Saginak & Dollarhide, 2006).

Johnson and Johnson (2003) defined a system as a process for homeostasis. When one element in a system changes, it would cause all other elements to change in order to achieve balance (p. 182). Johnson and Johnson (2003) stated that with respect to the National and State Model, the framework component of foundation, management, delivery and accountability, and system elements of community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources were needed for program implementation. Furthermore, Johnson and Johnson (2003) stated that when all elements were present, the system provided the framework for which school counselors and administrators could work together to ensure that school counselors were a part of the learning organization (p. 182).

Peter Senge emphasized the need for the individual to recognize what is important, and to see the current reality of the situation. In *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (Senge, 2006) Peter Senge, speaks clearly about personal mastery. No

longer can school counselors just be satisfied with feeling good at the end of the day, but also must be able to articulate how their work and the program's work, are connected to student success (Kuranz, 2003).

Systems thinking connects to the current reality of school counseling, which is how students are different because of their access and full participation in the school counseling program. In order for school counselors to be on the front line of reform and transformation of school counseling programs, school counselors must have a working knowledge of systems and systemic change (Saginak & Dollarhide, 2006).

School Counselors Advocating for Systems Change

When school counselors question the beliefs, and values behind school policies, or structures, they become an integral part of the educational reform in schools (House & Sears, 2002). Current school counselors' activities result from conflicting roles and a system that does not utilize school counselors' skills.

House & Sears (2002) suggested that school counselors do not involve themselves in advocating for systems change because school counselors lacked a strong personal/professional scope. Furthermore, House & Sears (2002) stated that school counselor's conceived program, and identified role function were at the discretion of others, such as administrators.

School counselors' professional roles were the product of expectations of administrators, and school counselors. The success of the transformation of school counseling programs relies on the leaders and system's ability to change (ASCA, 2003; The Education Trust, 2003). In addition, school counselors are not aware of how to examine and question the inequitable practices in the school counseling profession (House & Sears, 2002).

As leaders in advocating for systems change, school counselors need to examine their own attitudes, beliefs, and skills (House & Sears, 2002). School counselors also need to understand the need for change based on inquiry about their practices. Finally school counselors need to understand how systems change in incorporating the internal supports, such as school administrators (House & Sears, 2002). Saginak & Dollarhide (2006) suggested that school counselors can utilize the National Model as a tool to support system transformation.

At the state level, the State Model is the tool for school counselors to utilize in leading administrators to view the role of the school counselor as an integral member of the learning organization. Currently, local school districts have assigned responsibilities to school counselors including testing coordination, hall duties, and clerical tasks (House & Sears, 2002). To date, no studies have been conducted in New York State to investigate school counselors' and school administrators' perceptions of the role of school counselor, as well as how the State Model is being implemented as a component of systems change for school counselors.

Responsibilities of School Counselors

Research on school counselor responsibilities has focused on how school counselors spend their time in particular activities (Scarborough, 2005). Do school counselors currently perform activities related to academic, personal/social, and career development in alignment to the ASCA National Model? As a result, studies do show that there remains a discrepancy between what is advocated as best practice and what is actually performed in schools (Scarborough, 2005).

Actual activities are defined by the current responsibilities of the school counselors. Best practices are determined by the four components of both the National and State Model as a framework for a comprehensive school counseling program. Additionally there are a number of

activities referred to as non-guidance responsibilities that are assigned to school counselors such as proctoring, teaching in classes, and substitute.

In a national study performed by Whinston and Sexton (1998) regarding a review of school counseling outcome research, the results yielded that only 50 studies were published from 1988 through 1995 regarding school counseling practice. Whinston and Sexton (1998) utilized the four components of the National Model as a focus to include reviewed studies. Results supported the knowledge that there were no studies performed with respect to the State Model and readiness for school counseling implementation.

School Counselor Activities

Rale and Adams (2007) conducted a research to explore the current realities of the comprehensive school counseling program and non-guidance activities school counselors were actually performing. They focused on the differential patterns among elementary, middle and high school counselors' daily work activities.

Participants in this study were members of the state chapters of the American School Counselor Association (N = 388). Participants represented more than 40 states and included 78.1% females and 21.9% males. The participants' reported total number of years of school counseling experience ranged from 1 to 36 years with a mean of 11.27 (SD=8.74) years (Rale & Adams, 2007, p. 11).

Rale and Adams (2007) utilized a questionnaire which included 20 comprehensive school counseling program based work activities that school counselors performed regularly. The list of activities included counseling, consultation, curriculum and non-guidance activities.

Results indicated participant demographics of 45.9% elementary school counselors,

49.5 % of middle school counselors, and 56.4% high school counselors (Rale & Adams, 2007, p. 14). Regarding the current work activities, results indicated a significant difference in elementary, middle and high school counselors' actual daily work activities. More elementary school counselors than middle or secondary school counselors reported implementing a comprehensive school counseling program based on the National Model (Rale & Adams, 2007).

Overall, the findings showed that 48.5% of school counselors reported participation in comprehensive school counseling activities as actual activities. The different levels indicated the varying times devoted to actual as well as non-guidance activities (Table 5). Finally, Rale and Adams (2007) recommended reviewing proactive programming and training to implement preferred activities as related to the National Model.

Table 5

<i>Study on School Counseling Actual Activities</i>	
Level	Actual Activities
Elementary	Individual Counseling
	Guidance Curriculum
	Consultation/Collaboration
	Program Management
	Program Evaluation

Table 5 (continued)

Study on School Counseling Actual Activities

Middle	Individual Counseling
	Group Counseling
	Consultation/Collaboration
Secondary	Guidance Curriculum
	Consultation
	Supervision of Interns

Rale and Adams, 2007

Non-guidance Activities

Non-guidance activities are defined as those tasks that do not fit into the National Model (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000, p. 53). Non-guidance activities can be identified as administrative, clerical, instructional, or student supervision activities (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Examples of such tasks can include administering school-wide testing programs, entering data, counting test booklets, tutoring students, or covering classes for teachers.

These non-guidance tasks are assigned to school counselors by the local school administrator. When school counselors are assigned a disproportionate amount of time to these non-guidance responsibilities, the integrity of a comprehensive school counseling program is impaired (Gysbers, 2001). If school counselors allow themselves to participate in non-guidance activities, then the opportunity of implementing a National or State Model is impaired as well as the perception by school administrators of school counselors as professionals.

In the previous study, Rale and Adams (2007) conducted the research to additionally explore the non-guidance activities school counselors were actually performing. Results

indicated that the different levels showed varying times devoted to actual as well as non-guidance activities (Table 6).

Table 6

Study on School Counseling Actual Non-guidance Activities

Level	Actual Non-guidance Activities
Elementary	IEP/504 Planning
	Classroom Coverage
	Bus Duties
	Lunchroom Duties
Middle	IEP/504 Planning
	School Wide Testing
Secondary	IEP/504 Planning
	School Wide Testing

Rale and Adams, 2007

In another study, Partin (1990) conducted research focused on activities which school counselors perceived to be their greatest time wasters. Partin’s (1990) definition of time wasters included any activity that school counselors believed detracted them from the delivery of a comprehensive school counseling program.

Partin (1990) utilized a questionnaire that contained a listing of the major categories of counselor activities based upon the nine dimensions of school counseling from the Ohio Department of Education (1976). School counselors were asked to estimate the amount of time spent on the activities such that the sum equaled 100% (Partin, 1990, p. 276).

The researcher mailed the questionnaire to 300 randomly selected Ohio elementary, middle, and secondary school counselors with 100 counselors selected at each level (Partin,

1990). Returned surveys totaled 210 of which 52 were from elementary, 83 middle school and 70 secondary school counselors (Partin, 1990).

Partin (1990) analyzed the results by means, standard deviations and an analysis of variance (ANOVA). Results indicated that all three levels of school counselors identified paper work as their greatest time robber (Partin, 1990). Secondary school counselors identified scheduling ($M = 5.04$), and time spent on administrative tasks ($M = 4.04$) as non-guidance activities school counselors spent more time on (Partin, 1990, p. 277). Middle school identified discipline problems ($M = 3.40$) as the main non-guidance activity of their daily responsibilities, while elementary school counselors rated teaching duties ($M = 2.74$) as interfering more with their time (Partin, 1990).

The study conducted by Partin (1990) revealed that the non-guidance activities were still a part of the school counselors' responsibilities, but differed at each of the three levels. The researcher also established that school counselors' job descriptions have changed to encompass a vast array of non-guidance activities, from supervising restrooms to conducting school fund drives (Partin, 1990). Partin recommended that when school counselors were asked to perform non-guidance activities, it was essential for school counselors to show the impact non-guidance activities had in the school counselor professional functions, and area of specialization (Partin, 1990). Non-guidance activities could impact the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program.

Readiness to Implement School Counselor Responsibilities

In addition to understanding actual and preferred school counseling activities, research has determined conditions deemed necessary for the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program (Carey et al., 2005). Conditions have been established as community

support, leadership, guidance curriculum, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources. A recent study by McGannon (2007) placed the conditions for implementation in categories of school counselor characteristics, district conditions and school counseling program support. This review of research will provide insight into the current trends in the conditions in implementing the National Model

School Counselor Characteristics. According to McGannon (2007), in recent research, school counselor characteristics included items related to school counselors' beliefs, and school counselors' skills. Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, and Jones (2004) researched the extent to which school counselors should emphasize the ASCA National Standards and the Education Trusts' scope of school counseling work as school counselor characteristics in the school counseling program.

Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, and Jones (2004) addressed how are elementary, and secondary school counselors, and school principals alike or different in their perceptions about the degree of emphasis given to the ASCA National Standards of School Counseling; and how are elementary and secondary school counselors, and school principals alike or different in their perceptions about appropriate tasks for school counselors.

Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, and Jones (2004) did not look at the perception of school counselors on current activities and best practices as defined by the ASCA National Model. Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, and Jones (2004) did not look at predictors for best practices for school counseling as perceived by school counselors, and school principals.

A random sample of 1000 professional school counselors was obtained by the American School Counselor Association's membership database (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004). A random sample of 500 secondary school principals was obtained from the

National Association of Secondary School Principals and another random sample of 500 elementary school principals was obtained from the National Association of Elementary School Principals (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004). Respondents were representative of urban, suburban, and rural schools. Of the respondents, Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, and Jones (2004) reported 218 as elementary school counselors; 376 as secondary school counselors; 207 elementary school principals; and 231 secondary school principals.

Participants responded to a questionnaire with two sections (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004). The first section was related to the ASCA National Standards of School Counseling and respondents were asked to rate each standard on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1= no emphasis, 2 = limited emphasis, 3 = moderate emphasis, 4 = more emphasis, and 5 = most emphasis) (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004, p. 155). In the second component of the questionnaire participants identified appropriate school counseling tasks, and inappropriate non-guidance tasks such as proctoring exams.

Results indicated that school counselors, and school principals at each level gave emphasis to the ASCA National Standards of School Counseling as guidelines for a school counseling program (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004). Elementary school counselors showed greater support for the personal/social domain while high school counselors showed greater interest in the career development domain (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004)

Results at all three levels regarding the appropriate and inappropriate tasks for school counselors showed that there was no clear agreement about what were appropriate or inappropriate tasks (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004). Results indicated that the same tasks that school principals highly endorsed such as registration, and scheduling of new

students were also the most frequently performed inappropriate tasks by school counselors at each level (Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, & Jones, 2004, p. 259).

In another similar study, school counselors surveyed on the perceptions of school counseling standards indicated a low professional interest towards program development, implementation and evaluation (Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, & Rahill, 2002). Grouping by elementary, middle, and secondary grade levels showed significant differences among counseling and guidance knowledge, and skills (Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, & Rahill, 2002).

District Conditions. McGannon (2007) described district conditions as factors that were needed by a school district to facilitate implementing the National Model. District conditions included the readiness components of community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, and district resources (McGannon, 2007).

Amatea and Clark (2005) studied 26 administrators' perceptions of the school counselor role. Through this qualitative study, Amatea and Clark (2005) focused on the value that school administrators placed on particular functions, or the way school counselors were structured within the schools.

Amatea and Clark (2005) interviewed school administrators in the Southeastern United States who were representative of public schools. Participants were 11 elementary; 8 middle; and 7 secondary school administrators (Amatea & Clark, 2005, p. 20). Participants were selected based on their ability and interest in sharing their experience in working with school counselors. Data were gathered in a 2- year grounded theory study exploring how school administrators expected school counselors to function in their schools.

This study identified agreement among school administrators about the challenges their schools faced and needed changes as well as how school counselors could contribute to the

changes (Amatea & Clark, 2005). School administrators identified types of work activities for school counselors as counseling, consultation, and coordination. School administrators differed on the value given to each of these work activity areas, which affected negatively the particular specialized knowledge that differentiated school counselors from other staff in the school (Amatea & Clark, 2005).

Amatea and Clark (2005) reported that twelve percent of the respondents gave priority to the school counselor taking an active leadership role with school staff in improving the functioning of the school as a whole. Three administrators only identified their school counselor as having specialized expertise that could help their school staff members improve how they worked with students.

Amatea and Clark (2005) reported that 8 out of 26 administrators believed that the counselor's primary role should be that of providing direct services to students through individual or classroom guidance. These administrators expected the school counselor to offer a separate set of services that complemented the work of other staff (Amatea & Clark, 2005).

Finally, 6 out of 26 respondents identified school counselors as members of the administrative team (Amatea & Clark, 2005). Common activities included non-guidance tasks such as scheduling and testing.

School Counseling Program Support. The school counseling program support (MGannon, 2007) included the appropriate use of school counselors' time, and leadership skills as well as community support to implement a National Model. School administrators have been identified as a possible challenge or barrier to transforming the role of the school counselor (House & Martin, 1998).

There exists much literature about the lack of agreement between school principals and school counselors on the importance of school principals defining the school counselor's role. The National Association of Secondary School Principals and the American School Counselor Association have agreed that the success of a school counseling program is dependent upon principal's support at the building level (Perusse, 2004).

It is important to acknowledge that both principals and school counselors share a common interest in supporting student achievement. Methods of doing this vary based on different perspectives, causing a conflict of role understanding and task definition for school administrators. Williamson, Broughton, and Hobson (2003) studied the need to minimize conflict and maximize collaborations between school counselors and principals. Results from surveys completed by school counselors only demonstrated the need for principals to understand that school counselors would like routine meetings to comprehend the impact of programs; to build trust between school counselors and principals; to establish clear protocols and procedures for the school counselor's role; and to advocate for the counselor's role in support of students (Williamson, Broughton, & Hobson, 2003).

In other research, Beesley and Frey (2006) studied the principal's perceptions of school counselor roles and satisfaction with counseling services. The response of 300 principals nationwide showed that 73% of the principals reported being somewhat satisfied to very satisfied with the counseling services in the school (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

At least two thirds of the respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the following counseling services: staff development, peer mediation/conflict resolution, scheduling/enrollment, career counseling, scheduling/enrollment, career counseling, special education placement, testing/appraisal, academic placement/college preparation, individual

counseling, program coordination, group counseling, consultation, and classroom guidance (Beesley & Frey, 2006). Results identified the areas of comprehensive school counseling programs in academic, personal/social and career domains, as well as non-guidance activities such as testing, scheduling and enrollment.

