

Predicting School Counselors' Supports and Challenges When Implementing the ASCA National Model

Professional School Counseling

Volume 21(1): 1-11

© 2018 American School

Counselor Association

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/2156759X18777671

journals.sagepub.com/home/pcx



Heather J. Fye¹, Lynne Guillot Miller², and J. Steve Rainey²

Abstract

This study examined a national sample of school counselors and their ability to implement the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model. Percentage of time spent in noncounseling duties, perceived level of principal support, and principals' knowledge of school counselors' appropriate roles were statistically significant predictor variables for school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model. We discuss implications for the school counseling profession.

Keywords

ASCA National Model, noncounseling duties, school counselor

For several decades, school counselors have provided service delivery through a comprehensive school counseling program framework (Gysbers & Henderson, 2012). Comprehensive programs focus on the career, social/emotional, and academic development of all students (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2012, 2014). The ASCA (2012) National Model, introduced in 2003, provides a framework for practice within comprehensive school counseling programs that is "comprehensive in scope, results-oriented in design, and developmental in nature" (p. xi). Now, in its third edition, the ASCA National Model includes school counselors educating stakeholders (i.e., other school personnel, parents/guardians, and community members) on the appropriate roles of school counselors. It provides a structure for practice that includes performing appropriate roles and duties through a program-centered, comprehensive school counseling program. Furthermore, it incorporates the national standards (ASCA, 2004) for school counseling programs and aligns the professional practice of school counselors with the educational standards of schools' academic missions (ASCA, 2012). Overall, comprehensive programs and the ASCA National Model help shift school counselors' roles into activities that ensure every student's success (Cinotti, 2014).

Comprehensive school counseling programs are well established because they are a primary component of school counseling preparation programs and the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012). Several researchers have previously studied comprehensive program implementation. For example, Studer and Oberman (2006) found that 26% of site supervisors had a comprehensive school counseling program and 23% were in

the process of developing one. This means more than half (51%) were not working in or developing a comprehensive program. Similarly, Dixon Rayle and Adams (2007) found that 59% of their school counselor participants were operating a comprehensive program based on the ASCA National Model, and elementary school counselors were more often implementing such a program than middle or high school counselors. As part of a larger scale study on school counselor advocacy, Simons, Hutchison, and Bahr (2017) included a comprehensive school counseling program self-reported demographic questionnaire and found 52% reported implementation started and 26% reported implementation completed. Finally, Pyne (2011) reported that 58.8% of participants were implementing many aspects of a comprehensive school counseling program, while 29.9% were implementing some aspects. Related to graduate training utilizing comprehensive programs, Studer, Diambra, Breckner, and Heidel (2011) reported that participants were more confident in increasing implementation of comprehensive programs with graduate training in the ASCA National Model. Studer et al. (2011) participants further described significant differences in comprehensive program implementation in the

¹ Department of Counselor Education, Winona State University, Winona, MN, USA

² Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

Corresponding Author:

Heather J. Fye, PhD, Department of Counselor Education, Winona State University, Winona, MN 55987, USA.

Email: hd.smith123@gmail.com

areas of delivery between elementary and high school counselors and accountability between elementary and middle school counselors. Elementary school counselors were more frequently conducting guidance lessons and collecting data as part of their school counseling programs.

Overall, approximately half of school counselors have begun or are implementing comprehensive programs (Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007; Pyne, 2011; Simons, Hutchison, & Bahr, 2017; Studer & Oberman, 2006). However, these studies vary in how the programs or the ASCA National Model were measured, resulting in limited data for further understanding and reasons for underutilization of comprehensive program implementation. Therefore, Mason (2010) initiated a study to understand predictor variables related to successful ASCA National Model implementation. Mason studied the relationship between leadership practices of school counselors and their comprehensive school counseling program implementation and found leadership practices of modeling the way and enabling others to act predicted model implementation. The present study builds upon Mason's findings and investigates additional predictor variables (i.e., demographics, school counselor practices, and principal supports) for school counselors when implementing the ASCA National Model.

Benefit of Implementation

One of the first models for school counselor practice was the Missouri Comprehensive Guidance Program, developed in the early 1970s (Lapan, Gysbers, & Sun, 1997). This served as a springboard for implementing comprehensive school counseling programs across the United States. To understand the impact of comprehensive programs, Lapan, Gysbers, and Sun (1997) studied the relationship between school counseling program implementation and school experiences for students. They concluded that more fully implemented school counseling programs were associated with increases in positive student climate, higher grades, and brighter futures. More recently, Lapan, Whitcomb, and Aleman (2012) found that well-established and principal-supported comprehensive school counseling programs resulted in the provision of more responsive services and college and career counseling.

A special edition of the *Professional School Counseling* journal, published in 2012, focused on the benefits of comprehensive school counseling programs. In this special edition, researchers reported finding positive relationships between comprehensive school counseling program implementation and student outcomes (Lapan, 2012), higher ACT test scores (Carey, Harrington, Martin, & Stevenson, 2012), fewer discipline problems, and lower student-to-school counselor ratios (Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012). Moreover, lower student-to-school counselor ratios in high schools resulted in lower occurrences of suspensions and reported disciplinary incidents. Data-driven programs with higher levels of responsive services showed lower suspension rates (Lapan, Gysbers, et al., 2012; Lapan, Whitcomb, et al., 2012). When exploring

the connection between comprehensive program implementation and school demographics, Dimmitt and Wilkerson (2012) reported less implementation of comprehensive programs in schools with higher percentages of minority students and those receiving free and reduced lunch. Clearly, Lapan et al.'s (1997) study laid the foundation for continued research of comprehensive school counseling program and student outcomes.

