SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND COUNSELORS:

PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

The undersigned, approved by the Department Chair of Graduate Studies in Education, have examined a dissertation entitled:

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND COUNSELORS:

PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

Presented by Alison J. Roffers a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Science in Educational Leadership and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Benny Fong, Chair
Assistant Professor, Southwest Baptist University

Dr. Pamela Hedgpeth, Committee Member
Professor, Southwest Baptist University

Dr. Jonathan Mathis, Committee Member
Senior Vice President, Education Policy and Systems Change, City Year

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND COUNSELORS:

PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Southwest Baptist University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Science
in
Educational Leadership

by

Alison Roffers

Dr. Benny Fong, Dissertation Advisor

August 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Two of my professional passions are the role of a school counselor and leadership. I believe the relationship between school counselors and principals is vital to the success of an educational institution. I have a love for education, but not in just the academic use of the word. Social emotional education is equally as important as core academic content for successful development of an individual. I wish for all schools to have a principal-counselor relationship where school counselors and principals can collaborate and communicate with mutual respect and trust.

I first want to acknowledge my husband, Lance Roffers, for the countless hours he endured as a single parent while I went to class and worked on my dissertation. He has always been a huge supporter of my educational growth and aspirations. He reminded me to not feel guilty being away from the home, and to focus on tasks at hand that would lead me to finishing the goals I set for myself. I could not have finished this journey without him by my side.

I also want to express my gratitude to my dissertation chair and committee members. Dr. Benny Fong was an inspiration to me every step of the way. He would listen to my frustrations with a patient, non-judgmental ear and respond with empathetic encouragement. Dr. Pam Hedgepeth was an inspiration for me throughout the whole program as I looked at her compassionate, strong model of leadership. Having her insight and support throughout my dissertation journey was invaluable. She helped me understand leadership theories and helped me shape my literature review. Dr. Jonathan Mathis was on this dissertation journey with me from before I technically even started writing. He exudes warmth, professionalism, and leadership. He helped me balance my

school counselor background with insights into the role of principal. He has given me amazing feedback and support.

I am so happy to have earned the gift of more education. My mother would always say “education is one thing nobody can take from you.” What a blessing that I can now share that wisdom with my own children, Avery Jewel, Lane Gabriel, and Arden Jo. They are young and I hope they will not remember the times I have and to be away from them throughout this process. Instead I pray that they will forever acknowledge the value we place on education within our family. I pray that they find professional and personal passions and follow those passions throughout their lives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

School counselors and principals are important roles within schools throughout the United States of America. Ambiguous role definitions and increasing expectations placed on both school counselors and principals has presented a strain on the relationship between school counselors and principals. The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations of the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. Findings indicated that secondary school counselors and principals equally value certain characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship, but have a statistically significant different ratings of some characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship. Findings in this research also identified differences between secondary school counselors and principals in time spent connected to the role of school counselors and principals.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

School systems employ a multitude of educational professionals in varying roles. At the building level, the principal is known to be the leader. Principals are entrusted to make decisions that align with the district's mission and vision (Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019; Mombourquette, 2017). The role of a principal is multifaceted (Neumerski et al., 2018). Being the leader in the building, principals must be ready to quickly problem-solve and dedicate themselves to being an organizational manager and instructional leader (Neumerski et al., 2018; Sebastian, Camburn, & Spillane, 2018).

The role of a school counselor can be ambiguous (Havlik, Ciarletta, & Crawford, 2019). The American School Counselor Association (ASCA, n.d.) has defined the school counselor to help eliminate inconsistencies. Yet, perceptions of what a school counselor should be doing with their time can vary (Savitz-Romer, 2019; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017). A school counselor caseload can vary by age range of students, the size of the student body, free/reduced lunch percentages, diversity ranges, and gender differences. The levels at which the counselors work can add many layers of variance to their role (Boyland et al., 2019; Savitz-Romer, 2019). In an effort to help add clarity to the role of the school counselor, ASCA (2019b) developed a list of appropriate and inappropriate school counselor duties.

The role of a school principal is complex and consistently evolving (National Association of Secondary School Principals [NASSP], 2018; Thornton, Usinger, & Sanchez, 2019). Principals, as leaders of a school building, have immense pressure to perform in a multitude of areas (Sebastian et al., 2018; Yan, 2020). Time and resources

are often limited for school principals (Grissom, Loeb, & Mitani, 2015; Yan, 2020). Principals have professional standards to which they adhere while also attending to district expectations, student achievement, staff needs, and building operations (Grissom et al., 2015; NASSP, 2018; National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2015; Sebastian et al., 2018). Having so many expectations paired with a lack of resources and time is stressful for principals (Alenezi, 2020; Levin, Bradley, & Scott, 2019; Yan, 2020).

Building principals play a key role in determining the duties of the school counselor (Edwards, Grace, & King, 2014; Ruiz, Peters, & Sawyer, 2018). Building principals have varying styles and opinions on how to lead a school. Different leadership styles and opinions can be a factor in the assignment of duties given to school counselors. Inconsistencies in the school counselor role may lead to more opportunities for the school counselor to be given duties that are suggested to be inappropriate by ASCA (ASCA, 2019b; Dollarhide, Smith, & Lemberger, 2007). School counselors may find themselves in the difficult position of trying to advocate for using their time appropriately, while also being supportive of their principal's expectations.

Both principals and school counselors hold valuable roles in a school building. Both roles interact with staff, families, and the student body. Although their expectations and daily tasks vary, principals and school counselors are key players in the school system (Dahlkamp, Peters, & Schumacher, 2017; Dollarhide et al., 2007). A collaborative, respectful relationship between principals and school counselors is ideal for the overall climate and development of any school (Goodman-Scott, Sink, Cholewa, & Burgess, 2018; Yavuz, Cayirdag, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017). When adult leaders work

to fulfill the same goals, it benefits the entire population of staff, students, and community members.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used in this research was based on the Adlerian theory (Adler, 1927). Alfred Adler was an Austrian doctor, psychotherapist, and founder of individual therapy (Miller & Dillman Taylor, 2016). In his early years, Adler was considered a student of Sigmund Freud. As Adler continued to mature and research, he began to distance himself from Freud's work. Adler was a strong advocate for education, mental health, and at-risk youth (Adler, 1927, 1988; Watts & Ergüner-Tekinalp, 2017).

Adler's theories are referred to as the Adlerian theory. Adlerian theory is known for being relationship focused (Ferguson, 2020; Watts & Ergüner-Tekinalp, 2017). Adler theorized that people strive for perfection not solely for individual gain, but for the greater good. He believed that people work to be their best to serve the community in which they live or work (Bitter & Griffith, 2019; Miller & Dillman Taylor, 2016; Watts & Ergüner-Tekinalp, 2017). Adler felt that when a person feels a sense of belonging they are more likely to strive to serve others (Adler, 1927; Miller & Dillman Taylor, 2016).

Those strong beliefs in an individual's need for connection and serving the greater good makes the Adlerian theory relevant to this research (Bitter & Griffith, 2019; Ferguson, 2020). School counselors and principals share common interests when it comes to how they want to be treated (Finkelstein, 2009; Rock, Remley, & Range, 2017). Adler theorized that individuals strive to be a part of a community where they find value in their perceptions of relationships with others (Bitter & Griffith, 2019; Bluvshtein, 2020). School counselors and principals desire a positive school climate and working

relationship, which supports Adler's individual psychology theory (Bitter & Griffith, 2019; Bluvshtein, 2020; Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017). When school counselors and principals work under the same mission and vision they are more equipped to meet their personal goals and achieve the value they seek from a working relationship with one another (Bitter & Griffith, 2019; Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017).

Problem Statement

Past literature suggests that the school principal and counselor relationship can impact student learning and overall school climate (Mombourquette, 2017; Rock et al., 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Identifying key factors of the principal and counselor relationship that lead to perceived satisfaction is vital in developing and maintaining student success (Bowers, Whitford, & Maines, 2018; Edwards et al., 2014; Goodman-Scott et al., 2018). Different perceptions and expectations from principals and counselors could cause conflicting practices, which would result in barriers to a positive relationship (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009; Ruiz et al., 2018). The problem is that even though there is a better understanding of the role of a school counselor than there once was, many inconsistencies still exist that create barriers to successful relationships between principals and counselors (Howell, Thomas, Sweeney, & Vanderhaar, 2019; Ruiz et al., 2018).

Educational research has shown deficits in the relationship between school counselors and principals connected to specific areas of the relationship, as well as a connection between the school counselor and principal relationship related to student success (Bowers et al., 2018; Edwards et al., 2014; Goodman-Scott et al., 2018; Yavuz,

Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Studies have examined the impact of a school counselor and principal relationship related to school climate (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Rock et al., 2017). Current research is lacking in the areas of secondary school counselors and principals being asked to examine key characteristics of their relationship and use of time for each role respectively.

Principal and school counselor educational training often lacks resources to help develop an understanding of each related role (Boyland et al., 2019; Lowery, Quick, Boyland, Geesa, & Mayes, 2018). The lack of education and experience leads to a lack of understanding and unmet expectations (Boyland et al., 2019; Dollarhide et al., 2007; Lowery et al., 2018). This leaves principals with little help in identifying how to best utilize school counselors in their buildings. Little training on the role of a school counselor can cause counselors to be assigned duties that may not be within the scope of what they were expecting as appropriate for their profession (Boyland et al., 2019; Howell et al., 2019; Lowery et al., 2018).

When school counselors are asked to use their time on duties that are outside of the training they have received, it can lead to feelings of frustration and resentment (Howell et al., 2019; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017). Negative feelings that go unnoticed or unspoken often result in discord between the principal and counselor (Rock et al., 2017; Savitz-Romer, 2019). Even when principals receive adequate training regarding the role of a school counselor, they may not have the resources or ability to enforce the expectations they have learned. Some principals may have an idea of how they feel their counselors should spend their time, but the actual responsibilities given to the counselors are not what they consider ideal expectations (Boyland et al., 2019;

Finkelstein, 2009; Lowery et al., 2018). An ineffective principal-counselor relationship detracts from a positive school climate and as a result, student success suffers (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Rock et al., 2017).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations of the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. The independent variables of interest, secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations, were generally defined as key elements that lead to perceived satisfactory relationships, the most important needs of students, and job expectations for school counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). The dependent variable of interest, the secondary school counselor-principal relationship, was generally defined as perceived relational satisfaction from both secondary school counselors and principals. The Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating was used to measure the perceptions of the relationship between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. The differences measured included job components of both school counselors and principals and key elements to an effective working relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Research Questions

This study examined the inner workings of the principal-counselor relationship. The researcher analyzed data to assist in answering the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
2. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
3. What is the difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?

Null Hypotheses

The study was created to examine the following null hypotheses in relation to the research questions:

H_{01}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{02}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{03}: There will be no statistically significant difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

Significance of the Study

With the growing pressures and expectations for student safety and achievement, effective collaboration between principals and school counselors is more vital than ever (Bowers et al., 2018; Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017).

Nationally, youth suicide rates have increased by 56% over the last 10 years (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2019; Curtin & Heron, 2019). Suicide is the second leading cause of death for individuals ages 10-34 (CDC, 2019). Mental health concerns and suicide ideation for students are trending upwards (CDC, 2020; Curtin & Heron, 2019; Depue, Kryah, VonDras, Sale, & Tokac, 2018; Gallo, Rausch, Beck, & Porchia, 2020). If counselors use their time on inappropriate duties the mental health needs of students may be left unfulfilled (Howell et al., 2019; Kim & Lambie, 2018). If a student's mental health needs are left unfulfilled, as a result their academic achievement may also suffer (Goodman-Scott et al., 2018; VanderLind, 2017). With a shared vision and understanding, the principals and school counselors can work together to ensure that the needs of all students are met (Finkelstein, 2009; Mombourquette, 2017).

Educational research has been done on the relationship between school counselors and principals as it relates to school counselor burnout (Goodman-Scott et al., 2018; Holman, Watts, Robles-Pina, & Grubbs, 2018; Kim & Lambie, 2018). There has been research to address student success and the relationship between school counselors and principals (Bowers et al., 2018; Edwards et al., 2014; Goodman-Scott et al., 2018; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Academic articles have been written to address the topic of expectations that principals have for school counselors (Howell et al., 2019; Ruiz et al., 2018). However, an in-depth look at the relationship characteristics that lead to relationship satisfaction between school counselors and principals has not been explored within the last decade. The survey, A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship, was done over a decade ago to gain information about the topics this study covered (Finkelstein, 2009). Many changes related to education, student success, and

mental health have occurred over the past decade. Current studies are showing a correlation between mental health and student success (Eisenberg, Lipson, & Posselt, 2016). School climate impacts self-efficacy among students and staff (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Rock et al., 2017). The relationships between staff members impact school climate (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Rock et al., 2017). Given the influx in mental health needs of students, it is time to reassess the relationship between principals and counselors so that advocacy and support of the school counselor role can continue to progress (CDC, 2020; Curtin & Heron, 2019; Depue et al., 2018). On a national level, the relationship between school counselors and principals has not been self-assessed for more than a decade.

Definition of Key Terms

Adlerian Theory. All humans are goal oriented and strive for success. Individual success is not only perceived from within, but also through connecting with others and contributing to society (Adler, 2019).

American School Counselor Association (ASCA). The American School Counselor Association is a nonprofit foundation that started in 1952 in Alexandria, Virginia. The purpose of ASCA (2019b) is to provide support for school counselors in their work with students.

American School Counselor National Model. The American School Counselor National Model is a resource for school counselors on how to implement a completely comprehensive program that enhances student achievement (Campbell & Dahir, 1997).

College Board. The College Board is a mission-driven, not-for-profit organization that connects students to college success and opportunity (College Board, n.d.).

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). The NASSP (2020) is the leading organization of voice for secondary principals and other school leaders across the United States (NASSP, 2020).

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). The NPBEA (2020) is a national alliance of major membership organizations committed to the advancement of school and school-system leadership (NPBEA, 2020).

Principal. The principal is the school's leader and promotes equity and excellence in education for each student. This leadership is vital to every aspect of education–academics, the arts, athletics, co-curricular activities, and general administration (NASSP, 2002).

School Counselor Activities. Standards were created in 2016 as a part of the *ASCA National Model* to help define the role of a school counselor by determining what activities should and should not be done by a school counselor who implements a comprehensive school counseling program (ASCA, 2016, 2019b).

School Counselor. An integral part of school leadership that works with students to develop skills in the following areas: academic, college and career, and social-emotional (ASCA, n.d.).

Secondary School. A school intermediate between elementary school and college and usually offering general, technical, vocational, or college-preparatory courses ("Secondary School", n.d.). For the purpose of this research, the term *secondary school* encompasses sixth through 12th grades.

Limitations

The following limitations were identified in this study:

- The honest response of participants.
- Not all requested participants responded.
- No control over the administration of the instrument.
- Participant bias-related on survey responses related to individual's professional role.
- The number of actual responses of school counselors and principals across the nation who responded to the online survey was a smaller percentage of those who could have responded.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were identified in this study:

- Only secondary school counselors and principals were chosen to participate in this research.
- Participants that were chosen based on membership of a professional organization may have had more knowledge and understanding of role expectations for principals and school counselors.
- The research was focused on finding comparisons and perceptions between secondary school counselors and principals regarding their working relationship.
- The research was focused on finding comparisons and differences of opinions between secondary school counselors and principals regarding the use of their time spent in relation to desired student outcomes.
- The data in this study were based on feedback from secondary school principals and counselors.

- New survey questions were developed loosely based on questions from a previous nationwide study conducted by data scientist Doreen Finkelstein in collaboration with the College Board, American School Counselor Association (ASCA), and National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) in 2009.
- New survey questions were formed around current ASCA and NASSP standards.
- The research was processed through the lens of the Adlerian theory.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were identified in this study:

- The participants in the survey were being truthful in their responses.
- The findings in this study can be generalized to the relationship between school counselors and principals only at the secondary (middle, junior high, or high) school level.

Design Controls

This quantitative survey was given to secondary school counselors and principals to assess their perceptions on different elements and barriers to an effective working relationship and priorities of time spent to increase student outcomes. The initial participants were invited based on membership in a state principal or school counselor organization. Initial participants were encouraged to share the survey with other secondary school counselors and principals to elicit further participation. Confidentiality was ensured as a priority to encourage honest feedback from the participants. Organizations were asked to send out the survey more than one time to encourage more survey participation.

The first portion of the survey asked participants to identify their role given the following choices: principal, assistant principal, school counselor, school counseling supervision and/or leadership, college advisor, and others. The responses to the question allowed the researcher to disaggregate needed data for this study. The study was based on the Adlerian theory (Adler, 1927) to guide the research. The groups being studied were secondary school counselors and secondary principals. Due to the groups being studied, purposive sampling was used as a way to provide limitation stability. Multiple emails with the survey link were sent to elicit more responses. The survey was sent using QuestionPro, which allowed the participants to remain anonymous. Anonymity was a priority of this research to encourage honest answers from school counselors and principals surrounding their relationships and time spent on activities.

The research recognizes several potential limitations that could have occurred. The researcher had no control over the level of transparency and honesty of the responses to the survey questions. Participants may have had a bias when answering questions related to their work and the work of their principal. The researcher had no control over how the survey was administered since it was sent by The College Board. Not all participants responded completely to the survey. The survey did not reach every potential qualifying participant, secondary school counselor, and principal across the United States.

Participants were given questions related to their current demographics to ensure that data were kept for only those who indicated they were current secondary school counselors and principals. Only responses from participants who identified themselves as a secondary school counselor or secondary principal were included in this research.

Initial participants were given the survey based on their connection with a professional organization tied to school counseling and secondary school principals. The national school counselor and principal organizations were asked to share the survey with their listservs as a way to connect with current secondary school counselors and principals. Participants were given thorough descriptions of each category for answer selections in an effort to increase understanding and build consistency. The participants were asked to give their perceptions related to the relationship they had with their school counselor and principal. Questions were created based on the standards of two national associations related to the targeted participants. The standards from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) were used to form survey questions relevant to both school counselors and principals. The research was processed through the lens of the Adlerian theory.

The researcher worked under the assumption that the participants in the survey were transparent and truthful in their responses. The findings in this study can be generalized to the relationship between school counselors and principals at only the secondary school levels. The researcher has an assumption that data collected from school counselors and principals at other educational levels would reflect differences when compared to this study's data.

Summary

School counselors and principals share the same vision for all students to achieve success in school and life (Dahir, Cinotti, & Feirsen, 2019; Lashley & Stickl, 2016). Sharing the same vision is foundational for successful collaboration (Dahir et al., 2019; Kotter, 2009; Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019; Mombourquette, 2017). Sharing the same

vision does not always equate to sharing the same ideas on how to achieve the vision. The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations to the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. Looking at the principal-school counselor relationship through the lens of the Adlerian theory tied relational and self-concepts together (Adler, 1927). Adler believed that we all work to achieve collaboration and companionship for intrinsic gains, but also for the good of the community as a whole (Adler, 2019; Ferguson, 2020). School counselors and principals are important figures in an educational setting. They work to independently achieve goals, but also strive to make the community in which they serve prosper (Mullen, Lambie, Griffith, & Sherrell, 2016; Thornton et al., 2019). This research will fill the gap in literature by looking at the relationship characteristics between school counselors and principals that have not been explored within the last decade.

