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ABSTRACT

Counselors in the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada were chosen for a study of the relationship of job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role conflict. A written survey consisting of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984) and the Role Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970) was conducted of selected full-time K-12 counselors in an attempt to assess the effects of role ambiguity and role conflict in six selected areas of job satisfaction: work itself, working conditions, recognition, responsibility, supervision and colleagues.

The results showed that as the job satisfaction of the counselors increased, the amount of role ambiguity and role conflict decreased. Two areas of job satisfaction — colleagues and responsibility — appeared to have no relationship with either role ambiguity or role conflict. General comments from the counselors indicated concern in the areas of: counseling budget, double school assignments, lack of clear understanding of the counselor's role and counselors being given tasks that could be performed by clerical staff.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The position of school guidance counselor came into being at the beginning of the 20th century. That was a time of rapid industrial growth, social protest, social reform and utopian idealism (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988).

Initially, the guidance service provided to students focused completely on vocational information and was provided by teachers, who were given time during the work day to offer those services. Frank Parsons developed a concept of guidance that stressed a scientific approach to choosing an occupation. He was concerned with society's general lack of attention to the development of human resources. Additionally, he was concerned with students making a smooth transition from school to work (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988). As industry became more technological in nature, that proved to be an invaluable service both to business as well as to students. Students were now leaving school with the training needed to enter the work force. The George/Barden Act of 1946 provided federal funds to be used in support of guidance activities in a variety of settings and situations, and provided for materials, leadership and
financial support. It signaled a need for attention to be paid to the professional training of counselors. School guidance counselors were no longer teachers assigned to provide counseling information to students. They were now being trained to provide counseling to meet the needs of the students. By the 1960's, federal funds were provided for counselors at all grade levels. More emphasis was placed on the role and function of counselors and less emphasis on a school guidance program (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988).

That led to confusion regarding the role of the school guidance counselor. Counselors were being trained to believe that their major role was to deal with students in small groups or individually and to consult with teachers, parents and administrators. Difficulty and confusion arose based on the fact that administrators in schools had a different perception of the counselor's role when compared with the counselor's perception of their role. Suddenly, the counselors found themselves responsible for a variety of other activities that included scheduling, attendance, discipline and lunch/hall duty. This perceptual incongruity led to confusion and dissatisfaction on the part of many counselors.

The Clark County School District (CCSD) opened its' first high school in 1931 and it was believed that high school counselors were a part of the staff. Their responsibilities included a vocational guidance strand as well as counseling and scheduling.
In the 1978-79 school year, the CCSD felt it necessary to expand the counseling function to the elementary schools. Originally, 12 elementary counselors were hired. They provided counseling services at 12 schools and their primary responsibilities included classroom developmental lessons and group counseling. The 1981-82 school year saw budgetary constraints being implemented and at that time the position of elementary school counselor was in danger of extinction. The Southern Nevada School Counselor Association met with leaders of the school district and stressed the need for elementary counselors and as a result, the 12 counselors were assigned to double school assignments.

As the school district's population grew in size and complexity, a continual need emerged to increase the number of elementary school counselors hired by the district. By early 1990, the number of elementary counselors hired by the CCSD had doubled.

With more elementary counselors being hired by the CCSD and placed in schools that had never had the services of a counselor available, the issues of role ambiguity and role conflict accelerated. In an attempt to alleviate this problem, a curriculum guide for counselors was developed. The guide did not resolve the issue of role conflict because of the differing perceptions of administrators and counselors regarding the role of counselors. Elementary schools were now dealing with the fact that many of their counselors were new
to the field of counseling, having been teachers before they were hired as counselors. Additionally, the building administrators were oftentimes confused regarding the duties of these counselors, having never before had a counselor assigned to their building.

In the CCSD, during the 1995-95 school year there were 72 elementary school counselors servicing 103 of the 127 elementary schools in comparison to 80 middle school counselors and 111 senior high school counselors servicing a total of 54 schools. Not only was there a disproportionate number of school counselors in the middle and senior high school level but approximately half of the elementary school counselors (32) were assigned to more than one school.

Problem Statement

What was the relationship of role ambiguity and role conflict to job satisfaction of school guidance counselors in the Clark County School District? Did the school level assignment of the counselor (i.e.: elementary, middle, or high school) play a part in the counselor’s job satisfaction?

Research Questions

The following research questions were considered relating to school counselors:
1. Did a relationship exist between job satisfaction and role ambiguity?

2. Did a relationship exist between job satisfaction and role conflict?

3. Did a relationship exist between the subcategories of job satisfaction (responsibility, supervision, colleagues, work itself, working conditions and recognition) and role ambiguity?

4. Did a relationship exist between the subcategories of job satisfaction (responsibility, supervision, colleagues, work itself, working conditions and recognition) and role conflict?

5. Did elementary school counselors have more role ambiguity than middle school counselors or high school counselors?

6. Did elementary school counselors have more role conflict than middle school counselors or high school counselors?

**Definition of Terms**

Role ambiguity: The term, role ambiguity (RA) was defined as the extent to which an individual was unclear about the role expectations of others, as well as the degree of uncertainty associated with one's role performance (Rizzo et al., 1970; Sears & Navin, 1983). It was often noted in the literature that role ambiguity led to role conflict.

Role Conflict: Role conflict (RC), as defined by Rizzo et al. (1970), was the degree to which expectations of a role were incompatible or incongruent with
the reality of the role. The incompatibility was due to conflicts between organizational demands and one's own values, problems of personal resource allocations or conflicts between obligations to several different people. In a school setting, those conflicts often came in the form of scheduling, handling discipline, lunch/hall duty and differing perceptions of the counseling role on the part of the administrator and building counselor. Role conflict was measured using the Role Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction was defined, for the purpose of this study, as the extent to which the counselor perceived and valued various factors of the work situation (Lester, 1984). Factors being measured included:

1. Work itself -- The job of counseling or the tasks related to the job; the freedom to institute innovative materials and to utilize one's skills and abilities in designing one's work; the freedom to experiment and to influence or control what goes on in the job

2. Working conditions -- The working environment and aspects of the physical environment

3. Responsibility -- The opportunity to be accountable for one's own work and the opportunity to take part in policy or decision-making activities

4. Supervision -- The task-oriented behavior and person-oriented behavior of the immediate supervisor
5. Colleagues — The work group and social interaction among fellow counselors

6. Recognition — Some act of notice, blame, praise or criticism (Lester, 1984).

Job satisfaction was measured using selected items of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984). Editorial changes were made where necessary and the word "teacher" was changed to "counselor" in statements where appropriate.

School guidance counselors: The term school guidance counselors, as used for this study, referred to individuals who provided a comprehensive guidance and counseling program within the school setting. Those individuals were employed full-time as counselors and held a valid Nevada certificate in school counseling. The terms "guidance counselor(s)", "elementary school counselor(s)", "secondary school counselor(s)" and "counselor(s)" were also used to refer to those individuals.

Conceptual Rationale

The many varied perceptions of the school counselor's role led to role ambiguity and role conflict on the part of many school counselors. Those feelings of confusion often led to job dissatisfaction which was most clearly seen in the turnover rate of counselors each year.
Herzberg (1968) identified two important factors associated with job satisfaction. These factors were called hygiene and motivator factors. Hygiene factors included supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies and administrative practices, benefits and job security. When hygiene factors deteriorated, job dissatisfaction was seen. Herzberg stressed that motivator factors led to job satisfaction. Those factors included achievement, recognition, work environment and responsibility. It should be noted that hygiene and motivator factors were separate continuums not opposite ends of the same continuum.

Lawler and Porter (1967) believed that intrinsic rewards, those rewards given to an individual by himself, led to more job satisfaction than extrinsic rewards, which were organizationally controlled. Intrinsic rewards were as simple as a feeling of having accomplished something perceived as worthwhile.

Individuals were satisfied with their job only to the extent that the job provided what the individual desired. Lawler and Porter (1967) stated that job satisfaction was closely effected by the quality of rewards people derived from their jobs.

If school guidance counselors were intrinsically motivated, what caused the turnover rate each year? The counselor's perception of their role in the
school setting and the conflict that resulted from the supervisors misperception of the counselor's role was a leading factor in the turnover rate of counselors.

In order for counselors to have felt satisfaction with their job, the issue of role ambiguity and role conflict must be resolved. Role conflict, defined as conflict about which public to satisfy, affected the stress level of school counselors (Olson & Dilley, 1988) and was seen as having caused a decrease in job satisfaction.

Role conflict had often been seen as a by-product of role ambiguity. Role ambiguity most often occurred when an employee did not know what he/she had the authority to decide, what they were expected to accomplish and how they had been judged by their supervisor or colleagues. Those characteristics often led to hesitation in decision making and resulted in the employee relying on the trial and error approach to meeting expectations (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Additional areas of ambiguity seen included: (1) the counselor being unclear about the scope of their relationships - they did not know what they were supposed to do; (2) they did not know how to do the job; (3) uncertainty caused by lack of knowledge regarding whose expectations were required to be met - an inability to distinguish between legitimate role senders and others that could be safely ignored; and (4) doubts regarding how others evaluated the counselor (Kahn et al., 1964). In situations where the counselor was assigned to two or more schools, role conflict was seen as a source of lowered job satisfaction as
counselors struggled to meet all the varying conflicting demands of their role
definers, i.e. their supervisors (Gade & Houdek, 1993).

