A Thesis by

Jamie Marie Forte (Greene)

Bachelor of Arts, Wichita State University, 2010

Submitted to the Department of Counseling, Educational Leadership, Educational and School Psychology
and the faculty of the Graduate School of
Wichita State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

May 2015
COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF COUNSELING AND RELATED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: PREPARATION AND PERFORMANCE MATCH

The following faculty members have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Education with a major in Educational Psychology.

__________________________
Marlene Schommer-Aikins, Committee Chair

__________________________
Susan Bray, Committee Member

__________________________
Kathy Strattman, Committee Member
DEDICATION

To my husband, Cameron P. Forte, for always being there to motivate me when I needed it the most, for being supportive, and most importantly for being patient with me throughout this entire process. To my parents, David L. Greene and Deborah A. Greene, and my sister, Jennifer N. Greene, for being positive and pushing me toward achieving my goals.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have never had a more enjoyable learning experience as I have had throughout the course of this Master’s program thanks to my committee chair, professor, and most importantly invaluable friend, Dr. Marlene Schommer-Aikins. I cannot thank you enough for dedicating countless hours teaching me, guiding me, being patient, and always making time to be my friend and mentor. Thank you for giving me that gentle push and motivating me when I struggled, for being understanding when I became overwhelmed, and for reminding me that I was always capable of more. You turned this potentially stressful process into a pleasant experience and made sure I never felt like I was in this alone. Truly, I cannot thank you enough. I couldn’t have done this without you.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Susan Bray and Dr. Kathy Strattman. Dr. Susan Bray, thank you for giving me the opportunity to work with you and for imparting to me all of your invaluable knowledge on the school counseling profession. Most importantly, thank you for being so supportive, patient, and understanding throughout this entire process. Dr. Kathy Strattman, thank you for taking the time to be part of my committee. I truly appreciate your keen attention to detail and suggestions you have given me in writing this thesis.
ABSTRACT

This study explored whether school counselors who attended a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited program varied from those who did not attend a CACREP accredited program in their sense of feeling prepared to perform tasks within the four fundamental categories: counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. This research also sought to determine if CACREP and non-CACREP professionals differed in their sense of performance match between what they actually do in their counseling position and what they believed was appropriate for their position. There were a total of 838 participants between the ages of 23 and 71 who were members of the American School Counseling Association, were currently practicing, and had earned either a master’s or specialist degree. Participants completed an adaptation of the School Counseling Rating Scale (SCARS), originally developed by Scarborough (2005), to rate their sense of how well their education prepared them for tasks within the four fundamental categories, how often they actually engage in these tasks, and how appropriate they felt those tasks were in their profession. The analyses yielded some significant findings. One of these findings indicated accreditation did have an effect on perceived preparedness for one of the fundamental categories. Also, several significant differences existed in preparedness among all participants without regard to accreditation.
## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Problem</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of School Counseling Profession</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Roles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New/Trending Roles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP Accreditation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with CACREP Accreditation Standards</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of School Counselors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Versus Perceived Roles</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying the Profession</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. RESULTS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DISCUSSION</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Study</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings and Their Implications</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Implications</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Research</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REFERENCES 37
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (Adaptation)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Demographics Questionnaire</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Informed Consent</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Descriptive Statistics – Preparation</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sense of Preparedness Graph (Category * Accreditation)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Sense of Preparedness Graph (Among All Participants)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The concept of school counseling was first introduced in the early 20th century during a time of rapid development and expansion in the United States. Inevitably, the focus of the school counseling profession has continually evolved to accommodate both well-established and novel student needs. Originally viewed as vocational education guidance counselors, early school counselors were dedicated to promoting character development, socially appropriate behavior, and aiding in vocational planning (Paisley & Border, 1995). Over time, however, school counselors have integrated personal growth counseling, services for “at-risk” populations, and programs for the development of all students (Baker, 1992, Paisley & Border, 1995).

Educational trends have assisted the profession in gaining recognition in the school setting and have allowed counselors to adjust their roles as needed. These adjustments have resulted in four fundamental interventions known as counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination (ASCA, 1999). The interventions include individual or small group counseling, assisting with classroom lessons, consulting with parents, teachers, and other professionals, and coordinating the organization and management of regular and special education program events (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Comprehensive and developmental school counseling interventions are associated with positive academic, career, and emotional development (Lapan, Gyspers, & Petroski, 2001). Such favorable outcomes have paved the way to the development of models that aid in the implementation of these interventions. These models are utilized to unify the profession and are emphasized throughout counselor education by various accreditation
bodies including the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) (CACREP, 2001).

Currently the primary accreditation body for the counseling profession, CACREP has accredited more than half of the school counseling master’s programs in the United States (CACREP, 2009; Goodman-Scott, 2015; Schmidt, 2011). Established in 1981, CACREP continually revises their standards to reflect societal changes and encourages all stakeholders to provide input to be considered during the standard renewal process (Foster, 2012). While these standards are viewed as advanced and difficult to achieve, most CACREP-accredited faculty members regard the standards as being crucial to accreditation and relevant to the profession (Vacc, 1992). Some have speculated that this insight may influence counselor educators to strive for CACREP accreditation (Vacc, 1992). Furthermore, research has found that students from CACREP accredited programs show significantly more positive attitudes toward accreditation than students from non-accredited programs (Wilcoxon, Cecil, & Comas, 1987).

Regardless of the tireless efforts of accreditation bodies to unify the profession through standards of excellence, school counselors often find themselves struggling to establish an identity in the profession (Baker, 2001; Baker & Gerler, 2010; Green & Keys, 2001; Gyspers, 2001, Paisley & McMahon, 2001). While some argue that school counselors are responsible for a specific set of roles and functions (Green & Keys, 2001; Gyspers, 2001), others maintain the ideal of shifting roles and values in coordination with changes in society (Baker & Gerler, 2001). The real issue, however, arises when school counselors are to suggested to ―be all things to all people‖ (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). This is especially controversial when supported by research indicating that roles vary depending on building level (e.g., elementary versus secondary school) and expectations of others, such as the school principle (Perusse, Goodnough,
Donegan, & Jones, 2004). This conflict between actual and appropriate roles highlights the importance of school counselor self-advocacy as research has found that lack school counselor advocacy is associated with role stress (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005).