A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship (Finkelstein, 2009) was a survey done to gain a better understanding of the relationship between school counselors and principals. The survey results revealed many shared visions and goals between the two professionals. The research also uncovered differences in expectations for student success and appropriate job activities for a school counselor (Finkelstein, 2009). The value of the topic of the relationship between school counselors and principals is evident when looking at past research (Edwards et al., 2014; Lowe, Gibson, & Carlson, 2017; Rock et al., 2017). Revisiting the relationship between school counselors and principals more closely in current times is a piece of literature that is missing.

Chapter Two of this study is a thematically organized review of literature that will take a deeper look at the roles and relationships between school counselors and principals. The literature addresses the role of a school counselor, barriers to the principal and counselor relationship, and key characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship. Details of how the study was conducted are found in Chapter Three. Included in the details are how the participants were selected and contacted. An analysis of the data that were collected in response to the survey is defined throughout Chapter Four of this research. Finally, Chapter Five concludes the research with a summary of the findings, significance of the results, and recommendations of areas for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

School counselors and principals help to support all students in a school (Chandler et al., 2018; Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019). Both school counselors and principals have multifaceted roles that connect with the overarching mission of meeting the needs of students and staff (Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). School principals have rising expectations for student achievement (NASSP, 2018; NPBEA, 2015; Neumerski et al., 2018). The more collaboratively the principals and school counselors work together, the more effective interventions are for students (Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017).

The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations to the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. The independent variables of interest, secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations, were generally defined as key elements that lead to perceived satisfactory relationships, the most important needs of students, and job expectations for school counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). The dependent variable of interest, the secondary school counselor-principal relationship, was generally defined as perceived relational satisfaction from both secondary school counselors and principals. This research explored the differences in the principal-counselor relationship characteristics since Finkelstein's (2009) study on the perceptions and expectations tied to the principal-counselor

relationship between secondary school counselors and principals. The current study was framed around the Adlerian theory. Adler's social interest theory was included as a part of his holistic idea of individual psychology (Adler, 2019; Frank & Shoshana, 2019). Adler theorized people all longed for a connection and acceptance (Adler, 2019; Emmons & Belangee, 2018; John, 2020). School counselors and principals both seek approval and acceptance in their relationship with one another (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009; Ruiz et al., 2018).

The main focus for both school counselors and principals should be the well-being of staff and students (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; VanderLind, 2017). In order for students to flourish, they must also have their mental wellness needs met (Bowers et al., 2018; Goodman-Scott et al., 2018). The mental health needs of youth in the United States have shown an increase throughout the past decade (CDC, 2020; Curtin & Heron, 2019; Depue et al., 2018; Welfare, Grimes, Lawson, Hori, & Asadi, 2020). School counselors are trained to work with students to help support academics, college and career readiness, and social-emotional learning (ASCA, 2019b; Howell et al., 2019; Sink, 2016). School counselors work with students and families to provide mental health prevention and support (ASCA, 2019b; Sink & Ockerman, 2016).

Principals are typically the school counselor's supervisor and have authority over what duties should be performed by the school counselors (Boyland et al., 2019; Lowe et al., 2017; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005). Different work settings, leadership styles, educational experiences, and building dynamics lead to a wide variety of expectations set by school principals. If expectations are not met between school counselors and principals it could cause feelings of discord (Ducote, 2017; Rock et al., 2017). By

working together, principals and school counselors can make changes that reflect positive student outcomes and a healthier school climate (Rock et al., 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017).

Adlerian theory

Alfred Adler was an Austrian doctor, psychiatrist, and professor (Hoffman, 2018; Miller & Dillman Taylor, 2016). Adler, a known follower of Sigmund Freud, broke away from Freud's theories to develop his own, which are now commonly referred to as Adlerian theory (Hoffman, 2018; Watts & Ergüner-Tekinalp, 2017). Adlerian theory focuses on how the history of an individual shapes their future and how humankind strives for connectedness (Bitter & Griffith, 2019; Hoffman, 2018). A person's background shapes the way they behave throughout their entire life. However, Adler theorized that some factors could change the course of an individual's path (Emmons & Belangee, 2018; Parker & Dickson, 2020).

Adler believed that if a person was raised in unfavorable circumstances they would struggle with feelings of inferiority, but that they could rise above their struggles if they were able to form meaningful connections with others (Emmons & Belangee, 2018). According to Adlerian theory, everyone has goals and wants to reach their goals not only for their self-fulfillment but for the greater good (Ferguson, 2020). Adler wrote about social context being of value to humankind (Adler, 1927; Frank & Shoshana, 2019; Hoffman, 2018). He felt that a sense of belonging led to a greater desire to achieve goals and please others (Ferguson, 2020; Frank & Shoshana, 2019). Adlerian theory is often referred to as a social or relationship-oriented theory based on the fact that Adler

emphasized the connection of human interaction and self-worth (Adler, 1927; Emmons & Belangee, 2018; Watts & Ergüner-Tekinalp, 2017).

The literature suggests strong ties between the values of relationships, self-worth, and desires of individual success within Adlerian theory, which makes it a meaningful framework for this research (John, 2020; Parker & Dickson, 2020). School counselors seek positive relationships with staff, especially with their direct supervisors (Mullen, Gutierrez, & Newhart, 2017). School counselors and principals struggle with feelings of inferiority and burnout when positive relationships and results are missing as a part of their jobs (Alenezi, 2020; Edwards et al., 2014). School counselors and principals recognize the importance of making connections with students and staff (Mullen et al., 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). A valuable relationship between school counselors and principals can facilitate healthier self-perception, which has lasting impacts on the entire school (Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Rock et al., 2017).

The Role of a School Counselor

The job title that is now known as a school counselor has encountered various name changes and role expectations since the beginning of its existence over 100 years ago (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Savitz-Romer, 2019). In the early 1900s school counselors were hired to provide vocational guidance (ASCA, 2019b; Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). The title that is now school counselor was then known as a guidance counselor (Baker, Zyromski, & Granello, 2021; Zyromski, Hudson, Baker, & Granello, 2019). It was not until 1990 that the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) recommended a formal name change to the title of a school counselor. American School Counselor Association believed the title school

counselor reflected the multifaceted layers of the role of a counselor within the schools (ASCA, 2019b; Zyromski et al., 2019).

The role of a school counselor widened its focus to mental health in the 1920s but lacked structure and consistency (ASCA, 2019b; Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Gysbers, Lapan, Blair, Starr, & Wilmes, 1999). More structure was added to help define the role of a school counselor in the 1930s. After World War II, America began to see a need for more counselors in schools (ASCA, 2019b; Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Gysbers et al., 1999). This sparked an expansion of school counseling programs in the 1940s and 1950s. Role confusion continued in the 1960s and 1970s as schools struggled to identify consistent ideas on what should be defined priorities of a school counselor. The continued inconsistencies in the 1980s and 1990s led to the development of a national model framework for school counseling (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Gysbers et al., 1999).

In 1984 an initiative was created in the state of Missouri to help refocus the use of a school counselor's time (Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers et al., 1999; Zyromski et al., 2019). The initiative was named the Missouri Comprehensive Guidance Program (MCGP). The MCGP was not fully developed for K-12 use until 1988 (ASCA, 2019b; Gysbers, 2010; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001; Gysbers et al., 1999). Over the course of 14 years, Gysbers et al. (1999) tracked data from 441 school districts in the state of Missouri using the MCGP. The program focused on counselor program components and the use of a school counselor's allocation of time. Missouri Comprehensive Guidance Program (MCGP) is now known as the Missouri Comprehensive School Counseling Program, has been adopted by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and is now recognized

nationally as the best practice for school counseling programs (ASCA, 2019b; Missouri School Counselor Association, 2018).

Gybers et al. (1999) also noted that two items need to be in place for a school district to have a complete comprehensive guidance program. The Board of Education should have a written plan for a school counseling program and the written plan must be implemented by the counselors in the school district on all levels. Gybers et al. reported positive changes over the course of their 14 years of data collection. They recognized that part of the positive change could have been because the schools had the MCGP as a guide. Missouri is considered to be one of the leaders in school counseling models for their state-level advocacy and organization (ACSA, 2019b; Savitz-Romer, 2019).

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2019b) created a model framework titled the *ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* to help define the role of a school counselor. In 2001, three school counseling trailblazers, Norm Gysbers, Ph.D.; Clarence D. "Curly" Johnson, Ph.D.; and Robert Myrick, Ph.D., helped create the national model (ASCA, 2019b). The three school counseling leaders came together to merge their ideas to share the future of all school counselors. The first edition of the *ASCA National Model* was published in 2003. Since the original work, many changes have been made based on feedback and educational shifts (ASCA, 2019b).

The ASCA National Model has parameters set for how a school counselor's time should be spent. According to the model, school counselors should spend at least 80% of their time on indirect and direct services for students (ASCA, 2019b). Student services that are listed within the *ASCA National Model* include instruction, appraisal and

advisement, counseling, consultation, collaboration, and referrals. School counselors should be spending the majority of their time actually with students or working with other key stakeholders to advocate and serve students. That leaves 20% or less of a school counselor's time to be used doing activities that are considered program planning or fair school support activities. (ASCA, 2019b). Activities that are considered program planning include data collection, lesson plans, professional learning, calendar planning, and advisory council meetings. School support activities are duties that are expected of all staff members (i.e., bus duty, cafeteria supervision, hallway monitoring between classes, etc.). Even with appropriate expectations listed for almost two decades, the role of a school counselor continues to be open to various interpretations (Chandler et al., 2018).

Although the perception and understanding of the role of a school counselor have improved over time, there is still a lack of attention to role specifics (Chandler et al., 2018; Gysbers, 2010; Havlik et al., 2019). Lack of role identification and appropriate role assignments have been shown to lead to school counselor job dissatisfaction and turnover (Havlik et al., 2019; Holman et al., 2018). The *ASCA National Model* (ASCA, 2019b) pinpoints three major pillars of school counseling to support student success: Academic, College and Career Readiness, and Social-Emotional. The three pillars provide a structure for school counselors to frame student learning and achievement. Academic supports that school counselors provide happen through school counselor lessons, academic planning, student scheduling, graduation requirements, and collaboration with school staff and families. School counselors support students' college and career readiness through classroom lessons, postsecondary awareness events, and individual

student planning. Students' social and emotional learning is provided through school counseling curriculum, individual meetings with students, individual student behavior planning, and collaboration with staff and families. Support in all three areas is done through direct student interaction and indirect services through collaboration and planning with school staff and families (Sink & Ockerman, 2016; Ziomek-Daigle, Goodman-Scott, Cavin, & Donohue, 2016). School counselors should work to be a support system and advocate for all students (ASCA, 2019b; Mau, Li, & Hoetmer, 2016; Sink & Ockerman, 2016). Savitz-Romer (2019) compared the role of a school counselor to that of a primary care physician in the sense that they are the person that screens the student before determining treatment and what specialists need to be included. The education and training that counselors receive make them a valuable resource that often goes untapped (Savitz-Romer, 2019). Adlerian theory is connected to the role of a school counselor through its understanding of meaningful relationships for self-fulfillment and goal achievement (Mullen & Lambie, 2016; Savitz-Romer, 2019; Watts & Ergüner-Tekinalp, 2017).

School counseling activities.

The American School Counselor Association (2019a) created a guideline of appropriate and inappropriate activities of a school counselor. The guideline was created as a quick reference to help school professionals better understand the role of a school counselor. The appropriate activities are closely connected to the three pillars of school counseling: Academic, College and Career Readiness, and Social-Emotional Learning (ASCA, 2019b). Lack of understanding about the role of a school counselor can lead to assignments of inappropriate activities (Armstrong, MacDonald, & Stillo, 2010; Ruiz et

al., 2018). Cook, Goodman-Scott, Parker, and Welch (2018) found that when a school counselor's time is used on inappropriate duties, it makes it difficult for adequate time to be spent on the appropriate duties. The inappropriate use of time can cause shortages in preventative care in important areas of development in youth. Some of the areas of development that could suffer are behavioral, social-emotional, mental, academic, and career planning (Chandler et al., 2018; Cook et al., 2018; Sink & Ockerman, 2016).

School counselors are usually under the supervision of principals. Therefore, principals have the authority to assign tasks to school counselors (Armstrong et al., 2010; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005). Researchers Kirchner and Setchfield (2005) surveyed principals and school counselors regarding duties assigned to school counselors. Their study found that principals and school counselors agreed that the *ASCA National Model*'s tasks should be given to school counselors. Their findings also showed differences of opinions between principals and school counselors when asked about tasks given to school counselors that are listed as nonschool counseling duties in the *ASCA National Model* (ASCA, 2019a, 2019b).

Kirchner and Setchfield's study found that principals, when compared with the answers from school counselors, have less of a problem with school counselors using their time on noncounseling duties (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005). This discrepancy may be present due to principals' lack of awareness of the ASCA National Model's recommendation of school counselor duties (ASCA, 2019a; Lowery et al., 2018). The differences might suggest that there simply are not enough staff members to address the comprehensive needs of the school as a whole (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Waalkes, DeCino, Haugen, & Dalbey, 2019). All school staff are asked to help with various tasks

to assist in the school's operation. Tasks expected for all staff are called fair share. Fair-share tasks should also be expected of a school counselor (ASCA, 2019b; Chandler et al., 2018; Kim & Lambie, 2018). Fair-share tasks include before and after school supervisory roles, hallway supervision between classes, and any other school-wide expectations held by all staff. Tasks that are assigned to school counselors that are not considered fair share and are not listed as the American School Counselor Association's "appropriate duties" prevent school counselors from fully implementing a comprehensive guidance program in a school (ASCA, 2019a; Gysbers et al., 1999).

Counselors as leaders.

Challenges and ever-changing demands on school administration make it very difficult for one person to succeed without the help of others. Both principals and counselors should be viewed as leaders within a school (Dahir et al., 2019; Howell et al., 2019). Distributed leadership happens when principals delegate responsibilities to other staff members such as teachers and school counselors to help carry the heavy load (Elmore, 2000; Shava & Tlou, 2018). School counselors should be a natural consideration when creating a leadership team (Dahir et al., 2019; Janson, Stone, & Clark, 2009). Distributed leadership can generate new and different ideas and methods of thinking that would not be possible otherwise (Janson et al., 2009; Spillane, Camburn, & Stitziel Pareja, 2007).

The American School Counselor Association (2016) has a 12-page document titled *Ethical Standards for School Counselors.* The ASCA's ethical standards encourage school counselors to be leaders through collaboration with administration (ASCA, 2016; Mullen et al., 2016; Shields, Dollarhide, & Young, 2018). American School Counselor

Association (ASCA) also recommends school counselors advocate by emphasizing specific responsibilities of their role as a school counselor (ASCA, 2019b; Shields et al., 2018; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). Finding a balance between taking on more leadership tasks and maintaining the role and responsibilities of a school counselor can be difficult (Kim & Lambie, 2018; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015).

In a study done by Lowery et al., (2018), the authors surveyed principals and counselors at all grade levels and found that principals were not satisfied with their school counselor's responsibilities or level of participation in the school. The principals did agree that the counselors played an important role in school climate control and leadership. School counselors are trained in areas that benefit student growth and success (Boyland et al., 2019; Dack & Merlin-Knoblich, 2019; Mulhern, 2019). Providing school counselors with the opportunity to lead other staff members, parents, or community members in learning would be beneficial for all school stakeholders (Janson et al., 2009). If an individual feels important and that they matter, they are more likely to strive to make a difference that impacts more than just themselves (Adler, 1927; John, 2020). When leadership is viewed as a practice versus a character trait, more doors open to more people (Janson et al., 2009).

Shields et al., (2018) suggested transformative leadership as an approach for school counselors to adopt. School counselors should be change agents (Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Changes occur in education when a team works together to achieve the same vision (Kotter, 2009; Shields et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). Transformative leadership focuses on advocating specific sets of beliefs to create systematic change (Bass, 1999; Burns, 1978; Shields et al., 2018).

Transformative leadership would allow school counselors to embrace leadership responsibilities while avoiding unethical school counselor role tasks (ASCA, 2016; Shields et al., 2018; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015).

When a school counselor is viewed as an educational leader, barriers to student success can be more easily surpassed (Bagwell, 2019). Many of the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* connect to the work school counselors should be doing (NPBEA, 2015). At the core of the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* is "Student Learning" (NPBEA, 2015). Tied directly to that core are many areas that school counselors influence: Equity and Cultural Responsiveness; Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Community of Care and Support for Students; and Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community (NPBEA, 2015). School counselors should seek ways to get involved with initiatives that impact the entire student population. Being visible in a variety of professional capacities naturally builds leadership skills and status. Keeping data to show the effectiveness of a school counseling program can make a huge difference in helping to define a school counselor as a leader (ASCA, 2019b; Ziomek-Daigle et al., 2016).

The Role of a School Principal

School principals are the foundational leaders in school buildings (NASSP, 2018). Principals have individual strengths, ideas, and styles. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (2018) created best practices for school principals K-12 titled *Building Ranks. Building Ranks* is a framework designed to give principals structure to lead schools. At the core of *Building Ranks* are two essential domains: building culture and leading learning (NASSP, 2018). Another key element of the

document is to focus school leaders on how to help students prepare for future character, college, and career success.

In 2015 the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) updated the *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* in an effort to better encompass the ever-changing demands placed on school leaders. The following 10 professional standards were developed for all levels of educational leadership: mission, vision, and core values; ethics and professional norms; equity and cultural responsiveness; curriculum, instruction and assessment; community of care and support for students; professional capacity of school personnel; a professional community for teachers and staff; meaningful engagement of families and community; operations and management; and school improvement (NPBEA, 2015). The newest draft of professional standards for school leaders gives pointed attention to student learning (NPBEA, 2015) Student learning is the central idea from which all of standards stem (NPBEA, 2015).

The role of a school principal continues to increase in complexity (Reid, 2021; Sebastian et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019). Principals are known also as administrators and building leaders. They oversee a variety of management duties (Grissom et al., 2015; Sebastian et al., 2018). Principals spend time on a wide array of tasks working with students, staff, and community members (Grissom et al., 2015; Reid, 2021; Sebastian et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019). Setting standards for the school community's shared vision to reach goals, and collaborating with key stakeholders are all important aspects of the school principal (Kotter, 2009; Mombourquette, 2017; NPBEA, 2015). The role of a principal has continued to evolve, adapting to educational settings and norms (Sebastian et al., 2018).

Being a leader in a school building also brings expectations of instructional knowledge, student success, and an overall positive school climate (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; Grissom et al., 2015; Neumerski et al., 2018). Grissom et al. (2015) had hopes that their research would define which duties performed by principals equated to positive school performance. Grissom et al. categorized principal effectiveness into five dimensions: Instruction Management, Internal Relations, Organization Management, Administration, and External Relations. Similar to research from Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2001), they found the strongest correlation between organization management and school improvement. When a school staff perceives the overall climate in their building to be comfortable through trust and clear communication, turnover is reduced and student achievement increases (Collie, Granziera, & Martin, 2020; Grissom et al., 2015; Marzano et al., 2001; Ryu, Walls, & Louis, 2020). Their results also indicated beneficial ties connected to hiring candidates who have strengths in Organization Management such as budgeting and hiring (Grissom et al., 2015).