A final survey question in this research asked what principals identified as the major roles of school counselors (Beesley & Frey, 2006). Results showed that two thirds or more of the principals identified the following school counselor role domain: classroom guidance, group counseling, program coordination, consultation, individual counseling, academic planning/college preparation, career counseling, multicultural counseling, program evaluation/accountability, and public relations/community outreach (Beesley & Frey, 2006).

Summary

The review of the literature provided the reader with an overview of the historical perspective of the development of the school counseling profession. The establishments of the ASCA National Standards for School Counseling as well as the ASCA National Model were initiatives that included school counselors in the educational reform process. An overview of national changes provided an insight into the adaptation of the New York State Model.

The literature also provided an overview of the responsibilities of school counselors as defined by their perception of actual activities and best practices, with the latter linked to the ASCA National Model. The concept of responsibilities was also aligned to the school counselor characteristics, district resources, and school counseling program support for an understanding of what is necessary for a change in the systems' process of understanding the school counselors' role and the implementation of the State's Model.

The literature review included an overview of the change theory that is essential for new systems' thinking to occur. Senge's (2000) systems' thinking theoretical framework was presented establishing that in order for systems to function holistically, individuals must engage in learning new concepts, and providing insight onto how best practices are an integral part of the learning organization. In addition, for systems change to occur, school counselors need to advocate as leaders to establish integrity for this program, and this profession as a whole.

Finally, there have been no studies conducted on the role of the school counselor in New York State as well as the implementation of the State Model as a framework for defining the practice of school counselors. Research on school counselors' and school administrators' perceptions of the role of school counselor would provide direction about the readiness of educational organizations to accept the implementation of the State Model and to change the school counselors' role to being an integral member of the local school district.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The following section will first describe the research questions and hypothesis for this study. Additional information regarding the participants, selection method and research process will be presented. Finally, an overview of the analysis of data analysis procedures and threats to the study will be provided.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study:

1. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - a. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - b. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

- c. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - d. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - e. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
2. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York State Comprehensive Model into their districts?

Hypothesis

1. School counselors' readiness to implement the State Model will significantly explain the variation among the scores for preferred practice of school counselors after the influence of actual practice variables are accounted for.

2. School counselors will have significantly higher perceptions than administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York State Comprehensive Model.

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative methodology which included a multiple correlation design for research question one. The criterion for research question one was determined to be the preferred school counseling activities as defined by the ASCA National Model as counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance activities.

The predictors were established as the school counselors' readiness for implementation to include community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources; and actual performed school counseling activities as determined by: counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance activities.

For research question two, a causal comparative design explored the differences between the perceptions of school counselors and principals about community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources with regards to the implementation of the State Model. A post test only design with no treatment was used to respond to research question two. There were no control groups for either design.

Participants

Participants represented school districts in urban, suburban, and rural areas of New York State. Participants were from school districts of various sizes and represented the elementary, middle and secondary levels of schools (see Table 7).

Table 7

Public Schools in New York State

Level	<u>N</u>
Elementary	3701
Middle	878
Secondary	1375

New York State Education Department, 2007

Participants' contact information was obtained from the New York State Basic Educational Data System (NYSED, 2006) database which was received from the New York State Education Department with written permission. The database contained the name, school, and school address for all New York State school administrators and school counselors as per the written request.

This researcher merged the information and combined school administrators and school counselors contact information into one database for appropriate selection purposes. Combining the contact information for participants from the same school district gave the researcher the ability to code selected participants by school district.

In addition, the databases for the New York State School Counselor Association and New York State members only for the American School Counselor Association were obtained with written permission to use. These databases provided the most accurate contact information for school counselors as a cross-reference to the New York State Basic Educational Data System database (NYSED, 2006).

The contact information was also updated by utilizing the New York State school district listings from the New York State Education Department. This researcher reviewed each school

district’s Website for each participant to check accuracy of current administrators and school counselors. This researcher also obtained professional email addresses from the individual participants’ school district website, and used these for necessary follow-up of survey completion for the sample selected.

Sample Selection

This researcher selected a stratified sample to represent the New York State school counselor and school administrator target population. The sample was selected using a random process from the school counselor database. A sample size was determined by utilizing the *Handbook in Research and Evaluation* (Isaac & Michael, 1995). According to Isaac and Michael (1995), the sample selected from a randomly chosen sample of a given finite population of 6,694 school counselors in New York State, should be equivalent to 361 participants. To obtain a 50% percent return of surveys and a diversified sample representing all areas of the state, this researcher increased the sample size to 900 school counselors (Table 8).

Table 8

Sample Demographics (N= 1500)

Participants	<u>N</u>
School Administrators	600
School Counselors	900
Grade Level	
Elementary	233
Middle	332
Secondary	919
Charter Schools	16

Table 8 (continued)

<i>Sample Demographics (N= 1500)</i>	
School Setting	<u>N</u>
Urban	351
Suburban	330
Rural	819

School administrators were selected by using a matching method to the school counselors' sample. For each district selected for which school counselors were represented, the matching school districts' school administrator was identified and added to the sample. This would provide the researcher with the opportunity to compare both groups on the *Readiness Survey*.

Instrumentation

School Counseling Activity Rating Scale

The *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* was developed by creating a design for the instrument that reflected task statements, rating scale, and format (Scarborough, 2005). The author created a list of work activities that represented the job of the school counselor with task statements reflecting the activities under the four interventions described in the ASCA National Model. The items were selected to describe activities in each of the five areas: counseling (individual and group), consultation, coordination, curriculum (classroom lessons), and "other as defined as clerical and other duties performed by school counselors" (Scarborough, 2005, p. 2).

The author reviewed related school counseling literature for common school counseling work activities. The 50-item instrument represented activities for the categories of school counseling.

Survey Construction. The *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* (SCARS) uses a verbal frequency scale in which participants are asked how often an activity is performed (Scarborough, 2005). The instrument was designed to measure both the frequency with which the school counselor actually performed the activity and the frequency with which the school counselor would prefer to perform each activity. On actual performance as well as preferred performance, participants rated on a 5- point verbal frequency scale whether they (a) 1, never do this, (b) 2, rarely do this, (c) 3, occasionally do this, (d) 4, frequently do this, or (e) 5, routinely do this (Scarborough, 2005).

After the construction of the instrument, the author proceeded with a pretest in an effort to identify production mistakes, question /statement construction, and readability and understanding (Dillman, 2000; Scarborough, 2005). The author engaged knowledgeable colleagues with specific areas of expertise in school counseling to provide feedback based on their experience with previous surveys and their knowledge of the study's objectives (Dillman, 2000; Scarborough, 2005). Based on the feedback from the pretest, some task statements were removed due to redundancy and replaced with other task statements (Scarborough, 2005).

Reliability and Validity. As a field test for the *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale*, the author selected elementary, middle and high school counselors from two Southern states to participate in the study (Scarborough, 2005). A list of members of the state school counselor association for two southern states was obtained for the selection process. A total of 600 participants, 100 per level of school setting, were randomly selected to receive the survey.

A total of 361 usable surveys were returned representing 117 elementary school counselors, 120 middle school counselors, and 124 high school counselors (Scarborough, 2005). The sample consisted of 89.7% females and 10.3% males who on average had 11 years of school

counseling experience and 27.9% who had 5 or fewer years of experience (Scarborough, 2005). According to the author, 90% of the participants indicated that their school counseling license was a result of receiving a master's degree (Scarborough, 2005).

The author utilized the principal components factor analysis with orthogonal transformation using the varimax rotation to identify factors and assess construct validity (Scarborough, 2005). The author decided to analyze each category independently from the other using the orthogonal rotation (Scarborough, 2005).

Construct validity was further assessed with the use of a one-way analysis of variance as well as a correlation between subscales and selected demographic variables (Scarborough, 2005). Internal consistency and reliability were assessed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Results of the analyses indicated that a 4-factor solution was found for the original 40 items representing the counseling, coordination, consultation, and curriculum categories. All factors met Kaiser's criterion with eigenvalues greater than 1 (Scarborough, 2005). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .91 and Bartlett's test was significant (Scarborough, 2005).

In the coordination subscale, the alpha reliability coefficient was .84 for Actual and .85 for Preferred. The consultation subscale showed a .75 for Actual and .77 for Preferred in the alpha reliability coefficient. The curriculum subscale showed a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .93 for Actual and .90 for Preferred. The "other" subscale alpha reliability coefficient was .43 for Actual and .52 for Prefer (Scarborough, 2005).

The author examined group differences to obtain convergent construct validity among grade levels of employment (Scarborough, 2005). The ANOVA was utilized in examining group differences and analyses revealed a statistically significant effect of grade level on all four

School Counseling Activity Rating Scale subscales (Scarborough, 2005). A Scheffe's post hoc revealed a significant difference among all three grade levels on the counseling, coordination, and curriculum scales (Scarborough, 2005).

In addition, discriminant construct validity was established by conducting a correlation between the years of experience and school counselor tasks. Results indicated two correlations as the following: (a) years of experience and the coordination subscale ($r = .21, p < .001$), and (b) years of experience and the consultation subscale ($r = .19, p < .001$) (Scarborough, 2005).

The study has supported the SCARS as an instrument to measure process data reflecting how school counselors actually spend their time versus how they would prefer to spend their time with respect to the components of the ASCA National Model (p. 279). The subscales reflected competencies addressed in The National Standards of School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) as well as the four categories of intervention recognized in the national and State Model.

Readiness Survey

The *Readiness Survey* was developed to assist school counselors and school administrators in assessing their readiness to implement the National Model. Measuring the readiness to change can be identified from four perspectives: (a) the individual, (b) the organizational structure, (c) the specific change, and (d) the process for change (McGannon, 2007; Holt, 2004). The *Readiness Survey* is the only instrument that has incorporated all four of these perspectives, in comparison to other existing surveys (Carey, Harrity, & Dimmitt, 2005).

Survey Construction. The *Readiness Survey* was developed with authors Carey, Harrity and Dimmit (2005), after their reviewing extensive literature on implementing comprehensive guidance programs (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000; McGannon, 2007). This information provided

the foundation for understanding the relevant factors related to a successful transition to a new school counseling program (McGannon, 2007, p. 42).

In addition to current literature, the National Model was reviewed to identify necessary skills school counselors needed to possess before being able to complete the tasks in a new comprehensive program. The authors consulted subject matter experts including the authors of the National Model, current school counselors in the process of implementing the National Model, and several school counselors familiar with the contents of the National Model (McGannon, 2007).

Upon finishing the review, the authors selected seven readiness constructs. These constructs included community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staffing time, school counselors' beliefs and attitudes, school counselors' skills, and district resources. An initial version of the *Readiness Survey* was presented to school counselors attending the 2003 Massachusetts School Counselor Association Conference as well as the authors of the National Model. Feedback was solicited regarding the instrument's clarity, readability, logical consistency, and perceived usefulness (McGannon, 2007).

The revised version of the instrument was field tested with three New England school districts attempting to implement the National Model (McGannon, 2007). Information was obtained about the effectiveness of the instrument by identifying the obstacles in implementation of the National Model (McGannon, 2007). The authors utilized this information to provide an understanding of the most effective use of the instrument.

The *Readiness Survey* was developed utilizing minimal technical terms. It was made as easily as possible so all members of the school community could understand it (McGannon, 2007). The authors utilized a 3-point rating scale for simplicity and efficiency (McGannon,

2007). Each item within the constructs was scored on a 3-point rating scale as follows: (0) “like my district”, (1) “somewhat like my district”, and (2) “not like my district” (McGannon, 2007). The authors understood that the rating scale limited the variance in ratings; however it made comparison of responses across school districts easier to assimilate (McGannon, 2007).

The final version of the *Readiness Survey* contained 63 items clustered into seven factors based upon initial perceived similarity of items (McGannon, 2007, p.46). These constructs were community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staffing time, school counselors’ beliefs and attitudes, school counselors’ skills, and district resources.

Reliability and Validity. All data were evaluated utilizing the information gathered via a Web-based version of the *Readiness Instrument*. Participants included 693 respondents during the time period of January 21, 2005 through April 19, 2006 (McGannon, 2007). Responses to the survey were considered invalid under two conditions: whether or not a respondent had previously completed the survey, and if the computer address had been recorded more than once (McGannon, 2007).

The data were analyzed by conducting confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses (McGannon, 2007). A standardized factor loading of each predicted item ranged from .43 to .91 (McGannon, 2007). A correlation between latent variables showed that the correlation between school counselor skills, and beliefs and attitudes was high (.84) suggesting that these items are measuring similar constructs (McGannon, 2007). The seven-factor loading proved not to support the four components of the ASCA National Model and the authors explored a three-factor model for analysis.

Due to the high loading of each factor, the authors decided to create variable parcels within each factor. The parcels were created by rank ordering items into three approximately

equal variable groups based on corrected item-total statistics (McGannon, 2007, p. 92). A confirmatory factor analyses was conducted on this defined three-factor model resulting in reasonable fit of data to the ASCA National Model. The results were cross-validated with a second independent data set and the data from a second sample provided adequate fit. Results also indicated that measurement errors were not excessively high (McGannon, 2007).

In addition, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify the underlying factor structure of the *Readiness Survey* (McGannon, 2007). Researchers' finding provided support of divergent validity, with a variance range from .02 to .27 for the three-factor model, showing that the factors were measuring distinctly different constructs (McGannon, 2007). Researchers' also investigated scale reliability by calculating Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Results of the scale reliability measures indicated a high coefficient alpha for the three factors as listed: (a) school counselor characteristics (.924), (b) district conditions (.936), and (c) school counseling program supports (.927) (McGannon, 2007). These results supported the instruments' internal consistency.

According to McGannon (2007), test-retest reliability was not conducted because there were very few demographic questions were asked in the survey and there was no format to identify respondents in a manner. The only reliability evidence that currently exists was provided by estimating the internal consistency of the three factors using coefficient alpha (McGannon, 2007). The *Readiness Survey* remained with the seven original subscales.

Data Collection

This researcher utilized a combination of a mail and Web-based survey formats. Given the limited time the selected professionals have for survey completion, the main idea was to create a format of data collection that would yield responses and be user-friendly. Finally, a

discussion of the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* and the *Readiness Survey* will give an understanding of the use of these instruments.

Survey Responses

The standards for acceptable return rates are shaped by how many responses a researcher can get as much as by how many she or he should get (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003). Literature points to two factors that influence the expected rate of return: the type of case or subject being investigated and the method of data collection (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003). The type of case can be defined as the individuals, and the method of collecting data can be referred as to how those surveyed received and submitted their responses.

Choice of method in a given project often hinges on the tradeoff between costs and likely return rates (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003). Mailed questionnaires are the least expensive method, but they typically yield the lowest return rates (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003). However mailed questionnaires allow researchers to obtain a large amount of information for a large sample, give respondents time to consider their answers, potentially allow respondents to remain anonymous, help reduce interviewer bias, and have geographic flexibility. Mailed questionnaires remain a common choice for researchers despite the variety of technological options that have become available (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003).

As for return rates, according to Hager, mail surveys adhere to the approach outlined by Dillman (2000). The method is based on a theory in which survey researchers receive survey responses in exchange for information, monetary and nonmonetary incentives, or goodwill (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003). Dillman also outlined a process of mailings to include pre-contacts, attractive career letters, carefully constructed surveys, follow-ups with

postcards or reminder letters, personal contacts and grateful acknowledgement of the receipt of completed surveys (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003).