There was obviously a difference in the counselors' role based on their assignment - either elementary or secondary. Students were frequently unsure of the counselor's role in the school, oftentimes because of a lack of exposure to the counselor. Additionally, in schools where the counselors played a role in the discipline procedures, there was often a misunderstanding of the counselors appropriate function. It was difficult to establish a counseling relationship and rapport with students when the counselor possessed the authority and/or responsibility for discipline (Gilbert, 1965).

The school assignment of the counselor often added to the confusion that led to role ambiguity and ultimately, role conflict. In the Clark County School District, approximately one-half of the elementary school counselors were assigned to two schools. Based on the counselors' assignment, they were supervised by two administrators. This led to confusion and ambiguity regarding the counselor's duties and responsibilities. In one school, the counselor was expected to focus on group counseling and individual counseling while in the other school, the focus for the counseling program was developmental classroom lessons. Additionally, the extra duties a counselor was expected to fulfill, such as lunch room supervision and hall duty supervision, varied from school to school.
Working conditions also varied. In some of the newer elementary schools, a counseling office was provided as well as an area for parent/teacher conferences and group counseling. It was not unheard of for elementary counselors working in older buildings to find their office was a renovated supply room that lacked access to a phone or heating/air conditioning. Under those circumstances, it was not surprising that many elementary counselors chose to move into middle school or high school counseling positions.

Some of the same confusions regarding responsibilities and duties existed in the middle school. A middle school counselor was often faced with the issue of more than one supervisor giving them instructions on their responsibilities and those instructions conflicted. Concurrently, the administrator's perception of counseling responsibilities was contradictory to the counselor's perception of what the work itself entailed. As with elementary counselors, middle school counselors in CCSD often spent a portion of their day involved in non-counseling activities, such as lunchroom and hall supervision.

Advantages to be considered in a middle school assignment were seen in the area of working conditions. Middle school counselors were assigned to only one school and were part of a team of counselors, ranging in number from two to five. Unfortunately, this caused confusion and conflict when the counselors who made up the team did not get along with their colleagues or did not have similar counseling styles. Working in close proximity with counselors who had differing
philosophies led to resistance when new ideas were presented and stress resulted (Ponzo, 1989).

A high school counseling assignment incorporated many of the same aspects as a middle school assignment. High school counselors were assigned to only one school and were a part of a counseling team that included up to ten colleagues, based on the number of students in the school. Most high school counselors did not perform the extra supervisory duties that elementary and middle school counselors performed. It was noted, however, that high school counselors did not spend as much time in actual counseling duties as did counselors at other grade levels. High school counselors in the Clark County School District were true guidance counselors and spent a great deal of their time assisting students in making choices that led to graduation and beyond.

As employees were placed in more ambiguous situations at work, their job dissatisfaction increased as did the conflicting role pressures they experienced. Sawyer (1992) saw the two role constructs of role ambiguity as being the extent to which the individual's work goals and responsibilities were clearly communicated by the supervisor and the degree to which an individual understood the processes required to achieve these goals.

Ambiguous situations resulted from a lack of clear role expectations. Role expectations consisted of the person's performance and person's office and abilities, i.e.: specific acts: personal characteristics and style; what a person
should do; what the person thought and believed; and how they related to their colleagues and others (Kahn et al., 1964). Individuals also experienced role conflict when the expectations of their role were ill-defined or contradictory.

It was necessary to clarify the role of the counselor from the functions they were performing versus what the counselor felt was what they were performing (Rippee et al., 1965). In order to adequately perform their role, counselors had to know: (1) what the expectations of the role set were, e.g. rights, duties, and responsibilities; (2) what activities fulfilled the role responsibilities e.g. means-end knowledge; and (3) the consequence of role performance to self, others, and the organization (Kahn et al., 1964).

Counselors were clear about their goals and responsibilities, as assigned by their supervisor, while not knowing how they were expected to attain or meet them. Being told what one's goals were did not give any information about how to achieve the goals (Sawyer, 1992) and caused further ambiguity and/or conflict.

**Summary**

As was seen in the research, when role ambiguity led to role conflict the result was often lack of job satisfaction. With school counselors there were many reasons that were attributed to causing role ambiguity included, but
not limited to: double school assignments, the expectations of more than one supervisor, school level assignment and working with colleagues with differing philosophies. Through the use of the Role Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970) and select items of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984) (see Appendix A), this study attempted to determine the effect of role ambiguity and role conflict on the job satisfaction of school counselors.

Delimitations

This study was conducted in the Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada. The CCSD was the 10th largest school district in the nation and operated 184 schools: 127 elementary schools, 27 middle schools, 24 senior high schools and 6 special schools. All full-time school guidance counselors were asked to participate in the study with the exception of those counselors employed in rural K-12 school, counselors employed in alternative setting schools within the CCSD and/or those school counselors employed in a private school in Clark County, Nevada. Counselors were asked to respond to a descriptive survey composed of the Role Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970) and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In order to fully understand the issue of role ambiguity and role conflict in the school guidance program, a brief history of the guidance movement was necessary. Therefore, the first section of this chapter dealt with the history of the guidance movement from the early 1900's to today. The second section dealt with the issues of role ambiguity and role conflict, terms which were often used interchangeably in the literature dealing with counseling. The final section in this chapter was a review of the literature dealing with job satisfaction.

History of Counseling

The issue of the duties and functions of school guidance counselors were traced back to the inception of school guidance counselors, in the early 1900's. Initially, a vocational guidance program was developed to prepare students for a smooth transition from school to work. In 1912, Grand Rapids, Michigan, established a citywide department for vocational guidance within the school system (Shertzer & Stone, 1980). The program was begun in secondary
schools and was under the direction of teachers who spent part of their work
days offering guidance services to students (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988). The
original guidance program was seen as technical and simple with the role of
teacher/counselor being one of a dispenser of information (McCully, 1965).

By the 1920's, less emphasis was placed on guidance as vocational
training and more emphasis on education as guidance. Record keeping, as well
as assessments and follow-up (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988) had become an
important aspect of the guidance program. The major emphasis of school
counseling programs was still the secondary school, although elementary
counselors were beginning to appear in schools. In a study conducted by
Gordon in 1929 (Muro, 1970), 75 selected U. S. cities were surveyed. At that
time, only 16 municipalities reported definite counseling programs in elementary
schools.

The 1930's brought more changes. Now the emphasis of guidance was
found to be an all inclusive term that referred to problems dealing with
adjustments to health, family and friends. The 1936 passage of the George -
Dean Act brought about an extension of federal aid for vocational education to
Jones and Hand as advocating the use of teacher-counselors for small groups of
students, as a major effort was made to make guidance an integral part of the
instructional program in schools.
By the time the George-Barden Act of 1946 (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988) was enacted, it was recognized that more funding was necessary to support counseling activities and the training of counselors. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 led to Public Law 85-864 and funds were provided in the form of grants to states to establish statewide testing programs and to develop training to prepare individuals to be counselors in secondary schools.

A 1953 survey was conducted by the National Association of Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers, an organization that was the forerunner for the present Association for Counselor Educators and Supervisors. The survey sampled five percent of all elementary schools in the nation, for a total of 611 schools in 19 states. Of the schools surveyed, 34.7 percent had the services of a counselor. It was noted that only six percent employed a full-time counselor while an additional 3.6 percent provided counseling services at least half-time. At the same time, 25.1 percent of the schools reported they had counseling services less than half-time (Muro, 1970). In 1959, James B. Conant published The American High School Today, which recommended the employment of counselors in high schools (Shertzer & Stone, 1980).

It wasn't until the 1960's that a need was recognized and funds were provided for counselor training in the elementary and junior high levels. In 1962, Gilbert Wrenn outlined the four major functions of a counselor. Those functions were:
1. Counsel with students;
2. Consult with teachers, administrators and parents about students;
3. Study the changing facts of the student population and interpret what was found to the community and administrators, and;
4. Coordinate the counseling resources in the school and between the school and community.

This interpretation of a counselor's function totally changed the perception of what a school counselor's role actually was.

While it was noted that some elementary schools in Boston had counselors as early as 1910 (Gysbers & Henderson, 1988), the 1960's actually saw the birth of the elementary school guidance program. In 1964, the National Defense Education Act was amended to include the preparation of elementary school counselors (Shertzer & Stone, 1980).

Faust (1968) outlined the three time periods that led to the current elementary guidance program. The Traditional period lasted from 1908 to the 1940's and methods used for elementary counseling were borrowed from secondary school settings. During this time the guidance program emphasized occupational information. From 1950 to 1965, the Neotraditionalist period emphasized groups and learning climates. By the mid 1960's, the Developmentalist period emphasized developmental counseling over crisis centered counseling as well as individual and group counseling. Additionally, standards for the preparation of elementary school counselors were approved by the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Shertzer & Stone, 1980).
Gysbers and Henderson (1988) saw guidance as a program that dealt with:

a) student outcomes  
b) activities and processes that assist students in achieving these outcomes  
c) professionally recognized personnel and  
d) materials and resources (p.30).