The vitality of a school building is impacted by the person in charge (Levin et al., 2019; NASSP, 2018; NPBEA, 2015). A principal is involved in every area of the school and makes an impact for better or worse in each area. Stability in the role of the principal is important. When leadership changes it causes ripple effects throughout the whole school (Levin & Bradley, 2019). Principal turnover has been a common problem for many years (Beausaert, Froehlich, Riley, & Gallant, 2021; Levin & Bradley, 2019; NPBEA, 2015; Yan, 2020). Researchers Levin and Bradley (2019) found high turnover rates from principals across the country with only 11% of principals staying at the same school for 10 years or more. Levin et al. (2019) found the following five reasons to be the

most common for principal turnover: lack of role preparation, unsavory working conditions, low salaries, lack of decision-making, and high accountability. Insufficient salary is consistently correlated to high turnover for school principals (Levin & Bradley, 2019; Levin et al., 2019; Yan, 2020). Nationally, the average timeframe for a principal to remain in the same position is 4 years (Levin et al., 2019).

Principals As Leaders.

Principals are the main leaders in a school building. The perception of a school principal used to be as an exclusive leader of a school. That perception has shifted to now view school principals as a member on the team they lead (Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019; Sebastian et al., 2018; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). Leadership styles vary from leader to leader. Many leadership theories have been developed and implemented by school principals over the years (Dahlkamp et al., 2017). Ideas on how principals should lead their staff have varied throughout history (Lambert & Bouchamma, 2019; Thornton et al., 2019). Two prominent leadership theories that advocate for collaboration between principals and staff are transformational leadership and distributed leadership.

Principals are tasked with a wide variety of duties (Sebastian et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019). Delegating tasks to help share the responsibilities can be beneficial for all staff members (Bass, 1999; Breevaart & Bakker, 2018; Burns, 1978; Chen, 2018; Elmore, 2000). Leaders who practice transformational leadership have been found to have secondary employee engagement when met with challenging tasks (Bass, 1999; Breevaart & Bakker, 2018; Burns, 1978; Wasonga & Fisher, 2018). When educational staff felt that principals were learning and growing they were more open to accepting challenging work (Breevaart & Bakker, 2018; Dahlkamp et al., 2017). When a

principal demonstrated transformational leadership, teachers felt supported and inspired (Breevaart & Bakker, 2018). Although transformational leadership did not result in educational staff feeling less stressed about personal situations, it did show a positive impact on professional stressors (Breevaart & Bakker, 2018; Wasonga & Fisher, 2018).

Distributed leadership (DL) is a leadership model that is grounded in the theory that more minds are better than one when making decisions for the betterment of all (Chen, 2018; Chitpin, 2019; Elmore, 2000; Spillane et al., 2007). It is not just about delegating tasks to others. It is about making conscientious efforts to include key stakeholders when making decisions and executing plans (Chitpin, 2019; Spillane et al., 2007; Zuckerman Wilcox, Durand, Lawson, & Schiller, 2018;). Tapping into the minds and seeking help from others can be helpful for a leader. It does not come without risks. If the minds of those selected are not following the same vision as the leader, it can lead to unsavory actions that could drive a wedge in an organization (Chitpin, 2019; White, Cooper, & Anwaruddin, 2016; Zuckerman et al., 2018).

The general concept of DL is to understand the strengths of those with whom you work and assign tasks based on those strengths (Elmore, 2000). Creating shared expectations is essential when establishing DL (Elmore, 2000). There are two main components involved within the DL framework (Chitpin, 2019; Elmore, 2000; Spillane et al., 2007). The first component is a leader-plus approach. Much like it sounds, the leader-plus approach simply means the leader utilizes other professionals within their setting to co-create and facilitate leadership tasks (Spillane et al., 2007). Before assigning tasks to professionals, expectations need to be clearly stated and model behaviors exhibited (Elmore, 2000; Spillane et al., 2007). The second component is known as practice. There

are three categories of DL practice: collaborated distribution, collective distribution, and coordinated distribution (Spillane et al., 2007). Collaborated distribution happens when two or more leaders work together at the same time on the same task. Collective distribution is when two or more leaders work independently on the same task. Coordinated distribution means that there is an exact sequence that needs to be followed to complete a task (Spillane et al., 2007). If leaders delegate tasks to others they also should have the responsibility of ensuring adequate training and time are given to complete the newly assigned expectations (Elmore, 2000). Distributed leadership is not intended to minimize a leader's authority by sharing aspects of their leadership. Instead, it provides innovative forms of management to schools (Chen, 2018; Chitpin, 2019; Elmore, 2000; Spillane et al., 2007).

The Principal-Counselor Relationship

When looking at a hierarchical system of a school, principals are found at the top of the structure. Principals have a long list of expectations placed on them and the list has continued to grow over the past several years (Sebastian et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019). As the main leader in a school building they are tasked with accountability initiatives, operational challenges, safety concerns, and instructional leadership (Sebastian et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019). When school leaders can share responsibilities with others they can more easily achieve a school's goals (Thornton et al., 2019; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). Partnering with a school counselor to distribute appropriate leadership tasks can be a positive experience for both stakeholders (Armstrong et al., 2010; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). However, without proper

communication of leadership expectations both principals and counselors can be left feeling frustrated (Shields et al., 2018; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015).

When principals and counselors work together they can form a powerful alliance (Edwards et al., 2014; Ruiz et al., 2018). The relationship between principals and counselors has changed with the change in expectations of accountability for schools (Cook et al., 2018). More pressure on standardized testing has resulted in principals incorporating counselors as a part of the leadership team. Principals are realizing that school counselors can provide preventive methods of social-emotional learning, which can positively impact student academic achievement (Cook et al., 2018). How principals advise and support the use of a school counselor's time can impact the relationship between the principal and school counselor (Waalkes et al., 2019). It is important that these leaders have a positive working relationship since student success increases when adults work collaboratively to coordinate and address needs (Marzano et al., 2001; Savitz-Romer, 2019).

Principals and counselors both hold important roles within a school. Finkelstein (2009) found when there are mutual trust and respect between principals and counselors, they can positively impact student achievement. Janson et al. (2009) and Finkelstein (2009) found two of the most important elements of a principal-counselor relationship are communication and trust. Even though principals and counselors agreed that communication is important, Finkelstein found differences when defining what communication meant to principals and counselors. Counselors viewed effective communication by the frequency at which it occurred. Principals gauged the effectiveness of communication by type and quality. Time was indicated as being the biggest barrier to

their working relationship by both principals and counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). Both school counselors and principals have a multitude of expected tasks to complete. Both serve a large number of students and staff each day. With so many expectations and critical incidents to manage every day, time together can be a difficult feat to achieve (Edwards et al., 2014; Finkelstein, 2009; Havlik et al., 2019).

The roles of both principal and counselor have changed over the years (Finkelstein, 2009; Havlik et al., 2019; Janson et al., 2009). Advocacy and education of role definitions have not been kept up to speed, leaving room for ambiguity (Finkelstein, 2009; Havlik et al., 2019). The perceptions that principals and counselors have about one another's roles can directly impact their relationship. Janson et al. (2009), Finkelstein (2009), and Havlik et al. (2019) agreed if mutual respect is not perceived it can lead to mistrust and fear. Even when counselors are feeling unsatisfied it may be difficult for them to advocate for themselves. Fear of the repercussions of advocating for their role was mentioned as a concern for school counselors (Armstrong et al., 2010; Havlik et al., 2019).

Collaboration occurs when individuals work together to achieve the same vision, which is a goal that school counselors and principals should strive to meet (Kotter, 2009; Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Senge, 2006). Principals can help to build an inclusive environment by asking school counselors for feedback on decisions that will impact students and staff. School counselors can work to build trust from principals by maintaining open communication (Lashley & Stickl, 2016). A shared vision is a foundation to a successful principal-counselor relationship (Kotter, 2009; Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Senge, 2006).

When school counselors and principals work together through regular communication they are creating a solid foundation for school and student success (Shields et al., 2018; Thornton et al., 2019; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). Principals should be able to count on school counselors to fulfill leadership tasks that relate to the duties tied to a school counselor's role (Shields et al., 2018; Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). School counselors should inform principals when a community or student need arises (Tubin & Pinyan-Weiss, 2015). Tubin and Pinyan-Weiss (2015) found when principals helped to clarify the role of a school counselor and maintained consistent communication, the school counselors were more confident and open to accepting leadership roles. When school counselors and principals collaborate the climate of a school is positively impacted (Levin, Scott, Yang, Leung, & Bradley, 2020; Rock et al., 2017). Counselors should demonstrate professional advocacy by explaining their role to principals as needed. It would be helpful to the principal-counselor relationship and the overall school climate for the principal and school counselor to advocate for each other to the rest of the school staff and community (Edwards et al., 2014; Rock et al., 2017).

Characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship.

School counselors and principals serve the entire school community. The roles of school counselors and principals are valuable to the well-being of the school as a whole (Parzych, Donohue, Gaesser, & Chiu, 2019; Thornton et al., 2019). Individuals seek approval in relationships with those around them (Adler, 1927, 2019; Ferguson, 2020). When school counselors and principals work well together their work is even more powerful (Edwards et al., 2014; Finkelstein, 2009; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Principals should be encouraged to take initiative and

learn more about the role of a school counselor through the *ASCA National Model* (ASCA, 2019b; Ducote, 2017). School counselors should also take initiative by helping to provide educational pieces of their role to their principals (Ducote, 2017). Finkelstein (2009) identified that mutual trust and mutual respect were the two most desired elements of the relationship between a school counselor and a principal. Looking at the standards and existing literature of both school principals and school counselors the following characteristics were selected for this research (ASCA, 2019b; Finkelstein, 2009; NPBEA, 2015).

Collaboration.

Due to their desire to form relationships, people are more effective working together than working alone (Adler, 1988; Kotter, 2009; Senge, 2006). Successful schools have continuous collaboration among stakeholders (Senge, 2006). Organizations, such as schools, should have staff regularly work together to establish goals and check for progress (Senge, 2006). When school counselors and principals collaborate, student achievement and school climate are direct benefactors (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Janson et al., 2009; Rock et al., 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017).

Collaboration between school counselors and principals should be paramount in their working relationship (Janson et al., 2009; Finkelstein, 2009; Waalkes et al., 2019). Ducote (2017) indicated strong ties between the collaboration of school counselors and principals and counselor job satisfaction. Ducote looked at multiple administrative leadership styles and compared them to counselor job satisfaction. Collaboration can be achieved through various leadership styles (Bass, 1999; Burns, 1978; Elmore, 2000). What Ducote found was that principals who followed positive and transformational

leadership practices worked with counselors who reported higher satisfaction in their work.

Communication.

Effective collaboration is not attainable without effective communication (Chen, 2018; Ducote, 2017). Talking and listening to the ideas of one another gives space for people to be collaborative and inclusive (Chen, 2018; Rock et al., 2017). When people feel included they feel valued (Adler, 1927, 2019). School counselors and principals who have regular, transparent communication view their relationship as more satisfactory than those who feel communication is lacking (Rock et al., 2017; Waalkes et al., 2019).

Rock et al. (2017) and Waalkes et al. (2019) found links between duties performed by school counselors and positive factors in the principal-counselor relationship. They identified that the more time school counselors spent on curriculum and classroom instruction, the more positive relationships were reported between the school counselors and principals (Waalkes et al., 2019). Communication frequency was also a factor. More communication between principals and school counselors translated to higher relationship quality (Waalkes et al., 2019).

Mission and vision.

Defining a mission and vision for an organization is foundational for progress (Kotter, 2009; Senge, 2006). Individuals long to be a part of a greater society and community (Adler, 1927, 1988). When individuals come together to serve a purpose expectations and goals should first be addressed (Kotter, 2009; Senge 2006). To maximize efforts in student holistic achievement, school counselors and principals should

first ensure they have a harmonious vision and mission (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Mombourquette, 2017).

Setting aside time to collaborate on shared goals and expectations for students is a foundational piece for success in a school (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Mombourquette, 2017; Senge, 2006). Creating a shared vision ensures that tasks can be adequately distributed among staff members while still all working toward the same objectives (Ducote, 2017; Edwards et al., 2014). Communicating expectations through creating a mission and vision establishes unity between a school counselor and principal (Ducote, 2017; Edwards et al., 2014; Johnson, 2015). When a shared vision and mission are held by school counselors and principals they can not only set goals but also continuously track effectiveness through data collection (Boyland et al., 2019; Lashley & Stickl, 2016).

Respect.

Individuals yearn to feel valued and respected (Adler 1927, 1988). An individual seeks connection and acceptance from those around them (Adler, 2019, Ferguson 2020). Leaders and employees in organizations seek respect from one another as a way to feel valued in their work. Respect is an important aspect of national standards held by both school counselor and principal organizations (ASCA, 2019b; NPBEA, 2015). The quality of respect listed in the standards of each national organization speaks directly to its importance.

Previous research on the relationship between school counselors and principals has mutual respect listed as one of the most important attributes of the relationship (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017). Respect can be shown through the amount of time a school counselor and principal spend with each other

(Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009). Consistent, clear communication can be perceived as an act of respect between a school counselor and principal as well (Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Rock et al., 2017).

Responsibility.

Leadership comes with many responsibilities. School counselors and principals have a multitude of responsibilities within their roles (Kim & Lambie, 2018; Levin et al., 2019). Since principals are the direct supervisor of a school counselor, the role of a school counselor is included on their list of responsibilities (Havlik et al., 2019). School principals should oversee the tasks assigned to a school counselor (ASCA, 2019a, 2019b; Lowery et al., 2018). They should make informed decisions on how a school counselor's time should be spent to best support the school's mission and vision aligned with the American School Counselor Association's National Model (ASCA, 2019a, 2019b; Havlik et al., 2019; Kim & Lambie, 2018).

Many of the responsibilities held by school counselors and principals are held in unison (Howell et al., 2019; Lashley & Stickl, 2016). Both school counselors and principals seek to improve student achievement (Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Both roles strive to strengthen school climate (Armstrong et al., 2010; Rock et al., 2017). Both school counselors and principals work with students, staff, families, and community members to promote school and student success.

Trust.

In 2009 Finkelstein found mutual trust to be one of two top desirable characteristics of the relationship between a school counselor and principal. Lack of trust can lead to unsavory work conditions and ultimately result in burnout for school

counselors and principals (Kim & Lambie, 2018; Levin & Bradley, 2019; Levin et al., 2020). A trusting relationship with colleagues is sought from both principals and school counselors (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017).

A case study done by Odegard-Koester and Watkins (2016) in southeast Missouri examined the relationship between a school counselor and principal. In their research, they sought to find how the school counselor and principal worked to develop trust and respect for each other; how they communicated expectations, concerns, and beliefs about their relationship; and how they made decisions together (Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016). The following three themes were found to be shared between the school counselor and principal in their research: a student-centered focus, role differentiation, and trust.

Barriers to the principal-counselor relationship.

Lack of information for principals can lead to a misunderstanding regarding the role of a school counselor (Armstrong et al., 2010; Finkelstein, 2009; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017). Research done by Armstrong et al. (2010) showed that principals and school counselors at all levels felt their training had not adequately prepared them to understand each other's roles. Misunderstanding can lead to feelings of frustration and resentment for counselors. Some of the misunderstandings could stem from school counselors focusing much of their time advocating for individual students whereas principals may have a more global view in thinking of the school as a whole (Armstrong et al., 2010). Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli (2017) stated when a principal takes time to acknowledge a school counselor plays a vital role in student success, it will strengthen the principal-counselor relationship. Chandler et al. (2018) reported when a counselor is asked to perform duties that are outside of their training and national model expectations

it can lead to higher turnover, increased stress levels, and decreased overall job performance. Noncounseling duties, as stated by ASCA (2019a), are barriers to school counseling. When the duties are assigned by principals, barriers are created in the principal-counselor relationship. The most common barriers found to exist by Chandler et al. were clerical duties for the school administration office, testing coordination, and involvement in the master schedule.

According to Bailey (2012), principals and counselors agreed that school counselors are doing less of what is recommended of a school counselor and more of what is not. Both counselors and principals stated a shared vision of the role of a school counselor's appropriate duties being focused in the areas of counseling, consultation, curriculum, and coordination. Educational training on the role of a school counselor may not provide principals or counselors with the information needed to effectively implement a comprehensive school counseling program (Boyland et al., 2019; LeBlanc & Borders, 2021). There were differences of opinions between the principals and counselors when asked about the amount of time counselors should be spending on what ASCA refers to as noncounseling duties (ASCA, 2019a; Bailey, 2012). Bailey (2012) also found that differences exist between counselors at middle and high school levels. She wrote that middle school counselors reported they spent more of their time on appropriate school counseling duties when compared to the reports of high school counselors (Bailey, 2012). Armstrong et al. (2010) found more discrepancies between secondary principals and school counselors versus elementary principals and school counselors. Waalkes et al. (2019) found evidence supporting negative relational impact for principals and school counselors in correlation to the amount of time school

counselors spend on what ASCA would consider to be noncounseling duties. They found a wide gap in understanding the role of school counselors in the answers given from secondary principals and school counselors (Armstrong et al., 2010; Waalkes et al., 2019). They also found more unsatisfactory relationship indicators among the secondary principals and school counselors (Armstrong et al., 2010; Waalkes et al., 2019).

Howell et al. (2019) and Kim and Lambie (2018) all showed a correlation between counselor burnout and noncounseling assignments. Counselors stated feelings of detachment from the importance of their roles when given high volumes of noncounseling tasks (Howell et al., 2019; Kim & Lambie, 2018; Mullen, Chae, Backer, & Niles, 2021). Counselors who did not view their relationship with their principal as positive were typically overall not as satisfied when compared to counselors who did have a perceived positive relationship with their principal (Howell et al., 2019; Kim & Lambie, 2018).

Principals may need help understanding the role of a school counselor (Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Lowery et al., 2018; Ruiz et al., 2018). Havlik et al. (2019) found counselors may be leery to advocate for their role, fearing that would cause them to be seen as resistant to authority. Chandler et al. (2018) noted counselors should act as members of the team and practice flexibility when working in a school setting. It is a delicate balance that school counselors face: advocating for appropriate assigned duties and still maintaining a status of collaboration. Effective advocacy is difficult to achieve in an ineffective working relationship. When a counselor can effectively advocate for appropriate assigned activities research has shown a positive effect on the principal-counselor relationship (Armstrong et al., 2010; Havlik et al., 2019).

Principals find their educational training regarding the role of a school counselor to be insufficient (Armstrong et al., 2010; Boyland et al., 2019; Lowery et al., 2018). Lack of training on appropriate school counselor duties commonly leads to administrative duties being assigned to counselors (Boyland et al., 2019; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Lowery et al., 2018). Principals stated their educational training on the role of school counselor should have included information on how to collaborate with the counselor, basic knowledge of the role of a counselor, and the foundations of social-emotional learning for students (Lowery et al., 2018). Principals also added it would be helpful to know how to distribute tasks among staff members as a part of their leadership training (Lowery et al., 2018).