In an attempt to unify the profession and support advocacy, The Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) established a New Vision for school counselors and their roles (Perusse, et al., 2004). In addition to the TSCI and CACREP, the ASCA developed the National Model and National Standards to further define and unify the profession (ASCA, 2003; Campbell & Dahir, 1997). All associations share the goal of reinforcing academic missions while addressing the needs of students, however, much research is desired to uncover its effectiveness by graduates who were educated with these initiatives.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to explore whether school counselors who attended a CACREP-accredited program varied from those who did not attend a CACREP-accredited program in their sense of feeling prepared to perform tasks within the four fundamental categories: counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. This research also sought to determine if CACREP and non-CACREP professionals differed in their sense of performance match between what they actually do in their counseling position and what they believed was appropriate for their position. As previously stated, CACREP reviews and updates their standards every seven years and actively reaches out for feedback (Foster, 2012). By reaching out to professional school counselors who have graduated from both CACREP and non-CACREP programs, this study may aid in the revision of CACREP standards and introduce novel issues that demand attention.
Overview

This study focuses on preparation, and actual versus appropriate roles performed by school counselors as it pertains to CACREP accreditation. The second chapter outlines the necessity of continually altering the roles of a school counselor in order to accommodate the needs of students (Baker, 1992; Paisley & Border, 1995). It explains the origins and development of the four fundamental categories associated with the profession: counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination (ASCA, 1999; Lapan et al., 2001; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). The second chapter also addresses the development of CACREP and its standards as it pertains to accreditation and student requirement, as well as the efforts of the TSCI and the ASCA in an attempt to define and unify the profession (ASCA, 2003; CACREP, 2009; Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Perusse et al., 2004).

Chapter three covers the methodology used in this study, which includes participant demographics, instruments used, procedures followed, and a description of the data analysis. Chapter four contains both descriptive and quantitative results found in this study. Lastly, chapter five contains a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, their implications, limitations of the study, and proposed future research.

Research Problem

The purpose of this research was to explore differences between CACREP and non-CACEP accredited school counselors. This study addressed the following questions:

1) Do differences exist between CACREP and non-CAREP professionals in their sense of feeling prepared in the four fundamental categories?

2) Do school counselors (without regard to accreditation) feel different degrees of preparation between the four fundamental categories?
3) Do differences exist between CACREP and non-CACREP professionals in their sense of performance match?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The focus of school counseling has continually evolved since it was first introduced in the early 20th century. Originally viewed as guidance in relation to vocational education, early school counselors were dedicated to promoting character development, socially appropriate behavior, and aiding in vocational planning (Paisley & Borders, 1995). Over time, however, school counseling programs have redirected their efforts toward personal growth, services for special “at-risk” populations, and creating programs for the development of all students (Baker, 1992, Paisley & Baker, 1995).

**Development of School Counseling Profession**

A combination of historical events has contributed to the development of school counseling. The Industrial Revolution was particularly influential as it created a sense of urgency for vocational education. Immigrants, former slaves, and American citizens moved to larger cities seeking opportunities to improve their lives. Transition to an industry dependent society left the uneducated but self-sufficient, agrarian accustomed individuals restricted to menial jobs in factories, mills, mines, and railroads (Aubrey, 1977). These unsatisfactory working conditions, lack of jobs, and child labor quickly gave rise to economic turmoil. Proper education became a necessary skill required for desired employment and financial success. As compulsory school attendance laws spread, educators saw an opportunity to target children and adolescents in vocational and moral guidance to rectify the turbulences in society (Aubrey, 1977; Davis, 1914). Thus, interested educators and counselors became advocates for child abuse, poverty, and mental illness (Foster, 2012). Such guidance practices are largely accountable for creating the foundation for school counseling.
Following World War II, veterans were eager to make use of their GI bill and exercise their right to educational guidance and counseling (Minkoff & Terres, 1985). Professionals struggled to provide adequate services for their new clientele. This new generation left school counselors feeling oppressed and alienated, resulting in a calling out for change (Baker, 2000). In response to the Russian launching of Sputnik, Federal legislation passed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to encourage counselors to direct intellectually able students toward a college degree in engineering and physical science (Miller, 1961). Federal funds provided substantial expansion for counselor education for nearly two decades to aid their efforts (Baker, 2001). After much criticism regarding extensive focus on gifted students, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 were implemented to extend services for vocationally oriented students with interest in higher education, gifted students, students with an economic and academic disadvantage, as well as school dropouts (Paisley & Borders, 1995).

**Traditional Roles**

Educational trends have assisted the profession in gaining recognition in the school setting and have allowed counselors to adjust their roles as needed. These adjustments have resulted in four fundamental interventions: counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination (ASCA, 1999). Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) describe these interventions as individual or small group counseling, assisting with classroom lessons, consulting with parents, teachers, and other professionals, and coordinating the organization and management of regular and special program events. Models have been created to aid in the implementation of these interventions and are emphasized throughout counselor education by various accreditation bodies including the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2001). Empirical research by Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski (2001) has revealed that
implementing these comprehensive and developmental school counseling interventions has yielded considerable positive effects on student academic, career, and emotional development, including overall development and quality of life.

**New/Trending Roles**

In addition to attending to traditional roles, technology has brought about a whole new set of trending issues that must be addressed by school counselors in order to meet the needs of their students. By 2002, 99% of American public schools provided computers with Internet access to their students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). As access to these resources has expanded, parents and educators have found it increasingly difficult to monitor Internet activity and misuse. Through Internet use, bullying has morphed into a less direct, but equally denigrating form of aggression known as Cyberbullying (Chibarro, 2007). Cyberbullying is characterized by intentionally causing harm to others via technology such as text messaging, social media, and e-mail. Willard (2006) describes those who engage in cyberbullying as being social climber bullies. These students bully classmates in attempt to climb the social ladder and gain status within their school community. Victims of cyberbullying are likely to experience feelings of exclusion, develop academic and social problems leading to depression, illness, withdraw from school activities, and may become suicidal (Willard 2006). According to Chibbaro (2007), school counselors are expected to address the issue of cyberbullying by designing, managing, and implementing awareness campaigns in their school and community, creating and updating relevant school policies, creating intervention strategies for parents, school personnel, and students, as well as provide training to the victim and cyberbully. Generally, school counselors are expected to act as an awareness advocate for their school and its community as a whole.
As mentioned previously, suicide among adolescents has been linked with peer aggression-cyberbullying. In relation to cyberbullying, Hinduja and Patchin (2010) conducted a study focusing on the prevalence of suicide ideation and attempts of adolescents. They found that compared to non-victimized adolescents, traditional bully victims were 1.7 times more likely to attempt suicide, while cyber-bully victims were 1.9 times more likely to attempt suicide.

Furthermore, in 2010, suicide was the second leading cause of death among individuals 15 to 24 years old (Murphy, Xu & Kochanek, 2013). This age group suggests that school counselors practicing in a high school must be especially knowledgeable on the subject, however, a survey by King, Price, Telljohann, & Wahl (1999) found that only one out of three school counselors felt they were capable of recognizing a student at risk. Their research concludes that counselors might be more attentive to suicidal students if their training program devoted more time toward developing these essential recognition skills. King and Smith (2000) supported the extra devotion to acquiring these skills and found that training in project SOAR (Suicide, Options, Awareness, and Relief) greatly increased confidence in identifying suicidal warning signs, assessing risk, providing support, and implementing interventions. These skills are critical as school counselors should be able to address mental health issues with their students, adequately coordinate mental health programs, and remain up to date on appropriate interventions, at-risk profiles, and mental health resources available in the community (Remley, 1993).