This general method has become the standard for the survey research field and has spurred a field of research into how factors such as the nature and timing of incentives, the length and complexity of questionnaires, and the number of follow-ups can influence the return rates (Hager, Wilson, Pollack, & Rooney, 2003). Kanuk and Berenson (1975) concluded that, despite the large number of techniques, there is no strong empirical evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of any technique other than the use of monetary incentives and follow-up contacts (Yu & Cooper, 1983).

An alternate method of survey data collection is the use of web formats. Web surveys provide many more options for the designer. With the graphic and multimedia capabilities of the World Wide Web, the survey researcher has an almost unlimited set of design choices in developing a survey (Couper, 2000). Research on self-administered surveys suggests that the design of an instrument may be extremely important in obtaining unbiased answers from respondents (Couper, 2000). In web surveys, question texts can be supplemented with a variety of visual elements including color, graphs, and interactive features that provide immediate feedback on actions taken by the respondent (Couper, 2000).

According to Dillman, Tortora and Bowker (1998) there are principles of constructing respondent-friendly web questionnaires. These principles focus on the features of questionnaire designs that encourage respondents to connect and respond to such surveys (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker 1998). Dillman, Tortora and Bowker included the factors of source of errors as defined by coverage error (those with emails and those without); sampling error; measurement error (partial and completed surveys); and non respondent error.

Researchers indicated that to reduce the sampling error, increasing the number of respondents was important (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker 1998). Couper (2000) stated that coverage error was presently the biggest threat to making inferences from web surveys. In addition, Couper identified the challenges of sampling error which arises during the process of selecting a sample from the frame population.

Dillman, Tortora, and Bowker stated that the purpose of survey design was to be user-friendly for participants to respond. Questionnaires that were difficult to understand, took excessive time for people to figure out, embarrassed people, and were uninteresting to complete, were expected to decrease people's likelihood of responding to web questionnaires (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 1998).

Other than addressing the format of the web survey, Dillman, Tortora, and Bowker (1998) identified that it was important to note that of the population with access to email means must be found to ensure a known probability of selection for potential respondents. As a challenge, researchers must acknowledge that computer literacy varies greatly among people, as does the processing power of their computers (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker 1998). Respondent friendly designs must also take into account the logic of how computers operate, and how people expect questionnaires to operate (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 1998).

Couper (2000) mentioned that a decrease in survey responses could be attributed to technical difficulties when interacting with an Internet survey. Potential respondents should be directed to a web site either entered manually or by clicking on a link so that the respondent knows he or she has arrived in the right place (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 1998). As a component of design, an introductory message provided respondents with a reason for the survey which encouraged them to respond (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 1998).

After guiding respondents, Dillman, Tortora & Bowker (1998) stated that researchers should begin the questionnaires with a question that is fully visible on the first screen; preset each question in a conventional format; limit line length; provide specific instructions on how to take each necessary computer action; construct questionnaires so they will scroll from question to question; and avoid question structures such as check all that apply (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 1998).

Although the design of web surveys is important, Couper (2000) stated that the value of surveys that could be done on the web are limited, as with other approaches, by the willingness of people to do them. Web surveys must be done in the context of its intended purpose and claims made (Couper, 2000).

Understanding the reason for completing a survey included knowing how responses would be utilized. Couper (2000) stated that a possibility for reduced survey completions could be attributed to respondent's concerns about confidentiality. Some organizations keep a record of incoming mail and if the topic is particularly sensitive, respondents might be discouraged from completing the survey (Couper, 2000).

While electronic surveys are increasingly popular as a research method, their potential compared to mail surveys has only recently begun to be assessed. Researchers must consider limitations regarding response rates such as the timing of email and follow-up (Dillman, 1978). Additionally, ethical concerns, unsolicited email invading a person's private space (Yun and Trumbo, 2000), and knowledge of technology affect the participants' response rate. However, mail surveys can yield limitations such as non delivery of mail (Yun & Trumbo, 2000). In summary, web surveys as well as mail surveys have shown advantages and limitations, and

further research would be necessary to assist in refining survey techniques and increasing response rates.

Online Survey Procedure

This researcher developed a website as a source of link to the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* and the *Readiness Survey*. Since both surveys were Web-based, to minimize conflict in retyping links, the researcher provided clear directions on how to access the established website, www.nyschoolcounselor.org and connections to the individual surveys. The site was divided into two sections each pertaining to either school counselors or school administrators. A letter containing detailed instructions was mailed to each participant.

The *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* was retyped into www.zoomerang.com, a Web-based survey service development. The content and format of the survey was not altered. Participants were able to identify the level of satisfaction as in the original scale developed by Scarborough (2005). The *Readiness Survey* was linked to the National Research Center for School Counseling Outcomes, where the original authors of the instrument currently practice, located at the University of Massachusetts. All responses to the *Readiness Survey* were compiled electronically and sent to the researcher at the end of each month.

From the returned school counselor surveys, a random sample of 50 school counselors received an email asking which framework: the National Model, the State Model, or a local school district plan was utilized as a basis for the participants' replies to the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* and the *Readiness Survey*. The follow-up question was emailed to school counselors and requested that it be returned by email to an established research email account: wescresearch@aol.com.

Survey Completion Procedure

Participants received a letter of introduction identifying the purpose of the study and the importance of participation. The letter provided participants with instructions on accessing the Website and identified the two surveys that school counselors would have to complete. A code beginning with the letters “SC” was given to school counselors and “AD” was given to school administrators to enter in the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale*, and the *Readiness Survey* for data analysis purposes as well as to match returned surveys with consent forms, and to prevent the researcher from viewing names of respondents. Respondents could not redo the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* or the *Readiness Survey* once completed.

Participants also received a letter of consent to be signed and returned to a professor at Western Connecticut State University. A stamped return envelope was provided for participants. The researcher did not have access to letters of consent. Participants were thanked in advance. A list of codes was sent to the researcher to be able to compare the list of consents with that of completed surveys.

A follow-up letter was sent to participants who had not completed the surveys two weeks after the initial letters were mailed. For school counselors, incentives were offered to obtain an increased response rate. Incentives included a set of books for the school counselors’ library. This researcher also utilized the different association’s listservs to remind participants who are members to complete the surveys and for them to remind their school administrators to respond.

The use of personal emails for school administrators and school counselors was also used as a reminder. Participants received emails from the researcher, under a newly created email address designated for research only, reminding them of the importance of the research as well as the completion of the surveys. Consent forms and instructions were attached to the emails.

Data Analysis

This researcher utilized different methods of analyzing the results of the surveys. A regression procedure was performed with the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* while a MANOVA was conducted with the *Readiness Survey*.

The *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* was utilized in the first research question to obtain information about school counselors' preferred versus actual activities, as determined by the State Model, through a rating scale. This researcher utilized the subscales (community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources) from the *Readiness Survey*; as well as the rating of the actual activities performed from the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* as predictors. The focus was to examine the degree in which these variables influenced the school counselor's ratings of the preferred activities to perform.

For research question two, the responses from the *Readiness Survey* were analyzed utilizing the MANOVA. The dependent variable was the *Readiness Survey* and the independent variable, with two levels, was the category of school personnel (school counselors and school administrators). A multiple analysis of variance between responses from school counselors and school administrators was reviewed to determine the existence of mean difference for each subscale.

Statement of Ethics and Confidentiality

Permission to participate in this study was sought from all school counselors and school administrators selected for the sample. Informed consent forms were sent to participants selected for the study, and each participant was assigned a confidential code. Signed forms were returned to a professor at Western Connecticut State University. The codes were used to match returned consent forms with viable surveys.

CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study investigated actual and desired school counseling practices as well as readiness of school counselors, and administrators towards the implementation of the New York State Model. The two research questions addressed in this study were:

1. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - a. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - b. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
 - c. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to

implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

- d. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
- e. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

- 2. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York Model in their districts?

The presentation of results will be introduced with the description of data collected from the instruments. This will be followed by analyzing responses to the questions.

Description of the data

This study utilized interval data from responses to the *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS)* and the *Readiness Survey*. The *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* utilized a 5-point response format that identified the school counselors' responses about actual and

preferred performance activities in the subscales of counseling, consultation, coordination, curriculum and non-guidance activities. Only school counselors completed this survey. The researcher invited 900 school counselors to participate, and 136 surveys were returned indicating a 15% return rate for school counselors completing the *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* (Scarborough, 2005).

The *Readiness Survey* utilized a 3-point Likert scale to identify school counselors' and school administrators' perceptions about the readiness of personnel in local school districts to implement the New York Model. The measured subscales for the *Readiness Survey* included community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources. The researcher invited 900 school counselors and 600 school administrators to participate. From the sample, 273 surveys were returned by school counselors, and 98 surveys were returned by school administrators indicating a 30% return rate for school counselors and 16% return rate for school administrators completing the *Readiness Survey* (Carey et al., 2005).

Data Preparation

The individual cases, and the scores for the *School Counseling Activity Scale* and the *Readiness Survey* were carefully reviewed. Each numerical value was examined for its appropriateness (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006).

The School Counseling Activity Rating Scale did not require any additional coding because only school counselors completed this survey. For the *Readiness Survey*, the researcher designated a code of "1" for the school administrators, and a code of "2" for the school counselors. The researcher utilized the code for analysis of data for the *Readiness Survey*.

A visual review of the assigned codes for the surveys allowed the researcher to eliminate duplicate responses that entered the data set because respondents sent their completed online surveys more than once. The researcher identified school counselors with a code beginning with the letters “SC” and administrators with a code beginning with the letters “AD.” Partially completed surveys were eliminated from the analysis of data as part of the screening process. Additional visual review showed that responses matched questions from the survey with no missing values

Outliers and Data Normality

An evaluation of univariate and multivariate outliers was conducted for further assessment of data normality and the possibility of conducting any needed transformations using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, 1968). An analysis of stem and leaf plots for the univariate variables were conducted based on the responses from the *School Counselors Activity Rating Scale* forms.

After reviewing summaries for possible outliers, results indicated that skewness and kurtosis of all variables were within the ± 1 range of data normality (Meyer, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). Each subscale stem and leaf plot showed a normal distribution of data as well as place values.

Following the univariate analysis, a multivariate analysis for outliers was conducted on SPSS (Nie, 1968). Multivariate outliers were screened by computing the Mahalanobis distance for each of the *Readiness Survey* variables using SPSS. Mahalanobis distance was measured with a chi-square criterion of 3 degrees of freedom at $p < .05$ confidence level (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). For this study, all subscale Mahalanobis distance results exceeded the chi-square measure of 7.815 and were deemed appropriate.

A determination of normality of data was established by using SPSS. Tables 9, 10 and 11 provide the results of the normality of data through skewness and kurtosis (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006). The column headings in each of the tables represent the subscales of the surveys utilized. Results for skewness and kurtosis for all subscales were within the range of ± 1 as listed on Tables 9, 10, and 11 (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006). The data was deemed to be acceptable for the purpose of this study.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics: School Counselor Activity Rating Scale for Actual Activities Reported by School Counselors

	Counseling	Consultation	Curriculum	Coordination	Non-Guidance
Mean	1.21	1.18	.97	1.02	1.46
Std. Deviation	.40	.44	.63	.52	.42
Skeweness	-.03	-.31	.09	.20	-.64
Kurtosis	-.55	.32	-.88	-.97	-.20
Minimum	.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Maximum	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

Note: N = 136

There were no missing cases.

The standard error of skeweness for all subscales was 0.208.

The standard error of kurtosis for all subscales was 0.413.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics: School Counselor Activity Rating Scale for Preferred Activities Reported by School Counselors

	Counseling	Consultation	Curriculum	Coordination	Non-Guidance
Mean	.03	.74	3.32	3.56	2.35
Std. Deviation	.39	.54	.61	.60	.96
Skeweness	-.49	.45	.27	-.06	.69
Kurtosis	-.05	-.66	-.44	-.66	-.70
Minimum	.15	.00	2.00	2.14	1.00
Maximum	2.00	2.00	4.90	4.86	5.00

Note: N = 136

There were no missing cases.

The standard error of skeweness for all subscales was 0.208.

The standard error of kurtosis for all subscales was 0.413.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics: Readiness Survey Reported by School Counselors and School Administrators

	Community Support	Leadership	Guidance Curriculum	Staff Time	School Counselors' Beliefs	School Counselors' Skills'	District Resources
Mean	1.16	1.24	.93	1.03	1.46	1.36	.81
Std. Deviation	.44	.42	.44	.64	.53	.43	.41
Skeweness	-.14	-.22	.09	.08	-.74	-.51	.36
Kurtosis	-.52	-.69	-1.04	-.82	.08	-.12	-.78
Minimum	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.15	.00
Maximum	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

Note: N = 371

There were no missing cases.

The standard error of skeweness for all subscales was 0.127.

The standard error of kurtosis for all subscales was 0.253.

Analysis of the Data

This section reviewed the descriptive statistics and the results for each of the research questions of the study. The tables in the following section begin with a presentation of the demographics of participants with respect to both surveys. For research question one, an initial correlation between actual and preferred school counselor activities was examined as an overview of the degree of relationship between both variables used in the statistical analysis. The results are presented in an intercorrelation matrix (Table 14) for each of the criterion subscales. For research question two, results of a multivariate analysis of variance from school counselors and school administrators are presented.

School Counselors' Activities and Readiness to Implement the New York State Model

Research Question 1: To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

The subscales for preferred and actual performances were each defined as counseling, coordination, curriculum, consultation and non-guidance as per the *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale*. The readiness for implementation was defined by the subscales of community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources obtained by the responses to the *Readiness Survey*.

Descriptive Statistics. Table 12 identifies the demographics of participating school counselors. Table 13 provides the means and standard deviations for the variables of both surveys used in this study. Variables were defined as actual and preferred school counselor activities and school counselors' readiness components regarding the integration of the State Model. The subscales for each of the preferred activities served as the five different criterion variables for the study. The actual activities and readiness characteristics (community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources) were the predictor variables. Means for responses ranged from the lowest score for district resources ($M = 0.73$, $SD = 0.53$) to the highest mean score in coordination ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.59$)

Table 12

Demographics of School Counselors (N = 136)

School Counselors	n	%
Gender		
Male	96	71
Female	40	29
Total	136	100
Level		
Elementary	17	13
Middle	26	19
Secondary	71	52
Building	16	12
District	6	4
Total	136	100

Note: Building is defined as school counselors who have multiple grades in their caseload in a given building. District is defined as school counselors who have caseloads in different buildings.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Variables (N = 136)

	Mean	Standard Deviation
School Counseling Activity Rating Scale^a		
Preferred Activity		
Counseling	1.39	.39
Consultation	.74	.54
Curriculum	3.33	.61
Coordination	3.56	.59
Non-guidance	2.35	.96
Actual Activity		
Counseling	1.21	.39
Consultation	1.19	.44
Curriculum	.97	.63
Coordination	1.02	.52
Non-Guidance	1.46	.42

Coding for Activities = Actual (A); Preferred (P)

^a Responses were based on a 5-point scale.

Table 13 (continued)

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Variables (N = 136)

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Readiness Survey ^b		
Community Support	1.20	.40
Leadership	1.18	.44
Guidance Curriculum	.95	.60
Staff Time	1.01	.53
School Counselors' Beliefs	1.45	.42
School Counselors' Skills	1.39	.39
District Resources	.73	.53

^b Responses were based on a 3-point scale.