ASCA created the Recognized ASCA National Model Program (RAMP) initiative based on the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2017). RAMP aimed to establish a designation program to answer the question, "How are students different because of what school counselors do?" To receive RAMP designation, school counselors must demonstrate successful implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program and data collection to inform and support the school counselor's program (ASCA, 2017). Following a rigorous application process, the RAMP Review Committee determines whether the school has met RAMP requirements. To date, there are just under 700 RAMP-designated schools across the United States (Jill Cook, Personal communication, January 24, 2017).

Research of RAMP programs has focused on student achievement and use of data to inform school counseling programs (Young & Kaffenberger, 2011). Ward (2009) found that students' academic achievement, attendance, and reading achievement were significantly higher in RAMP elementary schools than state averages. Similarly, Wilkerson, Perusse, and Hughes (2012) reported that assessments of students in RAMP schools scored higher than students in non-RAMP schools on English/language arts and math assessments. Despite the outcome data describing RAMP school counseling programs' positive impacts on student achievement, only limited research has focused on variables that may impact implementation of the ASCA National Model.

Challenges of Implementation

School counselors' duties have evolved over several decades (see American Counseling Association, 2014; Cinotti, 2014; Gysbers & Stanley, 2014; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Schimmel, 2008). National educational trends, statewide high-stakes testing, high student-to-school counselor ratios, and engagement in noncounseling duties have negatively impacted school counselors' ability to implement comprehensive school counseling programs (Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007). School counselors in training learn the appropriate duties needed to meet the academic, career, and social/emotional needs of students; however, their actual duties in the field (i.e., test administration, substitute teaching, bus duty, lunch duty, and clerical tasks) are often misaligned with the ASCA National Model (Moyer, 2011; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Carey, Harrington, Martin, and Stevenson (2012) found no link between comprehensive programs and student outcomes. They posited that this outcome was influenced by the large number of non-counseling duties required of school counselors. Furthermore, Lapan, Whitcomb, et al. (2012) reported that school counselors

spent less time providing direct services because of noncounseling duties. Regular engagement in inappropriate duties may create barriers to the full implementation of the ASCA National Model and, therefore, reduce the ability of school counselors to effectively meet students' career, academic, and social/emotional needs. Despite frequent reports of the detrimental effects of school counseling professionals' engagement in noncounseling duties, research is limited on its impact on implementing the ASCA National Model.

Regular engagement in inappropriate duties may create barriers to the full implementation of the ASCA National Model and, therefore, reduce the ability of school counselors to effectively meet students' career, academic, and social/emotional needs.

School administrators and other personnel (e.g., principals) often do not have the training to understand the appropriate duties of school counselors as specified in the ASCA National Model (e.g., Graham, Desmond, & Zinsser, 2011; Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Zalaquett, 2005). Researchers have called into question principals' understanding of the ASCA National Model despite the recommendations by Wilkerson (2010). Principals often understand the roles of a school counselor to be a collaborative case consultant, an administrative team player, and a responsive direct service provider, and less often, an innovative school leader (Amatea & Clark, 2005). Zalaquett and Chatters (2012) found that 26.4% of principals were not familiar with the ASCA National Model; this may have significantly impacted school counselors' ability to implement comprehensive school counseling programs. For example, Studer and Oberman (2006) reported that principal support was a key factor associated with counselors employing the recommended counseling activities. Leuwerke, Walker, and Shi (2009) reported that when principals were informed of the ASCA National Model, they were more in favor of advocating for school counselors to move toward comprehensive program implementation. Furthermore, principal support has been shown to positively contribute to school counselors implementing the delivery system of the ASCA National Model (Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007).

School counselors' perceptions and beliefs about comprehensive school counseling programs (e.g., Scarborough & Luke, 2008; Sink & Yilik-Downer, 2001) may relate to implementation of such programs and of the ASCA National Model. For example, Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) reported that differences in school counselors' attitudes, beliefs, and priorities across grade levels impacted student well-being. More specifically, elementary school counselors spent more time managing their program, middle school counselors involved themselves in student-related tasks, and high school counselors were more oriented toward career and postsecondary development.

Hatch and Chen-Hayes (2008) found that school counselors believed the necessary components of school counseling programs included goal development, reduced student-to-school counselor ratio, student competencies addressed through specific school counseling programs, mission and philosophy statements, and consultation with administration for program improvement. Despite the challenges in implementing comprehensive school counseling programs and the ASCA National Model, the benefits seem undeniable. By studying factors related to program implementation, school counselors may begin to develop strategies to overcome some barriers that prevent ASCA National Model implementation.

Purpose of Study

Evidence supports the positive impact of comprehensive school counseling programs and student success (Lapan, 2012) and the relationship between leadership practices and school counseling program implementation (Mason, 2010). School counselors are called to implement comprehensive programs, and specifically the ASCA National Model, into their practices. Despite the benefits of such implementation, only limited research (i.e., Mason, 2010) has focused on variables predicting school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model. The purpose of this study was to investigate which variables predict school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of implementation of the ASCA National Model for school counselors' practices?
2. What variables predict school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model into their practices?