Additionally, they saw guidance programs as being developmental and comprehensive and featuring a team approach that involved the total school staff.

Role Ambiguity / Role Conflict

The issues of role ambiguity (RA) and role conflict (RC) were traced back to classical organizational theory in which organizations were developed on a chain-of-command theory. The theory was set on the basis of hierarchical relationships with a clear and single flow of authority from top to bottom (Rizzo et al., 1970; Kahn et al., 1964).

Rizzo et al. (1970) saw unity of command as being the existence of having only one supervisor or one leader that gave orders for any action an employee was expected to follow. Within organizations where unity of command was seen and employees received orders from only one supervisor or leader, job satisfaction was seen more often. Additionally, the principle of single accountability (Davis, 1951) found workers accountable for the successful execution of tasks to one, and only one, supervisor. This led to systematic and
consistent reporting, evaluation and control of work as well as preventing employees from playing one supervisor against another and avoiding an accurate evaluation by misleading or ambiguous reporting of performances (Rizzo et al., 1970). While theoretically the counselor wanted to do the best job possible, this was often an almost insurmountable task when directions being given were conflicting and the counselor was aware of the fact that both administrators had input into yearly evaluations.

Rizzo et al. (1970) stated that role theory was defined as "when behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent - one kind of role conflict - he will experience stress, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively than if the expectations do not conflict (p. 151)". Role conflict was then seen as having caused a decrease in individual satisfaction and decreased organizational effectiveness.

Role conflict had often been noted as a by-product of role ambiguity. Role ambiguity was most often seen when an employee did not know what he/she had the authority to decide, what they were expected to accomplish and how they were judged. These characteristics often led to hesitation in decision making and resulted in the employee relying on the trial and error approach to meeting expectations (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Additional areas of ambiguity included: (1) the counselors being unclear about the scope of their responsibilities - they did not know what they were
supposed to do; (2) they did not know how to do the job; (3) uncertainty caused by lack of knowledge regarding whose expectations were required to be met - an inability to distinguish between legitimate role senders and others that may be safely ignored; and (4) doubts regarding how others evaluated the counselor (Kahn et al., 1964).

As employees were placed in more ambiguous situations at work, their job dissatisfaction increased as did the conflicting role pressures they experienced. Sawyer (1992) perceived the two role constructs of role ambiguity as being the extent to which the individuals work goals and responsibilities were clearly communicated and the degree to which an individual understood the processes required to achieve these goals.

Ambiguous situations resulted from a lack of clear role expectations. Role expectations consisted of the person's performance and person's office and abilities, i.e.: specific acts, personal characteristics and style, what a person did, what the person thought and believed, and how they related to others (Kahn et al., 1964).

It was necessary to differentiate the role of the counselor and the functions they were performing versus what the counselor felt was what they performed (Rippee et al., 1965). In order to adequately perform their role, counselors had to know (1) what the expectations of the role set were, e.g. rights, duties, and responsibilities; (2) what activities fulfilled the role
responsibilities e.g. means-end knowledge; and (3) the consequence of role performance to self, others, and the organization (Kahn et al., 1964).

Counselors were clear about their goals and responsibilities while not knowing how they were expected to attain or meet them. Being told what one's goals were did not give any information about how to achieve those goals (Sawyer, 1992) and caused further ambiguity and/or conflict.

In 1966, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) clarified the functions of counselors to include counseling, consulting and coordination (Hutchinson et al., 1966). Those functions matched the ones developed by Wrenn (1962). The American Personnel and Guidance Association endorsed this definition in 1969 (Brown & Kameen, 1977).

Within the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), school counselors were specifically mentioned three times. Section 49.290 defined the use of the word 'counselor' as a "person who is regularly employed by a public or private school in this state as a counselor, psychologist or psychological examiner for the purpose of counseling pupils" and dealt with the issue of student confidentiality.

Section 389.120 dealt with providing secondary students information regarding careers and further education in the area of environmental quality.

Only in Section 389.180, which was added to NRS in 1991, was a specific course of study for occupational guidance and counseling in grades 7 to 12
addressed. The activities that counseling programs needed to be designed to provide included:

a) Promote normal growth and development.
b) Promote positive mental and physical health.
c) Provide each pupil with knowledge and skills which permit him to control his own destiny.
d) Assist each pupil to plan, monitor and manage his personal, educational and occupational development.
e) Meet the immediate needs and concerns of each pupil, whether his needs or concerns require counseling, consultation, referral or information.
f) Provide counselors, teachers and support staff with the knowledge and skills required to maintain and improve the course.
g) Provide such other related assistance and instruction as is deemed necessary (p. 10200).

It was noted that currently no specific statutes addressed an elementary counseling curriculum within the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Based on the state regulations for counseling programs, the Clark County School District developed a curriculum program for students in grades K-12. The primary function of counselor was "to provide a comprehensive guidance and counseling program for all children in grades K-5 (6-9, 9-12)" as well as "consult with teachers, parents, and staff to enhance their effectiveness in helping children (students) education, personal, social and career development, and provide support to other programs" (Clark County School District Counseling Curriculum Guide, 1993).

With the exception of word changes to indicate different grade levels, the major job responsibilities of all counselors in the Clark County School District included:
1) Implement, facilitate, and teach the elementary (middle school, high school) guidance curriculum;
2) Guide individual and groups of pupils through the educational, personal, social and career development;
3) Counsel individuals and small groups of children;
4) Consult with teachers, parents and staff regarding meeting children's developmental needs and regarding specific information about the children for whom they have responsibility;
5) Refer children with problems and their parents to special programs and/or specialists;
6) Plan and evaluate the campus guidance program;
7) Pursue continuous professional growth;
8) Develop appropriate work hours to coincide with the needs of students; cooperate with administration in planning the contractual day schedule for each counselor; plan and coordinate the use of facilities for services to be delivered (Clark County School District Counseling Curriculum Guide, 1993).

As can be seen from the list of major job responsibilities, many were duplicates of the list found in NRS 389.180, which was designed to meet the needs of students in grades 7-12.

Muro (1970) saw the basic differences in elementary and secondary counseling programs stemming mainly from the fact that a secondary counselor's primary role consisted of counseling students to help them understand themselves and make decisions that related to educational, vocational and personal problems. Differences existed because (1) there was seldom a choice of courses in an elementary school; (2) vocational planning was not encouraged in elementary school although occupation orientation was a part of the guidance program; (3) only a limited number of children in an elementary school setting had the maturity and self understanding needed for counseling related to personal problems; and (4) elementary students viewed time as now
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while secondary students were capable of viewing time in the present and the future.

Kahn et al. (1964) defined role conflict as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make compliance with the other more difficult. Subcategories of role conflict as defined by Kahn et al. (1964) included:

1. Intra-sender conflict - differing prescriptions and proscriptions from a single member of the role set that are incompatible
2. Inter-sender conflict - pressures from one role sender that oppose pressures from one or more senders
3. Inter-role conflict - membership in one organization conflicting with the pressures stemming from membership in other groups
4. Person-role conflict - role requirements violating the moral values of the individual, i.e.: doing things that go against one's better judgement
5. Role overload - a form of inter-sender conflict when various role senders hold legitimate expectations that an individual should perform a wide variety of tasks that are mutually compatible within given time limits and a conflict of priorities is seen (p. 20).

Conflict was often associated with dissatisfaction, anxiety, low performance, low commitment and a propensity to leave (Siegall, 1992). A factor that led to role conflict included the perception of the role senders power and importance. Siegall (1992) noted that the more a role sender withheld or provided something of value, the more distress was likely to be experienced by not complying with the role sender's expectations.

Another major area causing role conflict with school counselors stemmed from the fact that there was not a clear role definition of what a school
counseling program included. Conflict was noted not only between counselors and administrators but also within the counseling ranks.

In a study done by Wrenn (1962) to determine the optimum counseling program, elementary counselors believed that a better definition of what comprised a counseling guidance program designed for parents, teachers, administrators and the community was seen as the first step in clarifying the counselors role. Other components of the program that dealt with the issue of role ambiguity included more inservices for teachers for better understanding of the counseling program, teacher education in human relations, smaller case loads and greater resources.

While secondary guidance counselors agreed that role ambiguity existed, an optimal program for secondary schools was seen as one that allowed for more counseling with students, counseling with resources including professional specialists, vocational counseling, conferences with parents and time to work with groups (Wrenn, 1962; Corle & Hudson, 1962).

The counselor's role within the school needed to be defined by the counselor with input from administrators, teachers, students and the community. However, this was not always the case. Counselors frequently found their role being defined by administrators and as a result, the counselors found themselves placed in a position of being an administrative assistant or in a quasi-administrative role (Boy, 1962; Shertzer & Stone, 1973; Wasson &
Strowig, 1965; Coy, 1991). The counselor was viewed as a "jack of all trades" and was assigned duties that included developing curriculum, attendance, scheduling and discipline and then was condemned for failing to produce an adequate number of "cures" (Shertzer & Stone, 1973).