The researcher sent a clarification question to all participating school counselors asking them to identify the framework they used as a reference for their survey responses. The intent of the follow-up question was to verify if respondents had utilized the NYS Model as the basis for the responses as indicated in the letter of instruction for survey completion. The options were the ASCA National Model, the New York State Model, or a local district guidance plan. Only 50 of the 136 participants responded to the question. The remainder of the participants did not respond to the follow-up question sent in an email by this researcher after the receipt of the surveys. Results showed that 26 school counselors utilized the local districts' guidance plan; 18 referred to the New York State Model; and 6 used the ASCA National Model as a basis for their answers. According to New York State Education Department's regulations, all district plans should be based on a locally developed framework, not the National or State Model.

Correlation of Actual and Preferred School Counselor Activities. An initial correlation was conducted to analyze the degree of relationship between actual school counselor activities and preferred performance of school counselors as delineated by the New York State Model. All subscales of actual and preferred school counselors were correlated. Table 14 shows the results from the correlation.

Table 14

Intercorrelation Matrix Between School Counselor Activities and School Counselors' Readiness

Actual Activity	SCARS: Actual (1-5)				SCARS: Preferred (6-10)				
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Counseling	.618***	.513***	.583***	.397***	.453***	.463***	.456***	.276**	.332***
2. Consultation		.521***	.559***	.318***	.385***	.592***	.166*	.049	.184*
3. Curriculum			.596***	.384***	.516***	.591***	.191*	.111	.315***
4. Coordination				.333***	.383***	.405***	.289***	.156*	.341***
5. Non-Guidance					.630***	.312***	.231**	.038	.192*
Preferred Activity									
6. Counseling						.435***	.187*	.075	.150*
7. Consultation							.020	-.007	.150*
8. Curriculum								.535***	.608***
9. Coordination									.420***
10. Non-Guidance									

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 14 (continued)

Intercorrelation Matrix Between School Counselor Activities and School Counselors' Readiness

Readiness	SCARS: Actual Activity				
	1	2	3	4	5
11. Community Support	.411***	.246**	.356***	.360***	.213***
12. Leadership	.114	.042	.010	-.144*	.069
13. Guidance Curriculum	.313***	.149*	.107	.109	.162*
14. Staff Time	.187*	.043	.065	.031	.105
15. School Counselors' Beliefs	.196*	.151*	.086	.027	.116
16. School Counselors' Skills	.115	-.009	-.035	.026	.096
17. District Resources	.174*	.222**	.166*	.135	.221**

SCARS: School Counseling Activity Rating Scale

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 14 (continued)

Intercorrelation Matrix Between School Counselor Activities and School Counselors' Readiness

	SCARS: Preferred				
Readiness	6	7	8	9	10
11. Community Support	.270**	.322***	.416***	.453***	.617***
12. Leadership	.061	.065	-.005	.141	-.010
13. Guidance Curriculum	.209**	.007	.553***	.225**	.179*
14. Staff Time	.141	-.001	.410***	.647***	.219**
15. School Counselors' Beliefs	.066	.059	.427***	.322***	.560***
16. School Counselors' Skills	.050	-.015	.274**	.281***	.319***
17. District Resources	.231**	.118	.103	.120	.033

SCARS: School Counseling Activity Rating Scale

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 14 (continued)

Intercorrelation Matrix Between Readiness Subscales

Readiness	Readiness						
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
11. Community Support		.225*	.094	.240**	.282***	.443***	.197*
12. Leadership			.121	.088	-.074	.013	.672***
13. Guidance Curriculum				.603***	.441***	.353***	.264**
14. Staff Time					.452***	.447***	.283***
15. School Counselors' Beliefs						.618***	.055
16. School Counselors' Skills							.123
17. District Resources							

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Multiple Regression Analysis. Data were analyzed utilizing a multiple regression to examine to what extent actual activities, and readiness characteristics, were predictors in the variance in preferred performance of school counselors. The data were entered into SPSS (Nie, 1968) in a hierarchical approach to explore a predictive model.

Responses corresponding to community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources were entered as the first block. Responses corresponding to actual counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance activities were entered as the second block. An initial correlation was conducted for an analysis of the degree of relationship between the variables prior to entering the information in a two-block, stepwise regression. Table 14 provides the results of the correlation of predictor variables at the $p < .01$ confidence level.

Each of the preferred activities' subscales (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance) was established as individual constants. Results of the regression reported included the standardized betas (b), standard errors in beta ($Se b$), and the significance of the variable (β), with probability levels of $p < .01$ with an alpha level of .0034. These values are listed in Tables 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, one table for each of the five regression procedures.

Multiple regressions were run for the following research questions:

Research Question 1: To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model; and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged? Each of the subscales for preferred activities (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance activities) served as criterion variables for five separate regression procedures.

Preferred Counseling. Preferred counseling is defined as school counselor activities that include small group discussions, and advisement regarding personal and social issues. The first equation sought to predict the variation in scores for preferred counseling activities given the set of subscales from the readiness indicators and the actual counseling activities. Therefore, the following subquestion was posed: to what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

Table 15

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Counseling Activities (N=136)^a

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	b	Se b	Beta	t	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.737	.284		2.59		.010**
Block 1: Readiness	.42	.13	.37					3.97	.001***
Community Support				.196	.054	.342	3.66		.000***
District Resources				.216	.081	.304	2.67		.009**
Guidance Curriculum				.163	.073	.237	2.24		.027*
Leadership				-.155	.071	-.245	-2.18		.031*
School Counselors' Skills				-.112	.073	-.171	-1.53		.128
Staff Time				-.041	.082	-.055	-.503		.616
School Counselors' Beliefs				-.019	.053	-.039	-.358		.721

Research Question 1.a. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 15 (continued)

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Counseling Activities (N=136)^a

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	b	Se b	Beta	t	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.282	.239		1.18		.240
Block2 : Actual Activities	.71	.47	.29					10.88	.000***
Non-Guidance				.441	.068	.466	6.50		.000***
Curriculum				.164	.055	.260	3.00		.003**
Counseling				.103	.097	.104	1.06		.290
Coordination				-.059	.074	-.079	-.800		.425
Consultation				.040	.081	.044	.498		.619

Research Question 1.a. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

In predicting preferred counseling activities, results indicated that the set of variables for block 1 and 2 significantly predicted the variation in scores ($R^2 = .47$, $F_{5,123} = 10.88$, $p \leq .001$). Significant variables in block 1 were community support ($t(128) = 3.66$, $p \leq .001$), district resources ($t(128) = 2.67$, $p = .009$), guidance curriculum ($t(128) = 2.24$, $p = .027$), and leadership ($t(128) = -2.18$, $p = .031$). Significant variables in block 2 were actual non-guidance activity ($t(123) = 6.50$, $p \leq .001$) and actual curriculum ($t(123) = 3.00$, $p = .003$). A comparison of the means reported by school counselors indicated that when actual counseling ($M = 1.20$, $SD = .39$) is considered as part of their roles, counseling ($M = 1.39$, $SD = .39$) had a small increase in preference as an activity.

Preferred Consultation. Preferred consultation is defined as school counselor activities that include the coordination of referrals for students and/or families to community, or education professionals, as well as assistance in identifying exceptional or special education children. The second equation sought to predict the variation in scores for preferred consultation activities given the set of subscales from the readiness indicators and the actual counseling activities. Therefore, the following subquestion was posed: to what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

Table 16

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Consultation Activities (N=136)^b

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	<i>b</i>	Se <i>b</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.501	.390		1.29		.201
Block 1: Readiness	.397	.157	.505					3.41	.002**
Community Support				.328	.074	.421	4.45		.000***
School Counselors' Skills				-.229	.100	-.258	-2.27		.024*
District Resources				.154	.111	.160	1.38		.169
Leadership				-.105	.097	-.123	-1.08		.282
School Counselors' Beliefs				.071	.073	.107	.966		.336
Staff Time				-.096	.112	-.095	-.859		.392
Guidance Curriculum				.039	.100	.041	.386		.700

Research Question 1.b. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 16 (continued)

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Consultation Activities (N=136)^b

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	<i>b</i>	<i>Se b</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	F	Sig.
(Constant)				-.229	145		-.165		.869
Block 2: Actual Activities	.702	.493	.399					9.98	.000***
Consultation				.508	.112	.414	4.54		.000***
Curriculum				.324	.076	.414	4.28		.000***
Coordination				-.118	.103	-.116	-1.15		.253
Non-Guidance				.077	.094	.060	.818		.415
Counseling				.071	.134	.053	.532		.596

Research Question 1.b. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

In predicting preferred consultation activities, results indicated that the set of variables for block 1 and 2 significantly predicted the variation in scores ($R^2 = .49$, $F_{5,123} = 9.98$, $p \leq .001$). Significant variables in block 1 were community support ($t(128) = 4.45$, $p \leq .001$), and school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -2.27$, $p = .024$). Significant variables in block 2 were actual consultation ($t(123) = 4.54$, $p \leq .001$) and actual curriculum activity ($t(123) = 4.28$, $p \leq .001$). A comparison of the means reported by school counselors indicated that when actual consultation ($M = 1.18$, $SD = .43$) is considered as part of their roles, consultation ($M = .74$, $SD = .54$) decreased in preference as an activity.

Preferred Curriculum. Preferred curriculum is defined as school counselor activities that include conducting classroom lessons on various personal and/or social traits such as responsibility, respect. The third equation sought to predict the variation in scores for preferred curriculum activities given the set of subscales from the readiness indicators and the actual counseling activities. Therefore, the following subquestion was posed: to what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

Table 17

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Curriculum Activities (N=136)^c

Values entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	b	Se b	Beta	t	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.800	.340		2.35		.020*
Block 1: Readiness	.706	.471	.441					18.15	.000***
Staff Time				.539	.087	.511	6.18		.000***
Community Support				.390	.064	.443	6.07		.000***
School Counselors' Skills				-.235	.088	-.235	-2.68		.008**
School Counselors' Beliefs				.150	.064	.200	2.34		.021*
Guidance Curriculum				-.137	.085	-.141	-1.61		.109
Leadership				.030	.098	.027	.311		.756
District Resources				.016	.097	-.014	-.161		.873

Research Question 1.c. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 17 (continued)

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Curriculum Activities (N=136)^c

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	<i>b</i>	<i>Se b</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.860	.351		2.45		.016**
Block 2: Actual Activities	.743	.509	.425					12.65	.000***
Counseling				.401	.143	.264	2.81		.006**
Consultation				-.269	.119	-.194	-2.27		.025*
Curriculum				-.136	.080	-.141	-.168		.094
Coordination				.113	.109	.097	1.03		.305
Non-Guidance				.082	.100	.056	.822		.413

Research Question 1.c. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

In predicting preferred curriculum activities, results indicated that the set of variables for block 1 significantly predicted the variation in scores ($R^2 = .49$, $F_{5,123} = 18.15$, $p \leq .001$). Significant variables in block 1 were staff time ($t(128) = 6.18$, $p \leq .001$), community support ($t(128) = 6.07$, $p \leq .001$), school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -2.68$, $p = .008$), and school counselors' beliefs ($t(128) = 2.34$, $p = .021$). Significant variables in block 2 were actual counseling ($t(123) = 2.81$, $p < .01$) and actual consultation activity ($t(123) = -2.27$, $p = .025$). A comparison of the means reported by school counselors indicated that when actual curriculum ($M = .97$, $SD = .63$) is considered as part of their roles, curriculum ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .61$) increased in preference as an activity.

Preferred Coordination. Preferred coordination is defined as school counselor activities that include informing teachers and administrators about the role, programs, and intervention skills of the school counselor within the context of the school environment. The fourth equation sought to predict the variation in scores for preferred coordination activities given the set of subscales from the readiness indicators and the actual counseling activities. Therefore, the following subquestion was posed: to what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

Table 18

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Coordination Activities (N=136)^d

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	<i>b</i>	<i>Se b</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.655	.303		2.16		.033*
Block 1: Readiness	.767	.566	.393					26.20	.000***
Staff Time				.880	.087	.776	10.1		.000***
Community Support				.294	.057	.339	5.13		.000***
Guidance Curriculum				-.235	.078	-.226	-3.01		.003**
District Resources				-.223	.087	-.208	-2.58		.011*
School Counselors' Skills				-.179	.078	-.181	-2.30		.024*
Leadership				.166	.076	.174	2.20		.030*
School Counselors' Beliefs				.082	.057	.111	1.44		.154

Research Question 1.d. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 18 (continued)

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Coordination Activities (N=136)^d

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	b	Se b	Beta	t	F	Sig.
(Constant)				.712	.318		2.24		.027*
Block 2: Actual Activities	.789	.586	.384					16.96	.000***
Coordination				.207	.099	.181	2.09		.039*
Counseling				.228	.129	.152	1.77		.080
Consultation				-.169	.107	-.124	-1.57		.118
Non-Guidance				-.108	.090	-.075	-1.19		.236
Curriculum				-.083	.073	-.087	-1.13		.258

Research Question 1.d. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

In predicting preferred coordination activities, results indicated that the set of variables for block 1 significantly predicted the variation in scores ($R^2 = .59$, $F_{5,123} = 26.20$, $p < .001$). Significant variables in block 1 were staff time ($t(128) = 10.1$, $p \leq .001$), community support ($t(128) = 5.13$, $p \leq .001$), guidance curriculum ($t(128) = -3.01$, $p = .003$), district resources ($t(128) = -2.58$, $p = .011$), school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -2.30$, $p = .024$), and leadership ($t(128) = 2.20$, $p = .030$). A significant variable in block 2 was actual coordination ($t(123) = 2.09$, $p = .039$). A comparison of the means reported by school counselors indicated that when actual coordination ($M = 1.02$, $SD = .52$) is considered as part of their roles, coordination ($M = 3.55$, $SD = .59$) increased in preference as an activity.

Preferred Non-guidance. Preferred non-guidance is defined as school counselor activities that include the enrollment or withdrawal of students from school, school counselors' participation on school committees, or substitute teaching. The fifth equation sought to predict the variation in scores for preferred non-guidance activities given the set of subscales from the readiness indicators and the actual counseling activities. Therefore, the following subquestion was posed: to what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

Table 19

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Non-guidance Activities (N=136)^e

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	<i>b</i>	<i>Se b</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	F	Sig.
(Constant)				-.055	.480		-.115		.909
Block 1: Readiness	.776	.581	.608					27.70	.000***
Community Support				.861	.091	.617	9.49		.000***
School Counselors' Beliefs				.687	.090	.577	7.59		.000***
School Counselors' Skills				-.457	.124	-.287	-3.69		.000***
Leadership				-.140	.120	-.091	-1.17		.244
Staff Time				-.112	.138	-.062	-.812		.418
Guidance Curriculum				.032	.123	.019	.260		.796
District Resources				-.019	.137	-.011	-.141		.888

Research Question 1.e. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 19 (continued)

Regression Analysis Results for Variables Predicting Preferred Non-guidance Activities (N=136)^e

Variables entered as blocks	R	Adjusted R ²	SEE	b	Se b	Beta	t	F	Sig.
(Constant)				-.166	.504		-.330		.742
Block 2: Actual Activities	.797	.599	.608					17.84	.000***
Coordination				.416	.157	.226	2.65		.009**
Consultation				-.379	.170	-.172	-2.23		.027*
Non-Guidance				.056	.143	.024	.390		.697
Curriculum				.030	.115	.020	.263		.793
Counseling				-.009	.204	-.004	-.042		.967

Research Question 1.e. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

In predicting preferred non-guidance activities, results indicated that the set of variables for block 1 significantly predicted the variation in scores ($R^2 = .60$, $F_{5,123} = 27.70$, $p \leq .001$). Significant variables in block 1 were community support ($t(128) = 9.49$, $p \leq .001$), school counselors' beliefs ($t(128) = 7.59$, $p \leq .001$), and school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -3.69$, $p \leq .001$). Significant variables in block 2 were actual coordination ($t(123) = 2.65$, $p = .009$) and actual consultation ($t(123) = -2.23$, $p = .027$). A comparison of the means reported by school counselors indicated that when actual non-guidance activity ($M = 1.46$, $SD = .42$) is considered as part of their roles, non-guidance activity ($M = 2.35$, $SD = .42$) increased in preference as an activity.