Another inevitable change demanding attention in the United States is cultural diversity. The U.S. Census Bureau (2000) projects that over fifty percent of school-aged individuals between 5 and 17 years old will be of African American, Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaska Native, and other non-Caucasian descent. This drastic population shift presents school counselors with the need to be knowledgeable as a cultural mediator. Portman
(2009) describes cultural mediation in school counseling as intentionally engaging in prevention, intervention, and/or remediation activities that facilitate communication and understanding between culturally diverse human systems (e.g., school, family, community, and federal and state agencies) that aid the educational progress of all students” (p. 23) This skill is particularly necessary in dealing with barriers of language, culture, and values. When these barriers conflict with the school system, students are at a higher risk of school drop out. To prevent this occurrence, school counselors are very much responsible for bridging the gap between parents and their children’s education. Doing so and encouraging parent participation has been shown to improve grades, attitude toward schoolwork, homework completion, participation in the classroom, and academic perseverance (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001). Fortunately, nearly all school counselors have been trained in multicultural diversity; however, the need to continually reevaluate their approach and knowledge base is evident (Portman, 2009).

As an extension to the focus on multicultural competencies, another emerging role for school counselors is advocacy and support of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth. The majority of LGBTQ students, according to Bidell (2012), experience verbal/sexual harassment, bullying, and physical assault due to their sexual orientation. These individuals frequently encounter hostile treatment at school, which may subsequently result in depression, low self-esteem, anxiety, and isolation, and put them at higher risk for substance abuse, suicidal ideation, and sexual risk taking. In addition to feeling unsafe at school, they are more likely to report absenteeism, poor academic performance, and diminished academic aspirations (Kosciw, Greytak, Diax, & Bartkiewicz, 2010). With much at stake, it is critical that school counselors have the awareness, skill, and knowledge needed to effectively
work with these students. In fact, the Ethical Standards for School Counselors states that professional school counselors must acquire education, consultation and training to improve their ability to work with diverse populations regarding sexual orientation, and gender identity and expression (American School Counselor Association, 2010). Unfortunately, a study by Satcher and Leggett (2007) found health care professionals, teachers, and college students to be more knowledgeable than school-counseling students on issues faced by the LGBTQ community. Bidell (2012) outlined the same issue in a cross-specialization comparison between school counseling students and community agency students. He found that school counseling students reported significantly lower sexual orientation competencies than community agency students. Utilizing demographics, he speculated a variety of underlying reasons including limited LGBTQ acquaintances, fear of losing their job if they supported the LBGTQ community, disagreement due to religious beliefs, and prejudice generated from political party association. Current research indicates that an emphasis on sexual orientation in multicultural counseling courses greatly increases school counselor competency in working with these clients (Rock, Carlson, & McGeorge, 2010).

**CACREP Accreditation**

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) is currently the primary accreditation body for the counseling profession in the United States and has accredited 228 institutions and over 500 programs as of 2009 (CACREP, 2009; Goodman-Scott, 2015; Schmidt, 2011). Established in 1981, CACREP has and continues to revise and develop standards that educational institutions must meet for accreditation approval. According to Sweeney (1992), CACREP has been involved in debate on counseling since the 1967 release of George Hill’s *Manual for Self-Study by a Counselor Education Staff*. 
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Incorporated in this manual were the beliefs and standards held by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), which are famously credited for commencing the accreditation movement (Schmidt, 2011). The movement’s fame was quickly followed by additional ACES publications, political and professional debates, and recognition by other accreditation bodies in the 1970’s (Sweeney, 1992). Soon thereafter, ACES was granted the ability to conduct voluntary accreditation of various counseling programs. Finally, in an effort to increase cooperative accreditation, ACES approached the American Personnel and Guidance Association (now known as the ACA) and established CACREP (Schmidt, 2011).

For three decades, CACREP has provided a strong foundation of professional standards for the training of counselors at both the master’s and doctoral levels. Counseling departments may seek accreditation from the following seven program specialties: addiction counseling, career counseling, clinical mental health counseling, marriage, couple and family counseling, school counseling, student affairs and college counseling, and counselor education and supervision (CACREP, n.b.a.). In each specialty program, students must demonstrate sufficient knowledge and have clinical experience in professional orientation and ethical practice, social and cultural diversity, human growth and development, career development, helping relationships, group work, assessment, and research and program evaluation (Foster, 2012). On a larger scale, in order for educational programs to gain accreditation approval, they must meet all standards within eight core areas: the institution, academic unit, faculty and staff, evaluation, foundation, knowledge, supervisor qualifications and support, practicum, and internship (CACREP, 2009). In addition to meeting these standards, CACREP must approve of a written self-study, receive recommendation by the CACREP representative visitation team, and final
endorsement by the CACREP board (Smaby & D’Andrea, 1995). Once accreditation has been granted, the institution may reserve their status for eight years (CACREP, n.d.b.).

**Issues with CACREP Accreditation Standards**

Since the first release of CACREP accreditation standards, both CACREP-accredited and non-accredited educational counseling programs have found CACREP standards difficult to achieve. CACREP, however, suggests that its standards are considered minimal criteria for counselor preparation programs and meet most state licensing requirements (CACREP, n.d.a.; Foster, 2012). Additionally, they insist that their standards are not intended to hinder program innovation; in fact, they encourage programs seeking accreditation to include their proposed standard variations in their self-study. These proposals must include statements of rationale and will be reviewed by CACREP. If agreed upon, standards will be updated and revised every seven years to ensure its relevancy with societal changes (Foster, 2012).

In 1992, Bobby and Kandor conducted a study to identify whether any 1988 CACREP standards posed problems for both accredited and non-accredited programs. They found that non-accredited programs felt that requiring a 100 clock-hour practicum and 600 clock-hour internship and maintaining a 10:1 ratio of full-time students to full-time faculty was a hindrance to receiving accreditation. Additional standards of concern include the minimum of a 48-semester-hour or 72-quarter-hour program, requirement of three full-time faculty members within the department, and the 20:1 student-to-advisor ratio. Although CACREP-accredited programs did not identify any standard as hindering accreditation, both accredited and non-accredited groups did express concern about the student-to-advisor ratio.

A more recent complaint from CACREP-accredited programs and those who are seeking accreditation stems from the full-time faculty standard revision enforced in 2013. The standard
now requires all full-time faculty members to have a doctorate in counselor education to
strengthen the professional identity (Foster, 2012).

Of all complaints, the standard requiring a full-time, 600-hour internship posed the main
setback for both CACREP-accredited and non-accredited programs. (Pate, 1990; Weinrach,
1991). Pate (1990) argued that part-time students and school counseling students employed as
teachers would be discouraged from attaining an education from a CACREP-accredited program
due to the full-time internship standard. This criticism resulted in CACREP redefining internship
requirements, which currently states that a full-time internship is not required to meet the aim of
the standard.