Hargins' (1977) research found that counselors saw that a major problem with school counseling was the lack of role definition. The study indicated that counselors saw a need for increased group counseling. Additionally, it was believed that an optimum counseling program was one that each school developed to best meet its' needs.

Hannaford (1987) believed that three basic service areas needed to be considered when designing a counseling program. The areas were coordination, counseling and consultation. Coordination dealt with activities that required administrative skills and effective management concepts. Counseling included emphasis on academic, career, personal and social needs. Consultation involved acting as a facilitator in parent conferences, parent education programs and professional development.

Difficulties arose in defining the counselors' role in the school not only because of the fact that counselors and administrators often had differing opinions but also because counselors at different grade levels had different perceptions of their role. Elementary counselors saw their role as one that helped students develop a sense of responsibility and self understanding in
order to react with confidence to environmental demands as well as developing an awareness of the uniqueness of self. Other areas stressed by elementary counselors included decision making, social development and understanding the role of education and how it pertained to life (Cottingham, 1966; Corle & Hudson, 1962).

With limitations of available funds, there was a tendency to assign elementary counselors to multiple schools and as a result, the majority of an elementary counselor's time was spent delivering services in a large group or classroom setting (Boser et al., 1988). While the optimal student to counselor ratio was 350 to 1, elementary counselors often worked with 700-1000 students and in some cases even more (Corle & Hudson, 1962; Boser et al., 1988). A study done by Myrick and Moni in 1976 surveyed 10,770 public elementary school counselors. At that time, approximately 15 percent of the counselors surveyed were working in more than one school (Shertzer & Stone, 1980).

Secondary school counselors often found that the tasks in which they were trained did not necessarily match the tasks they were expected to fulfill (Dunlop, 1965).

While elementary and secondary counselors were trained in counseling, consulting and developmental and career guidance (Tennyson, 1989),
secondary counselors spent 10-29% of their time doing clerical activities such as scheduling and testing (Wellington, 1962). Additionally, rather than working with small or large groups, secondary counselors saw individual students to address issues related to conflict resolution, decision making, scheduling and writing recommendations. A large part of a secondary school counselors responsibilities also fell into administrative and support services and included arranging meetings, preparing bulletins and performing clerical functions (Tennyson, 1989).

There was obviously a difference in the counselor’s role based on their assignment - either elementary or secondary. Students were frequently unsure of what the counselor’s role in the school was, oftentimes because of a lack of exposure to the counselor. Additionally, in schools where the counselor played a role in the discipline procedures, there was often a misunderstanding of the counselor’s appropriate function. It was difficult to establish a counseling relationship and rapport with students when the counselor possessed the authority and/or responsibility for discipline (Gilbert, 1965). Lewis (1978) cited a study done by Mason et al. (1965) in which it was found that students perceived counselors largely as administrators who also did counseling. The counselor was seen as a source of help in educational and vocational planning.

Teachers perceived counselors as quasi-administrators who were a necessary evil that must be tolerated. They saw the counselors job as being
primarily centered around trying to help students who were disturbing to the teacher or the school (Berlin, 1963; Buckner, 1975). Teachers often felt that counselors coddled and pampered students and then used confidentiality as a "shield to hide behind when their activities were challenged" (Shertzer & Stone, 1973).

Additionally, teachers did not fully understand what a counselor did because many of their activities were not always observable. Lewis (1978) also cited Hattenschweller (1970) and noted that teacher viewed the counseling position as providing special privileges as well as status, which was seen because counselors often had an office, a secretary and a phone.

In 1977, the American School Counselor Association designated 37 counseling subroles (Olson & Dilley, 1988). This fact alone indicated that even within the counseling ranks, the role of the school counselor was wide and varied. As society changed and the counselor took on new or unfamiliar demands in areas such as drug abuse, suicide prevention, divorce, physical and/or sexual abuse and at-risk populations, the counselors' role expanded (Olson & Dilley, 1988; Wiggins et al., 1990). With the expansions and specialization of the counselor's role leading to more ambiguity and conflict for the counselor, it was only a matter of time before the counselor began to feel dissatisfied with their job.
Job Satisfaction

With many counselors experiencing role ambiguity and/or role conflict, how satisfied were they with their job? What were the characteristics of job satisfaction? What basic definitions and assumptions had been made regarding job satisfaction? The remaining portion of this chapter attempted to address and answer those questions.

Herzberg's et al. (1959) theory of motivation differentiated between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and viewed them as being two separate continuums rather than opposite ends of the same continuum.

Herzberg's theory stated that different types of factors led to either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Motivator factors were intrinsic and rewarded the needs of the individual to reach their aspirations. Motivator factors included achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. Lack of motivator factors did not lead to job dissatisfaction but rather to less satisfaction about the job.

Hygiene factors were considered to be extrinsic. They developed when feelings of unhappiness were associated with conditions that surrounded the actual doing of the job and an unhealthy psychological work environment was seen. Hygiene factors included recognition, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, company policies and administrative practices, benefits, job security and salary. Four of those factors - supervision, interpersonal relations,
working conditions and company policies and administrative practices - were linked to role ambiguity and/or role conflict and as such were seen as direct causation of the job dissatisfaction of counselors.

Schmidt (1976) cited Sergiovanni's replication of Herzberg's study which found that the factors identified as motivators tended to focus on the work itself while hygiene factors focused on the conditions of work.

Vroom (1964) felt that job satisfaction was closely affected by the quality of rewards people derived from their jobs. Individuals were satisfied with their job to the extent that the job provided what the individual desired. Job performance was effective to the extent that performance led to the attainment of what was desired (Vroom, 1964). Job performance was bound to suffer when individuals were not clear on what was expected of them or were uncertain of the rewards that can be attained.

Rigling's (1978) discrepancy theory considered job satisfaction to be the difference between what was received and some other standard for outcomes as people differed in their level of needs and desires.

Locke's (1969) definition of satisfaction was measuring the difference between what a person wanted and what he felt he received. Locke's three elements of job satisfaction were (1) the perception of some aspect of the job; (2) an implicit or explicit value standard; and (3) the conscious or subconscious judgment of the relationship between perception and value.
Equity theorists believed that job satisfaction was not measured without first considering the effort a person put into the job in relation to what he expected to receive. Workers were dissatisfied if they felt they were overcompensated for their efforts or if there was not enough work to do. Additionally, dissatisfaction was often the result of sizable efforts yielding low pay (Rigling, 1978).

Evans (1969) developed five methods to measure job satisfaction. They included:

1. Measurement of overall satisfaction;
2. Measurement of satisfaction with various aspects of the job;
3. Measurement of the attainment of either needs or goals;
4. Measurement of the level of aspiration of needs and goals; and
5. Measurement of the importance of job facets or needs and goals.

Scores were only compared if a common frame of reference existed.

Nord (1977) maintained that six common assumptions were made regarding job satisfaction. They were:

1. When dealing with job satisfaction, economic competition and growth was relegated to a secondary position in relation to economic factors;
2. Work was not seen as a central interest in life - individuals often did not seek more involving work;
3. Human nature was individualistic - cooperation was seldom considered a worthy goal;
4. Members of organizations were often seen in conflict with each other;
5. A maintenance of an existing distribution of power was common even when improvements in the quality of work life were possible if decision making responsibilities were shared; and
6. There existed an ideological conservatism.

When dealing with those common assumptions it was noted that enriching a work environment so that it was more meaningful had a low possibility of
success. While some individuals felt dissatisfaction with the work they did, they were more apt to deal with the situation that existed rather than attempting to change the situation (Nord, 1977).

Carroll (1973) cited Leon Festinger's theory of "cognitive dissonance" in which people strived to avoid inconsistencies in beliefs. An individual balanced one thing against another rather than dealing with the static process of having all-over satisfaction. Thus a school counselor who was satisfied with the work accomplished as a counselor often overlooked those aspects of the job that caused dissatisfaction. When the actual tasks of a job were stimulating to the worker, positive satisfaction arose and acted to motivate the individual (Carroll, 1973).

What role did satisfaction play on productivity? One would expect to see a relationship between satisfaction and performance with performance increasing proportionally to satisfaction. In reality, threats and rewards may effect productivity with the threat of the loss of a job keeping productivity high (Brayfield, 1955). In a field like counseling, where funding for current and future positions was often questioned, it was noted that many felt their job security was guaranteed by their performance. The more students a counselor was able to see, the more effective the counselor appeared.

Lawler and Porter (1967) cited Vroom's path-goal theory of motivation in which people were motivated to do things they felt hade a high probability of
leading to rewards that were valued. Performance led to extrinsic rewards, those that were organizationally controlled, and intrinsic rewards, those that were given to the individual by himself. Intrinsic rewards were subject to fewer disturbing influences and were more likely related to performance. Individuals expected equitable rewards, with the amount of reward received being a result of the individuals performance. An individual was often satisfied with a small amount of reward if they felt it was fair for the job that was done (Lawler & Porter, 1967).