Method

Procedures

Following institutional review board approval, we contacted 4,000 randomly selected ASCA professional members (approximately 20% of members from each state within the United States and the District of Columbia) to recruit participants for this study. The potential participants received a recruitment invitation e-mail and two follow-up requests. The invitation e-mail contained a link to the online survey in Qualtrics (2013). Once participants chose to participate, they were linked to the Qualtrics survey portal and asked to provide informed consent. Finally, participants completed the demographic form and the School Counseling Program Implementation Survey (SCPIS; Clemens, Carey, & Harrington, 2010) online.

Participants

A total of 252 practicing ASCA professional members from across the United States completed the survey ($N = 252$). This was a response rate of 6.3%. Their ages ranged from 26 to 69 ($M = 45.82$, $SD = 10.18$). Sixty-six participants (26.2%) identified as male and 186 identified as female (73.8%). The majority of participants ($n = 205$; 81.3%) identified as Caucasian, with the remaining participants representing African American ($n = 24$; 9.5%), Asian/Pacific Islander (4; 1.6%), American Indian/Alaskan Native American ($n = 4$; 1.6%), Hispanic ($n = 10$; 4.0%), and multiracial ($n = 5$; 2.0%). One hundred and ninety-five respondents (77.4%) completed a master's degree in school counseling, 20 (7.9%) completed either a master's degree in another human service or counseling specialty, and 37 (15.1%) completed a PhD or EdD degree. Participants worked in multiple grade levels ($n = 82$, 32.6%), K–6 elementary school ($n = 89$, 35.3%), middle school ($n = 16$, 6.3%), or high school ($n = 65$, 25.8%). In terms of setting, participants worked in rural (84; 33.3%), suburban (104; 41.3%), or urban (64; 25.4%) schools.

Regarding school counselor practices, participants worked from 7 to 60 hr per week ($M = 41.97$, $SD = 6.92$). Years of experience as a school counselor ranged from 2 to 41 years ($M = 13.44$, $SD = 7.46$). Participants worked in one to five or more buildings ($M = 1.26$, $SD = 0.81$) and reported caseloads ranging from 100 to 1,400 students ($M = 464$, $SD = 212$). They reported having 0–10 or more additional school counselors in their building ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 1.65$). Forty-five percent ($n = 115$) were the only school counselor in the school building. Participants received supervision from 0 to 600 min per month ($M = 60.78$, $SD = 109$), 102 (40.5%) received no supervision, and 200 (79.4%) received 60 min or less per month. Participants provided consultation each month from 0 to 5 hr ($n = 35$; 13.9%), 6 to 10 hr ($n = 56$; 22.2%), 11 to 15 hr ($n = 50$; 19.8%), 16 to 20 hr ($n = 57$; 22.6%), or 21 or more hours ($n = 54$; 21.4%). Participants reported that the weekly percentage of time they engaged in counseling duties ranged from 20% to 100% ($M = 72.51$, $SD = 19.51$) and noncounseling duties ranged from 0% to 80% ($M = 25.37$, $SD = 17.87$).

Regarding principal support, 128 (50.8%) participants reported that they believed their principal knew the appropriate duties of the job according to the ASCA National Model and 124 (49.2%) participants did not believe their principals knew the appropriate duties. Overall, on a Likert-type scale of one to five, participants felt supported by their principal ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 0.96$).

Instrumentation

Questionnaire. We created a questionnaire that included the 16 predictor variables for the present study. The predictor variables were self-reported and characterized into three categories: demographics, school counselor practices, and principal supports. The demographics variables included

(a) age, (b) gender, (c) race/ethnicity, (d) type of degree, (e) level of practice, and (f) type of school district.

The school counselor practices variables included (a) hours worked per week, (b) years of experience as a school counselor, (c) number of buildings responsible for, (d) approximate student-to-school counselor ratio, (e) number of additional school counselors in their building, (f) estimated amount of time in minutes engaged in supervision monthly, (g) estimated amount of time in hours engaged in consultation monthly, and (h) estimated percentage of time (totaling 100%) spent in counseling and noncounseling related duties each week.

The principal support variables included perceived principal support and whether or not the principal knows the appropriate roles of the school counselor according to the ASCA National Model. Perceived principal support was measured by participants rating the level of support they receive from their principal to complete their job on a Likert-type scale of 1 (*feeling very unsupported*) to 5 (*feeling very supported*). Last, participants responded yes or no to whether they believed their principal knew the appropriate roles of the school counselor according to the ASCA National Model.

SCPIS. The SCPIS (Clemens et al., 2010) is a 17-item inventory designed to measure the extent to which the ASCA National Model is implemented. The SCPIS has three subscales that use a 4-point Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = *not present*, 2 = *development in progress*, 3 = *partly implemented*, and 4 = *fully implemented*) to determine the degree to which the ASCA National Model is currently implemented in a school's counseling program. Scores on the SCPIS range from 17 (the ASCA National Model is not present) to 68 (the ASCA National Model is fully implemented). The SCPIS was normed on two samples of school counselors. The first sample included 201 school counselors and the second sample included 136 school counselors (Clemens et al., 2010).

Clemens, Carey, and Harrington (2010) completed an exploratory factor analysis with the two samples. A four-factor model emerged with 20 items. After deleting 3 items (Questions 6–8), Clemens et al. compared a two- and three-factor model and found the three-factor model allowed capture of more precise aspects of the ASCA National Model program implementation and explained more variance. The three-factor model accounted for 54% of the variance (Clemens et al., 2010). The first factor is programmatic orientation and a sample question on the SCPIS to measure Subscale 1 is “A written mission statement exists and is used as a foundation by all counselors.” Factor 1 is determined by summing Items 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, and 14. Factor 2 comprises items focused on school counselors' use of software to manage student data and use for school improvement. A sample question on the SCPIS to measure Subscale 2 is “School counselors use computer software to analyze student data.” Factor 2 is determined by summing Items 15–17. Factor 3 is school counseling services delivery. A sample question on the SCPIS to measure Subscale Three is “Services are organized so that all students are well served and

have access to them.” Factor 3 is determined by summing Items 2, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, and 20. The Cronbach’s α reliability estimate for Factor 1 was $\alpha = .79$, for Factor 2 was $\alpha = .83$, and for Factor 3 was $\alpha = .81$ (Clemens et al., 2010).