School Personnel and the Implementation of the New York State Model

Participants. The second research question studied the comparison of means from the responses to the *Readiness Survey* in a multivariate analysis of variance between two groups (school counselors and school administrators). Table 20 identifies the demographics of participants in the survey.

Table 20

Demographics of School Personnel (N = 371)

	School Counselors		School Administrators	
	n = 273		n = 98	
Level	n	%	n	%
Elementary	23	8	6	6
Middle	47	17	11	11
Secondary	133	49	34	35
Building	38	14	35	36
District	32	12	12	12
Total	273	100	98	100
Setting	n	%	n	%
Urban	39	14	15	15
Suburban	147	54	39	40
Rural	87	32	44	45
Total	273	100	98	100

Descriptive Statistics. Table 21 provides the descriptive statistics for the subscales of the *Readiness Survey*. The dependent variables were the subscales of community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources. The independent variable of school personnel had two levels: school administrators, and school counselors.

An examination of group means showed that the school administrators had significantly higher scores on community support, leadership, and staff time in contrast to school counseling in the same district (Table 21). School counselors had a higher mean score on school counselors' beliefs and school counselors' skills in contrast to the school administrators.

Table 21

Descriptive Statistics for Readiness Survey Variables by School Personnel (N = 371)

	School Administrators		School Counselors	
	n = 98		n = 273	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Community Support	1.25	.41	1.13	.42
District Resources	.92	.55	.77	.56
Guidance Curriculum	.85	.65	.95	.64
Leadership	1.39	.43	1.18	.46
School Counselors' Beliefs	1.46	.46	1.47	.42
School Counselors' Skills	1.35	.44	1.37	.40
Staff Time	1.15	.53	.99	.53

Note: These responses are on a 3-point scale where 0 = Like My District; 1 = Somewhat Like My District; and 2 = Not Like My District

A two-group multivariate analysis of variance test (MANOVA) or Hotelling's T^2 was performed on the seven subscales of the *Readiness Survey*. The dependent variables of community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' skills, school counselors' beliefs, and district resources. The use of the MANOVA examined the intercorrelation between dependent variables for each group of independent variables, and controlled for Type I error rate. The MANOVA also identified group differences that may have been unidentified by a univariate analysis (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006).

The use of more than one dependent variable required an examination of the Box's Test of equality to test the assumption of homogeneity. Results (Table 22) indicated that the Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was not significant (Box's $M = 22.88$, $p = .770$). The results indicated that the assumption of homogeneity was met and the matrices were equal. Table 23 shows a statistically significant Barlett's test of sphericity ($p < .001$) with sufficient correlation between the dependent measures to proceed with the MANOVA.

Table 22

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Box's M	22.88
F	.794
df1	28
df2	123096.6
Sig.	.770

Table 23

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Likelihood Ratio	.000
Approx Chi-Square	1388.825
df	27
Sig.	.000

A MANOVA was conducted to evaluate the differences between the two levels of the independent variable on the dependent variables. The Wilk's lambda was used as it is the most reported statistic in social science research (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). Results indicated that there were significant differences in the levels of independent variable as defined by school counselors and school administrators where $F(7, 363) = 5.99, p \leq .001$ (Table 24).

Table 24

		Hypothesis				Partial Eta	
Effect		Value	F	df	Error df	Sig.	Squared
Intercept	Wilk's	.068	707.812	7.000	363.000	.000	.932
	Lambda						
School	Wilk's	.896	5.993	7.000	363.000	.000	.104
Personnel	Lambda						

Equality of Variance. Each subscale of the dependent variable was subsequently tested for Levene's Test of Homogeneity of variance prior to conducting the follow-up procedures for the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The results of the dependent variables were not statistically significant ($p > .05$) indicating equal variances in the groups (Table 25).

Table 25

Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Each Dependent Variable for Follow-Up Analysis

Levene				
	Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Readiness Survey				
Community Support	.307	1	369	.580
District Resources	.180	1	369	.671
Guidance Curriculum	.438	1	369	.509
Leadership	1.21	1	369	.290
School Counselors' Beliefs	.792	1	369	.374
School Counselors' Skills	2.61	1	369	.107
Staff Time	.008	1	369	.931

*Significance at the $p > .05$

Each of the dependent variables was then evaluated separately in the Test of Between-Subjects Effects (Table 26) at the $p \leq .05$ confidence level. Results show that community support, leadership, staff time and district resources had a statistically significant multivariate effect on the independent variables of school personnel (school counselors and school administrators). A review of the group means (Table 21) revealed higher scores for school administrators in leadership ($M = 1.39$, $SE = .429$), community support ($M = 1.25$, $SE = .408$), staff time ($M = 1.15$, $SE = .525$), and district resources ($M = .921$, $SE = .548$) than for school counselors in leadership ($M = 1.18$, $SD = .46$), community support ($M = 1.13$, $SD = .42$), staff time ($M = .99$, $SD = .53$), and district resources ($M = .77$, $SD = .56$).

Table 26

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Leadership	3.119(c)	1	3.12	15.353	.000***	.040
	Staff Time	1.876(e)	1	1.88	6.792	.010*	.018
	Community Support	1.128(b)	1	1.13	6.432	.012*	.017
	District Resources	1.701(h)	1	1.70	5.531	.019*	.015
	Guidance Curriculum	.777(d)	1	.78	13.875	.172	.005
	School Counselors' Skills	.023(g)	1	.02	.136	.712	.000
	School Counselors' Beliefs	.002(f)	1	.00	.010	.919	.000

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Summary

Five multiple regression procedures and a two-group MANOVA or Hotelling's T^2 were conducted for this research. The data were obtained from responses from school counselors and school administrators to the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* and the *Readiness Survey*.

In research question one, the five multiple regression procedures were conducted using each of the subscales of preferred activities as criterion variables, while the predictor were the five subscales of the actual school counseling activities, as well as the seven subscales of the school counselor readiness to implement the New York State Model. Results indicated a significant correlation for preferred school counseling activity subscales of non-guidance and curriculum, as well as the readiness subscale of community support when the independent variable of readiness was entered in a single block. Furthermore, results indicated a significant correlation for preferred school counseling activity subscales of consultation and counseling when the subscales were entered as a set in block 2.

In the second research question, a comparison of survey responses between school personnel was conducted. Results from school counselors and school administrators regarding the readiness of school personnel to implement of the New York Model were examined. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the differences in means between groups. Results indicated that leadership, community support, staff time, and district resources showed a significant multivariate impact based on responses of school personnel. An overview of results and the implications of both research question findings will be presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Chapter 5 will begin with a summary of the first four chapters of this study. Following the summary, this chapter will elaborate on the findings from the statistical analysis in the previous chapter. The limitations section will follow and discuss previously presented issues that have surfaced throughout this study. Finally, the implications section will provide the intent of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Overview of the Study

Throughout history the school counseling profession has been faced with role ambiguity. (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This lack of professional identity has led to a misunderstanding of school counselors' activities as integral aspects of the educational environment (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). As a result, school counseling programs have been viewed as supporting programs instead of being integral components of the learning organization (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Research showed the development of different guidelines in recent history to define the role of school counselors (ASCA, 2003; Education Trust, 2003; Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The development of the National Standards by the American School Counselor Association (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) followed by the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003) provided a framework for school counselors to define their purpose in schools.

At the state level, the New York State School Counselor Association developed the New York State Model (NYSSCA, 2005) to support the ASCA National Model. Although a framework was developed, the absence of school counselor professional role definition remained a problem for New York State school counselors. School counselors' certification requirements

in New York State remained unchanged for many years, leaving local district administrators in control of defining school counselors' professional responsibilities. Furthermore, New York State regulations on school counselors' academic preparation showed a lack of coursework related to the components of the ASCA National Model and the State Model. If school counselors in New York State were to eliminate role ambiguity, then the current place of school counselors in public education should be researched.

Therefore, the researcher designed this study to investigate school counselors' preferred performance, as delineated by the components of the New York National Model, based on school counselors' actual activities, and readiness to implement the State Model in their local districts. In addition, this study examined the difference between school counselors' and school administrators' perceptions with respect to the implementation of the New York State Model.

The participants for this study were school counselors and school administrators representing school districts in New York State who were selected through a stratified sample. School counselors and school administrators were randomly selected from the New York State Basic Educational Data System (NYSED, 2006) database obtained from the New York State Education Department. From the randomly selected group of school counselors (N = 900), 600 school administrators were chosen representing the same district as the participating school counselors.

The researcher sent 900 letters to school counselors, and 600 letters to school administrators in New York State. Follow up e-mails were sent to increase the participation of selected school counselors and school administrators. The researcher had a 15% return rate for school counselors completing the *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* (Scarborough, 2005),

and a 30% return rate for school counselors and 16% return rate for school administrators completing the *Readiness Survey* (Carey et al., 2005).

Possible reasons for the low return rate could be attributed to school counselors' fear of retribution by school administrators upon completion of the surveys. Another possible reason for the low return rate for school counselors could be the awareness of current activities that are inappropriate as immediate feedback is provided by completing the *Readiness Survey*. Finally, low return rates could be attributed to the turnover in school personnel.

The specific research questions addressed were:

1. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
2. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators with respect to their readiness to implement the New York State Comprehensive Model into their districts?

The researcher used the SPSS Version 13.0 (Nies, 1968) as the statistical analysis tool. Frequencies, descriptive statistics of means, and standard deviations were examined for both research questions.

The researcher applied a correlational design with multiple linear regression for research question one to determine the proportion of shared variance using the combination of predictor variables, five subscales of actual activities (counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance) and seven subscales determining readiness (community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district

resources) in relation to the five separate criterion variables for preferred performance for school counselors. The researcher analyzed the regression model and examined the F values in the ANOVA summary tables. A determination of the significance of best fit model was established when F was less than .01 confidence level.

For the second research question, the researcher used a causal comparative design employing a two-group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to determine the differences in mean scores in seven readiness subscales between school counselors and school administrators. The researcher reviewed the ANOVA summary tables for each of the seven indicators (community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources) between groups at the .05 confidence level.

Results and Findings

This section presents the results and findings from the statistical analyses performed in Chapter Four. The results of this study's multiple regression considered the variation in preferred performance of school counselors for each of the subscales. The perceptions of school counselors and school administrators regarding the State Model were analyzed through the results of the MANOVA. A comparison of results to previously discussed issues in the literature review is offered. Finally, further research topics based on the findings of this study are suggested.

Research Question 1: Results and Conclusions

3. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred use of the New York State Model components, be

explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

- a. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred counseling use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
- b. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred consultation use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
- c. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred curriculum use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?
- d. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred coordination use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

- e. To what extent and in what manner can variation in school counselors' reported preferred non-guidance activity use of the New York State Model components, be explained by school counselors' readiness to implement the State Model and actual activities in which school counselors are engaged?

A block entry format was utilized in the analysis of the regression for each subscale. The first block of predictors included seven readiness variables (community support, leadership, guidance curriculum, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources) and the second block of predictors included the five variables reflecting the actual activities of school counselors in counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance. Equations were designed with the belief that school counselors needed to be ready to perform different activities first. This block of subscales was followed by the set of actual activities in order to predict preferred activities of school counselors in counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, and non-guidance.

Preferred Counseling. Preferred counseling is defined as school counselor activities that include small group discussions, and advisement regarding personal and social issues. Findings showed that, when preferred counseling was the dependent variable, and readiness and actual activity subscales were entered as the independent variables into block 2 the equation was, $R^2 = .51$, $F [12,123] = 10.88$, $p \leq .001$. The more school counselors preferred to engage in counseling activities, the more likely they were to identify that local districts should be ready to assist them through the areas of community support ($t (128) = 3.66$, $p \leq .001$), district resources ($t (128) = 2.67$, $p = .009$), guidance curriculum ($t (128) = 2.24$, $p = .027$), and a lower need for leadership ($t (128) = -2.18$, $p = .031$).

In reviewing the subscales of actual activity, results showed that curriculum and non-guidance activity contributed towards the variance in the dependent variable. School counselors who had a higher preference for counseling activities participated in more non-guidance activities ($t(123) = 6.50, p \leq .001$), and indicated more involvement in curricular activities ($t(123) = 3.00, p = .003$).

Preferred Consultation. Preferred consultation is defined as school counselor activities that include the coordination of referrals for students and/or families to community, or education professionals, as well as assistance in identifying exceptional or special education children. When readiness and actual activity subscales were entered as the independent variables the equation was $R^2 = .49, F [12,123] = 9.98, p \leq .001$. Regarding their readiness, school counselors who preferred consultation as part of their role also had a higher need for community support ($t(128) = 4.45, p \leq .001$), and a lower need for school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -2.27, p = .024$).

From the actual activity subscale two indicators contributed significantly to the dependent variable. Actual consultation ($t(123) = 4.54, p \leq .001$) and actual curriculum ($t(123) = 4.28, p \leq .001$) contributed to the variation in preferred consultation. The more school counselors practiced consultation and curriculum, the higher was their preference for consultation.

Preferred Curriculum. Preferred curriculum is defined as school counselor activities that include conducting classroom lessons on various personal and/or social traits such as responsibility, respect. When preferred curriculum was the criterion, readiness indicators resulted in the following equation, $R^2 = .50, F [7,128] = 18.15, p \leq .001$. School counselors who preferred curriculum as part of their role also indicated a high need for staff time ($t(128) = 6.18, p \leq .001$), community support ($t(128) = 6.07, p \leq .001$), and school counselors' beliefs ($t(128) =$

2.34, $p = .021$); however, school counselors rated a lower need for further development of school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -2.69, p < .01$) as a necessity to develop curriculum.

Although the entire set of predictors for actual school counselor activities, when entered as a block, did not show an increase in the contribution to the variance of the dependent variable, two of the subscales, actual counseling and actual consultation showed statistically significant contributions. A review of the results revealed that as school counselor increased their actual counseling activities ($t(123) = 2.81, p = .006$) their preference for curriculum involvement increased. At the same time, while actual consultation activity ($t(123) = -2.27, p = .025$) increased, preference for curriculum involvement decreased.