Mason and Perera-Diltz (2010) surveyed preservice principals to assess their perceptions of the role of a school counselor. The results of their study indicated little to no training is given to principals regarding the duties of a school counselor deemed appropriate by the *ASCA National Model's* (2019b) standards. Principals have big caseloads and may need to assign tasks to staff members to help share the heavy load (Janson et al., 2009; Mason & Perera-Diltz, 2010; Spillane et al., 2007). Since principals are in charge of what duties to assign personnel within their building, it would be helpful for them to understand what duties should be given and not given to school counselors (Lowery et al., 2018; Mason & Perera-Diltz, 2010; Rock et al., 2017).

The principal-counselor relationship and student success.

In 1943 Maslow, a psychologist, wrote a theory of human needs and motivation, which he labeled hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943). In his, work Maslow describes how the basic needs of humans must be met for one to reach full potential (Maslow, 1943).

The foundational pieces of Maslow's Hierarchy that need to be met before self-actualization can be achieved are physiological needs, safety, love/belonging, and esteem (Maslow, 1943). Adlerian theory supports the importance of human connectedness, socialization, and safety as they relate to mental wellbeing and success (Adler, 2019, 1988). The professional standards set for school counselors and principals correlate to all levels of Maslow's hierarchy of needs in the expectations they set for working with students (ASCA, 2019a; Maslow, 1943; NPBEA, 2015). Students will be more academically and socially successful when they feel safe and connected (Adler, 1988; Bowers et al., 2018).

One school counselor in a building can make a huge impact; however, ratios matter. One school counselor can make a greater difference with 200 students than with 800 (Goodman-Scott et al. 2018; Sink, Cholewa, & Burgess, 2018; Lapan, Gysbers, Stanley, & Pierce, 2012; Parzych et al., 2019). The school principal is another influential school-level factor related to student success (Levin et al., 2019; Yan, 2020). If counselors and principals work to lead together, positive changes can be made tied to student academic achievement (Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). It is vital to the success of a school for principals and counselors to work collaboratively to identify, understand, and support the modern standards of school counseling to ensure the needs of students are met (Dahir et al., 2019). The safety and well-being of students should be a goal for all school personnel. Schools are encouraged to close the large ratio gaps between student populations and school counselors to improve the development of all students (ASCA, 2019b; Yavuz Cayirdag, et al., 2017).

Mental health challenges impact student social and academic success (Hargens & Gysbers, 1984; VanderLind, 2017). The issue is not whether or not the comprehensive counseling program shows effectiveness in student achievement. Rather, the issue is overcoming the challenges that interfere with the implementation of a comprehensive counseling program (Edwards et al., 2014). Principals often state that they recognize the importance of school counselors working with students to improve academic and social achievement, yet the actual tasks given to counselors do not reflect recognition (Edwards et al., 2014).

Principal and counselor preparation programs typically fall short in educating each about the other (Edwards et al., 2014; Lowery et al., 2018). When principals know what a school counseling comprehensive program should look like, they are more apt to support the school counselor. When school counselors know what duties should be expected from school principals they are better able to support them. When school counselors can implement a truly comprehensive counseling program there is an increase in student academics, behavior, and attendance (Dahir et al., a2019; Edwards et al., 2014). A data-driven, standards-based school counseling program that is implemented with support from the administration can benefit all students (Dahir et al., 2019).

Counselors are overlooked key players in educational reform (Lashley & Stickl, 2016). School counselors are trained to be equipped with all of the necessary ingredients to enhance student success (Mulhern, 2019; Yavuz Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Data are tools that counselors can use to accentuate their role importance (ASCA, 2019b; Lashley & Stickl, 2016). The use of data in a comprehensive school counseling program can

minimize student learning deficits and increase equity of student learning (Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Yavuz Cayirdag, et al., 2017).

When supported by principals, school counselors can positively impact school climate (Bowers et al., 2018; Rock et al., 2017). School counselors should be a support for all students, staff members, and families. When students, staff, and families feel supported they feel more comfortable and satisfied in the school setting (Dahlkamp et al., 2017). School counselors and principals should work together to ensure the well-being of all students and staff (Rock et al., 2017). Quality principal-school counselor collaboration equates to a better quality of school environment, which allows students to be more apt to flourish (Tygret, Mendez, Arndt, Lovato, & Scott, 2020; Waalkes et al., 2019).

Summary

School counselors and principals are often seen as leaders in a school building (Grissom et al., 2015; Shields et al., 2018). Both school counselors and principals impact equity and access, student success, and overall school climate (Bowers et al., 2018; Rock et al., 2017). The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations to the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. When school counselors and principals have a positive working relationship, schools benefit in a multitude of ways (Edwards et al., 2014; Lowe et al., 2017). School counselors and principals seek a relationship that includes transparent communication and trust (Edwards et al., 2014; Finkelstein, 2009; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016).

People thrive when they feel supported (Frank & Shoshana, 2019). According to Adlerian theory, people desire to understand themselves and those around them (Frank & Shoshana, 2019; John, 2020). Adler believed a leader should aim to build up those around them while also attaining personal achievement (John, 2020). When school principals have a true understanding of their needs they are better equipped to help meet the needs of others (Dahlkamp et al., 2017; John, 2020).

The research found in Chapter Two helped to shape the research questions for this study through identifying expectations and experiences for school counselors and principals. Current research has not addressed the principal-counselor relationship characteristics as identified by secondary school counselors and principals. Current research has not addressed the use of principal-counselor time spent from the perspectives of secondary school counselors and principals, which is addressed in this study's second research question. The goal of Chapter Two was to illustrate the need for further research surrounding the perceptions between school counselors and principals. Chapter Three includes the details of how the study was conducted. Included in the details are how the participants were selected and contacted. Chapter Four is an analysis of the data that were collected in response to the survey. Chapter Five provides a summary of the research findings, the significance of the results, and recommendations of areas for further research.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The principal-counselor relationship has been the subject of many pieces of literature (Finkelstein, 2009; Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Rock et al., 2017). The importance of having a positive, collaborative relationship between a school counselor and principal has been made evident in multiple studies (Dahir et al., 2019; Finkelstein, 2009; Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Rock et al., 2017). Past literature has addressed the importance of principal and counselor collaboration (Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016). A decade has passed since the study *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* was published (Finkelstein, 2009). Finkelstein (2009) partnered with ASCA, The College Board, and NASSP to identify important qualities and characteristics of the relationship between school counselors and principals. The original survey concepts were reformatted to fit the current school counselor and principal standards. The recent survey findings have provided updated key elements and barriers to the relationship that will give secondary school principals and school counselors access to immediate implementation ideas to help build and sustain more effective collaboration.

This specific study is relevant because barriers still exist that prohibit the effectiveness of the principal-counselor relationship (Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Waalkes et al., 2019). The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations to the secondary school

counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. A study aiming to answer similar questions was published previously (Finkelstein, 2009). Finkelstein (2009) worked alongside The College Board, ASCA, and NASSP to find differences of opinions between school counselors and principals in relation to their work with one another. While the concepts and overall objectives remained similar, the survey content was updated to reflect current school counselors' and principals' professional standards. Given the amount of time that has passed, the changes in the expectations of a school counselor, and the rise in mental health concerns it was time to reassess the relationship between the two supportive roles in a school (ASCA, 2019b; CDC, 2020; Curtin & Heron, 2019). Chapter Three will describe what steps were taken to complete this study. This chapter will include research questions, null hypotheses, research design, participants, samplings, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis (Roberts, 2018).

Research Questions

This study examined the inner workings of the principal and counselor relationship. The researcher analyzed data to assist in answering the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
2. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
3. What is the difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect,

responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?

Null Hypotheses

The study was created to examine the following null hypotheses in relation to the research questions:

H_{01}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{02}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{03}: There will be no statistically significant difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

Research Design

In an effort to ensure answers were achieved for the research questions, a quantitative instrument was created in collaboration with The College Board, ASCA, and NASSP. A quantitative method was selected for use in this research as a way to collect and assess data from the instrument. Quantitative research is conducted through the use of data and numbers processed to support or reject a hypothesis (Adams & Lawrence, 2019; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Quantitative research design can be used to show causal relationships (Salkind, 2010). Qualitative research uses words and narratives to explore ideas and concepts (Adams & Lawrence, 2019; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A qualitative research design would not be appropriate to use to analyze numerical data.

This study was shaped around concepts and findings from Finkelstein's (2009) research featured in the document, *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship*. The instrument used in this study was original. Once the Research Review Board (RRB) approved (Appendix A) the instrument, an analysis of the pilot study data began by the author of this research.

A quantitative causal-comparative research design was used in this study to attain data that would measure the differences between secondary school counselors and principals regarding the role of a secondary school counselor and important elements to achieve a satisfactory relationship between the two roles (Adams & Lawrence, 2019). The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations to the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. The independent variables of interest, secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations, were generally defined as key elements that lead to perceived satisfactory relationships, the most important needs of students, and job expectations for school counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). The dependent variable of interest, the secondary school counselor-principal relationship, was generally defined as perceived relational satisfaction from both secondary school counselors and principals.

A causal-comparative research design was used to determine relationships between independent and dependent variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The casual-comparative design seeks to find a reason for differences between groups or individuals (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). This research design was best suited for this study

because the objective was to find comparisons and contrasts between secondary school counselors and principals related to characteristics of their relationship and expectations of role responsibilities. Using casual-comparative research design helped to shape the data obtained from the study by looking at responses from the secondary school principals compared to those of the secondary school counselors.

Participants

Secondary school counselors and principals within the United States of America were participants in this study. Contact was made with potential participants through information from the following national organizations:

1. American School Counselor Association (ASCA)
2. National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
3. The College Board

Participants that did not identify within the definition of a secondary school counselor or principal were not included in this study's results. Public, charter, private, and parochial secondary schools were included in this study. Principals and school counselors that were not affiliated with secondary school were excluded from this research. Principals and school counselors who worked in multilevel settings that encompassed secondary school, Grades 6-12, were included in this study.

Survey participation came from 43 out of the 50 states. A total of 2,452 participants completed the survey. Out of the 2,452 respondents, 225 identified as secondary school principals, 163 secondary school assistant principals, 1,578 secondary school counselors, 345 as school counselor supervisors, 29 college advisors, and 112 identified as miscellaneous.

Participants were asked to identify the years they had been in their position. One hundred forty-six participants responded that they had been in their current position for less than three years. Eight hundred fifty-four participants selected 3-9 years of experience in their current position. Nine hundred fifty-two participants responded that they had been in their current position for 10-20 years. Four hundred sixty-four participants had been in their position for more than 20 years. Out of 950 participants, 713 participants associated their school as high school. One hundred five participants indicated their school was combined middle and high school. Forty-eight participants answered that their school was best described by K-12. Fifty-seven participants identified their school as other.

Sampling

In order to select participants, The College Board sent the study to the board members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and NASSP distributed the survey to their members. Some members chose to forward the survey to colleagues. According to the U.S Department of Education's National Center of Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education, 2019), there were 132,853 total schools in the United States of America. Out of that number, 91,147 were public schools, 7,011 public charter, and 34,576 were private. From those totals, 26,986 were secondary schools, and 21,287 were public secondary schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). Purposive sampling was used in this study to group principals and school counselors who were employed in secondary school buildings within the United States of America. One thousand five hundred and seventy-

eight secondary school counselors completed the survey. Three hundred and eighty-eight secondary school principals submitted responses to the survey. Purposive strategies led the researcher to focus on two specific groups of participants in this study and narrow the participants again by the level in which they were employed (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The revised Finkelstein's (2009) survey, A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship, was administered to secondary school counselors and principals along with the following demographic questions: job title, building level of students served, gender, free and reduced lunch numbers, student body enrollment total, years in their role, school location, student body ethnicity percentages, and percentage of students who continue to postsecondary education. Participants that indicated not being either a secondary school counselor or principal were eliminated from this study's findings. The participants' personal information was protected by remaining anonymous to the researcher. All survey materials and processes were reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to ensure ethical standards met compliance.

Once collected, the researcher used the information based on each participant's selected position to analyze the data. In Research Questions 1 and 2, an independent samples *t*-test was used to identify potential variation in groups (Salkind, 2010). Research Questions 1 and 2 used independent samples *t*-tests to compare the differences between secondary school counselors and principals. Sample size calculation for Research Question 2 included the independent samples *t*-test with a medium effect size of an alpha = .05 and a power = .8. Research Questions 3 used a chi-square test to examine the differences between the observed and expected frequencies of each of the following six

characteristics of a principal-counselor relationship: collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust (Salkind, 2010).

Settings

School counselors and principals currently employed by secondary schools in the United States of America were asked to participate in this study. Participating schools ranged from sixth to 12th grade. The United States of America has a total of 26, 986 public secondary school districts (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). As of 2017, there were 22,400 public secondary school principals, 8,900 combined public-school principals, 10,300 private secondary school principals, and 33,300 combined private school principals (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). U.S. Department of Education, 2019 reported 15,137,495 students in grades 9-12, and 66,077.3 secondary counselors nationwide. Schools in the United States had geographic locations used in this study categorized as rural, urban, and suburban.

The participants were invited based on their employment as either secondary school counselors or principals. Secondary school counselors and principals were chosen as the participants for this study in an effort to replicate a previous study done 10 years ago (Finkelstein, 2009). Similar to this study, Finkelstein's (2009) published work was commissioned by The College Board in collaboration with ASCA and NASSP. The research was due for an update based on the lapse of time, changing of information related to the role of a school counselor, and data on mental health (ASCA, 2019b; CDC, 2020; Curtin & Heron, 2019; Finkelstein, 2009).

Instrumentation

The revised instrument, The Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey (PCRS) from A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship (Finkelstein, 2009), was used to collect data for this study. Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey (PCRS) was administered to secondary school counselors and principals. The survey was revised from previous research with modified current counseling and administration standards considered. The original survey results were published over a decade ago, which presented the need for an updated survey to help shape the important relationship between school counselors and principals. The instrument used was from a project titled *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009) done in partnership with the College Board, the American School Counselor Association, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Permissions from both the original study author, Doreen Finkelstein, and the College Board, were obtained.

The original survey instrument was designed as a collective effort from The College Board, American School Counselors Association (ASCA), and National Association of Secondary Principals (NASSP). The survey intended to measure principals' and school counselors' opinions of six characteristics that they felt were important to have in their relationship with one another. The same six characteristics were used to assess principals' and school counselors' opinions on the presence of those characteristics in their current working relationship. The six characteristics assessed were the following: collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust.

The College Board was working to revise the original study it published (Finkelstein, 2009). The author of this research had hopes for replicating the study published by The College Board and started by obtaining a copy of the instrument used in the study *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009) from the author. The author gave the researcher the original instrument but mentioned that rights to the instrument were owned by The College Board. The researcher then initiated correspondence with The College Board to gain rights to replicate the study from 2009. The College Board was also interested in replicating the study *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009) and connected the researcher with a team who was working on a similar project. The researcher on this study worked alongside The College Board to revise the original instrument used in two studies prior (Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017).

The College Board sent the survey to a small number of principals and school counselors in the secondary setting as a pilot group. Data from the pilot study were not processed by The College Board to prove validity at the time. The larger study was sent to ASCA's and NASSP's Boards of Directors to be sent to all members of each organization. Data collection was completed in October 2020. Agreements were made between The College Board and individual researcher for the use of the data in this research as shown in Appendix B. When the data were given to the researcher, there was no proof of validity. The validity of the pilot study was completed by the researcher before the analysis of the larger study data.

Student outcomes are at the core of both school counselor and principal standards (ASCA, 2019b; NPBEA, 2015). School counselors and principals were also asked to rate

the importance of secondary school counselor and principal time spent engaging in activities to improve student outcomes. The seven activities listed in this study were written based on the school counselor and principal professional standards (ASCA, 2019b; NPBEA, 2015). The following seven activities were assessed: community engagement, equity and access, ethical norms, instruction and curriculum, mission and vision, professional learning, and school climate. School counselors and principals rated the same seven secondary school counselor and principal activities by using a scale to measure the participants' responses on how much time the secondary school counselor and principals spent on each of the 7 listed activities. The options for ranking were on a scale of 1 to 5. The options for ranking were on a scale of 1 (*the least time*) to 5 (*the most time*).

Validity and reliability data were absent from the original study. Researchers Rock et al. (2017) did a study using the instrument used in the original study, *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009). The researchers mentioned the lack of validity when referencing the original study, which led them to conduct a pilot study to check for validity. The researchers found consistency in the pilot study data test-retest reliability was .98, and Cronbach's alpha was .80 (Rock et al., 2017). Although the results from the pilot study were consistent, the sample size of 18 was too small to prove validity and reliability. The original instrument was revised, making the need for validity and reliability of the first instrument null for this research.

This study's researcher implemented a pilot study to assess the validity and reliability of the instrument using data from a pilot study administered by The College Board. The validity of the instrument was measured by using the Principal Components

Analysis (PCA) through the Statistical Packaging for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Principal Components Analysis is used to check the validity of a newly created measurement scale to assess whether the variables measure the construct (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-c).

The first step to measuring validity using PCA was to ensure PCA was an appropriate tool for measurement for the first two research questions. This was assessed by considering five assumptions: multiple variables can be measured at continuous levels, a linear relationship can be identified between all variables, adequate sample size is obtained, data reduction can occur, and no significant outliers are present. The construct validity for each separate characteristic of research as identified in Research Question 3 can be found in detail in Chapter Four of this research. For validity to be proven the data needed to provide a clear link between the construct and measure (Lund Research, 2012). The construct in Research Question 1 was the principal-counselor relationship. Using an independent samples *t*-test the researcher measured any differences between the secondary school counselors and principals related to their relationship. The construct in Research Question 2 was principal-counselor time spent. An independent samples *t*-test was used to measure potential differences between secondary school counselors and secondary principals related to time spent on activities. Multiple constructs exist in Research Question 3. Each following characteristic of the principal-counselor relationship acted as a construct: collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust. The chi-square test of homogeneity was used to measure each characteristic as it relates to secondary school counselors and secondary principals.

To determine the reliability of the instrument, the researcher calculated Cronbach's alpha (α) using SPSS. Cronbach's alpha is the most commonly used measurement to assess reliability in research (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-a). Cronbach's alpha measured the consistency of the data used in this research. The researcher used Cronbach's alpha to examine the relationship between the responses of school counselors and principals compared with the score of total responses in the first and second research questions. The α coefficient can range from 0-1. The greater the α coefficient, the more the items have collective covariance and probably measure the same fundamental notion, which indicated higher reliability (Salkind, 2010). A difference in an alpha level of .05 or greater is considered significant in this study (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-c). Many sources state that an α coefficient above .70 is acceptable, and .80 or great is preferred (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Salkind, 2010). When multiple Likert scale questions are used to form a scale, Cronbach's alpha is an appropriate measure to check reliability (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-a). The data in this research met the criteria for both Cronbach's alpha and PCA to be used for validity and reliability assessment as written in Chapter Four.

Procedures

Consent to use the original study *The Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey* from *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009) was obtained from the College Board (Appendix B). The original survey questions were given to the researcher from the original author (Finkelstein, 2009). A representative from the school counseling department at the College Board expressed interest in helping this study's researcher replicate the original work. After a series of emails to establish goals and commitments, the first video conference planning meeting was held on February 20,

2020. The team of school counselors, secondary principals, and professionals from the College Board reviewed the original survey's questions and compared them to current focus group data that had been recently collected from principals and school counselors by the team.