Despite difficulty of achieving CACREP standards, Vacc (1992) found that most
CACREP-accredited faculty members regarded the standards as being crucial or important to
being granted accreditation. He concluded that the standards were, in fact, relevant and that such
favorable views may influence counselor educators to strive for CACREP accreditation.
Additionally, Wilcoxon, Cecil, and Comas’ (1987) research concluded that students from
CACREP-accredited programs showed significantly more positive attitudes toward accreditation
than students from non-accredited programs.

As with any accreditation body, multiple controversial issues revolve around CACREP
standards. One issue is the variation in semester credit hours among the program specialties. In
1995, Smaby and D’Andrea noted that CACREP requires 60 semester credit hours for clinical
mental health counseling, and marriage, couple, and family counseling, and only 48 semester
credit hours for school, community (later revised as clinical mental health counseling), and
student affairs and college counseling. Research on this issue is minimal and introduces a great
concern of why students in one program require significantly less education in their field of interest than students of another program.

Much research has been conducted with the intent of understanding faculty and staff perceptions of CACREP standards, however, there is little feedback from professionals who received their degrees from CACREP-accredited programs. Foster (2012) suggests that future research extend its scope to include feedback from students and alumni. Do they feel the number of hours (600-clock hours) was too extensive? Was it essential to becoming a professional? Do they feel they would have received the same quality of education without the ratio (20:1 student-to-advisor and 10:1 full-time student to full-time faculty) requirements? Due to the variation in specialty semester hour requirements, do they feel they learned too much or too little? Furthermore, with perceived minimal room for innovation and creativity, does the curriculum accurately reflect the constant changes of society of which school counselors must have adequate knowledge?

As previously stated, CACREP reviews and updates their standards every seven years and actively reaches out for feedback. Foster (2012) states that CACREP engages all stakeholders in providing constructive criticism to aid them in the revision of their standards. This data includes surveys, focus groups, open dialogues, and other miscellaneous written submissions of feedback from state counseling and certification board members, other accrediting bodies, students, counselor educators, as well as members of CACREP (Foster, 2012). An experimental approach is utilized in order to receive feedback that results in alterations of the standards that accurately reflects counseling in an evolving society. This practice has resulted in better preparing counseling students in matters of multiculturalism, equity, and spirituality. By reaching out to professional school counselors who have graduated
from both CACREP and non-CACREP programs, this study may aid in the revision of CACREP standards and introduce novel issues that demand attention.

**Identity of School Counselors**

Regardless of accreditation bodies with standards and various requirements of excellence, there is a persistent debate regarding the role of school counselors. Baker & Gerler (2001) describe this debate as “identity vs. role confusion” (p. 289). They suggest that “there was no master plan” (p. 289) in the development of the roles of school counselors. The profession seeks to shift their values in coordination with changes in educational philosophies, the economy, federal legislation, and social movements. Many critics, such as Baker (2001) and Paisley and McMahon (2001) advocate the evolving roles of school counselors and have provided numerous events that aid in the development of school counseling services. However, others still propose that school counselors are responsible for a specific set of roles and functions (Green & Keys, 2001; Gysbers, 2001).

Green and Keys (2001) support the notion of school counselors performing well-established, conventional tasks. They suggest that school counselors must focus on and react to the needs of urban youth while maintaining traditional roles. In other words, to some degree, they must customize their practices based on the specific needs of their school and community. This approach will allow school counselors to fill in the gaps of what may be currently missing in developmental school counseling programs. With little review, it is apparent that Green and Keys’ (2001) argument comes strikingly close to that of their opponent. They advocate a particular role or function of school counselors; however, they agree that such functions and roles must change with consideration to their environment and student needs.
Paisley and McMahon (2001) conclude that there is no real argument in the debate. Both sides of the debate agree that the roles of school counselors are highly dependent on the specific needs of their community. If traditional services have little to no value to certain communities, changes must be made to make school counselors relevant to the communities that they serve. When changes are not made, all attempts at defining and unifying the profession are proven insignificant (Paisley & McMahon, 2001).

As all sides have agreed that the roles of school counselors can be altered as seen fit, it is of equal importance to determine mental health versus educational goals, and appropriate versus inappropriate tasks performed by school counselors. Paisley and McMahon (2001) created a list comprised of all appropriate roles and functions as noted from both sides of the debate. They argue that no one role or function is unnecessary; however, a dilemma festers when suggesting that ideal school counselors—be all things to all people” (p. 107).

**Actual Versus Perceived Roles**

Much research has been done in regards to accreditation programs such as American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and American Counseling Association (ACA); however, little effort has been placed on exploring the concerns of CACREP program graduates. For example, according to Dahir (2001), surveys of ASCA members on the National Standards for School Counseling Programs indicate that the roles of elementary school counselors provide support for personal and social development, while high school counselors are dedicated to career development. These surveys also address the discrepancy between actual and preferred practice and imply that the roles of counselors are more dependent on the school principal’s perceptions of their roles, rather than whether they practice in an elementary versus secondary school. In 2004, Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan and Jones expanded on this research and found
that school counselors and principles do not have a clear understanding of which tasks are appropriate or inappropriate for school counselors and they do not agree on appropriate and inappropriate tasks as identified by the National Standards. Furthermore, they also found evidence that the tasks that are highly sanctioned by the principal at each school level are also the inappropriate tasks most frequently performed by their school counselors. These tasks deemed inappropriate have been an issue of concern for over 30 years and often include clerical tasks, registration, scheduling classes of students, checking attendance, administering achievement, cognitive, and aptitude tests, monitoring classrooms, and maintaining student records (Hart & Prince, 1970). These data make a profoundly clear case that school counselors must acknowledge their roles and become their own advocate in order to perform their job correctly and efficiently.

Research has indicated that lack of school counselor self-advocacy leads to role stress (Brott & Myers, 1999; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Sink & Yillik-Downer, 2001). Role stress occurs when a school counselor struggles with the inconsistency between their professional training and the realities of their job (e.g. appropriate tasks versus principle expectations). In 2005, Culbreth et al. found that school counselors who felt better prepared for their job, in which their initial expectations of the job matched their actual experiences, was the most significant predictor of having lower role stress. Furthermore, school counselors who graduated from a CACREP-accredited program reported better preparation and lower role stress than those who graduated from a non-CACREP program.

Similarly, Akos and Galassi (2004) who proposed that role confusion may also be attributed to inconsistencies and variations among preparation programs as well as the introduction of standards-based educational reform movements. One recent educational reform
movement, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), forced school counselors to divert their focus away from clinical, mental health, and educational models as they were excluded from reform agendas (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). With transformation of school counselors’ roles imminent, professionals unified to develop new practice and preparation that would promote their changing roles. This progressive force, consisting of the DeWitt Wallace-Readers Digest, ASCA, ACES, and ACA, resulted in the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) (Education Trust, 1997).