Preferred Coordination. Preferred coordination is defined as school counselor activities that include informing teachers and administrators about the role, programs, and intervention skills of a school counselor within the context of the school. When preferred coordination was the criterion, readiness indicators resulted in the following: $R^2 = .60, F[7,128] = 26.20, p \leq .001$. School counselors who preferred coordination activities as part of their roles also indicated the need for staff time ($t(128) = 10.1, p \leq .001$), community support ($t(128) = 5.13, p \leq .001$), leadership ($t(128) = 2.20, p = .030$); and did not need guidance curriculum ($t(128) = -3.01, p = .003$), district resources ($t(128) = -2.58, p = .011$), or more school counselors' skills ($t(128) = -2.30, p = .024$) to achieve coordination goals.

Although the independent variables of actual coordination did not have a significant effect when entered as a block, the individual subscale of actual coordination ($t(123) = 2.09, p = .039$) did have a statistically significant contribution to the result. This meant that as school counselors increased their actual coordination activities, their preference for coordination involvement increased.

Preferred non-guidance. Non-guidance activities can be defined as school counselor activities such as the enrollment or withdrawal of students from school, school counselors' participation on school committees, or substitute teaching. When non-guidance activity was the criterion, readiness indicators resulted in the following: $R^2 = .60$, $F [7,128] = 27.70$, $p \leq .001$. School counselors who preferred non-guidance activities as part of their role also had a high need to gain community support ($t (128) = 9.49$, $p \leq .001$), review school counselors' beliefs ($t (128) = 7.59$, $p \leq .001$), and a lower need to develop school counselors' skills ($t (128) = -3.69$, $p \leq .001$).

After the effect of readiness skills were accounted for, the individual subscales of actual coordination ($t (123) = 2.65$, $p = .009$), and actual consultation ($t (123) = -2.23$, $p = .027$) had a significant contribution to the results. This means that as school counselors increased their preference for non-guidance activity, their actual coordination activity increased, while actual consultation decreased.

Research Question 2: Results and Conclusions

A two-group between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the dependent variables of readiness, which included the seven subscales of community support, leadership, staff time, school counselors' beliefs, school counselors' skills, and district resources. The independent variable was school personnel: administrators and counselors.

The main effect for school personnel was significant with a Wilki's Lambda of $F (7,363) = 5.99$, $p \leq .001$. Follow up analysis indicated that there were significant differences between school administrators' and school counselors' perceptions with respect to leadership in the

school, use of staff time by school counselors, the community and schools' support for the school counseling program, and district resources for the school counseling program.

Leadership encompassed the ideas that a comprehensive school counseling program had a school counseling leader who knows the principles of standards based reform (Carey, et al, 2005). Leadership also included the support of the school districts' administrators in allocating resources for a comprehensive school counseling program, and being receptive to redefining school counselors' activities (Carey, et al, 2005). Finally, leadership was defined as school counselors' knowing how to initiate and coordinate systemic change in the school counseling program.

School administrators ($M = 1.39$, $SD = .43$) believed that there was significantly more leadership support for the school counseling program than did the school counselors ($M = 1.18$, $SD = .46$). Remembering that this survey is directing school administrators and school counselors to respond to the components of the New York State Model for school counseling, school counselors did not think they received leadership support from the district administrators to implement the State Model effectively.

Staff time was defined by the percentage of time school counselors spend on activities that directly benefited students, such as counseling, curriculum, and consultation (Carey, et al, 2005). In other words, staff time identified how much time school counselors spent on guidance as well as non-guidance activities.

While school administrators believed that time allocation for school counselors was adequate for implementing the State Model ($M = 1.15$, $SD = .53$), school counselors ($M = .99$, $S = .53$) responded that they did not have appropriate time to implement the components of the

State Model. Results indicated that role ambiguity was related to time spent on non-guidance activities.

This supports Scarborough's (2005) previous research finding that there remains a discrepancy between what is advocated for implementing the State Model and what is actually performed in schools. In addition, Perusse, Goodnough, Donnegan, and Jones (2004) indicated that there is no clear agreement between appropriate and inappropriate tasks for school counselors given that the tasks deemed appropriate by school administrators were considered non-guidance activities.

Community support meant that school district administrators believed the school counseling program is an important component of the students' public education (Carey, et al, 2005). Additionally, community support included the understanding of students, parents and school administrators regarding the benefits of a comprehensive school counseling program (Carey, et al, 2005).

Results indicated that school administrators ($M = 1.25$, $SD = .41$) believed that community and local school support was adequate for school counselors to implement the State Model. Results showed that school counselors ($M = 1.13$, $SD = .42$) had a significantly lower perceptions regarding the amount of community support received to implement the State Model.

Finally, district resources was defined as school administrators supporting school counselors with evaluations based on a set of professional performance standards, such as the ASCA National Standards in School Counseling (ASCA, 1997) as well as providing professional development regarding necessary skills for the implementation of the State Model (Carey, et al, 2005). District resources included the coordination of school counseling activities, by school administrators and school counselors, as defined by the State Model.

Results indicated that school administrators ($M = .92$, $SD = .41$) believed that the local school district's administration provided resources for the implementation of the State Model. School counselors ($M = .77$, $SD = .56$) had a significant lower perception that adequate district resources were available for the implementation of the State Model.

The findings supported previous research by Perusse (2004) in which the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the American School Counseling Association agreed that the success of a school counseling program depended upon the principal's support at the building level. However, findings of this study indicated that either school administrators were not communicating to school counselors that they are providing the resources to support the State Model, or school administrators were not supporting the State Model in a satisfactory way.

The results indicated that there were no significant differences between the perceptions of school administrators and school counselors regarding guidance curriculum, school counselors' beliefs, and school counselors' skills. The indicator of guidance curriculum focused on a school counseling program having a set of learning objectives such as the ASCA National Standards in School Counseling (ASCA, 1997). Both school counselors and school administrators perceived that their local school districts had a set of learning objectives for their school counseling programs.

For the subscales of school counselors' beliefs results indicated that school counselors were considerate of the idea of school counselors being open to change, and supporting the adoption of the State Model. Responses showed that school administrators also supported the importance of change and of the implementation of the State Model.

Regarding their skills, school counselors focused on how school counselors utilized a variety of intervention skills, and how they utilized data for review of program effectiveness.

School counselors' and school administrators' perceptions showed that the school counselors were engaged in different intervention skills, and utilized data for program review.

Implications

The researcher intended to provide the results of this study to New York State school counselors and school administrators, the New York State School Counselor Association, and the New York State Education Department to increase knowledge of factors determining the role of school counselors in this state. In addition, the researcher intended to provide the same stakeholders with an understanding of school counselors' and school administrators' perceptions of the local school districts' readiness in implementing the New York State Model.

In research question one, in order for preferred activities to be accomplished, school counselors indicated that they needed the support of their local community and of their districts to effectively implement the State Model. Since school administrators believed that there was more community support for the school counseling program than did school counselors, this discrepancy should be resolved.

In order to focus on their counseling activities, school counselors identified the need for adequate distribution of district resources. Results also indicated that if they preferred small group counseling activities, they were actually doing more curriculum and non-guidance activities than was expected. This means that school counselors and school administrators should be aware that school counselors need to maintain a balance in these types of activities.

School counselors who preferred consultation, responded that they needed more community support for this activity. Community support was identified as a consistent need and school counselors required this support to maintain all activities.

School counselors who preferred curriculum activity also needed community support, the ability to enact a guidance curriculum, as well as necessary background skills. If they preferred conducting more curriculum activities than counseling work, a balance of these types of activities needs to be maintained.

School counselors indicated that having appropriate community support, staff time allocation, and an adequate guidance curriculum assisted with organizing and communicating information about the school counseling programs. This means that having the correct curriculum, and time to distribute information is needed.

Lastly, school counselors who preferred more non-guidance activities indicated that they had adequate community support, beliefs, and skills. These school counselors also stated that they spent time coordinating these activities.

In summary, a main implication for research question one is that for school counselors to change from having the local school districts define the role of the school counselor, which is sometimes imbalanced across crucial activities to implementing preferred practice that balances school counseling activities, the education of school administrators and local community members on the components of the State Model is needed. Additionally, school counselors showed a need to: be open for change, obtain skills in understanding preferred practice, and implement the State Model.

For research question two, the most significant difference between responses from school administrators and school counselors about the readiness to implement the State Model lies in internal versus external control. School administrators perceived their local school districts to have adequate leadership, community support, staff time allocation, and district resources for the implementation of the State Model. These were viewed as external factors pertaining to a school

district and controlled by the school administration that supported the implementation of the State Model.

School counselors perceived that school counselors' beliefs and skills were appropriate in implementing the State Model. In addition, school counselors believed they had an appropriate guidance curriculum as a component of the implementation of the State Model. These factors were viewed as internal factors pertaining to a school counseling program controlled by the school counselors that supported the implementation of the State Model.

Therefore, for research question two, the overall implication is that for systemic change to occur and school counselor practice to be aligned to the State Model, the control discrepancy between external and internal factors identified by the readiness components needs to be understood by all school personnel if the State Model is to be implemented in the local school district. This means school district administrators need to obtain more information about the State Model to better understand and support the school counselors, as well as provide leadership to implement the State Model in their local districts. Furthermore, school counselors need to better communicate to school administrators the school counselors' responsibilities as defined by the components of the State Model.

In conclusion, results indicated that an understanding of the school counselors' role can be attributed to school counselors' ability to promote information that supports preferred activities based on the State model to school administrators. School counselors have a duty to educate the school administrator of the school counselors' role ambiguity and promote the school counselors' preferred activities within the school community (Ross & Harrington, 2006).

Lambie and Williamson (2004) indicated that school administrators who were educated concerning the role of the school counselor and the National Model, and in this case the State

Model, were better informed about the school counseling program, established clear definition of the counselor's role, and viewed the school counselor as a team member. Furthermore, school counselors who remained visible in their local school districts increased their credibility as an integral member of the school environment (Saginak & Dollarhide, 2006). Finally, by school counselors building relationships through informed school counseling practice, school administrators supported the school counseling preferred activities (Saginak & Dollarhide, 2006).

A second conclusion was that school counselors need to enhance skills through professional development and higher education training to obtain a balance in counseling activities, and increase knowledge of the State Model components. Ford and Nelson (2007) identified that school counselors placed more importance on remaining status quo in school counseling methods and activities, therefore contradicting the new focus of school counseling that incorporated the State Model. Current lack of school counselor skills and knowledge of the State Model is a result of inadequate professional development training opportunities, and the deficiencies in State Model related graduate courses in school counselor preparation programs (House & Sears, 2002).

Lambie and Williamson (2004) stated that if school counselors were adequately trained to practice their professional activities as related to the State Model, such as counseling, consultation, and guidance curriculum, then non-guidance activities such as lunch duty would be reduced or eliminated. Counselor education programs could provide opportunities for school counseling students to learn how to view and deliver the skills defined by the State Model, as well as how to function as an integral member of the school (Amatea & Clark, 2005). If school counselors were advocates for their profession, they would need to acquire or renew professional

skills by attending professional development programs in order to subsequently educate school administrators about the school counselors' role and the comprehensive school counseling program (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research in the area of the New York State Comprehensive Model should include a qualitative process. Qualitative studies of the comparison of school counselors who have implemented the State Model with school counselors who have not would possibly provide information regarding obstacles towards implementation.

A qualitative study utilizing personal interviews with school administrators, teachers, and students would be beneficial in identifying which components of the New York State Model have been supported throughout the integration of the school counseling program into the school organization. Interviews would provide specific information on perceptions of school administrators and school counselors regarding support for school counseling programs and reasons why the State Model is not being implemented appropriately. Additionally, documentation of programmatic data would be examined for evidence of the effectiveness of school counseling programs as defined in the New York State Model.

Future quantitative research in the area of school counseling in New York State should focus on the graduate training programs for school counselors. A comparison of school counselor actual activities between graduates from a Council on Accredited Counseling and other Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and non-CACREP endorsed programs should be conducted. CACREP programs incorporate the components of the National Model into their graduate coursework standards. A comparison of school counselors' actual activities based on

program completion, and New York State Model recommendations of practice could identify the need of higher education program development for school counselors in New York State.

Considering these findings, the researcher suggests that school counselor graduate programs be reviewed to incorporate components of the National Model and State Model such as delivery methods and coordination activities as coursework for school counselor training. The New York State Education Department's certification requirements for school counselors includes obtaining 30 graduate credits from an accredited program that contains the courses required for certification and approved by the Commissioner of Education or an accrediting agency. Currently, graduate programs do not incorporate courses related to the State Model and its components into the graduate coursework requirements. Additionally, school administrators should attend professional training on the State Model along with school counselors as a support for required revisions of the local district guidance plan where the components of the State Model can be utilized as a reference.

While the current study adds to school counseling research in New York State, more studies are needed on the New York State Model to determine its effectiveness as a school counseling program. Additional research would be essential to determine the New York State Model's impact on the school counselors' performance activities once it has been integrated into the district.

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation is the accuracy of information related to school counselors and school administrators employed in the selected districts. Participants change positions in schools and districts over time. The sample utilized was selected from all current school counselors and school administrators; however the provided database contained contact information from a

previous year. The researcher updated contact information for each of the selected participants to reduce this limitation.

The response rate for participants contributed to the limitations of this study. Factors affecting the response rate included the daily events that influence school counselors and school administrators which prevented them from completing the surveys. Participants could have been influenced in their beliefs and attitudes depending on the time of day they completed the survey, and this could have affected the outcome of the survey.

The demographics of responses were another limitation. School counselors representing all geographical locations of New York State were invited to participate. Responses resulted in an overrepresentation of New York States' suburban and rural school counselors in comparison to urban.

Another limitation identified was the use of technology, and possible obstacles to response of surveys. Participants were asked to respond to Web-based surveys, so completion of the surveys could have been affected by participants' not having adequate computers or by using school system computers that could have blocked links to the Websites. Participants were instructed to eliminate barriers to connect with the survey links.

Participants had a one-time opportunity to provide responses to the surveys, and the lack of a second opportunity could have made it difficult to obtain a high response rate since potential respondents may have found it difficult to complete the survey in a timely manner. As a result, the number of respondents representing New York State did not equally represent all counties. Additionally, the unequal grade level representation of respondents could have been a factor in the response results because previous research has indicated perceptions of actual school counselor activities differ by grade levels (Partin, 1990).

Finally, it is important to note that another limitation to this study is the actual knowledge of participants regarding the ASCA National Model, and the New York State Model when they responded to the surveys. While school counselors should have utilized the National of State Model as a reference for completing for survey responses, some participants referred to a local district guidance plan. The researcher did, however, note a reference to the *New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model* on several occasions in several places in the information for participants.

Summary

The initial question was related to the extent and manner in which the predictors in actual activities and readiness varied the results of preferred school counselor performance. A multiple regression analysis of all subscales of preferred activity indicated that school counselors in New York State have not followed preferred practices at their local districts.

Secondly, the difference between school administrators' and school counselors' perceptions with respect to the implementation of the New York State Model in their districts was reviewed. Findings yielded that there were significant differences between groups with respect to community support, leadership, staff time, and district resources.

However, no significant difference was found between groups regarding guidance curriculum, school counselors' beliefs, and school counselors' skills. Indications showed that both groups supported a comprehensive program, as well as the professional skills and abilities of school counselors.

The results supported the fact that school counselors' professional identity development in New York State is a continual process involving external influences, such as the perceptions of school administrators, and internal contributions, as viewed by school counselors' skills and

beliefs (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This study was conducted to provide school counselors and school administrators with an overview of institutional and professional resistance towards change that limits the school counselors' best practice, and the implementation of the New York State Model.