A small team including the researcher scheduled meetings every few weeks to continue their work to recreate a study centered around questions from *The Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey* (Finkelstein, 2009), the *ASCA* (2019b) *National Model*, Professional Standards for School Counselors, NPBEA (2015) *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*, and the recent feedback from research with secondary school counselors and principals. The survey was shown to the leadership at ASCA and The College Board for feedback. The group worked together from February 2020 to November 2020 until satisfaction with the instrument was met.

In order to obtain validity, a pilot study was conducted by The College Board. After the survey was edited to meet the current needs and requests from principals and school counselors, the team administered the survey to a pilot group using The College Board's small sampling from a database of school counselor and principal contact information. The College Board did not run the pilot study data for validity at the time of collection. The researcher obtained approval to use the collected pilot data from the Institutional Review Board before analyzation. After receiving approval from the Institutional Review Board, the researcher was able to begin the process to validate the pilot study data. Once the pilot study data proved to be valid the researcher was able to focus on analyzing data from a larger selection of survey participants.

The College Board sent the instrument to a team of in-house data scientists for review. The data scientists made suggestions on the addition of some qualitative questions being added to the demographic's sections. The adjustments were made and The College Board sent the survey to the leaders of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) organizations in September 2020. The organizations used their listservs to forward the survey to elicit more participants in the research. The survey results concluded in October 2020. The author of this study sought and obtained consent from the Research Review Board (RRB) before analyzing the preexisting data used for both the both pilot study and larger study data. Once the pilot study proved the validity of the instrument, the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating, data from the larger study were analyzed.

Data Analysis

The researcher used the data collected from secondary school counselors and principals from the modified survey *A Closer Look at the Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009). The SPSS statistical program helped to analyze the given data. The independent samples *t*-test was used to compare the rankings from secondary school counselors with those from principals (Adams & Lawrence, 2019). Cohen's *d* was calculated to determine the standardized difference between the means.

The software program Statistical Packaging for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 26, was used to answer the research questions in this study. Data samples that did not identify themselves as responses from secondary school counselors or principals were detected and removed by way of data cleaning. An independent samples *t*-test was used

to analyze the first two research questions from this research. This was appropriate to use for the first two questions in this research since the researcher was wanting to identify whether two group means were different from one another (Salkind, 2010). A chi-square test of Homogeneity was used to measure the significance of data differences as related to the third research question. The research questions are meant to look at each group from the first two questions as independent from one another. The researcher examined the responses from secondary school counselors and established a sample means. The researcher then repeated the same analysis when looking at secondary school principals' responses. Finally, the researcher compared the two sample means to identify potential differences (Salkind, 2010). Cohen's *d*, as a measure of effect size, describes the intersection in the distributions of related samples on a given dependent variable (Salkind, 2010). A larger number equals a greater difference. Cohen's *d* was used in the data analysis of Research Question 1 as a way to show comparisons between two means (Adams & Lawrence, 2019). Cohen's *d* can be calculated using SPSS under group statistics by taking the sample size, mean size, and standard deviation for each group. From there, take the data into the RSTAT calculator for *t*-tests to get the Cohen's *d*. The greatness of Cohen's *d* indicated the extent of the disconnect between two variables, or the discrepancy of mean difference from zero.

A chi-square test of homogeneity was run to measure the differences found in Research Question 3. This nonparametric testing measurement was selected as a way to appropriately determine if frequency counts were disseminated identically across the two populations of school counselors and school principals (Salkind, 2010; Stat Trek, 2021). The chi-square test can only report whether groups in a single sample are significantly

different in some measurable attribute or behavior. The more flexible parameters held by the Chi-Square Test allow it to be used in many types of research (Salkind, 2010). The Chi-Square Test of Homogeneity has four steps to implement: state the hypotheses, formulate an analysis plan, analyze sample data, and interpret results (Stat Trek, 2021). The chi-square test commonly uses bivariate tabular analysis to interpret results (Salkind, 2010). A bivariate tabular analysis is used to identify if any relationship exists between two variables. In Research Question 3 the two variables analyzed were the six categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) and an effective relationship between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

The first research question was answered when the researcher examined differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses to how school counselors and principals rate characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship. The null hypotheses presented in this research aided in addressing the research questions. Data collected and used in this research provided a way to draw conclusions based on the null hypothesis (Salkind, 2010).

An independent samples *t*-test was used to show a statistical mean difference. Responses related to categories of how secondary school counselors' and principals' time should be spent showed variances after running an independent samples *t*-test. The independent samples *t*-test was used under the following assumptions: the dependent variable should be measured on a continuous scale, the independent variable consisted of two independent groups, there was no relationship between the observations in each group, no significant outliers existed, the dependent variable was approximately normally

distributed for each group of the dependent variable, and there was the consistency of variances (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-c).

Statistical Packaging for Social Sciences was used to analyze the data framed around the assumptions by providing two main tables of output. The null hypotheses could be rejected if the outputted p-value was less than .05. However, if the outputted p-value is greater than .05, the hypotheses will fail to be rejected. (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-b). The mean, sample size, and standard deviations were reported in this study before reports regarding *t*-test results and Cohen's *d*. The researcher then used the assumption output data to calculate effect sizes to tell what differences between secondary school counselors and secondary principals were present.

The second research question was answered when the researcher examined differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses on how school counselor and principals spent their time to improve student outcomes. The responses of secondary school counselors and principals in relation to ranking seven listed activities were analyzed using an independent samples *t*-test.

The third research question was examined when the researcher found differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses on what characteristics were key to having a positive relationship. The responses of secondary school counselors and principals in relation to ranking six characteristics were analyzed using the Chi-Square Test of Homogeneity. The following assumptions to the Chi-Square Test of Homogeneity were taken under consideration when analyzing the third research question: there is one dependent variable that is measured at the dichotomous level; one independent variable has three or more categorical independent

groups; independent of observation, certain types of sampling can be used, and a sufficiently large sample size (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-a). Six separate Chi-Square tests were calculated to identify potential differences between school counselors and principals. When $p < .05$ there is a significant statistical difference found. When $p > .05$ there is no significant statistical difference (Laerd Statistics, n.d.-a). Statistical Packaging for Social Sciences was used to run a Chi-Square Test to determine whether the interventions for each characteristic listed in Research Question 3 was significantly different statistically. The data analyzed determined the potential rejection of this study's third null hypothesis.

Summary

The purpose of this casual-comparative study was to measure the differences in responses regarding key characteristics of their roles and the relationship between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. The theoretical framework used was Adlerian theory to help the researcher focus on the importance of self-efficacy, motivation, and social interest. Chapter Three shared the details of how the study was conducted. Included in the details were the processes of how the instrument was created, how participants were selected, how participants were contacted, and which type of data analysis was used to answer the research questions of this study. Chapter Four is an analysis of the data that was collected in response to the survey. Chapter Five concludes the research with a summary of the findings, significance of the results, and recommendations of areas for further research.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The study used questions from the Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey (PCRS). Participants in this study were limited to secondary school counselors and principals. Participants were asked to rate in order of importance the activities in which school counselors and principals to engage in to improve student outcomes. Participants were also asked to rate activities based on how much time was spent by the school counselors and principals to improve student outcomes. In an effort to gain understanding between principals and school counselors, participants were asked to rate the importance of certain characteristics required for an effective relationship. Participants were also asked to rate the presence of the same characteristics in their relationship. The software program Statistical Packaging for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 26, was used to run statistical analysis on the data. The independent samples *t* test was used to compare the rankings from secondary school counselors with those from principals (Adams & Lawrence, 2019). Cohen's *d* was calculated to determine the standardized difference between the means.

Prior research has shown the value of an effective relationship between school counselors and principals (Edwards et al., 2014; Finkelstein, 2009; Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Rock et al., 2017). Alder (1927) theorized that individuals strive for connection with others. When two people focus on one another a sense of community can be established (Bitter & Grittith, 2019). When school counselors and principals take time to focus on one another they build a sense of community within their building (Lashley &

Stickl, 2016; Rock et al, 2017; Yavuz Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Chapter Four will analyze the collected data previously outlined to address each of the following three research questions.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations to the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. The independent variables of interest, opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations, were generally defined as key elements that lead to perceived satisfactory relationships, the most important needs of students, and job expectations for school counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). The dependent variable of interest, the secondary school counselor-principal relationship, was generally defined as perceived relational satisfaction from both secondary school counselors and principals. The Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating was used to measure the differences between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. The differences measured included job components of both school counselors and principals and key elements to an effective working relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Research Questions

This study examined the principal-counselor relationship. The researcher analyzed data to assist in answering the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
2. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
3. What is the difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?

Null Hypotheses

The study was created to examine the following null hypotheses in relation to the research questions:

H_{01}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{02}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{03}: There will be no statistically significant difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

Validity and Reliability

Principal-counselor relationship rating.

A principal components analysis (PCA) was run on the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating. The first step to measuring validity using PCA was to ensure PCA

was an appropriate tool for measurement for the first two research questions. This was assessed by considering five assumptions: multiple variables can be measured at continuous levels, a linear relationship can be identified between all variables, adequate sample size is obtained, data reduction can occur, and no significant outliers are present. This measured desired characteristics of the principal and school counselor relationship. The suitability of PCA was assessed prior to analysis. Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that the majority of variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was 0.86. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was not statistically significant ($p > .0005$), indicating that the data were likely, not factorizable. Nevertheless, the PCA was still conducted. PCA revealed equal variances were not assumed.

Table 1

Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy			0.860
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity			
	Approx. Chi-Square	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
	3443.348	15	<0.001

A Varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid interpretability. Varimax orthogonal rotation eases statistical interpretation of data by highlighting key variables. One construct consisted of six questions. One component was extracted from the six questions, verifying that these six questions measured one construct. The scale had a high level of internal consistency, as determined by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.868.

Table 2

Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating Component Matrix

Q1	0.796
Q2	0.841
Q3	0.666
Q4	0.830
Q5	0.732
Q6	0.851

Table 3

Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	0.868

Principal-counselor time spent rating.

The second research question measured principal and school counselor desired use of time spent. The suitability of PCA was assessed prior to analysis. Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all of the variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure was 0.526. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was not statistically significant ($p > .0005$), indicating that the data were likely, not factorizable. Nevertheless, the PCA was still conducted. PCA revealed equal variances were not assumed.

Table 4

Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy			0.526
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity			
	Approx. Chi-Square	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)
	285.371	91	0.000

A Varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid interpretability. One construct consisted of 14 questions. Four components were extracted from the 14 questions. The scale had a high level of internal consistency, as determined by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.926.

Table 5

Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating Component Matrix

	1	2	3	4
Q1		0.667		
Q2		0.329	-0.366	-0.462
Q3	-0.323	0.709		
Q4		0.523	0.703	
Q5		0.337	0.801	
Q6		0.459		
Q7	0.730			
Q8	0.454			0.721
Q9	0.688			0.414
Q10	0.860			
Q11	0.407	0.625		
Q12	0.578			
Q13	0.515	0.525		
Q14	0.756			

Table 6

Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	0.926

Study Design

Once the survey was closed for responses, the data were downloaded into Microsoft Excel. The data were cleaned prior to uploading them into SPSS for further analysis. The first part of the data cleaning process was to eliminate participants that did not identify as secondary school counselors or principals. The rest of the data cleaning consisted of the following: eliminating surveys that were not fulfilled, organizing data responses by participants' identified roles, and counting participants' answers to each principal-counselor relationship characteristic listed in Research Question 3. The survey concluded with a total of 2,452 responses from school counselors, principals, and leaders in both areas from the United States of America. Results included participants from 43 states. Only participants who identified themselves as secondary school counselors and secondary school principals or assistant principals were used in this study. The results include answers from 388 principals and 1,578 school counselors.

The first portion of the survey asked participants three demographic questions as a way to communicate who was meant to complete the survey. The first two questions asked for role identification and years of service. The third question was directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants were asked to rate the impact that COVID-19 had on their role. They were also encouraged to continue answering the survey questions through the lens of their role outside of the COVID-19 setting.

The second portion of the survey asked participants to rate important activities in which school counselors and principals could engage in related to improve student outcomes. Participants were asked to rate school counselors' and principals' actual time spent in activities listed to improve student outcomes. A Likert scale was used with *1 = least time, 2, 3 = neutral, 4, 5 = most time*. Two open-ended questions were included that asked participants to identify the most important role for principals and the most important role for school counselors to have to impact systemic change.

The third portion of the survey asked participants to rate characteristics needed for effective relationships between school counselors and principals. Participants were also asked to rate the presence of each characteristic within their relationship with school counselors and principals. Five open-ended questions were included in this section, which were all related to the principal-counselor relationship. Participants were asked to list the most important characteristic in the principal-counselor relationship out of all the ones provided in the rating questions. One question asked participants to state barriers in their existing principal-counselor relationship. Another question asked participants to reflect on successes they had experienced within the principal-counselor relationship. The final two questions in this section asked participants to identify what aspects of the principal-counselor relationship they wished to continue and aspects they wished to cease. The survey concluded with 12 demographic questions.

Data Analysis and Findings

Principal-counselor relationship rating.

Participants in this research included 388 secondary principals and 1,578 school counselors. An independent samples *t* test was run to determine if there were differences

in the principal-counselor relationship rating between school counselors and principals. The assumption of homogeneity of variances being violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equity of variances ($p < .001$). The principal-counselor relationship rating for counselors ($M = 11.92$, $SD = 13.62$) was smaller than for principals ($M = 14.23$, $SD = 14.01$), a statistically significant difference, $M = -2.32$, 95% CI [-3.87, -.77], $t(580.315) = -2.93$, $p = .003$, Cohen's d = .17, a small effect size.

Table 7

Principal-Counselor Relationship t test for Equality of Means

	t	*df*	*p* Value	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating	-2.933	580.315	0.003	-2.31502	0.78942	-3.87	-0.77

Principal-counselor time spent rating.

There were 1,578 school counselors and 388 principals. An independent samples *t* test was run to determine if there were differences in the principal-counselor time spent rating between school counselors and principals. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equity of variances ($p > .001$). The principal-counselor relationship rating for counselors ($M = 33.09$, $SD = 25.30$) was smaller than for principals ($M = 35.91$, $SD = 27.30$), a statistically significant difference since the p-value ($p = 0.065$) was close to the cutoff value of significance, $M = -2.82$, 95% CI [-5.820, -0.172], $t(561.529) = -1.851$, $p = .065$, Cohen's $d = .11$, a small effect size.

Table 8

Principal-Counselor Time Spent t test for Equality of Means

	t	*df*	*p* Value	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating	-1.851	561.529	0.065	-2.824	1.525	-5.820	0.172

Principal-counselor relationship rating differences.

Collaboration.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted between school counselors' and principals' rating on the Collaboration question. All expected cell frequencies were greater than 5. There was not a statistically significant difference between school counselors and principals, $\chi^2(4) = 4.755$, $p = .313$. The difference was small, Cramer's V = .073.

Table 9

Collaboration Likert Choices

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
School Counselor	0.9%	2.6%	6.9%	35.2%	54.5%	100.0%
Principal	0.0%	1.0%	7.0%	32.0%	60.0%	100.0%

Table 10

Collaboration Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	4.755	4	0.313

Table 11

Collaboration Cramer's V

	Value
Cramer's V	0.073

Communication.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted between school counselors' and principals' rating on the Communication question. All expected cell frequencies were greater than 5. There was not a statistically significant difference between school counselors and principals $\chi^2(4) = 4.930$, $p = .295$. The difference was small, Cramer's V = .074.

Table 12

Communication Likert Choices

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
School Counselor	0.9%	1.3%	2.0%	14.1%	81.8%	100.0%
Principal	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	16.1%	82.4%	100.0%

Table 13

Communication Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	4.930	4	0.295

Table 14

Communication Cramer's V

	Value
Cramer's V	0.074

Mission and vision.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted between school counselors' and principals' rating on the Mission and Vision question. There was a statistically significant difference (since the p-value is very close to .05) between school counselors and principals, $\chi^2(4) = 9.24$, $p = 0.055$. The difference was small, Cramer's V = .102.

Table 15

Mission and Vision Likert Choices

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
School Counselor	0.7%	2.4%	10.8%	36.4%	49.7%	100.0%
Principal	0.0%	1.5%	6.0%	32.7%	59.8%	100.0%

Table 16

Mission and Vision Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	9.243	4	0.055

Table 17

Mission and Vision Cramer's V

	Value
Cramer's V	0.102

Respect.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted between school counselors' and principals' rating on the Respect question. All expected cell frequencies were greater than 5. There was not a statistically significant difference between school counselors and principals, $\chi^2(4) = 5.963$, $p = .202$. The difference was small, Cramer's V = .082.

Table 18

Respect Likert Choices

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
School Counselor	1.0%	0.7%	2.7%	15.8%	79.7%	100.0%
Principal	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	20.6%	77.4%	100.0%

Table 19

Respect Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	5.963	4	0.202

Table 20

Respect Cramer's V

	Value
Cramer's V	0.082

Responsibility.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted between school counselors' and principals' rating on the Responsibility question. There was a statistically significant difference between school counselors and principals, $\chi^2(4) = 17.875$, $p = .001$. The difference was small, Cramer's V = .141.

Table 21

Responsibility Likert Choices

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
School Counselor	1.0%	3.7%	13.6%	44.3%	37.4%	100.0%
Principal	0.0%	3.0%	6.0%	39.7%	51.3%	100.0%

Table 22

Responsibility Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	17.875	4	0.001

Table 23

Responsibility Cramer's V

	Value
Cramer's V	0.141

Trust.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted between school counselors' and principals' rating on the Trust question. All expected cell frequencies were greater than 5. There was not a statistically significant difference between school counselors and principals, $\chi^2(4) = 4.810$, $p = .307$. The difference was small, Cramer's V = .073.

Table 24

Trust Likert Choices

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
School Counselor	1.0%	1.3%	2.0%	17.8%	77.9%	100.0%
Principal	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	18.1%	79.4%	100.0%

Table 25

Trust Chi-Square Tests

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Chi-Square	4.810	4	0.307

Table 26

Trust Cramer's V

	Value
Cramer's V	0.073

Summary

Chapter Four included an analysis of data and study findings. Presented in Chapter Four were validity and reliability results, research questions, null hypotheses, and the design of the study. A description of the results of the independent samples *t* tests was shared. Descriptions of each characteristic for Research Question 3 were identified using chi-square results. Every null hypothesis was accepted or rejected based on whether or not statistical differences were found. If the effect size was not statistically significant the null hypothesis was accepted. If the effect size was statistically significant the null hypothesis was rejected. The effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's *d* to determine the difference. Chapter Five includes a detailed interpretation of the results, a synthesis of the research findings, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations of the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. The independent variables of interest, secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations, were generally defined as key elements that lead to perceived satisfactory relationships, the most important needs of students, and job expectations for school counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). The dependent variable of interest, the secondary school counselor-principal relationship, was generally defined as perceived relational satisfaction from both secondary school counselors and principals.

The review of current literature showed the need for a supportive working relationship between school counselors and principals. Previous research has been done showing the effect of the school counselor and principal relationship tied to student success, job satisfaction, and overall school climate (Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Rock et al., 2017; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017). The rise in mental health needs and supports and the rise in expectations for both school counselors and principals was also apparent in current national trends and research (CDC, 2020; Goodman-Scott et al., 2018; VanderLind, 2017). The Adlerian theory was used as a framework in this research to weave together themes of relationship, connectedness,

and the desire of individuals to be a part of a community (Bitter & Grittith, 2019; Emmons & Belangee, 2018).