**Unifying the Profession**

Written in 1997 by the Education Trust, the TSCI established a New Vision for school counselors and their roles, which would restructure school counselor training and education at the graduate level. Rather than focusing on clinical and mental health, TSCI supported programs to promote a universal education model. As a New Vision School Counselor, the initiative encourages school counselors to focus on academic achievement, assisting students in social, emotional and personal development, remove inequities and barriers to academic success, and close the achievement gap between disadvantaged or minority children and their more privileged peers (Perusse, Goodnough, Donegan & Jones, 2004). Furthermore, school counselors are expected to achieve these goals by engaging in leadership, advocacy, collaboration, counseling, coordination, assessment, data analysis, and utilizing evidence-based programs (House & Hayes, 2002).

Although many other well-known accreditation bodies foster the values of the TSCI, CACREP standards provide minimal skills for the New Vision School Counselors (Schellenberg, 2007). Much like the TSCI, CACREP also contributes to the unification of school counselors. They ensure that their school counselors will be proficient in utilizing evidence-based methods in
working with diverse and mentally disabled students. These methods reflect evolving educational trends including the incorporation of technology in the profession. Furthermore, school counselors must demonstrate knowledge in program evaluation, data, and needs assessments. Research by Paisley and Hayes (2003) indicate that CACREP school counselors must demonstrate competence in all previously mentioned skills in addition school specific counseling with intent of reflecting the contemporary educational reform agenda, and to the eight core areas (foundations, counseling, prevention, and intervention, diversity and advocacy, assessment, research and evaluation, academic development, collaboration and consultation, and leadership). CACREP also encourages counselor educators to collaborate with practicing school counselors in standard blending, the development of classroom instruction models to make a direct influence on closing the student achievement gap (Schellenberg, 2007).

In addition to the TSCI and CACREP, the ASCA developed the National Model and National Standards to unify and define the school counseling profession (ASCA, 2003; Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The National Model provides school counselors and their educators with a unified framework and language of foundation, delivery, management, and accountability to emphasize the provision of services for schools in their entirety. Within the National Model are the National Standards that promote competence in the academic, career, and personal/social domains. As with the TSCI and CACREP, the ASCA also focuses on standard blending by aligning school counseling with school academic goals to close the achievement gap (Schellenberg, 2007).

Literature from the TSCI, CACREP, ASCA and other accrediting bodies repeatedly outline the importance of making a connection with school counseling practices and the academic achievement. However, there is no official study making a successful link between the
efforts of school counselors on students’ success (House & Hayes, 2002). Literature has yet to provide adequate evidence that school counselors are critical to the successful academic performance (Borders, 2002; Dahir, 2004; Stone & Clark, 2001). It is with clear intention that the TSCI, CACREP and ASCA strive to develop the common goal of reinforcing academic missions while addressing the personal needs of students. Perhaps it is of great importance to gain feedback from practicing school counselors to gain a better understanding of the services that are lacking in the profession that are essential to directly improving academic achievement.

The purpose of this study was to explore whether school counselors who attended a CACREP-accredited program varied from those who did not attend a CACREP-accredited program in their sense of feeling prepared to perform tasks within the four fundamental categories: counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. This research also sought to determine if CACREP and non-CACREP professionals differed in their sense of performance match between what they actually do in their counseling position and what they believed was appropriate for their position. As previously stated, CACREP reviews and updates their standards every seven years and actively reaches out for feedback (Foster, 2012). By reaching out to professional school counselors who have graduated from both CACREP and non-CACREP programs, this study may aid in the revision of CACREP standards and introduce novel issues that demand attention.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

Participants

School counselors belonging to the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) were sent an e-mail request to voluntarily participate in this research study. This sample was obtained from the ASCA membership list on the schoolconselor.org website. Roughly 24,000 school counselors were contacted to participate in this study. Two e-mail requests were sent out at two weeks intervals requesting participation in an online survey. There were a total of 838 participants (Male = 146, Female = 691) between the ages of 23 and 71 ($M = 41.03; SD = 11.49$). Participants were currently practicing and had earned either a master’s or specialist degree (Master’s = 770, Specialist = 68).

Instruments

Participants were asked to complete a demographics survey (shown in Appendix A) and fill out the SCARS adaptation (shown in Appendix B). However, this thesis was a subset of a much larger research project and will focus specifically on accreditation status, preparedness, and actual versus appropriate performance of activities in the four fundamental categories.

Demographics Survey. A demographic questionnaire was presented at the beginning of the survey. Participants were asked questions regarding their gender, age, and ethnicity. They were also asked about their highest academic degree, the year they obtained their counseling degree, and whether they attended a CACREP or non-CACREP accredited institution. Additional questions such as location of employment, employment status, years of experience, age groups served, school setting, caseload, racial/ethnic groups served, and whether they are in a Title 1 school were asked to gain a better understanding of their unique professional
experience. With the purpose of this study in mind, participants were asked, in an open-ended format, to list the top five issues students in their school are dealing with. They were asked what percentage of their job is dedicated to counseling, consultation, curriculum, coordination, or other, and whether they felt what they had learned in School Counseling Training was adaptable enough to accommodate the changes and the learning/needs of their students. A section for additional comments was provided at the end of the demographic survey. The demographic survey is shown in Appendix A.

Again, as this thesis is a subset of a much larger study, accreditation status was the only information from the demographics survey used in the data analyses.

**Adaptation of the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS).** In 2005, Scarborough sought to measure both the frequency of actual and preferred performance of specific activities commonly performed by school counselors. She constructed the rating scale utilizing the four major interventions (counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination) as described by the ASCA and the National Model for school counseling programs. Each intervention/category contained several related task statements that should be performed by school counselors. A fifth category, “other activities,” reflects less traditional activities commonly performed by school counselors such as clerical duties and discipline. School counselors were asked to respond on a five-point verbal frequency scale in which they indicate how often an activity is performed (i.e. 1 = I never do this, 2 = I rarely do this, 3 = I occasionally do this, 4 = I frequently do this, 5 = I routinely do this). For each of the four major categories, Scarborough reported the internal reliability coefficients for actual and preferred frequency ranged from .75 to .90. Scarborough divided the “other” activity category into three subcategories resulting in internal reliability coefficients ranging from .43 to .84. In order to
determine convergent construct validity, Scarborough examined group differences between grade levels of employment on the ―actual‖ SCARS subscales. Significant differences of activities performed by school counselors among all grade levels were found (p = .007) (Scarborough, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, an adaptation of SCARS was created to measure the frequency at which school counselors actually perform specific activities, the frequency at which those activities are appropriate, and how well prepared they feel in performing each of the activities. Due to the fact that all individuals are different and may prefer to perform one activity to another regardless of its importance, the ―prefer‖ category was altered to ―appropriate‖ to focus on how appropriate each activity is in relation to their jobs. The level of preparedness was included in the survey to gain insight on the education school counselors are receiving and the extent at which each activity is being taught. Participants were given the same five-point verbal frequency scale as indicated in Scarborough (2005) to respond to the ―actual‖ scale. Similarly, the ―appropriate‖ scale will also include a five-point verbal frequency scale as follows: 1 = It [the activity] is never appropriate, 2 = It is rarely appropriate, 3 = It is sometimes appropriate, 4 = It is often appropriate, 5 = It is always appropriate. The ―preparedness‖ scale prompted the participants to respond on a four-point likert scale, such that 1 = I feel underprepared [for the activity], 2 = I feel adequately prepared, 3 = I feel well prepared, and 4 = I feel over-prepared. (The adapted SCARS is shown in Appendix B.)