Clemens et al. (2010) established the validity of the SCPIS by correlating participant scores with scores on the School Counseling Activity Rating Scale (SCARS), a 40-item instrument developed by Scarborough (2005). The SCARS yielded four factors with a variance of 47%; therefore, Clemens et al. determined that the initial steps in SCPIS development indicated preliminary evidence of psychometric suitability. Both SCPIS and SCARS measure school counselors’ activities, but the SCPIS also allows researchers a way to measure characteristics of school counseling programs according to the ASCA National Model (Clemens et al., 2010). Pyne (2011) suggested using the SCPIS to measure ASCA National Model program implementation. The present study utilized the three-factor model. We calculated internal consistency reliabilities for the total and subscale scores and found all to be high and similar to previous findings with total SCPIS $\alpha = .91$, programmatic orientation $\alpha = .86$, use of software and data $\alpha = .84$, and services delivery $\alpha = .83$.

Results

Research Question 1

To understand the ASCA National Model level of implementation, means and standard deviations were obtained for the SCPIS. Total scores for the SCPIS ranged from 21 to 68 ($M = 50.10$; $SD = 10.32$). Given that a fully implemented program would have a score of 68 and a program not implemented in any way would have a score of 17, we determined the implementation level to be the percentage of the possible range of scores. For example, the mean for the total score was 50.10. The lowest possible score was 17, the difference between 17 and 50.10 is 33.10, and the difference between the lowest and highest possible scores was 47. To arrive at the percentage of implementation, we determined the percentage that 33.10 was of 47, which was 70.42%. We interpreted these calculations to indicate that the mean level of implementation of the ASCA National Model in our study was 70.42%.

Participant scores for SCPIS Factor 1, programmatic orientation, ranged from 9 to 28 ($M = 19.48$; $SD = 5.14$) with an implementation percentage of 65.78%. For Factor 2, use of software and data, scores ranged from 3 to 12 ($M = 9.71$; $SD = 2.33$) with an implementation percentage of 65.56%. Scores for Factor 3, services delivery, ranged from 9 to 28 ($M = 20.91$; $SD = 4.52$) for an implementation percentage of 73.21%. See Table 1 for results.

Research Question 2

The second research question focused on variables predicting school counselors’ ability to implement the ASCA National Model, as measured by the SCPIS. We selected multiple linear regression analysis to determine the impact of the predictor

Table 1. Qualities of SCPIS.

Instrumentation	Scores	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	%	α
SCPIS	21–68	50.10	10.32	70.42	.91
SCPIS_F1	9–28	19.48	5.14	65.78	.86
SCPIS_F2	3–12	9.71	2.33	65.56	.84
SCPIS_F3	9–28	20.91	4.52	73.21	.83

Note. $N = 252$. SCPIS = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey total score; SCPIS_F1 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 1, Programmatic Orientation; SCPIS_F2 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 2, Use of Software and Data; SCPIS_F3 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 3, Services Delivery.

variables (demographic, school counselor practices, and principal supports) on the implementation level of the ASCA National Model. An α of .05 and a moderate effect size was maintained for all statistical procedures (Cohen, 1992).

First, we calculated bivariate correlations (see Table 2) for all continuous variables. Next, all 16 predictor variables were entered into the regression equation to determine their predictive value of implementing the ASCA National Model (i.e., total SCPIS scores). We used International Business Machines (IBM) SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0, to complete data analysis. Completed assumption checks showed no outliers or influential data points, as concluded by data analysis and a visual inspection of the data and residual plots. We checked multicollinearity and found it to be issue for race/ethnicity (Variance Inflation Factor; VIF for White participants = 7.997) and level of practice (VIF ranged from 8.780 to 30.751). Therefore, we removed these two predictor variables and reentered the remaining 14 demographic variables into a new regression equation. After this step, multicollinearity was no longer determined to be an issue. Although the SCPIS factors correlate highly, multicollinearity did not apply because each factor was analyzed as a separate dependent (or outcome) variable, not as predictor (or independent) variables (Dimitrov, 2009). Finally, to control for Type I error, we used the Bonferroni method to adjust the family-wise α and determine the statistically significant predictor variables for Research Question 2 (Darlington & Hayes, 2017).

The regression equation for the total SCPIS produced an R of .527 ($R^2 = .277$; $R^2_{adj} = .231$), which was statistically significant, $F(15, 236) = 6.040$, $p < .001$. Therefore, approximately 27.7% of the variance in the total level of implementation of the ASCA National Model was explained by the predictor variables: percentage of time spent on noncounseling duties ($\beta = -.450$), perceived principal support ($\beta = .201$), and whether or not the principal knew of the school counselor’s appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model ($\beta = -.212$). We found a negative relationship between noncounseling duties and ASCA National Model implementation, whereas perceived principal support and knowledge were positively related with ASCA National Model implementation.