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed the literature regarding the issues of role ambiguity and role conflict for school counselors. Additionally, it discussed the impact of role ambiguity and role conflict on the school counselors' job satisfaction. As had been seen in the review, role ambiguity existed for school counselors in the definitions of the role. It had also been seen, specifically in Clark County, that while a curriculum guide existed for counselors, the responsibilities listed for each grade level tended to be identical. That combined with differing viewpoints of the school counselors role, such as performing quasi-administrative duties and assisting with discipline, led to role conflict not only on the part of the counselor but also by teachers, students, administrators and parents. The
literature showed that this role ambiguity and role conflict contributed to the
counselors difficulties regarding job satisfaction.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between role ambiguity, role conflict and job satisfaction of school guidance counselors employed in the Clark County School District (CCSD), Las Vegas, Nevada. This relationship was measured using the Role Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970) and selected items from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984).

(See Appendix A)

Selection of Subjects

Subjects for this study consisted of all full-time counselors employed by the CCSD. School counselors employed by the CCSD were certified by the state of Nevada and had a minimum of a master's degree in counseling. Those counselors employed in rural K-12 settings, alternative school settings within the CCSD and/or those school counselors employed in private schools in Clark County, Nevada were not included.
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The number of identified subjects was 248. This group consisted of 68 elementary school counselors, 75 middle school counselors and 102 senior high school counselors. Of the 54 elementary school counselors, only 2 of the counselors were male (3%). At the middle school level, 16 of the counselors were male (25%) while in the secondary school level, 29 of the counselors were male (28%). The gender breakdown by grade level matched what was commonly seen with teachers. As the grade level increased, moving from elementary to middle to secondary school, the number of male teachers increased. Based on the fact that most school counselors began their careers as teachers, this could be an explanation for this phenomenon.

Data Gathering

Instrumentation

The Role Questionnaire (Rizzo et al., 1970) was used to measure role ambiguity and conflict. Selected items of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Lester, 1984) was used to measure job satisfaction of counselors with editorial revisions to reflect a change in wording. When "teacher" was used in a statement, the wording was changed to "counselor".
Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict

The Role Questionnaire was designed to assess the role ambiguity and role conflict of individuals within an organization.

Reliability

The role conflict scale which consisted of eight items scored from one (very false) to seven (very true) had a Cronbach's alpha of .88 while the role ambiguity measure of six items (similarly scored) had a Cronbach's alpha of .73.

Validity

Content validity. The questionnaire developed consisted of 30 items, 15 of which dealt with role ambiguity and 15 with role conflict. Of the 15 role conflict items, 10 were stress worded and 5 were comfort worded. The 15 role ambiguity items consisted of six items that were stress worded and nine that were comfort worded (Tracy & Johnson, 1981). Subjects (N=300) were asked to respond to each item which indicated the degree to which the condition existed for him (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Construct validity. The original 30 items were factor analyzed using an image covariance method and a varimax rotation. Through factor analysis, 14 items were retained and two factors emerged accounting for 56% of the common factor variance (Bishop & Lester, 1993). All items were scored based on a Likert scale ranging from one (very false) to seven (very true). The eight items on the role conflict scale were worded in a stressful manner and a high score indicated
feelings of role stress. The six items on the role ambiguity scale were worded to represent nonstressful characteristics. A high score indicated feelings of comfort with a role, however, scoring on these items was usually done in the reverse to indicate ambiguity or discomfort (Tracy & Johnson, 1981).

**Job Satisfaction**

Statements dealing with job satisfaction were taken from the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) by Lester (1984). Those statements that referred to teaching specifically were reworded to reflect the fact that the questionnaire was now geared towards school counselors.

**Reliability**

The original instrument had tests of reliability run and Alpha coefficients were provided for each of the subscales. Factors to be considered for the purpose of this study and corresponding Alpha coefficients were:

- a) Working conditions .83
- b) Responsibility .73
- c) Work itself .82
- d) Supervision .92
- e) Colleagues .82

**Validity**

**Content validation.** Items for the sample were generated from the literature on job satisfaction. The content of the instrument was examined by several experts in the field. Content validation for the instrument was
accomplished by a modified Q sort by faculty and graduate students, and statements with less than 80% agreement were either rewritten or rejected. A representative sample of items was developed generating an initial item pool of 120 items (Lester, 1984).

**Criterion validity.** Criterion validity was not obtained for the TJSQ because no other instruments had been designed specifically to measure the job satisfaction of teachers.

**Construct validity.** Construct validity was determined through use of factor analysis. The factor analysis was used to discover clusters of related variables and based on the results, the final questionnaire was composed of 66 items (Lester, 1984). Subscale of the final 66 items and number of items per subscales included:

1. Supervision - 14 items
2. Colleagues - 10 items
3. Working conditions - 7 items
4. Pay - 7 items
5. Responsibility - 8 items
6. Work itself - 9 items
7. Advancement - 5 items
9. Recognition - 3 items

All items were scored based on a Likert scale ranging from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree) for favorable items. For unfavorable items, the scoring was reversed (Lester, 1984). Although the final questionnaire
measured nine factors only six factors were considered for the purposes of this study. The factors that were measured were work itself, working conditions, recognition, responsibility, supervision and colleagues as it was believed that these factors were impacted by role ambiguity and role conflict. The other factors measured in the initial study—pay, advancement and security—did not play a critical role in the counseling aspect within Clark County.

Field Test

In an attempt to determine the reliability of the questions contained in the survey, a copy of the survey was sent to three counselors in the Clark County School District—an elementary counselor, a middle school counselor and a high school counselor. The counselors were made aware of the purpose of the survey, that being a measurement of role ambiguity, role conflict and job satisfaction of school counselors. The counselors were asked to evaluate the questions based on whether or not they felt the questions indeed measured the areas of concern. A question was left in the survey if two out of three of the counselors felt it indeed measured role ambiguity, role conflict or job satisfaction. With the exception of one question being the same as another question on the survey (questions 8 and 19 on the Teacher Job Satisfaction
Questionnaire), all counselors involved in the field test felt the questions measured the areas of concern.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Before the questionnaire was sent to the selected counselors, it was submitted to the Social Behavioral Committee of the Institutional Review Board at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas as well as the Committee to Review Coopertative Research Requests at the Clark County School District. After the questionnaire was approved by each of the committees, each respondent was sent a cover letter along with a questionnaire consisting of selected items of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Role Questionnaire, a short inquiry concerning demographics of the counselor and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope to their work location. A reminder/thank you postcard was sent out to all respondents one week after the initial mailing of the questionnaire. A reminder letter was sent out three weeks after the initial mailings to non-respondents.

**Analysis of Collected Data**

The purpose of this study was to determine whether a relationship existed between the role ambiguity and role conflict of school counselors and their job
satisfaction. The study followed an ex-post-facto design, defined by Kerlinger (1973) as:

Ex-post-facto research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences among variables are made, without direct intervention from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables (p. 379).

The statistical techniques to be used in this study included:

1. Role ambiguity and role conflict scores were correlated with job satisfaction scores. Pearson product-moment correlations were used to determine if significant relationships existed regarding these variables.

2. A multiple regression analysis was used to determine if significant relationships existed between the variables that made up job satisfaction (work itself, working conditions, recognition, responsibility, supervision and colleagues) and role ambiguity and role conflict.

The criterion of significance was set at a .05 level of significance.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS OF STUDY

Introduction

Of the 248 questionnaires mailed, 68 were sent to elementary school counselors, 75 were mailed to middle school counselors and 105 were mailed to senior high counselors. Of the 163 questionnaires returned, 6 were unusable, 52 (33.1%) were returned from elementary school counselors, 45 (28.7%) were returned from middle school counselors and 60 (38.2%) were returned from senior high school counselors for a total return rate of 157 (64%) questionnaires. This return rate was a result of an initial mailing, follow-up postcards sent out one week later and a second mailing three weeks following the initial mailing. All mailings were sent to the counselor’s school and confidentiality was strictly maintained.

Statistical Analysis

Correlation Coefficient

The statistical analysis used on the returned data was the Pearson Product Moment Correlation and a multiple regression. Prior to the analysis, a
number of questions in Section I and Section II of the questionnaire were recoded. Those items in Section I that were recoded to eliminate negatively worded questions were items 4, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36 and 37. Items that were recoded were originally scored 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree and 5=strongly agree. The recoding process changed the meaning of the responses given to indicate 1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=neutral; 4=disagree and 5=strongly disagree. As a result of the recoding, all items in Section I were coded to indicate that a low score on the Likert scale indicated dissatisfaction of a particular area on the job satisfaction subcategory being measured while a high score indicated satisfaction regarding the job satisfaction subscale being measured.

Additionally, the questions measuring role conflict in Section II of the questionnaire, items 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14 were also recoded as items measuring role ambiguity were comfort worded and items measuring role conflict were stressed worded (McGee, et. al., 1989; Kelloway & Barling, 1990). Items that were recoded were originally scored 1=definitely not true through 7=extremely true. After the recoding, scoring indicated 1=extremely true through 7=definitely not true. As a result, all items in Section II were scored to indicate that a low score indicated high levels of role ambiguity and/or role conflict and a high score indicated low levels of role ambiguity and/or role conflict.
As a result of the recoding that was performed, the scores of the correlation coefficients while appearing to be positively correlated, were, in reality negatively correlated. Those scores indicated that as individuals received more satisfaction with the recognition they received on the job, the amount of role ambiguity and role conflict they experienced decreased.