Procedures

A Qualtrics panel was used to send an e-mail invitation to the participants requesting voluntary completion of the survey. A link to the Qualtrics survey was imbedded in the e-mail. Upon clicking the link, participants were directed to the Informed Consent form where they
could either click “Agree to Participate” or decline participation, the latter prompting Qualtrics to log them out (The Consent form is shown in Appendix C.) Those who agreed to participate were redirected to the survey. For those who did not take action after receiving the first email request, two more emails were sent two weeks apart to solicit more responses. The survey was estimated to take 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

Again, as this study is only a portion of a much larger study, it specifically analyzes accreditation status, and preparedness, and actual versus appropriate performance of activities in the four fundamental categories.

**Data Analysis**

This non-experimental study contains quantitative data. In order to determine whether differences exist between CACREP and non-CACREP professionals in their sense of feeling prepared in the four fundamental categories—counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination—a series of one-way analyses of variance was conducted with accreditation status as the independent variable and the category of preparedness as the dependent variable. A repeated measures analysis was conducted to determine if there were significant differences among all participants in their sense of preparedness between the four fundamental categories. In order to determine if there was a difference in counseling and curriculum preparation among all participants, a paired t test was conducted. Finally, a chi square test was used to determine if participants perceived a good match between what they actually do in their counseling position and what they believed was appropriate.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Descriptive statistics were generated for all major variables to be analyzed in this study. They are shown in Appendix E. As can be seen on the Appendix E, scores varied substantially and there was no extreme skewness. This suggests that the data are appropriate for further analysis.

The major question in this research was whether differences existed between CACREP and non-CACREP professionals in their sense of feeling prepared in four categories: counseling, consultation, curriculum and coordination. In order to address this question, a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted with accreditation status (CACREP vs. non-CACREP) as the independent variable and the category of preparedness served as the dependent variable in each of the four ANOVA’s. Among the four analyses, there was one significant finding which was the sense of being prepared for coordination activities: $F(1, 589) = 9.17, p = .003$, eta squared = .01. In this analysis, CACREP accredited professionals felt significantly more prepared for coordination activities compared to non-CACREP professionals. See Appendix D to see these means for coordination activities.

Follow-up analyses were conducted to determine if participants felt different degrees of preparation between major categories. A repeated measures analyses was conducted to determine if there were significant differences in their sense of preparedness between counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination among all of the participants regardless of accreditation status. In this repeated analysis, the repeated within subject variable was the category of activities, the between subject variable was accreditation status. The multi variance
statistics was significant for category: $F (3, 573) = 55.12, p < .001$, eta squared = .22. The interaction between category of activity and accreditation status was not significant. Because there was a significant main effect for category, post hoc analyses were conducted to see specifically which means were significantly different. Based on Appendix E, the following comparisons were made using paired t tests with an alpha level of .01 to avoid an inflated error rate. Preparation in counseling versus consultation was found to be significantly different: $t (1, 662) = 8.36, p < .001$, eta squared = .23. Comparison between preparation in counseling and coordination were significantly different: $t (1, 582) = 11.68, p < .001$, eta squared = .35. Comparison between preparation in curriculum and consultation were significantly different: $t (1, 647) = 5.58, p < .001$, eta squared = .23. Comparison between preparation in curriculum and coordination were significantly different: $t (1, 584) = 10.99, p < .001$, eta squared = .35.

Looking at Figure 1, it is unclear if counseling preparation is significantly different than curriculum preparation. Therefore, generating a tentative hypothesis based on Figure 1, one more paired t test was conducted with a one tailed test in mind. In this analysis, counselors did not feel significantly more prepared for counseling than curriculum: $t (1, 642) = .77, p = .22$, eta squared = .07.

To determine if participants perceived a good match between what they actually do in their counseling position and what they believed was appropriate for their position, a performance match scored was calculated. For each category, their mean score for how appropriate the activities were to perform was subtracted from the mean score counselors actually engaged in these activities. This generated difference scores between +5.0 to -5.0. For the purpose of this study, each difference score was then categorized as a "good" match if it was between +2 and -2, "should not be doing this" if it was greater that +2.0, and "should be doing
but I’m not” if the difference score was less than -2.0. A chi square test was conducted to
determine if accreditation status related to the sense of a match. This analysis did not yield
significant findings.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Summary of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to compare school counselors who received their education from a CACREP accredited program with those from a non-CACREP accredited program in their sense of academic preparation to perform various activities. These activities fall within four fundamental intervention categories—counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination—as described by the ASCA and the National Model for school counseling programs (Scarborough, 2005). This study also sought to compare how often school counselors actually perform activities within the four categories and how appropriate they feel it is to engage in these activities in their profession. This comparison, called a performance match, was included to determine if school counselors perceived a good match between what they actually do in their counseling position and what they believe was appropriate for their position. Due to previous literature outlining superior expectations (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Foster, 2012; Pate, 1990; Smaby & D’Andrea, 1995; Vacc, 1992), it is plausible that CACREP educated individuals may report a higher sense of preparation as well as reporting a more favorable “good match” than non-CACREP educated individuals.

This study focuses on CACREP due to its dominating presence in the counseling profession. Although several accreditation bodies exist, CACREP currently accounts for more than half of the school counseling master’s programs in the United States (Goodman-Scott, 2015). Due to constant changes in society, school counseling programs, such as CACREP, are expanding and renewing several aspects of their standards to meet the evolving needs of students.
(Borders, Drury & Gerler, 1992; Foster, 2012). In doing so, it is crucial that accreditation bodies are aware of their school counselors’ perceptions about their education, their sense of academic preparation to competently perform their duties, and have an accurate understanding of how often school counselors out in the field most commonly perform activities. Such feedback is often sought by accreditation bodies as it is known that job roles, activities, and expectations taught in counselor academic preparation programs can and do differ from those actually implemented (Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan & Jones, 2004).

For the purposes of this study, school counselors were asked to rate preparedness, actual performance and appropriateness of activities using an adaptation of the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS). Originally developed by Scarborough (2005), SCARS sought to measure both the frequency of actual and preferred performance (how they actually spend their time versus how they prefer to spend their time) of specific activities commonly performed by school counselors within the four major intervention categories. In the adaptation of SCARS, the column for preferred performance was replaced with “appropriate” to determine how appropriate the participants felt each activity was in their profession. Additionally, a column labeled “Preparedness” was included to determine perceived sense of preparation school counselors felt they received from their education.