Table 2. Correlations for Study Subscales.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age	—														
2. Years of experience	.69**	—													
3. Buildings	.16**	.09	—												
4. Caseload	.12	.09	.26**	—											
5. SUP	-.05	-.07	-.03	-.11	—										
6. Consult	.08	.04	-.05	-.03	.02	—									
7. Counseling	.04	.03	-.08	-.07	.07	-.09	—								
8. Noncounseling	-.11	-.12	.09	.01	-.03	.04	-.84**	—							
9. Principal support	-.04	.01	-.03	-.15*	.13*	.02	.23**	-.13*	—						
10. Hours worked	-.01	.03	.03	.02	.02	.05	-.12	.08	.05	—					
11. Add SC	.02	.14*	-.03	-.29**	.09	.06	.13*	-.10	-.04	-.05	—				
12. SCPI_S_F1	.12	.09	.05	-.01	.08	-.02	.14*	-.28**	.25**	.17*	-.02	—			
13. SCPI_S_F2	.00	-.01	-.06	.05	-.02	-.05	.09	-.11	.15*	.15*	-.04	.55**	—		
14. SCPI_S_F3	.00	.06	-.05	.17**	.16*	-.02	.40**	-.47**	.40**	.03	.09	.68**	.44**	—	
15. SCPI_S	-.06	.07	-.01	-.07	.11	-.03	.27**	-.36**	.33**	.13*	.02	.92**	.70**	.90**	—

Note. $N = 252$. Buildings = number of buildings responsible for; SUP = amount of time engaged in supervision monthly; consult = amount of time engaged in consultation monthly; counseling = percentage of time spent in counseling duties; noncounseling = percentage of time spent in noncounseling duties; principal support = perceived principal support; hours worked = hours worked per week; Add SC = number of school counselors in your building; SCPI_S_F1 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 1, Programmatic Orientation; SCPI_S_F2 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 2, Use of Software and Data; SCPI_S_F3 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 3, Services Delivery; SCPI_S = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey total score.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 3. Multiple Regression Analyses.

Predictor	R^2	R^2_{adj}	B	$SE\ B$	β	t	Significance (p)
SCPI_S	.277	.231					
Noncounseling			-.0260	0.060	-.450	-4.316	.000
Principal support			2.152	0.709	.201	3.037	.003
Principal roles			-4.359	1.338	-.212	-3.258	.001
SCPI_S_1	.192	.141					
Noncounseling			-.0113	0.032	-.392	-3.557	.000
SCPI_S_3	.411	.374					
Noncounseling			-.0134	0.024	-.531	-5.640	.000
Principal support			1.111	0.280	.237	3.969	.000
Principal roles			-1.859	0.529	-.206	-3.516	.001

Note. $N = 252$. SCPI_S = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey total score; SCPI_S_F1 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 1, Programmatic Orientation; SCPI_S_F3 = School Counseling Program Implementation Survey, Factor 3, Services Delivery; noncounseling = percentage of time spent in noncounseling duties; principal support = perceived principal support; principal roles = whether or not the principal knows the appropriate roles of the school counselor according to the American School Counselor Association National Model.

Next, we completed separate multiple linear regression analyses for each factor of the SCPI_S. This step provided additional information regarding which variables predicted specific factors of the ASCA National Model. For Factor 1, programmatic orientation, the regression equation predicted an R of .439 ($R^2 = .192$; $R^2_{adj} = .141$), which was statistically significant, $F(15, 236) = 3.749$, $p < .001$. Therefore, approximately 19.2% of the variance in the level of programmatic orientation was explained by the percentage of time spent on noncounseling duties ($\beta = -.392$). For Factor 2, use of software and data, the regression equation was nonsignificant at $F(15, 236) = 1.666$, $p = .059$. For Factor 3, services delivery, the regression equation predicted an R of .641 ($R^2 = .411$; $R^2_{adj} = .374$), which was statistically significant, $F(15, 236) = 10.986$, $p < .001$.

Therefore, approximately 41.1% of the variance in the level of school counseling services delivery was explained by percentage of time spent on noncounseling duties ($\beta = -.531$), perceived principal support ($\beta = .237$), and whether or not the principal knew of school counselor appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model ($\beta = -.206$). Statistically significant results are displayed in Table 3.

Discussion

Previous research has focused on the effects of comprehensive school counseling programs and the ASCA National Model on student outcomes (e.g., Lapan, Gysbers, et al., 2012; Lapan et al., 1997; Lapan, Whitcomb, et al., 2012; Wilkerson,

Perusse, & Hughes, 2012). Our results show that the ASCA National Model has been implemented at about a three-quarter level. This is an increase relative to previous findings (Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007; Pyne, 2011; Simons et al., 2017; Studer, Diambra, Breckner, & Heidel 2011; Studer & Oberman, 2006) and shows that ASCA has been effective in educating school counselors and many school administrators of the importance of ASCA National Model (2012) implementation. However, inferring improvement may be premature because different methods of measurement and instruments were used to determine participants' ASCA National Model implementation across studies.

For Research Question 2, we found that the statistically significant predictor variables affecting school counselors' levels of ASCA National Model implementation were noncounseling duties, perceived principal support, and principals' knowledge of school counselors' appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model. Overall, 27.7% of the variance in ASCA National Model implementation was explained by percentage of noncounseling duties ($\beta = -.450$), perceived principal support ($\beta = .201$), and principals' knowledge of school counselors' appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model ($\beta = -.212$). Noncounseling duties were negatively associated with ASCA National Model implementation, whereas perceived principal support and knowledge were positively associated. Results of this study confirm the positive relationship between principal support and comprehensive school counseling program implementation (Leuwerke et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2007) and negative relationship between noncounseling duties and comprehensive school counseling program implementation (Dixon Rayle & Adams, 2007; Lapan, Whitcomb, et al., 2012).