Chapter Five provides a summary of the methods used to collect and analyze the data related to the three research questions. This study attempted to reject or fail the null hypothesis for each of the three research questions. Findings for each of the research questions, recommendations for future research, practical implications, and conclusions are included in Chapter Five.

Summary of Methods

This quantitative research was conducted after the approval of the Research Review Board of Southwest Baptist University, which was granted in April 2021. Consent to use the original study The Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey from *A Closer Look at the Principal-Counselor Relationship* (Finkelstein, 2009) was obtained from the College Board (Appendix B). The original survey questions were given to the researcher from the original author (Finkelstein, 2009). A representative from the school counseling department at the College Board expressed interest in helping this study's researcher replicate the original work. A small team including the researcher scheduled meetings every few weeks to continue their work to recreate a study centered around questions from The Principal-Counselor Relationship Survey (Finkelstein, 2009), the *ASCA*'s *National Model*, *Professional Standards for School Counselors* (2019b), NPBEA *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders* (2015), and the recent feedback from research with secondary school counselors and principals.

The College Board sent the survey to the leaders of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the National Association of Secondary School

Principals (NASSP) organizations in September 2020. That data were obtained by the researcher from The College Board. Consent to use the data was given to the researcher from The College Board (Appendix B). Survey participation came from 43 out of the 50 states. A total of 2,452 participants completed the survey. Out of the 2,452 respondents, 225 identified as secondary school principals, 163 secondary school assistant principals, 1,578 secondary school counselors, 345 as school counselor supervisors, 29 college advisors, and 112 identified as miscellaneous.

Once the pilot study proved the validity of the instrument, the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating, data from the larger study were analyzed using Statistical Packaging for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 26. An independent samples *t* test was used to analyze the first two research questions from this research. A chi-square test of Homogeneity was used to measure the significance of data differences as related to the third research question.

Research Questions

This study examined the inner workings of the principal-counselor relationship. The researcher analyzed data to assist in answering the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
2. What is the difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?
3. What is the difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect,

responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals?

Null Hypotheses

The study was created to examine the following null hypotheses in relation to the research questions:

H_{01}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{02}: There will be no difference in the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

H_{03}: There will be no statistically significant difference in the ranking of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories (collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust) between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals.

Summary of Findings

The differences in the secondary principal-counselor relationship and time spent between secondary school counselors and principals was the focus of this research. After a review of literature presented in this research indicated a gap, the researcher formed null hypotheses to analyze current data related to the difference between secondary school counselors and principals. Each research question was investigated through quantitative analysis to test the corresponding hypothesis.

Research question 1 conclusions: Principal-counselor relationship rating.

This section includes an in-depth interpretation, analysis, and synthesis of the results and findings of Research Question 1. This question sought to determine whether

or not there was a difference in the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals according to secondary school counselors and principals. An independent samples *t* test was run to determine if a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) was present. Results of this study revealed a *p*-value of .003. The principal-counselor relationship rating for secondary school counselors ($M = 11.92$, $SD = 13.62$) was smaller than for principals ($M = 14.23$, $SD = 14.01$), but the difference between the mean values was small. Therefore, there was a statistically significant difference in responses of principal-counselor relationship rating between secondary school counselors and principals. The null hypothesis for Research Question 1 could be rejected.

The first research question was answered when the researcher examined differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses to how school counselors and principals rated characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship. The null hypotheses presented in this research aided in addressing the research questions. At the completion of data analysis, the researcher could reject the null hypothesis of the first research question. There was a statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Research question 2 conclusions: Principal-counselor time spent rating.

This section includes an in-depth interpretation, analysis, and synthesis of the results and findings of Research Question 2. This question sought to determine whether or not there was a difference related to time spent between secondary school counselors and principals according to secondary school counselors and principals. An independent samples *t* test was run to determine if a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) was

present. Results of this study revealed a p-value of .065. The principal-counselor relationship rating for secondary school counselors (M = 33.09, SD = 25.30) was smaller than for principals (M = 35.91, SD = 27.30). The p-value (.065) was close enough to .05 to indicate a statistically significant difference. Therefore, the researcher determined that there was a statistically significant difference in responses of principal-counselor time spent rating between secondary school counselors and principals. Because of the statistical difference found, the null hypothesis for Research Question 2 could be rejected.

The second research question was answered when the researcher examined differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses on how secondary school counselor and principals spent their time. The responses of secondary school counselors and principals in relation were analyzed using an independent samples t test. At the completion of data analysis, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis of the second research question. There was a statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated time spent between secondary school counselors and principals.

Research question 3 conclusions.

This section includes an in-depth interpretation, analysis, and synthesis of the results and findings of Research Question 3. The third research question asked school counselors and principals to rank the differences of the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating categories: collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust. The third research question was examined when the researcher found differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses on what characteristics were key to having a positive relationship.

The responses of secondary school counselors and principals in relation to rating six characteristics were analyzed using the chi-square test of homogeneity. The third research question was answered when the researcher examined differences between secondary school counselors' and secondary school principals' responses on how secondary school counselor and principals' rated characteristics of their relationship. Each characteristic was examined independently to assess any differences between responses from secondary school counselors and principals.

Collaboration.

At the completion of data analysis, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of the collaboration characteristic addressed in Research Question 3. The chi-square value was $\chi^2(4) = 4.755$, $p = .313$, which indicated no statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the characteristic collaboration between secondary school counselors and principals. Data indicated that secondary school counselors and principals have a statistically similar perception related to the importance of collaboration being present in the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Communication.

At the completion of data analysis, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of the communication characteristic addressed in Research Question 3. The chi-square value was $\chi^2(4) = 4.930$, $p = .0.295$, which indicated no statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the characteristic communication between secondary school counselors and principals. This data indicated that secondary school counselors and principals have a statistically similar perception

related to the importance of communication being present in the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Mission and vision.

At the completion of data analysis, the researcher was able to reject the null hypothesis of the mission and vision characteristic addressed in Research Question 3. The chi-square value was $\chi^2(4) = 9.243$, $p = 0.055$, which indicated a statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the characteristic mission and vision between secondary school counselors and principals. The significance was small, but the researcher chose to reject the null hypothesis because it was close to the statistical cutoff of 5%. These data indicated that secondary principals rated the importance of mission and vision to the principal-counselor relationship higher when compared to the ratings from secondary school counselors.

Respect.

At the completion of data analysis, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of the respect characteristic addressed in Research Question 3. The chi-square value was $\chi^2(4) = 5.963$, $p = 0.202$, which indicated no statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the characteristic respect between secondary school counselors and principals. These data indicated that secondary school counselors and principals have a statistically similar perception related to the importance of respect being present in the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Responsibility.

At the completion of data analysis, the researcher was able to reject the null hypothesis of the responsibility characteristic addressed in Research Question 3. The chi-square value was $\chi^2(4) = 17.875$, $p = 0.001$, which indicated a statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the characteristic responsibility between secondary school counselors and principals. These data indicated that secondary principals rated the importance of responsibility to the principal-counselor relationship higher when compared to the ratings from secondary school counselors.

Trust.

At the completion of data analysis, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis of the trust characteristic addressed in Research Question 3. The chi-square value was $\chi^2(4) = 4.810$, $p = 0.307$, which indicated no statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the characteristic trust between secondary school counselors and principals. This data indicated that secondary school counselors and principals have a statistically similar perception related to the importance of trust being present in the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Discussion

The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations of the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. Adlerian theory supported the themes of this research through its belief that individuals seek acceptance,

socialization, and connectedness with others (Adler, 1927; John, 2020). School counselors and principals have a relationship that flourishes when the two roles accept one another. School counselors and principals desire a working relationship that embraces the following characteristics: collaboration, communication, trust, and respect. When those characteristics are present in the principal-counselor relationship, school counselors and principals are more likely to have a positive working relationship. Positive principal-counselor relationships impact overall school climate and student outcomes (Rock et al., 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017).

An analysis of data in this research indicated no statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals. On average secondary school counselors rated the characteristics lower than the principals rated the characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship, but the difference was not significant. The research responses from school counselors and principals supported previous research showing that both principals and school counselors see the value of a positive principal-counselor relationship (Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017). Alderian theory supports the findings from this research through the foundational belief that humans seek relational connections with those around them (Adler, 1927; Frank & Shoshana, 2019).

The lower ratings of characteristics from school counselors was unexpected from the researcher. Previous research on the principal-counselor relationship has found that school counselors seek a more positive relationship with principals (Lowery et al., 2018; Ruiz et al., 2018). The lower ratings from school counselors support research that has

been done previously that reflects feelings of frustration and underappreciation of principal-counselor relationships (Armstrong et al., 2010; Boyland et al., 2019; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016). When school counselors are given tasks from principals that fall outside of the list of recommended duties for school counselors they are more prone to frustration and potential burnout (ASCA, 2019a; Havlik et al., 2019; Holman et al., 2018; Kim & Lambie, 2018). When school counselors do not feel as though their role is understood the principal-counselor relationship suffers (Chandler et al., 2018; Dollarhide et al., 2007; Havlik et al., 2019). Overall the difference between secondary school counselor and principal ratings was small, which means secondary school counselors and principals perceive the principal-counselor relationship to be of close to equal importance. Adler (1927, 1988) theorized that humans feel safe when they experience healthy socialization and relationships.

Each of the six characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship was examined in this research. Those characteristics include: collaboration, communication, mission and vision, respect, responsibility, and trust. Responses from secondary school counselors and principals were studied to identify differences. Significant differences were only identified within 2 out of the 6 characteristics: mission and vision and responsibility. Principals rated the importance of mission and vision and responsibility higher than school counselors. Principals' preparation programs focus more on leadership theories, which could be why the concepts of mission and vision and responsibility were more important to principals in this research. However, school counselor preparation programs typically do not include specific leadership theories and practices, leaving

school counselors oblivious to the importance of creating and sustaining a shared mission and vision (Ducote, 2017; Kotter, 2009; Senge, 2006).

The research from this study shows that secondary school counselors and principals felt similarly about the following characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship: collaboration, communication, respect, and trust. The top three characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship as identified by secondary school counselors were respect, trust, and communication. The top three characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship identified by secondary principals were respect, communication, and trust.

Previous research on the relationship between school counselors and principals has mutual respect listed as one of the most important attributes of the relationship (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009; Rock et al., 2017). This research supports the findings from previous research related to the importance of respect between school counselors and principals. Respect can be shown through the amount of time a school counselor and principal spend with each other (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Finkelstein, 2009). Consistent, clear communication can be perceived as an act of respect between a school counselor and principal as well (Lashley & Stickl, 2016; Rock et al., 2017). When a school has a shared mission and vision that are understood by all key stakeholders communication can improve (Dollarhide et al., 2007; Ducote, 2017; Kotter, 2009; Senge, 2006). Adlerian theory connects individual success and mental health to how respected a person feels. When an individual feels respected, they are more likely to be successful (Adler, 1927; John 2020).

This research also supports prior studies done examining the principal-counselor relationship related to trust (Finkelstein, 2009; Odegard-Koester & Watkins, 2016; Rock et al., 2017). Both school counselors and principals highly rated the importance of trust in the principal-counselor relationship. School counselors and principals deal with confidential situations daily. Oftentimes they collaborate together on confidential issues and trust is a valuable characteristic to their working relationship.

The third highest rated characteristic from both school counselors and principals in this research was communication. Previous research has demonstrated that school counselors and principals who have regular, transparent communication view their relationship as more satisfactory than those who feel communication is lacking (Rock et al., 2017; Waalkes et al., 2019). Standards for both principals and school counselors highlight the importance of commination (ASCA, 2019b; NASSP, 2018). In the document, *Building Ranks* published by the NASSP (2018), communication is listed as one of the foundational characteristics for supporting school climate. ASCA's (2019b) *National Model* provides many tools for school counselors to use to communicate with principals and other educational leaders. One specific tool ASCA recommends is the Principal-Counselor Agreement, which sets the stage for communication between school counselors and principals. Expectations placed upon both principals and school counselors have shifted and increased over time. Without effective communication it is difficult to work together collaboratively. Collaboration between school counselors and principals should be paramount in their working relationship (Finkelstein, 2009; Janson et al., 2009; Waalkes et al., 2019).

An analysis of data in this research indicated a statistical difference between how secondary school counselors and principals rated time spent to improve student outcomes. The research responses from school counselors and principals supported previous research showing that a discrepancy existed in the areas of how both principals and school counselors spend their time (Chandler et al., 2018; Havlik et al., 2019). The roles of school counselor and principal have changed throughout recent years. Educational training within school counselor and principal degree programs surrounding the changes in role definitions has not updated, which has provided room for uncertainty (Finkelstein, 2009; Havlik et al., 2019; Janson et al., 2009). The reported lack of education that principals and school counselors possessed for each other's roles is supported by this research.

Principals and school counselors both rated the same top three areas (ethical norms, school climate, and curriculum and instruction) as the most important on which principals should focus their time to improve student outcomes. School counselors and principals rated 2 out of their top 3 responses the same areas of school climate and curriculum and instruction as the areas on which the principals spent the most time to improve student outcomes. There was a difference between school counselors and principals related to the third top response of how principals actually spent their time. Principals rated ethical norms as one of the three highest areas of time actually spent by principals to improve student outcomes. This study described ethical norms as encompassing the following characteristics: transparency, trust, communication, and moral direction. Principals understand the importance of building and maintaining a positive school climate (Levin & Bradley, 2019; Yan, 2020). School counselors rated

community engagement as one of the three highest areas of time actually spent by principals to improve student outcomes. This study described community engagement as two-way communication between principals and school families and community stakeholders. School counselors find value in principals keeping consistent communication with all stakeholders connected with the school. People want to be a part of a larger civilization and community (Adler, 1927, 1988).

Principals and school counselors both rated the same top three areas (direct interventions, postsecondary planning, and scheduling) as the areas on which school counselors should spend the most time to improve student outcomes. School counselors and principals rated the same top three responses (direct interventions, postsecondary planning, and scheduling) as the areas on which the school counselors actually spent the most time to improve student outcomes. The biggest discrepancy of percentages related to school counselors' actual use of time spent in a specific area was connected to scheduling. Principals' top responses related to how much time school counselors spent scheduling was 26%. However, school counselors' top responses related to how much time school counselors spent scheduling was 40%. The difference in responses between school counselors and principals indicated that school counselors perceived they spent more of their time scheduling than principals perceived school counselors spent scheduling. The discrepancy between principal and counselor perceptions of school counselors' time spent on scheduling supports previous research tied to school counselor role ambiguity (Chandler et al., 2018; Havlik et al., 2019; Howell et al., 2019). Principals do not understand how much time it takes to create schedules and continuously schedule

students. School counselors experience frustration because of the lack of understanding, and also because they would like to spend their time on direct student contact.

Implications

Principals are leaders in a school building who work to serve students, staff, and the surrounding community in areas related to academics, the arts, athletics, cocurricular activities, and general leadership (NASSP, 2002). School counselors should be a member of a school's leadership though their work with students to develop skills in the areas of academic, college and career, and social-emotional (ASCA, n.d.). This study strived to fill a gap in the area of the relationship between secondary school counselors and principals. Previous research had been done focused on the relationship between school counselors and principals, but none have been done recently that focused on specific relational characteristics and use of time spent on improving student outcomes. This study collected responses from secondary school counselors and principals throughout the United States asking them to rate both the role of the school counselor and principal. Previous research has found that the relationship between school counselors and principals impacted school climate and student outcomes (Mombourquette, 2017; Yavuz, Cayirdag, et al., 2017). Previous research has also found school counselor burnout connected to negative principal-counselor relationship characteristics commonly tied to school counselor role ambiguity (Armstrong et al., 2010; Finkelstein, 2009; Yavuz, Dahir, & Gümüşeli, 2017).

This study asked secondary school counselors and principals to evaluate use of time for both school counselors and principals, and characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship. Participants rated characteristics that they perceived to be

important to the relationship between school counselors and principals and the presence of the characteristics in their personal relationship. Secondary school counselors and principals were also asked to rate areas of importance for time to be spent that impact student outcomes for both secondary school counselors and principals and the actual time spent within the defined areas.

Key findings from this study show that secondary school counselors and principals value the same characteristics for the relationship. On average secondary school counselors rated the characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship lower than principals. The mutual top three rated characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship were respect, trust, and communication. Responses related to mission and vision and responsibility were the only two statistically significant differences between secondary school counselor and principals related to the principal-counselor relationship. This indicates that the secondary school counselors and principals feel similarly in all the other characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship.

Research from the review of literature showed a gap in educational training programs for school counselors and principals in the area of each respective role. Principals are not thoroughly trained to know the role of a school counselor. School counselors are not thoroughly trained to know the role of a principal. The response differences between school counselors and principals related to the characteristics of mission and vision and responsibility support the gaps in educational training. Typically, principal educational training has a targeted focus on creating mission and vision, whereas, educational training for school counselors does not typically address mission and vision. As the leaders of a school building, principals feel an immense responsibility

to meet the needs of the entire staff and student body. The same level of responsibility is not shared with a school counselor.

The response differences between school counselors and principals related to each role's time spent support the literature review findings. Principals and school counselors rated the areas of ethical norms, school climate, and curriculum and instruction as most important for principal time spent. Principals and school counselors agreed that principals spend most of their time in the areas of curriculum and instruction and school climate. Principals identified ethical norms as the other top area where they spend the most time. School counselors differed, identifying community engagement as the third top area where they thought principals spent their time. Principals and school counselors agreed that school counselors spend most of their time in the areas of direct interventions, postsecondary planning, and scheduling. Principals and school counselors also agreed that those three areas were the top three areas in which school counselors actually spent their time as well. The largest discrepancy of school counselors' time spent was in the area of scheduling. Principals rated the actual time spent in the area of scheduling by a school counselor lower than school counselors rated their own use of time scheduling.

As a result of the conclusion of this paper, educational professionals should be aware of the schoolwide impact a principal-counselor relationship possesses. School counselors and principals are both connected to the entire student body through their leadership and dedication to student success. School counselors and principals that have a positive relationship are better equipped to collaborate to ensure the needs of students are met. When principals and school counselors are able to work together, communicate effectively, and share the same vision, the entire school benefits by having a healthier

school climate. School counselors and principals both see the importance of mutual respect, communication, and trust within a principal-counselor relationship. Making conscientious, collaborative efforts to build and sustain those characteristics in their professional relationships with one another should be a focus area. School counselors and principals should also start and maintain continuous efforts to learn more about each other's roles and how they can be respectively supportive to the needs of each other.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations for future research will add to current educational research in regard to the relationship between school counselors and principals:

1. Although this was a quantitative study, further research can be done centered around the same research questions in this study using a qualitative (e.g. narrative or phenomenological) or mixed-methods research design.
2. This study focused on secondary school counselors and principals. Future research could be done using the same instrument with elementary school counselors and principals.
3. Replication of this study could be done with more of a focus on school counselor and principal use of time.
4. Replication of this study could be done with school counselors and principals ranking each characteristic of the relationship by level of personal importance.