When comparing the correlation's between the various subgroups of job satisfaction and role ambiguity, a relationship was seen between: supervision and role ambiguity (.41); working conditions and role ambiguity (.37); work itself and role ambiguity (.35) and recognition and role ambiguity (.36). In each of these cases, as the areas of job satisfaction increased the amount of role ambiguity decreased. The correlation in the areas of colleagues (.16) and responsibility (-.05) did not seem to be significantly effected by role ambiguity, thereby indicating no relationship to this study.

A comparison of the correlations between the various subgroups of job satisfaction and role conflict showed similar results. Significant relationships existed between recognition and role conflict (.45), work itself and role conflict (.41), working conditions and role conflict (.37), and supervision and role conflict (.29). In each case, as each of the subcategories of job satisfaction increased, the amount of role conflict decreased. As was the case with role ambiguity, colleagues (.12) and responsibility (-.06) appeared to have no relationship with role conflict.
Table 1. Correlation Coefficients — Job Satisfaction and Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COLL</th>
<th>RECOG</th>
<th>RESPON</th>
<th>SUPER</th>
<th>WORKC</th>
<th>WORKI</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLL</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.2239</td>
<td>-.0302</td>
<td>.1487</td>
<td>.2276</td>
<td>.1679</td>
<td>.1563</td>
<td>.1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .005</td>
<td>P= .708</td>
<td>P= .063</td>
<td>P= .004</td>
<td>P= .036</td>
<td>P= .051</td>
<td>P= .131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOG</td>
<td>.2239</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.0073</td>
<td>.3364</td>
<td>.3692</td>
<td>.2797</td>
<td>.3552</td>
<td>.4505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .005</td>
<td>P= .928</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPON</td>
<td>-.0302</td>
<td>-.0073</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.0969</td>
<td>-.0625</td>
<td>-.0260</td>
<td>-.0465</td>
<td>-.0585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .708</td>
<td>P= .928</td>
<td>P= .229</td>
<td>P= .438</td>
<td>P= .747</td>
<td>P= .564</td>
<td>P= .468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPER</td>
<td>.1487</td>
<td>.3364</td>
<td>.0969</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.4662</td>
<td>.3332</td>
<td>.4105</td>
<td>.2931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .063</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .229</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKC</td>
<td>.2276</td>
<td>.3692</td>
<td>-.0625</td>
<td>.4662</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.2199</td>
<td>.3740</td>
<td>.3693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .004</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .438</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .006</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKI</td>
<td>.1679</td>
<td>.2797</td>
<td>-.0260</td>
<td>.3332</td>
<td>.2199</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.3515</td>
<td>.4088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .036</td>
<td>P= .747</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .006</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.1563</td>
<td>.3552</td>
<td>-.0465</td>
<td>.4105</td>
<td>.3740</td>
<td>.3515</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.3034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .051</td>
<td>P= .564</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.1209</td>
<td>.4505</td>
<td>-.0585</td>
<td>.2931</td>
<td>.3693</td>
<td>.4088</td>
<td>.3034</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= .131</td>
<td>P= .468</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td>P= .000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a positive correlation between role ambiguity and role conflict (.30) which was indicated in the current literature in the field of role ambiguity and role conflict. Other positive relationships between the subsets of job satisfaction were seen between recognition and supervision (.34), recognition and working conditions (.37), recognition and work itself (.28), supervision and working conditions (.47), and supervision and work itself (.33). In each of those subsets, as one characteristic of job satisfaction increased, the other characteristic also increased. For instance, as counselors became more satisfied with their relationship with their supervisor, an increase was seen in the satisfaction of working conditions.

**Multiple Regression**

Two separate multiple regressions were run. In one case, role ambiguity was the dependent variable and in the other case, role conflict was the dependent variable. Independent variables entered in both multiple regressions were supervision, working conditions, work itself and recognition. Based on the results of the correlation coefficient, the independent variables responsibility and colleagues were not entered in the multiple regression. The variables were entered in the multiple regression using a stepwise method.
Table 2. Multiple Regression -- Role Ambiguity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULT R</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>SIG F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work. Cond.</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The first variable entered (See Table 2), supervision, accounted for 16.8% of the total variance on role ambiguity. The second variable entered, working conditions, accounted for 21.1% of the variance on role ambiguity, with an increase of 4.3%. The third variable entered, work itself, accounted for 25.6% of the variance, an increase of 4.5%. The final variable entered, recognition, accounted for 27.8% of the variance on role ambiguity, an increase of 2.2%. Overall, the four subcategories of job satisfaction -- supervision, working conditions, work itself and recognition -- accounted for 27.8% of the variance on role ambiguity.

The first variable entered in Table 3 (See Table 3), supervision, accounted for 8.6% of the total variance on role conflict. The second variable entered, working conditions, accounted for 15.5% of the variance, an increase of 6.9%. The third variable entered, work itself, accounted for 25.2% of the
variance on role conflict, an increase of 9.7%. The final variable entered, recognition, accounted for 32.3% of the variance, an increase of 7.1%.

Table 3. Multiple Regression — Role Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>MULT R</th>
<th>R sq</th>
<th>SIG F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work. Cond.</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Overall, the four subcategories of job satisfaction — supervision, working conditions, work itself and recognition — accounted for 32.3% of the variance on role conflict.

The results of the correlation coefficient and multiple regression were used to address the issue of the Research Questions. Based on the results, there was a relationship between job satisfaction and role ambiguity as well as role conflict. The relationship that was seen in the results indicated that as the job satisfaction of the counselors increased, the amount of role ambiguity and role conflict decreased. This was seen specifically in the subcategories of work itself, working conditions, supervision and recognition. There was no apparent relationship between colleagues and role ambiguity and/or role conflict.
Additionally, no apparent relationship was seen between responsibility and role ambiguity and/or role conflict. The issue of role ambiguity and role conflict being seen in one grade level over another was not apparent in the results based on the questions asked in the survey. However, a difference in issues and concerns of the counselors was seen in the General Comments section of the questionnaire.

**Discussion of Variables**

Supervision: A correlation was seen between supervision and role ambiguity (.41) and role conflict (.29) indicating that as satisfaction with a counselor's supervisor increased, the amount of ambiguity and conflict decreased. When looking at the individual items that made up the variable supervision, it was seen that most of the counselors responded to the questions with either "agree" or "strongly agree". There were instances where the answers indicated a lack of satisfaction with supervisors. For instance, item 14, "My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions" was answered "agree" or "strongly agree" by 11.4% of the respondents. Item 32, "My immediate supervisor provides assistance for counseling" was answered positively by 53.5% of the counselors, however, 22.9% of the counselor's...
responded negatively indicating a perceived lack of assistance by supervisors. Additionally, 15.3% of the respondents indicated that they "receive too many meaningless instructions from their immediate supervisor" (item 28).

Working Conditions: Working conditions addressed the issue of the counselors perception of their work environment. A number of the questions dealt with working conditions asked the same question in a variety of ways. In item 19, "The administration in my school does not clearly define its policies", 20.4% of the counselors surveyed agreed that the policies were not clearly defined. Similar results were seen in item 8, "The administration in my school communicates its policies well", found 19.8% of the counselors disagreed. It was interesting to note that the responses to the two questions were so close. Additionally, 9.6% of the counselors found physical surroundings in their school to be unpleasant (item 15, item 23). It is also interesting to note that while 75.8% of the counselors described working conditions in their building as satisfactory, 71.4% also felt that working conditions could be improved. The "General Comments" from the counselors shed more light on this statement.

Work Itself: The items covered in the "work itself" questions in Section I of the questionnaire dealt with how counselors specifically viewed their job. Two of the questions (item 1 and item 31) indicated that counselors felt counseling provided an opportunity to use a variety of skills as well as indicating that counselors were not indifferent towards counseling. One question in this section
had very interesting results. Item 20, "The work of a counselor consists of routine activities" showed a wide range of responses. While 40.7% of the counselors either strongly disagreed or disagreed with this question, 40.1% of the counselors surveyed either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Additionally, 19.1% of the counselors neither agreed nor disagreed with the item. The responses to this question indicated that many of the counselors responding to the survey believed their job consisted of routine activities, which was reflected in many of their responses in the "General Comments" section of the survey.

The high percentage of counselors who indicated that their job consisted of routine activities may indicated some job dissatisfaction on the part of the counselors. One factor in this job dissatisfaction was seen in the responses to item 27, "I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions". This item was scored agree or strongly agree by 22.2% of the respondents.

Recognition: The questions in the area of recognition dealt with the recognition a counselor received on the job. Items 6 and 9 specifically dealt with recognition by teachers. The scores, 75.2% and 72.6%, respectively indicated that counselors felt they were being recognized positively by teachers. Additionally, 79% of the counselors (item 13) indicated that they were told that they were "good counselors". Items 16 and 30 were similarly worded although item 16 was phrased negatively and item 30 was phrased positively. Scores
were similar with over 50% of the counselors answering that they received recognition for their counseling. Overall, the general responses indicated that counselors were satisfied with their work.