This research study was an exploratory study related to New York State school counselors' professional activities, and the integration of the New York State Model into local school districts. This study supports the needs for future research on the effectiveness of implemented school counseling programs in New York State, in addition to school counselor preparation programs as training programs for the New York State Model.

References

- Amatea, E., & Clark, M (2005). Changing schools, changing counselors: a qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling*,9(1), 16-27.
- American School Counselor Association (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling program*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L.. Principals' perceptions of school counselor roles and satisfaction with school counseling services. *Journal of School Counseling*, 4(14), 1-27.
- Burnham, J. J., & Jackson, M. (2000). School counselors roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(1), 41-49.
- Campbell, C., & Dahir, C.A. (1997). *The national standards for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.
- Carey, J., Harrity, J., & Dimmitt, C.(2005). The development of a self-assessment instrument to measure a school district's readiness to implement the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counselor*, 8(4), 305-312.
- Clark, M. & Stone, C. (2001). School Counselors and principals: Partners in support of academic achievement. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 85, 46-53.
- Costa, A., & Kallick, B. (1995). *Assessment in the learning organization: Shifting the paradigm*. Alexandria: VA. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Council on Systemic Change (2000). Systemic Change in Education. Retrieved October 6, 2007 from <http://ide.ed.psu.edu/change/systemic-change-how.htm>.
- Couper, M. (2000). Web surveys: a review of issues and approaches. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64(4), 464-494.

- Dahir, C. (2004). Supporting a nation of learners: the role of school counseling in educational reform. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82(3), 344-364.
- Dahir, C., & Stone, C.(2007). *School counseling at the crossroads of change*. Alexandria:VA. American Counseling Association.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys--The tailored design method*. New York : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dillman, D., Tortora, R., & Bowker, D. (1998). Principles of constructing web survey. SESRC *Technical Report*, 98-50.
- Dimmitt, C. (2003). Transforming school counseling practice through collaboration and the use of data: A study of academic failure in high school. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(5), 340-349.
- Erford, B. (2003). *Transforming the school counseling profession*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ford, A., & Nelson, J. (2007). Secondary school counselors as educational leaders: shifting perceptions of leadership. *Journal of School Counseling*, 5(19), 1-27.
- Education Trust (1997). *Transformation of the role of the school counselor*. Washington D.C.: Education Trust.
- Gysbers, N.C. (2001). School Guidance and Counseling in the 21st Century: Remember the Past into the Future *Professional School Counseling*, 5, 123-132.
- Gysbers, N.C., & Henderson, P. (1997). *Comprehensive Guidance Programs that work*. Greensboro, NC: ERIC/CASS Publications.

- Gysbers, N.C., & Henderson, P. (2000). *Developing and managing your school guidance program* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N.C., & Henderson, P. (2002). *Implementing comprehensive school guidance programs: critical leadership issues and successful responses*. Greensboro, NC: ERIC/CASS Publications.
- Gysbers, N.C., & Lapan, R. (2003). The implementation and evaluation of comprehensive school guidance programs in the United States: Progress and prospects. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 222-227.
- Hager, M., Wilson, S., Pollak, T., & Rooney, P. (2003). Response rates for mail surveys of nonprofit organizations: a review and empirical test. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector*, 32(252), 252-267.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C., Bryan, J., & Rahill, S. (2002). Importance of the school counseling CACREP standards: School counselors' perceptions. *Professional School Counseling*, 6, 112-119.
- House, R., & Martin, P. (1998). Advocating for better futures for all students: A new vision for school counselors. *Education*, 119, 284-291.
- House, R., & Sears, S. (2002). Preparing school counselors to be leaders and advocates: a critical need in the new millennium. *Theory into Practice*, 41(3), 154-162.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego:CA. EDITS.

- Johnson, C., & Johnson, S. (2003). Results-based guidance: A systems approach to student support programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(3), 180-184.
- Kanuk, L., and L. Berenson (1975). Mail surveys and response rates: A literature review. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12 (4), 440-53.
- Kuranz, M. (2003). Connecting school counseling to the current reality. *Professional School Counseling*, 6(3), ii-iv.
- Lambie, G., & Williamson, L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: a historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(2), 124-131.
- Larsen, K. (1996). Learning Organizations. Retrieved November 10, 2007 from <http://home.nycap.rr.com/klarsen/learningorg/index.html>.
- McGannon, D. (2007). A validity study of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model Readiness Self-Assessment Instrument. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Meyers, L., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: design and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Morrissey, D., & Rotunda, R. (2006). School counselor certification in New York State: Answering the question. *The New York State School Counseling Journal*. Spring 2007, 1-50.
- New York State Education Department (2007). *New York State certification requirements*. Albany, NY: New York State Education Department.

- New York State School Counselor Association (2005). *The New York State K-12 comprehensive school counseling program*. Leicester, NY: Author.
- Partin, R. (1990). School counselors' time: where does it go? *American School Counselor Association School Counselor Magazine*, 20, 274-281.
- Perusse, R., Goodnough, G., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). *Perceptions of school counselors and school principals about the national standards for school counseling programs and the transforming school counseling initiative*. *Professional School Counseling*, 7(3), 152-161.
- Rale, A. D., & Adams, J. R. (2007). An exploration of 21st century school counselors' daily work activities. *Journal of School Counseling*, 5(8), 1-45.
- Ross, D., & Herrington, D. (2006). A comparative study of pre-professional counselor/principal perceptions of the role of the school counselor in public schools. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervisions Journal*, 23(4E), 1-18.
- Ryan, T.A., & Zeran, F.. (1978). *Guidance services: A systems approach to organization and administration*. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.
- Saginak, K. A., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2006). Leadership with administration: Securing administrative support for transforming your program. *Journal of School Counseling*, 4(10), 1-19.
- Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The school counselor activity rating scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 274-283.
- Sears, S. J., & Coy, D. R. (1991). The scope of practice of the secondary school counselor. Ann Arbor, MI: Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED328830)

- Senge, P. (2006) *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Roth, G., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (2000). *Schools that learn*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Statistical Package for Social Sciences for Windows, version 13, Rel. 2005. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- Webster. *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers.
- Whiston, S., & Saxon, T. (1998). A review of school counseling outcome research: implications for practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 76, 412-426.
- Williamson, R. D., Broughton, E., & Hobson, S. (2003). *Shaping the future: Collaborative opportunities for school administrators and school counselors*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Sedona, AZ
- Yu, J., & Cooper, H. (1983). A quantitative review of research design effects on response rates to questionnaires. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(1), 36-44.
- Yun, G.W., & Trumbo, C. (2000). Comparative response to a survey executed by post, e-mail, & web form. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 1-11.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

School Personnel Responses for Readiness Survey

Readiness Survey

Carey, 2005

Subscales	Means	
	School Counselors	School Administrators
A. Community Support		
1 - The school board recognizes that school counseling is an important component of all students' public education	1.29	1.44
2 - The school board believes school counselors can play an influential role in closing the achievement gap	1.18	.98
3 – Parents understand the intended benefits of the school counseling program	1.16	1.36
4 – Parents support the school counseling program	1.33	1.44
5 – Students believe the school counseling program is an important resource	1.42	1.57
6 – Teachers at all levels appreciate the importance of the school counseling program	1.11	1.33
7 – Teachers at all levels collaborate with school counselors in meeting school counseling program goals and objectives	1.04	1.20
8 – School counselors are recognized by teachers for their expertise in issues that have an impact on teaching and learning	1.14	1.17

9 – Parents from all racial/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds believe school counseling can be an important source of help for all children	1.11	1.35
10 – Influential business and community leaders are familiar with and support the school counseling program	.74	.86
11 – Community leaders would be eager to be active participants on a school counseling advisory board	.85	.80
B. Leadership		
1 – The superintendent believes the school counseling program is an essential component of the districts educational mission	1.39	1.60
2 – The superintendent believes the school counseling program can help support students academic achievement	1.44	1.66
3 - The school counseling program has a full time, district level leader who is respected by the superintendent, principals, and school counselors	.82	.93
4 – The superintendent commits resources to support school counseling program development	1.14	1.36
5 - The district's school counseling leader knows the principles of standards-based reform and can communicate the relationships between school counseling activities and student learning outcomes	.94	1.03

6 - The district's school counseling leader knows how to initiate and coordinate systemic change in the school counseling program	.93	.98
7 – The majority of principals believe school counselors ought to be engaged in developmental and preventative activities	1.33	1.62
8 – The majority of principals believe school counselors ought to be involved in helping students achieve academically	1.60	1.72
9 – The majority of principals would be receptive to redefining school counselor activities	1.23	1.48
10 – The majority of principals would be receptive to creating yearly plans with school counselors	1.30	1.59
11 – The majority of principals would be willing to commit resources to alleviate school counselors from routine clerical/administrative duties so they can devote at least 80 % of their time to activities directly benefiting students	.88	1.33

C. Guidance Curriculum

1 – The school counseling program operates from a set of student learning objectives that have measurable student outcomes	.76	.71
2 – The school counseling program operates from a set of student learning objectives that are grouped by grade or grade cluster	1.02	.98

3 – The school counseling program operates from a set of student learning objectives grounded in both the ASCA National Standards and local norms	.97	.85
4 – The school counseling program operates from a set of student learning objectives connected to the district's academic curricula	1.05	.86
<hr/> D. Staffing/Time use <hr/>		
1 – School counselor workload is consistent with needs of an ASCA National Model program	.86	.93
2 – School counselors spend at least 80 % of their time in activities that directly benefit students	1.05	1.24
3 – School counselors spend at least 25% of their time in educational activities that promote student development and prevent problems	1.08	1.24
4 – School counselors spend less than 30 % of their time responding to crises, emergencies, and delivering mental health counseling	1.15	1.19
5 – School counselors do not spend an inordinate amount of time on routine clerical tasks	.80	1.14
<hr/> E. School Counselors' Beliefs and Attitudes <hr/>		
1 – In general, school counselors are open to change	1.44	1.44

2 – In general, school counselors believe it is important to adopt the ASCA National Model	1.21	1.12
3 – In general, school counselors believe they should be responsible for helping all students achieve academically	1.72	1.73
4 – In general, school counselors believe it is important to demonstrate how students are different as a consequence of guidance interventions	1.41	1.52
5 – In general, school counselors believe it is important to collect outcome data in order to be able to modify interventions	1.10	1.22
6 – In general, school counselors agree on a mission statement that establishes the school counseling program as an essential educational program that is designed to serve all students	1.45	1.29
7 – In general, school counselors are willing to devote the time to learn new skills	1.57	1.54
8 – In general, school counselors believe it is important that they serve as advocates for underserved students	1.78	1.80

F. School Counselors' Skills

1 – School counselors are competent in a wide range of interventions	1.68	1.59
--	------	------

2 – School counselors understand the individual and systemic factors associated with poor academic achievement and the achievement gap	1.65	1.58
3 – School counselors are familiar with the principles of standards-based educational reform and can identify the relationships between school counseling activities and student performance	1.29	1.25
4 – School counselors can identify evidence-based interventions that enhance academic achievement, career development and personal/social development	1.29	1.30

APPENDIX B

Definition for SCARS and Readiness Survey

Subscale Definitions for *School Counseling Activity Rating Scale*

Counseling	Counseling activities include conducting small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills; and counseling students regarding personal/family concerns.
Consultation	Consultation activities can be defined as the coordination of referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g., mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment); and assistance in identifying exceptional children (special education).
Curriculum	Curriculum activities include conducting classroom lessons on various personal and/or social traits (e.g., responsibility, respect).
Coordination	Coordination activities include informing teachers and administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of the school, and coordinating orientation activities for students.

Non-Guidance Activities	Non Guidance activities include the enrollment of students in and/or withdraw students from school, school counselor participation on school committees, substitute teaching or coverage of classes, and handling discipline of students.
Scarborough, 2005	
Subscale Definitions for <i>Readiness Survey</i>	
Community Support	The community support indicators are about school and local community members' knowledge and value of school counseling programs (e.g., The school board recognizes that school counseling is an important component of all students' public education).
Leadership	The leadership indicators are related to the availability, knowledge, beliefs, and skills of superintendents, principals, and guidance directors (e.g., The school counseling program has a full-time, district-level guidance program director who is respected by the superintendent, principals, and school counselors).

Guidance Curriculum	<p>The guidance curriculum indicators identify the existence and use of a formal National Standards-based guidance curriculum as well as integration with existing state and district guidance curriculum standards as specified in the National Model (e.g., The school counseling program operates from a set of student learning objectives that have measurable student outcomes).</p>
Staff Time	<p>The staffing time use indicators concern school counselor workloads and time use that is conducive to effective National Model implementation (e.g., School counselors spend at least 80% of their time in activities that directly benefit students).</p>
School Counselors' Beliefs	<p>The school counselors' beliefs indicator cluster reflects the congruity of school counselors' beliefs and attitudes with the goals and modes of practice suggested by the ASCA National Model (e.g., In general, school counselors believe that they should be responsible for helping all students achieve academically).</p>

School Counselor's Skills

The school counselors' skills indicators are concerned with the skills needed by school counselors to enact activities specified in the ASCA National Model delivery, management, and accountability systems (e.g., School counselors can measure how students are different as a consequence of their interventions).

District Resources

The district resources indicators reflect the district's ability to provide resources, materials, and support necessary for ASCA National Model implementation (e.g., The district provides school counselors with regular institutional data reports [disaggregated student achievement, attendance, and school climate data] in user-friendly form in order to facilitate monitoring students and defining problems).

Carey, 2005

APPENDIX C

School Counselor Consent Form

Western Connecticut State University
Doctoral Dissertation Research Study

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL COUNSELORS IN NEW YORK
PLEASE READ

February 2007

Dear School Counselor:

As a doctoral candidate at Western Connecticut State University and the co-author of the New York State Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Model, I am contacting you regarding a dissertation study I am conducting. One of the issues in New York State is to understand the perceptions, attitudes and beliefs of school counselors regarding their practice as well as the integration of the New York State Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Model into the local school district.

The purpose of this research is to obtain information regarding school counselors' perception of actual and preferred practice, in addition to their readiness in implementing the NYS Comprehensive Model. This research will support the transitioning practice of school counselors and school counseling program development in New York State with respect to New York State Education Department's initiatives in:

- 1) School counseling certification;
- 2) Professional development and higher education training for school counselors;
- 3) School reform and the importance of a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program in achieving student success and promoting supportive learning environments;
- 4) The importance of the comprehensive K-12 school counseling program as a framework for the profession.

All information collected during the project will remain confidential and will be used only for research purposes. All subjects will be identified by code number only. No information will be provided for local school district use.

I ask that you participate in this project by signing the enclosed consent form and returning it in the self addressed stamped envelope provided. Instructions for completion of the web based surveys are on the back of this letter. Survey completion will only take about 15-20 minutes.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (914) XXX-XXXX or by email at XXX. Thank you for your interest in assisting me and the school counseling profession in New York State.

Sincerely,

Deborah Hardy
Doctoral Candidate
Co-Author, NYS Comprehensive School Counseling Model

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

I appreciate you taking time to provide information regarding school counselor activity as well as readiness to implement the NYS Comprehensive Model into your district. Your Principal has also been invited to complete the Readiness Survey. *Please take a moment to remind him/her to complete the survey as results will be matched by codes.*

This is a two part survey. *The School Counseling Activity Rating Scale* will measure how school counselors actually versus prefer to spend their time in job-related activities. The *Readiness Survey* will ask for background information and questions related to school setting, school district support and staff time use as related to the NYS Comprehensive Model integration. The purpose of the research is to obtain information of predictors affecting the integration of the NYS Comprehensive Model in local school districts.