5. Replication of this study could be done with school counselors and principals ranking each area of time spent by level of personal importance based on their perception of each role.

Conclusions

The purpose of this causal-comparative study was to test the Adlerian theory that compares the differences of opinions between secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations of the secondary school counselor and principal relationship for school counselors and principals in the United States. The researcher analyzed data for differences in the principal-counselor relationship as well as time spent between secondary school counselors and principals. The independent variables of interest, secondary school counselors' and principals' perceptions and expectations, were generally defined as key elements that lead to perceived satisfactory relationships, the most important needs of students, and job expectations for school counselors (Finkelstein, 2009). The dependent variable of interest, the secondary school counselor-principal relationship, was generally defined as perceived relational satisfaction from both secondary school counselors and principals. The Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating was used to measure the perceptions of the relationship between secondary school counselors and secondary school principals. The differences measured included job components of both school counselors and principals and key elements to an effective working relationship between secondary school counselors and principals.

Participants in this study included secondary school counselors and principals from 43 states within the United States of America. Survey links were sent to board members from ASCA and NASSP to send to their listservs. The quantitative results of

this survey included responses from 388 principals and 1,578 school counselors. For the first two research questions, the researcher used an independent samples *t* test to determine if statistically significant differences between school counselors and principals were present. For the third research question, the researcher used a chi-square test of homogeneity to analyzed differences between six characteristics of the principal-counselor relationship. Chapter Five included a conclusion of the research, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

Results of this study showed insignificant response differences between school counselors and principals related to the Principal-Counselor Relationship Rating. The statistical results do not indicate that the responses from the two groups differed from each other significantly. These findings indicated that secondary school counselors and principals have similar perceptions of the principal-counselor relationship. Results from this research showed significant response differences between school counselors and principals related to the Principal-Counselor Time Spent Rating. These findings indicated that the secondary school counselors and principals have different perceptions related to the use of time spent for the roles of both school counselors and principals. Results of this study showed insignificant differences between secondary school counselors and principals when rating the importance of collaboration, communication, respect, and trust being present within the principal-counselor relationship. These results indicated that both school counselors and principals rated those four characteristics as having similar importance to the principal-counselor relationship. Results of this study showed significant differences between secondary school counselors and principals when rating the importance of mission and vision and responsibility being present within the

principal-counselor relationship. As a result of this study, additional research in the area of principal-counselor relationship characteristics and time spent between the two roles must be done to provide school counselors and principals with specific ways to improve the principal-counselor relationship. Future research should be conducted to add clarity surrounding the role definitions of both school counselors and principals.

REFERENCES

Adams, K. A., & Lawrence, E. K. (2019). *Research methods, statistics, and applications* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE. Publications.

Adler, A. (1927). *Understanding human nature* (W.B. Wolfe, Trans.). New York, NY: Greenberg.

Adler, A. (1988). The child's inner life and a sense of community. *Individual Psychology*, *44*(4), 417-423.

Adler, A. (2019). The fundamental views of individual psychology. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 75*(3), 185-187.

Alenezi, A. S. (2020). Risk of turnover among US principals based on personal and school characteristics. *Journal of Research in Education*, *29*(1), 1-19.

American School Counselor Association. (n.d.). *The role of the school counselor*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/ee8b2e1b-d021-4575-982c-c84402cb2cd2/Role-Statement.pdf.

American School Counselor Association. (2016). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors.* Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/f041cbd0-7004-47a5-ba01-3a5d657c6743/Ethical-Standards.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2019a). *Appropriate and inappropriate duties for school counselors.* Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/8fe536c2-7a32-4102-8ce7-42e9b0683b3b/appropriate-activities-of-school-counselors.pdf

American School Counselor Association. (2019b). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

Armstrong, S. A., MacDonald, J.H., & Stillo, S. (2010). School counselors and principals: Different perceptions of relationship, leadership, and training. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(15). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ885153.pdf.

Bagwell, J. L. (2019). Exploring the leadership practices of elementary school principals through a distributed leadership framework: A case study. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, *30*, 83-103.

Bailey, T. T. (2012). *School counselor and principal perceptions regarding the roles of school counselors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/515.

Baker, E., Zyromski, B., & Granello, D. H. (2021). School or guidance counselor: How the title influences public perception. *Professional School Counseling*, *25*(1). doi: 10.1177/2156759X20981034

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32.

Beausaert, S., Froehlich, D. E., Riley, P., & Gallant, A. (2021, February). What about school principals' well-being? The role of social capital. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership.* doi:10.1177/ 1741143221991853.

Bitter, J. R., & Griffith, J. (2019). Adler's "The fundamental views of individual psychology": Context, clarification, and expansion. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *75*(3), 195-204.

Bluvshtein, M. (2020). Individual psychology as a "living force of progress." *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *76*(1), 6-20.

Bowers, H., Whitford, D. K., & Maines, N. (2018). Effects of the student success skills program with exceptional students: Influences and outcomes. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, *57*(3), 173-190.

Boyland, L. G., Geesa, R. L., Lowery, K.P., Quick, M.M., Mayes, R.D., Kim, J.,…McDonald, K.M. (2019). Collaborative principal-school counselor preparation: National standards alignment to improve training between principals and school counselors. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 14*(1), 188-205. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1218852.pdf.

Breevaart, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Daily job demands and employee work engagement: The role of daily transformational leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *23*(3), 338-349.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Campbell, C. A., & Dahir, C. A. (1997). *Sharing the vision: The national standards for school counseling programs*. Alexandra, VA: American School Counselor Association Press.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). *National health and interview survey.* Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis/releases/released201905.htm#13.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). *Data and statistics on children's mental health.* Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/childrensmentalhealth/data.html.

Chandler, J. W., Burnham, J. J., Riechel, M. E. K., Dahir, C.A., Stone, C.B., Oliver, D.F.,...Bledsoe, K. G. (2018). Assessing the counseling and non-counseling roles of school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling*, *16*(7). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1182095.pdf

Chen, S. (2018). Influence of functional and relational perspectives of distributed leadership on instructional change and school climate. *The Elementary School Journal*, *119*(2), 298-326.

Chitpin, S. (2019). Decision making, distributed leadership, and the objective knowledge growth framework. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *34*(2), 217-231.

College Board. (n.d.). *About Us.* Retrieved from https://about.collegeboard.org/.

Collie, R. J., Granziera, H., & Martin, A. J. (2020). School principals' workplace well-being: a multination examination of the role of their job resources and job demands. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *58*(4), 417-433.

Cook, J., Goodman-Scott, E., Parker, E., & Welch, T. (2018). School counselors and principals: Exploring the dynamics of an evolving relationship [Special section]. *Principal Leadership*, *19*(4), 24–31.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Curtin, S. C., & Heron, M. (2019, October). Death rates due to suicide and homicide among persons aged 10–24: United States, 2000–2017. *NCHS Data Brief*, (352), 107. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db352-h.pdf.

Dack, H., & Merlin-Knoblich, C. (2019). Improving classroom guidance curriculum with "understanding by design." *Professional Counselor*, *9*(2), 80-99.

Dahir, C. A., Cinotti, D. A., & Feirsen, R. (2019). Beyond compliance: Assessing administrators' commitment to comprehensive school counseling. *NASSP Bulletin*, *103*(2), 118–138.

Dahlkamp, S., Peters, M., & Schumacher, G. (2017). Principal self-efficacy, school climate, and teacher retention: A multi-level analysis. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(4), 357-376.

Depue, S., Kryah, R., VonDras, S., Sale, L., & Tokac, U. (2018). *Missouri student survey*. Retrieved from https://dmh.mo.gov/sites/dmh/files/media/pdf/2019/04/mss2018report.pdf.

Dollarhide, C. T., Smith, A. T., & Lemberger, M. E. (2007). Critical incidents in the development of supportive principals: Facilitating school counselor-principal relationships. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*(4), 360–369.

Ducote, L. (2017). *The relationship between administrator leadership style and job experience of school counselors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/2315/

Edwards, L., Grace, R., & King, G. (2014). Importance of an effective principal-counselor relationship. *Alabama Journal of Educational Leadership*, *1*, 34-42.

Eisenberg, D., Lipson, S. K., & Posselt, J. (2016, Winter). Promoting resilience, retention, and mental health. *New Directions for Student Services, 156*, 87-95.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.

Emmons, J. M., & Belangee, S.E. (2018). Understanding the discouraged child within the school system: An Adlerian view of the school-to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 74*(1), 134-153.

Ferguson, E. D. (2020). Adler's motivational theory: A historical perspective on belonging and the fundamental human striving. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *76*(1), 51-58.

Finkelstein, D. (2009). *A closer look at the principal-counselor relationship: A survey of principals and school counselors.* Washington, DC: College Board. Retrieved from https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/nosca/a-closer-look_2.pdf

Frank, M. L., & Shoshana, A. (2019). "It was a kind of togetherness feeling": An exploration of social interest in early recollections. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *75*(1), 42-57.

Gallo, L. L., Rausch, M. A., Beck, M. J., & Porchia, S. (2020). Elementary school counselors' experiences with suicidal students. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Counseling*, 7(1), 26-41.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Goodman-Scott, E., Sink, C. A., Cholewa, B. E., & Burgess, M. (2018). An ecological view of school counselor ratios and student academic outcomes: A national investigation. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *96*(4), 388-398.

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Mitani, H. (2015). Principal time management skills: Explaining patterns in principals' time use, job stress, and perceived effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *53*(6), 773-793.

Gysbers, N. C. (2010). *School counseling principles: Remembering the past, shaping the future.* Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. (2001). Comprehensive guidance and counseling programs: A rich history and a bright future. *Professional School Counseling*, *4*(4), 246-256.

Gysbers, N. C., Lapan, R. T., Blair, M., Starr, M. F., & Wilmes, D. (1999). Closing in on the statewide implementation of a comprehensive guidance program model. *Professional School Counseling*, *2*(5), 357-366.

Hargens, M., & Gysbers, N. (1984). How to remodel a guidance program while living in it: A case study. *The School Counselor, 32*(2), 119-125. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23900614.

Havlik, S., Ciarletta, M., & Crawford, E. (2019). "If we don't define our roles, someone else will": Professional advocacy in school counseling. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X19848331.

Hoffman, E. (2018). *The drive for self: Alfred Adler and the founding of individual psychology*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Holman, L. F., Watts, R., Robles-Pina, R., & Grubbs, L. (2018). Exploration of potential predictor variables leading to school counselor burnout. *Journal of School Counseling, 16*(9).

Howell, P. B., Thomas, S., Sweeney, D., & Vanderhaar, J. (2019). Moving beyond schedules, testing, and other duties as deemed necessary by the principal: The school counselor's role in trauma informed practices. *Middle School Journal*, *50*(4), 26-34.

Janson, C., Stone, C., & Clark, M. A. (2009). Stretching leadership: A distributed perspective for school counselor leaders. *Professional School Counseling*, *13*(2), 98–106.

John, K. (2020). Adlerian theory and practice wisdom promote democratic leadership and organizational health. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *76*(1), 84-98.

Kim, N., & Lambie, G. W. (2018). Burnout and implications for professional school counselors. *Professional Counselor*, *8*(3), 277-294.

Kirchner, G. L., & Setchfield, M.S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education, 126*(1), 10-16.

Kotter, J. P. (2009). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, *37*(3), 42-48.

Laerd Statistics. (n.d.-a). *Cronbach's alpha (α) using SPSS statistics.* Retrieved from https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/cronbachs-alpha-using-spss-statistics.php.

Laerd Statistics. (n.d.-b). *Independent t-test using SPSS statistics.* Retrieved from https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/independent-t-test-using-spss-statistics.php#procedure.

Laerd Statistics. (n.d.-c). *Principal components analysis (PCA) using SPSS statistics.* Retrieved from https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/principal-components-analysis-pca-using-spss-statistics.php.

Lambert, M., & Bouchamma, Y. (2019). Leadership requirements for school principals: Similarities and differences between four competency standards. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, (188), 53-67.

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*(2), 108–116.

Lashley, C. A., & Stickl, J. (2016). Counselors and principals: Collaborating to improve instructional equity. *Journal of Organizational and Educational Leadership*, *2*(1), 1-24.

LeBlanc, J., & Borders, L. D. (2021). Educating future leaders: Integrating leadership into an introductory school counseling course. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, *8*(1), 1-14.

Levin, S., & Bradley, K. (2019). *Understanding and addressing principal turnover: A review of the research.* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Levin, S., Bradley, K., & Scott, C. (2019). *Principal turnover: Insights from current principals*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Levin, S., Scott, C., Yang, M., Leung, M., & Bradley, K. (2020*). Supporting a strong, stable principal workforce: What matters and what can be done*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.

Lowe, C., Gibson, D. M., & Carlson, R. G. (2017). Examining the relationship between school counselors' age, years of experience, school setting, and self-perceived transformational leadership skills. *Professional School Counseling*, *21*(1b). doi: 10.1177/2156759X18773580.

Lowery, K., Quick, M., Boyland, L., Geesa, R. L., & Mayes, R.D. (2018). "It wasn't mentioned and should have been": Principals' preparation to support comprehensive school counseling. *Journal of Organizational & Educational Leadership, 3*(2). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1180120.pdf

Lund Research. (2012). *Constructs in quantitative research*. Retrieved from https://dissertation.laerd.com/constructs-in-quantitative-research.php.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2001). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346.

Mason, K. L., & Perera-Diltz, D. M. (2010). Factors that influence pre-service administrators' views of appropriate school counselor duties. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(5). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ885044.pdf

Mau, W. -C. J., Li, J., & Hoetmer, K. (2016). Transforming high school counseling: Counselors' roles, practices, and expectations for student success. *Administrative Issues Journal: Connection Education, Practice, and Research, 6*(2), 83-95. doi:10.5929/2016.6.2.5.

Miller, R., & Dillman Taylor, D. (2016). Does Adlerian theory stand the test of time?: Examining individual psychology from a neuroscience perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, 55*(2), 111-128. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1002/johc.12028

Missouri School Counselor Association. (2018). *Implementation of the Missouri School Counselor Program*. Retrieved from http://moschoolcounselor.org/files/2019/04/Implementation-of-the-Missouri-Comprehensive-School-Counseling-Program.2019-Final-docx.pdf

Mombourquette, C. (2017). The role of vision in effective school leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 45*(1), 19-36.

Mulhern, C. (2020). *Beyond teachers: Estimating individual guidance counselors' effects on educational attainment*. Retrieved from http://papers.cmulhern.com/Counselors_Mulhern.pdf

Mullen, P. R., Chae, N., Backer, A., & Niles, J. (2021, March). School counselor burnout, job stress, and job satisfaction by student caseload. *NASSP Bulletin*. doi: 10.1177/0192636521999828

Mullen, P. R., Gutierrez, D., & Newhart, S. (2017). School counselors' emotional intelligence and its relationship to leadership. *Professional School Counseling*, *21*(1b). doi: 10.1177/2156759X18772989.

Mullen, P. R., & Lambie, G. W. (2016). The contribution of school counselors' self-efficacy to their programmatic service delivery. *Psychology in the Schools*, *53*(3), 306-320.

Mullen, P. R., Lambie, G. W., Griffith, C., & Sherrell, R. (2016). School counselors' general self-efficacy, ethical and legal self-efficacy, and ethical and legal knowledge. *Ethics & Behavior*, *26*(5), 415-430.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (n.d.). *Who we are.* Retrieved from https://www.nassp.org/who-we-are/.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2002). NASSP statement of values. Retrieved from https://www.nassp.org/nassp-statement-of-values/#:~:text=The%20principal%20is%20the%20school's,cocurricular%20activities%2C%20and%20general%20administration.&text=The%20nation's%20student%20body%20is%20diverse.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2018). *Building ranks K-12: A comprehensive framework for effective school leaders.* Reston, VA: Author.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders.* Reston, VA: Author.

Neumerski, C. M., Grissom, J. A., Goldring, E., Rubin, M., Cannata, M., Schuermann, P., & Drake, T. A. (2018). Restructuring instructional leadership: How multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems are redefining the role of the school principal. *The Elementary School Journal*, *119*(2), 270-297.

Odegard-Koester, M. A., & Watkins, P. (2016). Collaborative relationships between principals and school counselors: Facilitating a model for developing a working

alliance. *Journal of School Counseling, 14*(9). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1119083.pdf.

Parker, M. M., & Dickson, S. (2020). Student wellness: Exploring personality priorities and perceived wellness among university students. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *76*(3), 245-257.

Parzych, J. L., Donohue, P., Gaesser, A., & Chiu, M. M. (2019). Measuring the impact of school counselor ratios on student outcomes. *ASCA Research Report*. Retrieved from https://www.schoolcounselor.org/getmedia/5157ef82-d2e8-4b4d-8659-a957f14b7875/Ratios-Student-Outcomes-Research-Report.pdf

Reid, D. B. (2021). US principals' sensemaking of the future roles and responsibilities of school principals. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *49*(2), 251-267.

Roberts, C. M. (2018). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Rock, W. D., Remley, T. P., & Range, L. M. (2017). Principal-counselor collaboration and school climate. *NASSP Bulletin*, *101*(1), 23–35. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636517698037.

Ruiz, M., Peters, M. L., & Sawyer, C. (2018). Principals' and counselors' lens of the school counselor's role. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory & Research*, *45*(1), 1-16.

Ryu, J., Walls, J., & Seashore Louis, K. (2020, September). Caring leadership: The role of principals in producing caring school cultures. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1-18.

Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of research design* (Vol. 1). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Savitz-Romer, M. (2019). *Fulfilling the promise: Reimagining school counseling to advance student success*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Sebastian, J., Camburn, E. M., & Spillane, J. P. (2018). Portraits of principal practice: Time allocation and school principal work. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *54*(1), 47-84.

Secondary school. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/secondary%20school.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Danvers, MA: Currency.

Shava, G. N., & Tlou, F. N. (2018). Distributed leadership in education, contemporary issues in educational leadership. *African Educational Research Journal*, *6*(4), 279–287. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.30918/AERJ.64.18.097.

Shields, C. M., Dollarhide, C. T., & Young, A. A. (2018). Transformative leadership in school counseling: An emerging paradigm for equity and excellence. *Professional School Counseling*, *21*(1b). doi: 10.1177/2156759X18773581.

Sink, C. A. (2016). Incorporating a multi-tiered system of supports into school counselor preparation. *The Professional Counselor*, *6*(3), 203-219.

Sink, C. A., & Ockerman, M. S. (2016). School counselors and a multi-tiered system of supports: Cultivating systemic change and equitable outcomes. *The Professional Counselor*, *6*(3), vix. doi: 10.15241/csmo.6.3.v.

Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M., & Pareja, A. S. (2007). Taking a distributed perspective to the school principal's workday. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *6*(1), 103-125.

Stat Trek. (2021). *Chi-square test of homogeneity.* Retrieved from https://stattrek.com/chi-square-test/homogeneity.aspx.

Thornton, B., Usinger, J., & Sanchez, J. (2019). Leading effective building level change. *Education*, *139*(3), 131-138.

Tubin, D., & Pinyan-Weiss, M. (2015). Distributing positive leadership: The case of team counseling. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *43*(4), 507-525.