Colleagues: When considering the items that dealt with colleagues it must be remembered that the definition of "colleagues" was varied and determined by the grade level assignment of the counselors. While middle school and high school counselors generally worked with other counselors (two or more per school), elementary counselors were either assigned to single school or double school assignments and in either situation were the only counselor in the school. Therefore, in most cases, elementary counselors were referring to the teachers in the building as their colleagues while middle school and high school counselors were referring to the other counselors assigned to their school in addition to the teachers in the building.

In most cases, the counselors surveyed appeared to like the people they worked with as was seen in response to item 29, which 89.1% of the counselors answered agree or strongly agree. However, 11.4% of the counselors felt they did not get cooperation from the people with whom they worked (item 4). Additionally, 19.8% of the respondents did not believe that "my colleagues provide me suggestions for feedback about my counseling" (item 34). In response to item 21, "My colleagues are highly critical of one another" found 13.4% responding agree or strongly agree which indicated that while most of the
counselors participating in the survey got along with and liked their colleagues, there were certain components dealing with colleagues that led to dissatisfaction.

Responsibility: The final variable to be discussed from Section I of the job satisfaction questionnaire was responsibility. The counselors responding to the survey overwhelmingly (93.0%) believed they had responsibility for their counseling (item 11). The counselors also believed they were responsible for their actions (item 35 - 91.1%). A majority (91.1%) of the counselors found counseling to be interesting work (item 2) and an additional 91.7% of the counselors believed that their students respected them as counselors (item 26). While 87.9% of the counselors were interested in the policies of their school (item 37), it was interesting to note that 96.8% of the counselors tried to be aware of the policies in their school (item 17).

As was seen by the responses to the questions in Section I of the questionnaire, the counselors who responded to the survey were generally satisfied with the aspects of job satisfaction that were being measured. Areas existed however, that led to role ambiguity and/or role conflict.

Role Ambiguity: When dealing with the issue of role ambiguity or confusion regarding what one's roles were, 90.1% of the respondents indicated to some degree that they "know what [my] responsibilities are" (item 5). At the same time, 81.5% of the counselors felt they had clear, planned goals and
objectives for their job (item 1). Other questions dealing with role ambiguity indicated that in certain areas, more ambiguity exists. For instance, while 63.1% of the counselors believed that they knew they had divided their time properly (item 3), 14.6% of the counselors did not appear to be as confident in this matter.

Another area that seemed to indicate ambiguity on the part of counselors dealt with the degree of authority they had. While 64.9% of the counselors were certain of the amount of authority they had (item 10), 17.8% of the counselors were not certain about their authority. Additionally, 15.3% of the counselors did not feel that a clear explanation of their goal and objectives. Those answers indicated the existence of role ambiguity for a percentage of the counselors that participated in the survey.

Role Conflict: All of the questions that dealt with role conflict were stress worded in the survey and were recoded for statistical analysis. The answers to the role conflict questions showed the most widespread response of the entire survey, indicating that role conflict existed within the counseling ranks. Item 2, "I have to do things that should be done differently" was scored positively by 42.0% of the counselors and scored negatively by 40.8%. This indicated that 42% of the counselors believed that some of the expectations regarding how they did their job were in conflict with the counselors' beliefs. Item 11, "I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not by others" was scored
positively by 44.6% of the counselors and negatively by 41.4% of the counselors. This question also indicated that an almost equal percentage of counselors believed that at times what they were doing would either be accepted or not accepted by more than one person. This was a problem seen with elementary counselors who had two administrators to answer to (see General Comments). Another question that supported this theory was item 7. In item 7, "I work with two or more groups who operated quite differently", 56.0% of the counselors agreed with this statement. Working with groups who operated differently led to conflict.

There were areas that the counselors were asked about that they indicated did not cause as much conflict. For instance, while 24.2% of the counselors believed they "receive an assignment without the assistance to complete it" (item 4), 61.1% of the counselors felt they were given adequate assistance to complete assignments. Additionally, 55.4% of the counselors felt they were given adequate resources and materials to complete assignments (item 12), while 35.0% of the counselors disagreed. Finally, while 36.9% of the counselors believed that "I work on unnecessary things", 52.3% disagreed (item 14). This question was more fully explained by the General Comments to follow.

In conclusion, based on the responses given, it appeared that those counselors who responded to the survey were satisfied with their job. While
some of the counselors experienced both role ambiguity and/or role conflict, it was not at a level that adversely effected their job satisfaction.

General Comments

Many of the counselors who participated in the survey included comments regarding aspects of their job that were not covered within the questions provided. Those comments were discussed by grade level -- elementary, middle and high school

**Elementary school:** One of the major issues addressed by elementary counselors was the fact that many of the counselors were assigned to two schools.

"Counselors are needed in every elementary school — there is such a need for each child to have an outlet to discuss and work on their problems."

"This year is the first year at a single school assignment. It is great to follow through on a daily basis."

"A critical issue for me is the student/counselor ratio. Although I am able to provide services which my colleagues are satisfied with, I feel that I could be much more effective if I had even 600 students, rather than the 1200+ I currently serve."
"My job is difficult because I do not have enough time to do an adequate job because I have a two school assignment. Every elementary school needs a full time counselor."

"I have a two school assignment elementary counseling job. The problem with this is time management. It is like having two full time jobs. I feel every elementary school needs one full time counselor regardless of neighborhood."

"The policy of the Clark County School District of two school assignment is detrimental to how counselors are seen by coworkers and parents."

Another issue raised concerned a lack of a budget for counselors.

"There is no policy for a budget for the counseling program. Principals are sometimes not willing to allow the counselors to follow the job description."

"The counseling department of each school should have a budgetary allowance."

"Materials and supplies are always an issue in the educational field."

Other areas addressed by elementary counselors: "I believe that sometimes we, counselors, are viewed by teachers as being quasi-administrative and viewed by the administration as something other than the professionals we are. I'm not sure if the administration or the teachers are very clear on the role we are to play within the faculty or general overall structure of the hierarchy."
"I really enjoy my job and working with at-risk students but am appalled by the difference in resources and facilities available in my school as opposed to those in affluent areas. I am told to see kids and do groups but no place has been provided."

"I feel the district doesn't support elementary counselors. We are moved often and part of our effectiveness as a resource in the school is knowing children, their families and the school staff."

"School counseling is a vital part of our educational process."

"Elementary counseling is a challenging and most rewarding position in education."

"Counseling is a fun and rewarding job."

"Some principals have very little knowledge of how to use counselors at their schools."

"This is a very rewarding job. Flexibility is a necessity and self reliance is important."

**Middle school:** One of the areas of concern for middle school counselors was the amount of time spent in a quasi-administrative role.

"Too many times counselors are used as administrators — lunchroom attendants, nurses — anything that the principal or supervisor do not wish to do. No prep time. Assigned non-counseling duties."
"My job as school counselor is primarily to do hall and cafeteria duty. Counseling sessions even those that are a crisis to the student are interrupted when hall duty arises."

"Counseling at least at the secondary level is quasi-administrative -- too much paperwork and duties."

"Counselors are given many responsibilities that are more administrative in nature, i.e., lunch duty, scheduling, testing and discipline problems."

Another concern was the perceived lack of definition of the role of a counselor.

"Counselor time is not effectively utilized. A large proportion of time is spent completing tasks that do no require a degree in counseling."

"The Clark County School District comprehensive guidance services curriculum delineates how counselors should spend their time. This indicates misrepresentation between what the district designates as our duties vs. what we actually every day. This may be the result of our school counselor role being poorly defined."

"Administrators need to allow counselors to counsel and not be their "gofer's". I feel administrators need to be better informed about the role of the counselor."

"Job descriptions for counselors are not consistent within the district. Counselors need to be paid for their prep as teachers are."
"Middle school counselors are also concerned about the fact that they do not have enough time to do actual counseling."

"School counselors wear many hats on the job -- from the serious role of intervention in crisis's to scooping ice cream at many recognition programs. My administrators are supportive."

"I feel I spend too much time on unnecessary scheduling."

"Too much unmeaningful work to complete."

"Expectations and time allotted seem very incompatible. Sometimes I am expected to be in three places at once."

"Too much time is spent on menial tasks and not enough time spent on actual counseling activities."

"I see my job more as trouble shooting than as counseling."

"Although I enjoy counseling, I feel that counselors are somewhat of a "wasted" resource especially at middle school."

**High school:** High school counselors agreed with middle school counselors that much of the job consisted of quasi-administrative tasks.

"Counseling in the Clark County School District has become a quasi-administrative deans job in which the counselors main activities revolve around discipline, tardies and attendance. I consider this a threat to the role and function of the profession."
"I really don't counsel — I schedule, I check credits, I put out fires among parents, kids and teachers."

"Counseling at the high school level in the Clark County School District is almost entirely administrative. In addition, nearly every action must be documented or facilitated by paperwork."

High school counselors were also concerned with the extraordinarily heavy load of paperwork and secretarial tasks.

"As counselors we need more secretarial support. It seems odd that instead of working with students, I often spend hours on a computer doing schedule changes."

"Counseling in the senior high in the Clark County School District is clerical-type work. The district needs to evaluate what the real role of a counselor should be. Many of the tasks required of us are meaningless and could be done by clerical staff."