Through the use of participants’ ratings on the SCARS adaptation, the following questions were addressed: (a) Do differences exist between CACREP and non-CACREP professionals in their sense of feeling prepared in the four fundamental categories?; (b) Do school counselors (without regard to accreditation) feel different degrees of preparation between the four fundamental categories?; (c) Do differences exist between CACREP and non-CACREP professionals in their sense of performance match? A series of one-way ANOVA’s were
conducted to explore the first question, followed by a repeated measures analysis to answer the second, and lastly, a chi-square test was conducted to address the last question.

Findings and Their Implications

When investigating the differences between CACREP and non-CACREP school counselors, there was one significant finding. This finding indicated that school counselors who attended a CACREP accredited program felt significantly more prepared for coordination activities compared to those who attended non-CACREP accredited programs. This heightened sense of preparation may be in part due to the emphasis CACREP standards have placed on specific coordination activities addressed on the SCARS adaptation. For example, participants were asked to indicate their sense of preparation on the following coordination statement: “Coordinate and implement a comprehensive school counseling program”. A similar statement is addressed in one of CACREP’s (2009) Foundation standards for school counselors, A. 5., that states that their school counselor must “Understand current models of school counseling programs (e.g., American School Counselor Association [ASCA] National Model) and their integral relationship to the total educational program” (pg. 39). The second coordination statement regarding school-wide crisis response is also specifically addressed by CACREP standards for Counseling, Prevention, and Intervention C. 6., which outlines the importance of understanding “the potential impact of crises, emergencies and disasters on students, educators, and schools, and know the skills needed for crisis intervention” (pg. 40). The third and fourth coordination statements on the SCARS adaptation regarding program evaluation can also be found in CACREP’s Research and Evaluation Section I. 2. The last statement, “Articulate and advocate for the school counselor role to other professionals in the school and to the parents and guardians”, is addressed in Section II of the CACREP standards which designated pages 8
through 13 to Professional Identity. Ultimately, this close alignment of coordination activities with CACREP standards may have had been a factor in the results. However, this interpretation should be considered tentative, as this study does not attempt to look at the standards that non-CACREP accreditations may or may not emphasize.

By placing importance on professional identity in the CACREP standards, it may be of interest to note that this emphasis may have an effect on counselors’ sense of preparedness in fulfilling their roles. In a study conducted by Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson and Solomon (2005), school counselors were considered to have a strong professional identity when they perceived little conflict between the realities of their job and what they were professionally trained to do. Those who reported having a strong professional identity also reported having less role stress, and therefore, were more confident in their professional abilities and felt more prepared. Hence, it is possible that the emphasis CACREP places on professional identity, which strives to adequately prepare their school counselors for the reality of their job, will have an effect on how prepared they feel to perform their job.

When addressing school counselors’ sense of preparation between the four fundamental categories without regard to accreditation, there were several significant findings. In general, school counselors felt significantly more prepared for counseling (e.g., individual or group counsel on personal, academic, or relationship issues) and curriculum activities (e.g., conducting classroom lessons on career development and personal growth) than for consultation and coordination activities. These findings are consistent with several other studies. In one study conducted by Goodman-Scott (2015), the item “consult with school staff concerning student behavior” had the highest mean for job activity actually performed, however, out of 48 preparation items, consultation ranked only 18th. These results were supported by several other
studies that also reported similar findings, one of which found that while only 20% of school
counseling preparation programs provided instruction for consultation, proficiency in
consultation was one of the top three requirements for school counseling interns (Akos &
Scarborough, 2004; Pérusse, Goodnough & Noël, 2001). Furthermore, a 2013 national study of
ASCA school counselors ranked their preparation and education in consultation 15th out of 20
course content areas (Carlson & Kees, 2013). Additionally, CACREP has only recently doubled
its emphasis on consultation from 2001 to 2009. Considering that consultation was not
traditionally emphasized in school counseling programs, it comes as little surprise that school
counselors lack some of the preparation needed to fulfill their roles.

Upon further analysis, between the two fundamental categories that all counselors felt
more prepared – counseling and curriculum – there was no significant difference. Although
counseling is expected to be among the highest priority of school counselors, curriculum is not
necessarily considered a main focus. How can we explain this nearly equal sense of preparation?
One consideration is that more than half of school counselors have prior work experience as
either a teacher or administrator before becoming a school counselor (Bridgeland & Bruce,
2011). These individuals understand curriculum and have the skills required to present a lesson
to a classroom of students. This experience gives them an advantage when it comes to guidance
curriculum lessons (e.g., bullying, friendship, how to be a good citizen in school) as a school
counselor.

The final research question, which sought to find differences between CACREP and non-
CACREP professionals in their sense of performance match, did not yield significant findings.
Remember that a good match indicated that participants actually perform the duties that they
believe are most appropriate in their profession. In this study, accreditation did not account for
any variation in these scores. This lack of distinction may be due to a fairly recent attempt to unify the profession by implementing the ASCA National Model in 2003. Keeping in mind that the participants in this study were obtained through the ASCA member list, both CACREP (2009) and ASCA (2014) suggest that school counselor programs are aligned with the ASCA National Model. This may place this sample of participants on a level playing field on their sense of performance match.

**Practical Implications**

This research has several practical implications for school counselors and their academic preparation programs. This study offers insight on how well school counselor academic programs are preparing their students for the realities of the profession by looking at the degree at which the actual tasks performed by school counselors aligns with tasks they feel are appropriate for the profession. Furthermore, it provides evidence for potential lack of education within the four fundamental categories and gives an indication of where efforts should be directed for improvement (e.g., consultation and coordination). As students’ needs are evolving, it is important that school counselors view this study as a continued step in the right direction in unifying the profession in a way that best serves clientele.

**Limitations of the Study**

There are several limitations in this study. The participants in this study were obtained from the ASCA member list and volunteered to complete the survey, which inevitably narrows diversity to some degree within the sample. Additionally, the sample size was considerably smaller than expected which may have an effect on how well the findings are generalized to other populations.
Another limitation is that the survey is composed of self-reported perceptions rather than observed behaviors. No cooperation items were included (e.g., “Leave this item blank”); therefore, all responses must be taken at face value, as there is no way of guaranteeing honest, thoughtful answers. Also, although responses consist of school counselors currently working in the field, it does not take into account the year their degree was obtained. As a result, it is possible that those who are not recent graduates may not remember their education in full detail.

Finally, the adaptation of SCARS is another source of limitation. Responses are limited to a Likert scale with predetermined statements attached to each rating (e.g., 1 = I never do this, 2 = I rarely do this, etc.). Allowing participants to provide explanations for their ratings, or lack thereof, may have aided in interpreting the findings. Another limitation is that all of the activities associated with the four fundamental categories were not incorporated in the SCARS adaptation. Including all activities would not have been feasible for this study, as it would have made the survey extensive and exhausting for participants to complete.