Related to the specific factors of the SCPIS, for Factor 1, 19.2% of the variance in the level of programmatic orientation was explained by noncounseling duties ($\beta = -.392$). We found a negative relationship between the amount of time spent on noncounseling duties and school counselors' ability to implement programmatic aspects of the ASCA National Model; results previously described by Dixon Rayle and Adams (2007). For Factor 2, use of software and data, the model was nonsignificant. Although utilizing data through accountability to inform school counseling programs appears to have much support (Young & Kaffenberger, 2011), the present study did not include statistically significant variables that predicted data collection and assessment implementation. For Factor 3, 41.1% of the variance in the level of school counseling services delivery was explained by noncounseling duties ($\beta = -.531$), perceived principal support ($\beta = .237$), and principals' knowledge of school counselors' appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model ($\beta = -.206$). For this factor, noncounseling duties and lack of principal's knowledge of school counselor appropriate roles were negatively associated with school counseling services delivery, while perceived principal support was positively associated with services delivery. Previous researchers (Moyer, 2011; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008) have

informed the school counseling profession of the negative impacts of noncounseling duties on school counseling roles and of principals' understanding and support of school counselors on implementing comprehensive school counseling programs (Leuwerke et al., 2009; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Zalaquett & Chatters, 2012).

Our results confirm a positive relationship between principal support and percentage of time spent on appropriate counseling duties. Although this relationship does not show cause, we believe that supportive principals trust the judgment of school counselors and allow them to make professional judgments on how they use their time. School counselors can enhance this relationship through agreed-on activities and support from data. Again, strong agreements and more supportive data provided to principals could help create a more efficient use of school counselors time in appropriate roles. Our results show that school counselors who have supportive and knowledgeable principals and engage in many appropriate activities and limited inappropriate activities have higher levels of ASCA National Model implementation.

Our results confirm a positive relationship between principal support and percentage of time spent on appropriate counseling duties. . . . Supportive principals trust the judgment of school counselors and allow them to make professional judgments on how they use their time.

ASCA National Model implementation has many benefits. As Mason (2010) described, she found a positive relationship between leadership practices and comprehensive school counseling program implementation. Most significantly, students who attend schools with highly implemented school counseling programs have better outcomes (Lapan, 2012) and student achievement (Wilkerson et al., 2012).

Implications for School Counselors

Overall, our results address the predictor variables that impact school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model. This implications section addresses how to advocate for increased alignment of appropriate school counselor roles through principal support and knowledge. Once appropriate school counselors' roles are identified and students' needs addressed, school counselors can work toward implementing increased levels of the ASCA National Model and show accountability through data analysis, results data, action plans, and evaluations for continued improvements (ASCA, 2012).

Based on our study's results, a key outcome was the influence of principals on ASCA National Model implementation. The school is an operating system in which school counselors often work in tandem with the school principal. Therefore, acknowledging this crucial relationship and working to increase principals' understanding of school counselors' duties is important for school counselors, as is emphasizing their

unique qualifications to meet students' social/emotional, academic, and career needs. In developing collaborations with school principals, school counselors may want to first spend time building a trusting relationship.

For school counselors to elicit better student outcomes, they should focus on advocacy activities with their principal primarily in the area of education. In other words, they could teach their principals about the appropriate and inappropriate activities for school counselors and provide data to support this distinction. To begin the self-advocacy process, the school counselor could provide data demonstrating the effectiveness of the appropriate duties and utilize the annual agreement, use of time assessment, and school data collection via the School Data Profile Template as described in the Management section of the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012). For example, in the state of Ohio, the principal–counselor agreement has been included in the counselor performance evaluation system (Ohio Department of Education, 2016). We believe principals will have difficulty making requests of school counselors for inappropriate duties when they have agreed to the counseling activities and duties required to meet performance standards. Even in states or districts without a formal requirement for a principal–counselor agreement, counselors could make the request of their principal for an agreement. Regarding noncounseling duties, school counselors may find it helpful to consider who may take on some of these duties. Noncounseling duties may never be fully eliminated and the level of practice (i.e., elementary, middle, or high school) or type of school district (i.e., rural, suburban, or urban) may determine the number and types of extra duties assigned. For example, if school counselors are serving as testing coordinators, they might consider obtaining a parent volunteer to assist with the basic testing procedures (i.e., filling in bubble sheets). School counselors should consider which stakeholders might be available to complete noncounseling duties. These suggestions require that legal and ethical issues are addressed and in place for volunteer work.

[School counselors] should focus on advocacy activities with their principal primarily in the area of education. . . . They could teach their principals about the appropriate and inappropriate activities for school counselors and provide data to support this distinction.

We believe principals will have difficulty making inappropriate requests of school counselors when they have agreed to the counseling activities and duties required to meet performance standards.

Over time, school counselors will want to inform principals of their duties based on each system within the ASCA National Model, increase implementation of the ASCA National Model, use data to show accountability, and demonstrate students' academic successes as a result of the school counseling program. School counselors will want to include various sections

of the ASCA National Model to advocate for appropriate roles and demonstrate program management, delivery, and accountability (ASCA, 2012). When school counselors use data to inform practices, they may find including prosocial and meaningful outcomes helpful (i.e., decrease in bullying, decrease in suicide threats, as a result of the school counselor's interventions). Overall, influencing principals through the use of accountability and data opens up understanding and valuing of what school counselors are trained to do.