ACCESS CODE:

Surveys are web based and can be completed anywhere you have access to the internet. *All surveys must be completed as soon as possible and will remain open until April 7, 2007.* You will need your access code listed below for both surveys as the information remains confidential.

- 1) Please go to www.nyschoolcounselor.com
- 2) Click on the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* link and begin the survey. Please enter your access code at the beginning of the survey in order to proceed with your responses.
- 3) When finished with the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale*, you will be directed to return to the www.nyschoolcounselor.com website to complete the *Readiness Survey*.
- 4) Please complete the *Readiness Survey* and at the end of the survey enter your access code.

You are finished! Thank you.

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent Form – School Counselors

1. Purpose of the Experiment:

The experiment in which you are about to participate is designed for the following purpose:

The purpose of the study is to obtain quantitative data regarding the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators regarding their integration of the New York State Comprehensive Model. Studies on this topic have not been done in New York State and there is a need to support current initiatives related to school counselor's practice. The study will also research what predictors as defined by current practice, in addition to beliefs and attitudes of school counselors and its effects in integrating the comprehensive school counseling model into their local districts. Subjects represent a segment of the school counseling professionals from all genders with a range of age and ethnic background.

The project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, the University's human subjects review committee.

2. Description of Experiment; Outline of hypothesis procedure and precautions to be taken:

Human subjects will be school counselors, both female and male ranging in age from 22 to 65 who are from New York State. Their participation will be short term in format in answering two online surveys, the *School Counselor Rating Scale* and the *Readiness Survey*, with links provided for their completion.

3. Confidentiality of Data; Voluntary Participation:

Please be assured that any information that you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researchers. At no time will your name be reported along with your responses. All data will be reported in group form only.

Please understand that your participation in this research is totally voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty and to remove any of the data that you have contributed. You may receive a final report of the research results in aggregate form upon request to the Project Director.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of and understand the nature and purpose of this study and freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Print Name: _____ Code: SC _____

Project Director: Deborah Hardy_____

APPENDIX D

School Administrator Consent Form

Western Connecticut State University
Doctoral Dissertation Research Study

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
PLEASE READ

February 2007

Dear School Administrator:

As a doctoral candidate at Western Connecticut State University and the co-author of the New York State Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Model, I am contacting you regarding a dissertation study I am conducting. One of the issues in New York State is to understand school administrators' perceptions and beliefs regarding school counselor's practice, availability of resources and school setting information as it relates to the integration of a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program.

This research will support the transitioning practice of school counselors and school counseling program development in New York State with respect to current initiatives in:

- 1) School reform and the importance of a comprehensive K-12 school counseling program in achieving student success, and promoting supportive learning environments;
- 2) The importance of the comprehensive K-12 school counseling program as a framework for the profession that assists in reducing learning barriers and promotes academic, personal and social, as well as career skill development for all students.
- 3) The integration of a school counseling program and practice as a collaborative and essential part of the learning community.

All information collected during the project will remain confidential and will be used only for research purposes. All subjects will be identified by code numbers only. No information will be provided for local school district use.

I ask that you participate in this project by signing the enclosed consent form and returning it in the self addressed stamped envelope provided. Instructions for completion of the web based surveys are on the back of this letter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (914) XXX-XXXX or by email at mailto:XXX. Thank you for your interest in assisting me and the school counseling profession in New York State.

Sincerely,

Deborah Hardy
Doctoral Candidate

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS

The Readiness Survey will ask for background information and questions related to school setting, school district support and staff time use as related to the NYS Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Model integration. The purpose of the research is to obtain information of predictors affecting the integration of the NYS Comprehensive K-12 School Counseling Model in local school districts.

ACCESS CODE:

Surveys are web based and can be completed anywhere you have access to the internet. All surveys must be completed as soon as possible and will remain open until April 7, 2007. You will need your access code listed below for the survey. Codes maintain the information confidential.

- 5) Please go to www.nyschoolcounselor.com
- 6) Click on the Readiness Survey link. Please complete the Readiness Survey and at the end of the survey enter your access code.

You are finished! Thank you for your support in this study.

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent Form – School Administrators

2. Purpose of the Experiment:

The experiment in which you are about to participate is designed for the following purpose:

The purpose of the study is to obtain quantitative data regarding the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators regarding their integration of the New York State Comprehensive Model. Studies on this topic have not been done in New York State and there is a need to support current initiatives related to school counselor’s practice. Subjects represent a segment of the school administration professionals from all genders with a range of age and ethnic background.

The project has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, the University’s human subjects review committee.

2. Description of Experiment; Outline of hypothesis procedure and precautions to be taken:

Human subjects will be school administrators, both female and male ranging in age who are from New York State. Their participation will be short term in format in answering one online survey, the *Readiness Survey*, with links provided for their completion.

4. Confidentiality of Data; Voluntary Participation:

Please be assured that any information that you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researchers. At no time will your name be reported along with your responses. All data will be reported in group form only.

Please understand that your participation in this research is totally voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty and to remove any of the data that you have contributed. You may receive a final report of the research results in aggregate form upon request to the Project Director.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of and understand the nature and purpose of this study and freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Print Name: _____

Code: AD _____

Project Director: __Deborah Hardy_____

APPENDIX E

Human Subject Review Form

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
Human Subjects Research Review Form

Principal Investigator Deborah Hardy
Department Instructional Leadership – Doctoral Programs
Address signed form should be sent to XXXXXX
E-mail XXXXX Phone number: (914) XXXXXXXX

New research project Continuation Modification Teaching

Exempt Review (attach a completed copy of the “Application for Exemption”)

Expedited/Full Review

To complete this form, please follow the instructions in sections A and B.

=====
=
Checklist for attachments:

- Completed Application for Exemption (if claiming exemption)
 - Answers to A1 through A 6
 - Survey or questionnaire
 - Informed consent form
 - Student’s current NIH training certificate
 - Instructor’s current NIH training certificate
 - Chair’s current NIH training certificate
- =====

The department chair and the principal investigator (PI) must sign this form. If the PI is a student, his/her faculty supervisor must also sign.

Assurance of continued compliance with regulations regarding the use of human subjects. I certify that the information provided for this project is accurate. If procedures for obtaining consent of subjects change, or if the risk of physical, psychological, or social injury increases, or if there should arise unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or others, I shall promptly report such changes to the Institutional Review Board. I shall report promptly unanticipated injury of a subject to my department chair and to the Institutional Review Board.

Principal Investigator’s Signature	Date
Faculty Supervisor’s Signature (if PI is a student)	Date
Department Chair’s signature	Date

Committee Action:

_____ Approved through exempt review
review

_____ Approved by full committee

_____ Approved through expedited review

_____ Not approved; clarification or
modification required

IRB Chair's Signature

Date

A. Instructions for completing the HUM-1 Form (attach answers):

1. Describe the characteristics of the subject population (anticipated number, age ranges, gender, ethnic background, and health status).

Subjects are professional school counselors and school administrators in New York State. School counselors range in ages from 24 to late 50's; gender, male and female and include a variety of ethnic backgrounds. The anticipated number of subjects to be surveyed is in the range of 800. Subjects are members of the New York State School Counselor Association and represent the school counselors from elementary, middle, secondary levels, as well as counselor educators and graduate students. School administrators are male and female subjects representing rural, urban and suburban school districts. School administrators will be selected from the same school districts representing school counselor subjects.

2. Explain the rationale for use of special classes of subjects (children, mentally disabled, elderly, prisoners, or others).

The purpose of the study is to obtain quantitative data regarding the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators regarding their integration of the New York State Comprehensive Model. Studies on this topic have not been done in New York State and there is a need to support current initiatives related to school counselor's practice. The study will also research what predictors, as defined by demographics in years of experience and grade level, in addition to beliefs and attitudes of school counselors regarding the comprehensive model affect the integration of the comprehensive model into local districts. Subjects represent a segment of the school counseling professionals from all genders with a range of age and ethnic background.

3. Identify the records or data to be obtained for individually identifiable living human subjects.

Subjects' names and addresses will not be obtained as part of the survey. Subjects will receive a consent form and a letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary participation and the precautions that will be used to protect the confidentiality of information. Surveys will be mailed to a professor at Western Connecticut State University and researcher will not have access to letter of consent.

4. Describe plans for recruitment of subjects and the consent procedures to be followed, or explain why consent is not needed.

School counselors will be recruited through the New York State School Counselor Association's membership database. A letter of approval from the association has been requested. Subjects will receive a letter of explanation of the purpose of the survey requesting consent, the survey and a stamped addressed envelope. Subjects will return the completed survey to a professor at Western Connecticut State University. School administrators will be selected from the New York State Education Department's database of schools. School administrators will be matched from the same school districts represented by the school counselor subjects.

5. Describe safeguards to assure anonymity and voluntary participation of subjects. In the case of student subjects, indicate that failure to participate in or withdrawal from the project will not affect class grade.

Subjects' information is confidential. Subjects will be provided a code to enter when completing the online survey. Results will not be provided to local school districts for use therefore not placing subjects at risk with employers. Researcher will not have access to signed consent forms.

6. "Subject at risk" means any individual who may be exposed to the possibility of injury, including physical, psychological, or social injury, as a consequence of participation as a subject in any research, development, or related activity that departs from the application of those established and accepted methods. [45CFR 46.3(b)]

The study will not provide an environment of physical, psychological or social injury. Results received will remain confidential and will not be provided for use of local school districts. Surveys do not have subject identification.

B. Answer the following (if you answer yes to either question, the protocol requires full review):

- Does your project involve risk of physical injury to subjects?

_____ Yes X No

(If yes, describe the nature of the risk, the justification for undertaking the risk, and the procedures used to obtain the subject's informed consent to take the risk.)

- Does your project involve risk of psychological or social injury to human subjects?

_____ Yes X No

(If yes, describe the nature of the risk, the justification for undertaking the risk, and the procedures used to obtain the subject's informed consent to take the risk.)

NOTE: If participation in the research involves physical, psychological, and/or social risk to the subject, the informed consent form must say so in bold type.

Please send the completed form (if the protocol requires full review, send 12 copies) to: Director of Grant Programs, 321 Warner Hall. If you have questions, call 7-8281.

Protocol # _____

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION

“Use of Human Subjects Application Form” (HUM-1) must be completed and attached.

Principal Investigator: ___ Deborah Hardy _____ Phone: _(914) XXX-XXXX__

Investigator’s department: ___ Instructional Leadership- Doctoral Student
E-mail: XXXXXX.

Address to which you want the signed copy sent: ___XXXXXX _____

Title of Project: Perceptions of School Counselors and School Administrators with respect to the roles of school counselors as they implement the New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model into their districts.

NOTE: If this research is for a student project, your supervising professor must sign below indicating approval for submission of the proposal to the IRB.

WCSU Department/Class: _ EdD – Instructional Leadership Professor’s signature: _____

Sponsoring Agency (if applicable): _____ Western Connecticut State University _____

Project Start Date: ___January 2007_____

- A. See the list of exemption categories attached at the end of this form. Indicate the exempt category/ies into which you believe your project falls: _____
- B. Please check Yes or No for each of the following items:

1. My research deals with sensitive topics (i.e., those dealing with behaviors which, if publicly disclosed, could be damaging to participants or place them at risk of criminal or civil prosecution): _____ YES
__X__ NO

2. My research participants may experience physical, emotional, or mental stress, discomfort, or harm as a consequence of their participation (note: this includes embarrassment):
_____ YES ___X__ NO

3. My research will include a hospitalized, institutionalized, or mentally retarded persons, prisoners, pregnant women/fetuses, or other members of a vulnerable population.
_____ YES ___X__ NO

If you answered “yes” to any of the above questions, **STOP HERE**. Your project does not qualify for exempt status; you should apply for an expedited or full review.

4. My research participants will include children under the age of 18 years.
_____ YES ___X__ NO

5. My research will be conducted in a normal classroom setting and will involved only normal educational practices. _____ YES _____X___ NO

If you answered “yes” to Item 4 and “no” to Item 5, **STOP HERE**. Your project does not qualify for exempt status. You should apply for an expedited or full review.

If you believe your project is eligible for exempt review, please type a brief answer to each of the following:

1. Describe the nature and purpose of your research. Be sure to describe your methods (150 words maximum).

The purpose of the study is to obtain quantitative data regarding the perceptions of school counselors and school administrators regarding their integration of the New York State Comprehensive Model. Studies on this topic have not been done in New York State and there is a need to support current initiatives related to school counselor’s practice. The study will also research what predictors, as defined by demographics in years of experience and grade level, in addition to beliefs and attitudes of school counselors regarding the comprehensive model affect the integration of the comprehensive model into local districts. Subjects represent a segment of the school counseling professionals from all genders with a range of age and ethnic background.

2. Summarize all involvement of humans in this project. (Who, how many, age, sex, length of involvement, etc.)

Human subjects will be school counselors and school administrators, both female and male ranging in age from 22 to 65 who are from New York State. Their participation will be short term format in answering an online survey with link provided for their completion.

3. Describe the procedures you will use to assure participants that their involvement in the project is voluntary and that there is no penalty for not participating. Include text of document, if applicable.

Subjects’ names and addresses will not be obtained as part of the survey. Subjects will receive a consent form and a letter of introduction explaining the purpose of the study, the voluntary participation and the precautions that will be used to protect the confidentiality of information. Surveys will be mailed to a professor at Western Connecticut State University and researcher will not have access to letter of consent.

4. Will the information you collect include identifiers of any kind? _____ YES ___X___ NO

If yes, please describe the procedures you will use to inform your participants of this and to ensure the confidentiality of the responses.

Principal investigator's signature: _____

Note: Your signature indicates your belief that this study is exempt from review.

For IRB use only

_____ I certify that this project is exempt from review by the WCSU IRB

_____ I certify that this project is NOT exempt from review by the WCSU IRB

Signature of the IRB chair or designee: _____

Date: _____

Protocol # _____

WESTERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

Approval Form for Undergraduate Student Research Involving Human Subjects

To Be Used for Research in the EXEMPT Category Only

(Note: Please complete and attach the "Application for Exemption." Note that any study that involves experimental manipulation cannot be exempt.)

To: Chair, Institutional Review Board

From: _____ Department _____

I have given ___Deborah Hardy_____ permission to interview and collect data from employees, faculty, students/others at _____ (agency).

The student has also received agency permission to collect this information.

The instrument(s) used for data collection is a survey or questionnaire. There is no risk of any kind to the study subjects. The research does not involve questions or investigations related to sensitive or illicit areas of behavior. Adequate provisions have been made to obtain informed consent and ensure subject confidentiality/anonymity. The student has completed NIH training for research with human subjects.

The title of the student's project is: Perceptions of School Counselors and School Administrators with respect to the roles of school counselors as they implement the New York State Comprehensive School Counseling Model into their districts.

(Attach a copy of the project.)

Instructor's signature

Chair's signature

Check List for Required Attachments:

___ Completed Application for Exemption

___ Proposed project

___ Student's NIH training certificate

___ Instructor's NIH training certificate

___ Chair's NIH training certificate