Tygret, J., Mendez, S., Arndt, A., Lovato, D., & Scott, M. (2020). The need for collaboration: Experiences and perceptions of preservice principals and school counselors. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, *13*(4). Retrieved from https://repository.wcsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1399&context=jcps.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2018* (NCES 2020-009), Table 105.50.

VanderLind, R. (2017). Effects of mental health on student learning. *The Learning Assistance Review, 22*(2), 39-58.

Waalkes, P. L., DeCino, D. A., Haugen, J. S., & Dalbey, A. (2019). The relationship between job roles and gender on principal-school counselor relationship quality. *Professional School Counseling, 22*(1). Retrieved from doi: 10.1177/2156759X19861105.

Wasonga, T. A., & Fisher, T. A. (2018). Understanding, responding to, and influencing school community: Principals' perspectives. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 46*(3), 47-66.

Watts, R. E., & Ergüner-Tekinalp, B. (2017). Positive psychology: A neo-Adlerian perspective. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 73*(4), 328-337.

Welfare, L. E., Grimes, T. O., Lawson, G., Hori, K., & Asadi, G. (2020). The school to prison pipeline: Quantitative evidence to guide school counselor advocacy. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, *8*(1), 16-29.

White, R. E., Cooper, K., & Anwaruddin, S. (2016). Canadian contexts in educational leadership: a hermeneutic approach to distributed leadership for teachers' professional learning. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *20*(6), 682-696.

Yan, R. (2020). The influence of working conditions on principal turnover in K-12 public schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *56*(1), 89-122.

Yavuz, O., Cayirdag, N., Dahir, C., & Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2017). Improving student achievement through strengthening principal and school counselor partnership. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, *26*(2), 176–201. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/105678791702600205.

Yavuz, O., Dahir, C., & Gümüşeli, A. I. (2017). School principal perceptions of the school counsellor's role: Traditional or transformed? *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, *32*(2), 81-97.

Ziomek-Daigle, J., Goodman-Scott, E., Cavin, J., & Donohue, P. (2016). Integrating a multi-tiered system of supports with comprehensive school counseling programs. *The Professional Counselor*, *6*(3), 220-232.

Zuckerman, S. J., Wilcox, K. C., Durand, F. T., Lawson, H. A., & Schiller, K. S. (2018). Drivers for change: A study of distributed leadership and performance adaptation during policy innovation implementation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *17*(4), 618-646.

Zyromski, B., Hudson, T. D., Baker, E., & Granello, D. H. (2019). Guidance counselors or school counselors: How the name of the profession influences perceptions of competence. *Professional School Counseling*, *22*(1). doi: 10.1177/2156759X19855654

APPENDIX A

Research Review Board Approval

COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS
4431 S. Fremont
Springfield, Missouri 65804
(417) 820-2069 | FAX (417) 887-4847

April 20, 2021

Re: School Principals and Counselors: Perceptions and Expectations

Dear Ms. Roffers,

On April 20, 2021 a review of your application and supporting documents for the above-named research proposal was completed. The Research Review Board (RRB) for Southwest Baptist University has determined that the proposed research project meets the criteria for Exempt status as per policy 1.15.3 in the faculty guidelines. As per the above policy "If the project is certified exempt, the principle investigator need not resubmit the project for continuing RRB review as long as there are no modifications in the exempted procedures". The study has now been approved, therefore, work on the project may begin.

If any modifications to the exempted procedures are made, the RRB will need to complete a new review of the changes to determine if the project remains Exempt or if further review is necessary.

Congratulations on the approval of your project, we wish you well during its completion. If you have any questions regarding the RRB's decision, please contact me at sxmorrow@sbuniv.edu.

Sincerely,

Suzie Morrow

Suzie Morrow, DNP, RN, CNE
Southwest Baptist University
Research Review Board, Chair
Sxmorrow @sbuniv.edu
(417) 893-7138

030 Roffers
School Principals and Counselors: Perceptions and Expectations

THIS FORM IS FOR RRB USE ONLY

RRB RESEARCH REVIEW DETERMINATION

___x_ Exempt from Review (Chair RRB)

____ Expedited Review (RRB Subcommittee)
Chair, please list names of the subcommittee:

____ Full RRB Review (Full RRB Committee)

RRB RESEARCH APPROVAL DETERMINATION

____ Disapproval Date: _____ ____ Conditional

Approval* (circle A or B) Date: _____ A. Approval,

subject to minor change

B. Approval in general but requiring major alterations, clarifications or assurances (* Data collection cannot begin until Full Approval is given by the RRB Chair) ___x_ Full Approval Date: ___4/20/21____

COMMENTS:

__ _DNP, RN, CNE_____ Date 04/20/2021
Chair, Research Review Board

APPENDIX B

College Board Agreement

CollegeBoard

INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR

AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT (including all appendices, exhibits and schedules attached hereto) (the "Agreement") is made as of February 1, 2020 ("Effective Date") between College Board, a non-stock, not-for-profit education corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and located at 250 Vesey Street, New York, New York 10281; Business Telephone: (212) 713-8000; ("College Board") and the independent contractor set forth below in Section 1:

1. **IDENTITY OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR.** The Independent Contractor ("IC") is identified as the entity whose name, principal business address and other relevant information are set forth below:

   Name of IC: Alison Roffers
   Street Address: 2839 E. Rocklyn Rd.
   City/State/Zip: Springfield, MO 65804
   Tele & Fax: 417-522-9390
   Email: alisonroffers@gmail.com

   Entity: Individual

2. **TERM.** The term of this Agreement shall be February 1, 2020 to August 1, 2022 unless sooner terminated in accordance with Section 13 or extended by written agreement of duly authorized representatives of the parties.

3. **REPRESENTATIVES.** The representative is the primary person with whom each party will communicate regarding all matters pertaining to this Agreement.

   The representative for College Board is Martha Morris
   The representative for the IC is: Alison Roffers

4. **TERMS OF PAYMENT.** N/A. There are no Fees under this Agreement.

5. **SERVICES TO BE PERFORMED.** IC agrees to perform the Services outlined in the attached Schedule A Description of Services ("Services"), which is incorporated by reference hereto. IC shall request prior written approval from College Board for any change in the Services, schedule, and reports or other deliverables set forth in the Services.

6. **EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS OR SUPPLIES.** IC shall supply, at IC's sole expense, all equipment, materials and/or supplies to accomplish the Services to be performed.

7. **INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR RELATIONSHIP.** IC and College Board understand, acknowledge and agree that IC is an independent contractor for purposes of this Agreement and nothing in this Agreement is intended to or should be construed to create a partnership, joint venture, employment relationship, or establish a relationship of agency between College Board and IC. IC also agrees that it will not hold itself out as an employee affiliate of or partner, joint venturer, co-principal or co-employer with College Board or any of its affiliates by reason of this Agreement and that IC will not knowingly permit any of its employees, agents or representatives to hold themselves out as, or claim to be, officers or employees of College Board or any of its affiliates by reason of this Agreement. IC shall not enter into any contract or agreement with a third party that purports to obligate College Board.

8. **SUBCONTRACTORS**. IC may not subcontract any services under this Agreement.

9. **NONEXCLUSIVE RIGHTS.** It is expressly understood that this Agreement does not grant IC an exclusive privilege to furnish to College Board any or all of the Services. College Board expressly reserves the right to contract with others for the purchase of any services including without limitation services comparable or identical to the Services which are the subject of this Agreement.

10. **TAXES.** N/A.

11. **FRINGE BENEFITS.** IC is not eligible for, and shall not participate in, any employee pension, health or other fringe benefit plans of the College Board.

12. **WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS.** No Workers' Compensation insurance shall be obtained by College Board concerning IC. It is agreed that IC shall not be deemed to be employees of College Board and shall not file any claim nor bring any action for any Workers' Compensation or unemployment benefits and compensation for which they may otherwise be eligible as a result of work performed pursuant to the terms of this Agreement.

13. **INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.** N/A

14. **TERMINATION.** College Board may terminate all or a portion of this Agreement without cause after giving fifteen (15) days prior written notice to IC, specifying the extent and the effective date of the termination ("Termination Date"). The parties shall perform their respective obligations hereunder in good faith until the Termination Date, upon which IC shall immediately stop performance of the activities that are the subject of the termination notice.

15. **NON-WAIVER.** Failure of either party to exercise any of its rights under this Agreement will in no way constitute a waiver of those rights, nor will such a failure excuse the other party from any of its obligations under this Agreement. No benefit or right that accrues to either party under this Agreement will be waived unless the waiver is reduced to writing and signed by both parties. The waiver, in one instance, of any act, condition, or requirement stipulated in this Agreement will not constitute a continuing waiver or a waiver of any other act, condition, or requirement, or a waiver of the same act, condition, or requirement in other instances, unless specifically so stated.

16. **REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES BY INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR.** IC represents and warrants the following: a) that IC has complied with all foreign, federal, state and local laws regarding business permits, certificates and licenses that may be required to carry out the work to be performed under this Agreement; b) that as applicable, IC is in full compliance with the policies and regulations of IC's employer (if any) in the provision of the Services hereunder; c) that none of the Services, as provided by IC, will in any way infringe any property right of others or violate any third party's right of confidentiality; d) that IC has the right to disclose all information transmitted by IC to College Board and, where third party information is being provided by IC to College Board for use by College Board, IC has obtained all licenses and approvals as may be required for College Board to use such information in the manner and to the full extent contemplated under this Agreement; e) that all statements and materials regarding its qualifications to perform the work contemplated under this Agreement are true and correct and are not misleading or incomplete for any reason including by reason of omission; f) that IC shall use sound and professional principles and practices in accordance with normally accepted industry standards in the performance of the Services hereunder and that performance of IC and its personnel shall reflect their best professional knowledge, skill, and judgment; g) that the Services shall be performed in a workmanlike manner; h) that IC has, and for the term of this Agreement will continue to have, access to the necessary facilities, equipment and personnel to provide the Services and perform its duties and obligations under this Agreement; and (i) that IC is not aware of any past, present, or planned interest, financial or otherwise, that may impair its objectivity in performing the Services.

17. **HOW NOTICES SHALL BE GIVEN.** Any notices, authorizations, or approvals in connection with this Agreement shall be directed to the representative set forth in Section 3, given in writing and shall be delivered to the party by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the party's address first stated in Section 1 or be sent by e-mail, provided that the email sender receives confirmation of a "read-receipt", or a return email, that acknowledges recipient's opening of such email. Any party may change its address stated herein by giving notice of the change in accordance with this Section.

18. **ASSIGNABILITY.** IC will perform the Services. IC shall not assign any right or interest under this Agreement or delegate or subcontract any obligation to be performed or owed under this Agreement without the prior written consent of College Board.

19. **OWNERSHIP.** The Services performed by IC are considered "work for hire" under the terms of this Agreement. Any intellectual property or deliverables, including but not limited to research reports, drawings, articles, journal publications and other works submitted or which are specified to be delivered under this Agreement to College Board or which are developed or produced and paid for under this Agreement ("Work Product") including all copyright and other intellectual property rights to such Work Product, are owned exclusively by College Board. College Board or its assignees have the exclusive right to reproduce all Work Product from this Agreement without further payment to IC. College Board's right to reproduction of Work Product includes promotional and advertising rights and/or reprints connected with the Work Product. IC acknowledges that IC shall have no rights and obligations with respect to any revised editions of the Work Product unless a separate agreement is entered into between College Board and IC.

20. **ASSIGNMENT OF WORK PRODUCT.** Insofar as any Work Product, by operation of law, is not considered a work made for hire by IC for College Board, IC agrees to assign, and upon creation of Work Product automatically assigns, all worldwide right, title, and interest in and to Work Product created, made, conceived, reduced to practice, or authored by IC (or by any persons employed or supervised by IC) either solely or jointly with others, during the performance of this Agreement or with the use of information, materials, or facilities of College Board received by IC during the term of this Agreement. IC shall execute or cause to be executed, all documents and perform such acts as may be necessary, useful or convenient to secure for College Board statutory protection throughout the world for all intellectual property assigned to College Board pursuant to this Section.

21. **THIRD PARTY CONTENT.** IC shall obtain all licenses, approvals and permissions and shall supply College Board with such permissions as may be required for College Board to use, in accordance with this Agreement, content provided by persons or entities who are not parties to this Agreement, but whose text, information, data, images (still and moving), sound recordings, and/or software ("Third Party Content") is included in the Work Product furnished under this Agreement.

22. **CONFIDENTIALITY.** During the course of this Agreement, IC may be given access to certain College Board proprietary or other confidential information or materials in whatever form, tangible or intangible, from data subjects located within the United States and foreign jurisdictions, which includes without limitation, the terms and conditions of this Agreement, test items, data, designs, drawings, specifications and documents. IC agrees during the term of this Agreement and thereafter to take all steps reasonably necessary to hold in trust and confidence information which IC knows or has reason to know is considered confidential or proprietary by College Board. IC agrees to abide by College Board's Data Security Requirements described in Schedule B attached hereto and any other information security policies issued by the College Board, its customers, agents or affiliates. IC agrees that all such confidential or proprietary information shall not at any time be used by IC or IC's employees, affiliates or agents for any purpose other than the performance of this Agreement. IC will enter into written agreements with each of its employees, representatives, agents, consultants and subcontractors who perform Services hereunder sufficient to carry out IC's confidentiality obligations under this Agreement. Notwithstanding the contents of any such written agreements or failure by IC to enter into such written agreements with its employees, representatives, agents, or subcontractors, IC shall be and remain solely and completely liable to College Board for any breach of the confidentiality obligations of this Agreement. All rights, title to, and interest in College Board's confidential information shall remain with College Board.

23. **CONFIDENTIALITY JUDICIAL COMPULSION.** In the event that IC or its representatives are requested or required (by oral questions, interrogatories, requests for information or documents, subpoena, civil investigative demand or similar process) to disclose any information supplied to IC in the course of its dealings with College Board or its representative, it is agreed that IC will provide College Board with prompt notice of such request or requirement so that either College Board or IC or both may seek an appropriate protective order and/or by mutual agreement waive IC's compliance with any contrary provisions of this Agreement.

24. **INFORMATION SECURITY.** To the extent applicable, IC shall comply with the Data Security Requirements set forth in Schedule B.
25. **DATA PROCESSING**. To the extent applicable, IC agrees to process personal data collected by or on behalf of College Board in accordance with the Data Processing Addendum attached hereto as Schedule C and applicable foreign and U.S. federal, state and local data privacy laws.

26. **FORCE MAJEURE**. Neither party shall be considered in default in the performance of its obligations under the Agreement to the extent that performance of its obligations is prevented or delayed by an unforeseeable cause beyond its control, as set forth below: acts or omissions of governmental authorities; strikes; lockouts or other industrial disturbances; acts of public enemies; wars; blockades; riots; civil disturbances; epidemics; floods; hurricanes; and tornadoes ("Force Majeure "). In addition to the other termination provisions herein, College Board may terminate this Agreement due to a Force Majeure event.

27. **BACKGROUND CHECKS.** N/A

28. **ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENTAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS.** N/A

29. **RETURN OF COLLEGE BOARD PROPERTY.** IC agrees to deliver promptly to College Board any time upon the College Board's request and upon termination of the Agreement all of the College Board's property and all copies of the College Board's property in IC's possession. Such property may include all documents, such as drawings, manuals, notebooks, reports, sketches, records, computer programs, employee lists, customer lists and the like in IC custody or possession, whether delivered to IC by College Board or made by IC in the performance of Services under this Agreement, relating to the business activities of College Board or third parties and containing any information or data whatsoever, whether or not confidential information.

30. **USE OF COLLEGE BOARD'S NAME.** IC shall not use College Board's name, logo or any of its trademarks in any form of publicity, including published client lists or case studies, or otherwise disclose or advertise that IC has entered into this Agreement. Furthermore, IC shall not make any public announcements about this Agreement or the project(s) that are the subject of this Agreement or any amendment thereto, or any other business matter related to College Board.

31. **LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION.** For the purpose of this provision, College Board shall include any of College Board's divisions, affiliates, or subsidiaries; or any officer, director, trustee, employee, or agent of any of the foregoing and their respective successors, and assigns.

    College Board shall not have liability to IC, or any other entity or person for any claim, loss, damage, or injury incurred in the course of the performance of this Agreement or otherwise in connection therewith, other than the obligations of College Board stated in this Agreement.

    IC agrees to indemnify, hold harmless and defend College Board of any of the foregoing, from and against third party claims, demands, actions, liabilities, damages, and expenses (including reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation costs) resulting therefrom, arising out of, or related to, the Services and deliverables furnished under this Agreement, the acts or omissions of IC in connection with this Agreement, and the representations or certifications made by IC herein. Such claims include, without limitation, claims based on any claim that the performance or use of the Services infringes or misappropriates or is alleged to infringe or misappropriate any patent, copyright, trademark, service mark, trade secret or other legally protected intellectual property or proprietary right of any third party.

32. **SURVIVAL.** It is agreed that certain obligations of the parties under this Agreement, which, by their nature would continue beyond the termination, cancellation, or expiration of this Agreement, shall survive termination, cancellation or expiration of this Agreement. Such obligations include, by way of illustration only and not limitation, those contained in the Confidentiality, Return of College Board Property, Representations and Warranties and Ownership clauses.

33. **GOVERNING LAW AND FORUM.** The substantive laws of New York govern all matters arising under or relating to this Agreement. This Agreement shall be interpreted in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, and the laws of the State of New York, without regard to choice or conflict of law principles that would cause the application of any other laws. Any dispute arising under or in connection with this Agreement is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the state and/or federal courts located in New York, New York. Should any provision of this Agreement be determined to be unlawful by a court of law or adjudicative body with jurisdiction over the parties, the remaining provisions of this Agreement shall not be impaired and will continue to remain in full force and effect.

34. **COMPLIANCE WITH LAW.** IC shall comply with all federal, state and local laws regarding business permits, certificates and licenses that may be required to carry out the work to be performed under this Agreement. As applicable, IC shall comply with state laws and the policies and regulations of IC's employer in the provision of the Services hereunder and has obtained any and all approvals, as may be required, in order to provide such Services. IC agrees to take no action, or omit to take action, that would cause either party to be in violation of applicable law and regulations.

35. **ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENT.** N/A

36. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT & EXECUTION.** This Agreement and all appendices annexed hereto constitute the complete understanding of the parties and supersede any other prior agreements. In the event of any conflicting term or covenant in Sections 1 to 35 of this Agreement and the appendices hereto (including Schedule A (Description of Services)), Sections 1 to 35 of this Agreement shall govern and control. Notwithstanding the above, the provisions of Schedule B (Data Security Requirements) and Schedule C (Data Processing Addendum), however, shall prevail over any other provision of this Agreement. This Agreement may be executed through signatures to any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, which together will constitute one Agreement, but no signatory hereto will be bound until both parties have duly executed a counterpart of this Agreement.

37. **AMENDMENTS.** This Agreement may be supplemented, amended or revised only in writing by agreement of the parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed in their names and on their behalf by and through their duly authorized officer as of the Effective Date.

COLLEGE BOARD	**Alison Roffers**
Signature:	Signature: Alison J. Roffers
Name: Martha Morris	Name: Alison J. Roffers
Title: Director	Title: Independent Contractor
Date: 10/20/20	Date: 10/20/2020