In the age of accountability, embracing how they accomplish service delivery and resultant program assessment and evaluation is imperative for school counselors. This may be a shift in traditional services delivery (i.e., guidance counselor) to a more evidence-based, data-informed curriculum, resulting in measuring student learning outcomes appropriate to the school setting and academic needs of students. This shift will allow school counselors to spend increased time in appropriate school counseling duties as outlined in the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2012). Finally, identifying variables that may increase school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model will allow for increased practice that is "comprehensive in scope, results-oriented in design, and developmental in nature" (ASCA, 2012, p. xi) to meet the needs of every student.

Limitations and Future Research

This study had several limitations. First, the sample solely consisted of ASCA members and the majority of participants identified as Caucasian and female. A more diverse sample of participants, including school counselors of color, males, and non-ASCA members, might be helpful in future studies. This study sought to obtain a national sample of school counselors, but the response rate was low, at 6.3%, which may limit its generalizability. The questionnaire was a self-report measure of several variables, including perceived principal support. The extent to which participants responded in a socially desirable manner is not known. The SCPIS (Clemens et al., 2010) factors are highly correlated and limited application/cutoff scores have been established. Confirmatory factor analysis of the SCPIS in another sample of school counselors could be helpful in testing the construct validity of the model of factors and relationship among the factors (Dimitrov, 2009). In future studies, considering additional variables on how to measure ASCA National Model implementation would be helpful. The present study describes the school counselor–principal relationship as a foundational component of being able to implement the ASCA National Model into practice. Future research may want to study the effects of developing positive and proactive working relationships between principals and school counselors and effective ways school counselors can gain the support of and increase the knowledge of principals. Furthermore, considering the relationship between advocate and agent of change as part of school counselor preparation would be helpful. Finally, although we were interested to find that no demographic

variables predicted ASCA National Model implementation, the questionnaire did not include questions related to budgetary resources of school districts. Future research may want to consider additional variables that may predict school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model.

Conclusion

Factors impacting school counselors' ASCA National Model implementation have been clearly indicated through the results of this study. Amount of time spent on noncounseling duties, perceived principal support, and whether or not the principal knew of school counselors' appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model were statistically significant predictor variables for school counselors' ability to implement the ASCA National Model. As previous researchers have described (e.g., Lapan, Gysbers, et al., 2012; Lapan, Whitcomb, et al., 2012; Moyer, 2011; Studer & Oberman, 2006; Zalaquett & Chatters, 2012), noncounseling duties and principals' support and understanding of school counselors' appropriate roles are significant variables to school counselors' practices. Overall, this study adds to the previous literature predictor variables for school counselors' supports and challenges when implementing the ASCA National Model. Understanding the breadth and impact of these supports and challenges (i.e., amount of time on non-counseling duties, perceived principal support, and principal's knowledge of appropriate roles according to the ASCA National Model) will further assist school counselors implementing comprehensive school counseling programs and in meeting the academic needs of all students in the school setting.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Amatea, E. S., & Clark, M. A. (2005). Changing school, changing counselors: A qualitative study of school administrators' conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 16–27. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.9.1.w6357vn62n5328vp>
- American Counseling Association. (2014). *How does the school counselor of 20 years ago compare to the school counselor of today?* Retrieved from <https://www.counseling.org/news/news-release-archives/by-year/2014/2014/09/18/aca-school-counselor-info-graphic-educates-public-on-changing-roles>
- American School Counselor Association. (2004). *ASCA national standards for students*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2014). *ASCA mindsets and behaviors for student success: K-12 college- and career-readiness standards for every student*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/MindsetsBehaviors.pdf>
- American School Counselor Association. (2017). *Recognized ASCA model programs (RAMP)*. Retrieved from [https://www.schoolcounselor.org/school-counselors-members/recognized-asca-model-program-\(ramp\)](https://www.schoolcounselor.org/school-counselors-members/recognized-asca-model-program-(ramp))
- Carey, J., Harrington, K., Martin, I., & Stevenson, D. (2012). A state-wide evaluation of the outcomes of the implementation of ASCA national model school counseling programs in Utah high schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 89–99. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.89>
- Cinotti, D. (2014). Competing professional identity models in school counseling: A historical perspective and commentary. *The Professional Counselor, 4*, 417–425. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2164-5884.1924.tb00202.x>
- Clemens, E. V., Carey, J. C., & Harrington, K. M. (2010). The school counseling program implementation survey: Initial instrument development and exploratory factor analysis. *Professional School Counseling, 14*, 125–134. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.14.2.k811174041n4011>
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 155–159.
- Dahir, C. A., Burnham, J. J., & Stone, C. (2009). Listen to the voices: School counselors and comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 12*, 182–192. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.182>
- Darlington, R. B., & Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Regression analysis and linear models: Concepts, applications, and implementation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Dimitrov, D. M. (2009). *Quantitative research in education: Intermediate and advanced methods*. Oceanside, NY: Whittier.
- Dimmitt, C., & Wilkerson, B. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling in Rhode Island: Access to services and student outcomes. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 125–135. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.125>
- Dixon Rayle, A. L., & Adams, J. R. (2007). An exploration of 21st century school counselors' daily comprehensive school counseling program work activities. *Journal of School Counseling, 5*. Retrieved from <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v5n8.pdf>
- Graham, M., Desmond, K. J., & Zinsser, E. (2011). State mandated principals' training—Does it make a difference? An examination of principals' perceptions of the American School Counselors Association (ASCA) national model, state-specific models of school counseling and the roles of the school counselor. *Journal of Counselor Preparation & Supervision, 3*, 95–109. Retrieved from <https://repository.wcsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1029&context=jcps>
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2012). *Developing and managing your school guidance and counseling program* (5th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Stanley, B. (2014, January/February). From position to program. *ASCA School Counselor, 51*, 22–27.