**Future Research**

Although this study provides several implications for school counseling programs, much future research is needed to provide a well-rounded view of school counselors out in the field. As expectations of school counselors are changing, conducting research that takes a more in-depth look at the differences between CACREP and non-CACREP standards may supplement accreditation bodies in the decision making process of renewing standards.

In addition to accreditation and the four fundamental categories, focus should be placed on other factors, such as the year in which the school counseling degree was obtained, years of experience in the field, and building level (e.g., elementary, middle and high school, etc.). Such
research would benefit from incorporating qualitative data to have a better understanding of how well school counselors are being educated and ultimately, prepared for the profession.
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## APPENDIX A

### School Counseling Activity Rating Scale

Below is a list of activities that may be performed by school counselors.

In **Column 1**, please write the number that indicates the frequency with which you ACTUALLY perform each activity.

In **Column 2**, please write the number that indicates how APPROPRIATE each activity is for school counselors to be performing based on your professional experience.

In **Column 3**, please write the number that indicates your level of PREPAREDNESS. How well do you feel your education prepared you for each activity?

Please place the corresponding number in each box.

Ratings: 1= I never do this; 2= I rarely do this; 3= I occasionally do this; 4= I frequently do this; 5= I routinely do this;

1= It is never appropriate; 2= It is rarely appropriate; 3= It is sometimes appropriate; 4= It is often appropriate; 5= It is always appropriate;

1= I feel underprepared; 2= I feel adequately prepared; 3= I feel well prepared; 4= I feel over-prepared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counseling Activities</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Preparedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counsel with students on personal/family, academic or relationship issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct group counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel students regarding crisis/emergency issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide counseling for academic issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with school staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with community and school agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with parents and guardians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct classroom guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct classroom lessons addressing career development and the world of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct classroom lessons on personal growth and development issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate and implement a comprehensive school counseling program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate school-wide crisis response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and use data to enhance the school counseling program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct needs assessment and program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct academic and career advisement activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with teachers, staff, and community to promote student academic, career, personal, and social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the results of individual and group counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate and advocate for the school counselor role to other professionals in the school and to the parents and guardians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Other” Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate the standardized testing program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform hall, bus, and cafeteria duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle discipline of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule students for class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate holiday programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Gender: Male_____ Female____

2. Age: ____

3. Ethnicity: Caucasian_____ Hispanic_____ African American_____ Native American_____ Asian/Pacific Islander_____

   Other____

4. Highest academic degree: Masters_____ Doctorate____

5. What year did you obtain your counseling degree? ___________

6. Educational program: CACREP_____ non-CACREP ____

7. Location of employment: City____________________ State________________

8. Employment status: Currently practicing_____ Retired_____ Professor_____ Other____

9. Years of experience: _______

10. Age groups served: College_____ High School_____ Middle School_____ Elementary____ Other____

11. School Setting: Suburban____ Rural_____ Urban____ Other____

12. How many students are on your caseload? ____________
13. Racial/Ethnic groups served (mark all that apply): Caucasian_____ Hispanic_____ African American_____ Native American_____ Asian/Pacific Islander_____ Other_____

14. Are you employed at a Title 1 school? Yes_____ No_____

15. List the top 5 issues students in your school are dealing with.
   
   • __________________________________________________________________________
   • __________________________________________________________________________
   • __________________________________________________________________________
   • __________________________________________________________________________
   • __________________________________________________________________________

16. What percentage of your job is dedicated to (Must add up to 100%):

   Counseling (individual and group) ____ Consultation ____ Curriculum (classroom lessons) ____
   
   Coordination ____ Other (clerical and other duties)____

17. Is your learning in your School Counseling Training adaptable enough to accommodate the changes and the learning/needs of your students?

   Yes____ No_____
18. Additional comments:

______________________________________________________________________________
CONSENT FORM

Purpose: You are invited to participate in a study of activities performed by school counselors. Understanding the frequency at which various activities are performed, how appropriate it is to perform these activities, and how well prepared you feel to perform them will help instructors of school counselors improve teaching methods.

Participant Selection: You were selected as a participant for this study as a member of the ASCA. We expect to obtain a sample size of approximately 800 participants.

Explanation of Procedures: If you decide to participate, you will click on the link below to agree to participate. Then you will provide demographic information and complete the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale. We estimate that participation will take no longer than 15 minutes total. Example question: “What are five issues students are facing that you as a counselor are dealing with?”

Discomfort/Risks: We do not anticipate any risk or discomfort in completing the survey. However, if you feel uncomfortable with a question, you may skip it. All responses are anonymous and confidential. Participation is completely voluntary and participants are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or consequence. There is no monetary fee or compensation for participation.

Benefits: This research will benefit and further shape school counselor training programs that strive to successfully prepare school counselors in a society where students’ needs are constantly changing.

Confidentiality: Every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, in order to make sure the study is done properly and safely there may be circumstances where this information must be released. By signing this form, you are giving the research team permission to share information about you with the following groups:
Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
The Wichita State University Institutional Review Board;
The sponsor or agency supporting the study.

**Refusal/Withdrawal:** Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will **not** affect your future relations with Wichita State University. If you agree to participate in this study, you are free to withdraw at any time from the study without penalty.

**Contact:** If you have any questions about this research you can contact me at: Jamie Greene, telephone (316) 990-8057, e-mail jmgreene@wichita.edu. You may also contact Dr. Marlene Schommer-Aikins or Dr. Susan Bray, Wichita State University, College of Education, 1845 Fairmont Street, Campus Box 142, Wichita, KS 67260-0142; telephone (316) 978-6386 or (316) 978-6510. You can also e-mail at marlene.schommer-aikins@wichita.edu or susan.bray@wichita.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you can contact the Office of Research and Technology Transfer at Wichita State University, 1845 Fairmount Street, Wichita, KS 67260-0007, telephone (316) 978-3285.

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. By selecting “Yes” below, you are indicating that:
- You have read (or someone has read to you) the information provided above,
- You are aware that this is a research study,
- You have voluntarily decided to participate.

I have read the above and agree to participate in this survey. Yes  No

I would like to have a copy of the Consent Form emailed to me. Yes  No
APPENDIX D

Descriptive Statistics - Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-CACREP accredited</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-CACREP accredited</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-CACREP accredited</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-CACREP accredited</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

Sense of Preparedness Between Four Fundamental Categories (CACREP and Non-CACREP)

Accreditation
CACREP accredited
non-CACREP accredited

Level of Preparedness

Category
Counseling Consultation Curriculum Coordination
APPENDIX F

Sense of Preparedness Between Four Fundamental Categories Among All Participants

Level of Preparedness

Category

Counseling  Consultation  Curriculum  Coordination