- Hatch, T., & Chen-Hayes, S. F. (2008). School counselor beliefs about ASCA national model school counseling program components using the SCPCS. *Professional School Counseling, 12*, 34–42. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.34>
- Janson, C., Militello, M., & Kosine, N. (2008). Four views of the professional school counselor–principal relationship: A Q-methodology study. *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 353–361. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.353>
- Lambie, G. W., & Williamson, L. L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 124–131.
- Lapan, R. T. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling programs: In some schools for some students but not in all schools for all students. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 84–88. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.84>
- Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., Stanley, B., & Pierce, M. E. (2012). Missouri professional school counselors: Ratios matter, especially in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 108–116. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.108>
- Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Sun, Y. (1997). The impact of more fully implemented guidance programs on the school experiences of high school students: A statewide evaluation study. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*, 292–302. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1997.tb02344.x>
- Lapan, R. T., Whitcomb, S. A., & Aleman, N. M. (2012). Connecticut professional school counselors: College and career counseling services and smaller ratios benefit students. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 117–124. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.124>
- Leuwerke, W. C., Walker, J., & Shi, Q. (2009). Informing principals: The impact of different types of information on principals' perceptions of professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 12*, 263–271. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.263>
- Mason, E. (2010). Leadership practices of school counselors and counseling program implementation. *NASSP Bulletin, 94*, 274–285. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636510395012>
- Moyer, M. (2011). Effects of non-guidance activities, supervision, and student-to-counselor ratios on school counselor burnout. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*. Retrieved from <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v9n5.pdf>
- Ohio Department of Education. (2016). *Ohio School Counselor Evaluation Model*. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Career-Tech/Career-Connections/Resources-for-School-Counselors/School-Counselor-Standards-and-Evaluation/OSCES-Model.pdf.aspx>
- Pyne, J. R. (2011). Comprehensive school counseling programs, job satisfaction, and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling, 15*, 88–97. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2011-15.88>
- Qualtrics. (2013). *Qualtrics software*. Provo, UT: Qualtrics Research Suite. Retrieved from <http://www.qualtrics.com>
- Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The school counselor activity rating scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 274–283.
- Scarborough, J. L., & Culbreth, J. R. (2008). Examining discrepancies between actual and preferred practice of school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*, 446–459. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00533.x>
- Scarborough, J. L., & Luke, M. (2008). School counselors walking the walk and talking the talk: A grounded theory of effective program implementation. *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 404–416. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.404>
- Schimmel, C. (2008). *School counseling: A brief historical overview*. Charleston: West Virginia Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://wvde.state.wv.us/counselors/history.html>
- Simons, J. D., Hutchison, B., & Bahr, M. W. (2017). School counselor advocacy for lesbian, gay, and bisexual students: Intentions and practice. *Professional School Counseling, 20*, 29–36. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/1096-2409-20.1a.29>
- Sink, C. A., & Yilik-Downer, A. (2001). School counselors' perceptions of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A national survey. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 278–288.
- Studer, J. R., Diambra, J. F., Breckner, J. A., & Heidel, R. E. (2011). Obstacles and successes in implementing the ASCA national model in schools. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*. Retrieved from <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v9n2.pdf>
- Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA national model[®] in supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 10*, 82–87. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.10.1.f82t14475451422m>
- Walsh, M. E., Barrett, J. G., & DePaul, J. (2007). Day-to-day activities of school counselors: Alignment with new directions in the field and the ASCA national model. *Professional School Counseling, 10*, 370–378. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.10.4.47p342040286mw72>
- Ward, C. A. (2009). *An examination of the impact of the ASCA National Model on student achievement at Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP) elementary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi. Abstract retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/openview/021aa9550d4bd1aafcd7ecef8fba8ef3/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>
- Wilkerson, K. (2010). School counselor reform and principals' priorities: A preliminary content analysis of the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Bulletin (1997–2007) informed by guiding documents of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). *Education, 131*, 419–436.
- Wilkerson, K., Perusse, R., & Hughes, A. (2012). Comprehensive school counseling programs and student achievement outcomes: A comparative analysis of RAMP versus non-RAMP schools. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 172–184. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2013-16.172>

- Young, A., & Kaffenberger, C. (2011). The beliefs and practices of school counselors who use data to implement comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling, 15*, 67–76. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2011-15.67>
- Zalaquett, C. P. (2005). Principals' perceptions of elementary school counselors' role and function. *Professional School Counselor, 8*, 451–457.
- Zalaquett, C. P., & Chatters, S. (2012). Middle school principals' perceptions of middle school counselors' roles and functions. *American Secondary Education, 40*, 89–103.

Author Biographies

Heather J. Fye, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Counselor Education at Winona State University, Winona, MN in the United States.

Lynne Guillot Miller, PhD, is an associate professor in the Counselor Education and Supervision Program at Kent State University, Kent, OH in the United States.

J. Steve Rainey, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Counselor Education and Supervision Program at Kent State University, Kent, OH in the United States.