"There are too many frivolous and time wasting programs for which counselors are responsible. The paperwork is enormous."

"High school counselors have clerical duties that could be handled by a secretary."

"At the senior high school level, too much time must be spent on scheduling, credit checks and testing. Other staff members could take over
some of the clerical work to allow professionally trained counselors to do counseling."

"Many tasks expected of counselors could be done by clerical/paraprofessional staff. This would free a lot of my time to interact with students."

Another concern of high school counselors dealt with a lack of understanding of their role.

"We are always being asked to take on more and more — duties and responsibilities — while the number of students in our caseloads continues to grow."

"We have too many students to be completely effective in all areas. More counselors would equate to more personal interaction with students. Paperwork and secretarial duties are enormously time consuming."

"The administrative team has no clear understanding of what we do or should be doing. Case load is extremely high."

"The administration does not see the counselors as truly important."

"School counselors have such a wide range of responsibilities without the time and staff to implement these responsibilities."

"The high school counseling role of guidance remains highly traditional. Our roles are defined by school needs of 20 years ago yet with the constant pressure of a new kind of student."
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study compared the relationship of role ambiguity and/or role conflict to job satisfaction. Specific areas of job satisfaction that were chosen were: work itself, working conditions, supervisor, recognition, responsibility and colleagues. Subjects surveyed were selected K-12 counselors employed by the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, Nevada.

In all of the subcategories of job satisfaction, it was seen that as the satisfaction with each category increased, the amount of role ambiguity and/or role conflict decreased. Specifically, in the area of work itself, the counselors surveyed found their job to be pleasant as well as provided an opportunity to use a variety of skills. The counselors also felt that they had freedom to make their own decisions. A majority of the counselors surveyed believed that counseling encouraged originality. An interesting aspect of counseling that was revealed was the fact that an equal number of counselors either agreed or disagreed with the fact that counseling consists of routine activities.

In the area of working conditions, while the majority of counselors agreed
that working conditions in their schools are comfortable, it should also be noted that many of the counselors also agreed that working conditions could be improved. Specifically, counselors cited the fact that much of their day was spent either in quasi-administrative tasks or completing jobs that were basically clerical in nature. Additionally, while the majority of counselors felt that the policies in their schools were clearly communicated, a number of the respondents did not appear to agree with this statement.

In the area of supervision, most of the counselors seem satisfied with their interaction with their supervisors. Generally they agreed that their supervisors made them feel comfortable and provided assistance when the counselors needed help. Most of the counselors agreed that their supervisors backed them up and were willing to listen to the counselors' suggestions. There were a few instances in which the counselors believed that they received too many meaningless instructions from their supervisors which fit into the belief that many of the supervisors were not really aware of the role of the counselor in the school.

In the area of recognition, the majority of counselors agreed that they received recognition for successful counseling. It appeared that the counselors felt that teachers recognized them as support for their classroom and told the counselors they appreciated the support given. Overall, it appeared that the counselors were pleased with the recognition they received.
In the area of responsibility, it was overwhelmingly seen that the counselors surveyed tried to be aware of the policies of their school. The respondents agreed that they had responsibility for their counseling and as such, found counseling to be interesting work. The response to the questions dealing with responsibility indicated that the counselors surveyed felt that they were responsible for their work. This responsibility appeared to increase the satisfaction they felt toward their job.

Finally, in the area of colleagues, the respondents agreed that they got along with the people with whom they worked. It should be noted that the definition of "colleagues" was varied based on the grade level assignment of the counselor. This was due, in part, to the fact that middle school and high school counselors were a part of a team of counselors. In the elementary school, there were no schools with more than one counselor and in many instances the elementary counselor was assigned to more than one school. While counselors tended to like the people with whom they worked, a group of respondents who felt their colleagues did not provide suggestions for feedback about the counselor's skills. Additionally, a small proportion of respondents felt their colleagues were highly critical of one another.

The issues of role ambiguity and role conflict influenced the responses regarding job satisfaction. While most of the counselors who responded to the
survey expressed feelings of job satisfaction, there were also areas identified as being related to role ambiguity and role conflict.

The majority of counselors that responded indicated that they knew what their responsibilities were, thus, in this area, ambiguity was low. Higher areas of possible ambiguity dealt with counselors being uncertain about how much authority they had as well as receiving clear explanations of what tasks they were to perform.

The highest area of conflict being experienced by the counselors was seen in having to work with two or more groups who operated quite differently. Additionally, a large group of counselors found that some of the tasks they performed as a part of their job was apt to be accepted by one person and not by others. While a percentage of the respondents believed they worked on unnecessary tasks, it did not appear that those areas of ambiguity or conflict adversely affected the counselor's feelings of job satisfaction.

Conclusion

It appeared that the majority of respondents to the questionnaire were satisfied with their job. It must be noted that there were areas within the job of school counselor that led to job dissatisfaction.

Based on the "General Comments" section of the questionnaire, it was noted that there were many areas of concern to the Clark County School
District (CCSD) counselors that were not addressed in the questionnaire. Concurrently, it was noted that those concerns varied based on the school level assignment of the counselors.

Elementary school counselors were concerned with the issue of double school assignments and the lack of a counselor in every elementary school. They were also concerned with the lack of a budget being provided for the purchase of supplies.

Middle school counselors were concerned with the fact that they were often placed in quasi-administrative roles, such as doing "duties" and being a part of the discipline procedure in their schools. A concern was also expressed regarding a lack of knowledge on the administrators part regarding the actual role of the counselor. Middle school counselors also felt they were not being given an opportunity to actually counsel with students.

While high school counselors had a variety of concerns, they agreed with middle school counselors in believing that much of their job consisted of quasi-administrative duties. Additionally, they were concerned about a lack of understanding regarding what their role actually consisted of as well as an extremely large caseload. One of the concerns that seemed to be unique to high school counselors was an abundance of clerical tasks they performed.

Based on the comments of the counselors, it was seen that while, in general, the counselors were satisfied with their jobs, there were areas of
concern at each grade level. As the Clark County School District continues to grow in size, it is necessary to address the concerns and issues raised by the counselors to ensure a continued feeling of job satisfaction.

Recommendations

While the counselors who participated in the study indicated job satisfaction in the areas measured (work itself, working conditions, responsibility, supervision, colleagues and recognition), based on the General Comments there were aspects of their job that caused concerns to the counselors. The following recommendations were based on the concerns expressed by the counselors.

1. A task force should be convened to discuss the issues of lack of understanding of the counselors role in the different grade levels (elementary, middle and high school). Task force members should consist of counselors from each grade level.

2. Upon completion of the clarification of the counselor's role, the CCSD Counseling Curriculum Guide should be revised.

3. Principals should be inserviced on the role of the school counselor at each grade level.
4. A time management study should be performed to discover the amount of time middle school and high school counselors spend in quasi-administrative and clerical tasks.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Further study would add more to the knowledge base concerning the job satisfaction of CCSD counselors. After reviewing the results, several studies seem to be the next obvious step.

1. A study looking into the revision of the CCSD counseling curriculum guide would be valuable in addressing the issue of the role of a counselor at each grade level — elementary, middle and high school.

2. A qualitative study involving the CCSD counselors would address the issues and concerns not addressed specifically by this study.

3. A replication of this study with counselors from northern Nevada would give insight into the counseling program in public schools in Nevada.

4. A replication of this study in a school district of similar size would help clarify if the issues and concerns of the CCSD are being experienced by counselors in other parts of the country.
APPENDIX 1

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION I

The following statements refer to organizational factors that can influence the way a counselor feels about his/her job. These factors are related to counseling and to the individual's perception of the job situation. When answering the following statements, circle the numeral which represents the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

Key: 1 2 3 4 5

1. Counseling provides an opportunity to use a variety of skills. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Counseling is very interesting work. 1 2 3 4 5
3. My immediate supervisor gives me assistance when I need help. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I do not get cooperation from the people I work with. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Working conditions in my school are comfortable. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Teachers recognize counselors as a support for their classroom. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Counseling discourages originality. 1 2 3 4 5
8. The administration in my school communicates its policies well. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Teachers tell me they appreciate the support I give them. 1 2 3 4 5
10. My colleagues stimulate me to do better work. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I have responsibility for my counseling. 1 2 3 4 5
12. The work of a counselor is very pleasant. 1 2 3 4 5
Section I (cont.)

13. No one tells me that I am a good counselor. 1 2 3 4 5
14. My immediate supervisor is not willing to listen to suggestions. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Physical surroundings in my school are unpleasant. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I receive too little recognition. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I try to be aware of the policies of my school. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My interests are similar to those of my colleagues. 1 2 3 4 5
19. The administration in my school does not clearly define its policies. 1 2 3 4 5
20. The work of a counselor consists of routine activities. 1 2 3 4 5
21. My colleagues are highly critical of one another. 1 2 3 4 5
22. My immediate supervisor explains what is expected of me. 1 2 3 4 5
23. Working conditions in my school are good. 1 2 3 4 5
24. I have made lasting friendships among my colleagues. 1 2 3 4 5
25. My immediate supervisor makes me feel uncomfortable. 1 2 3 4 5
26. My students respect me as a counselor. 1 2 3 4 5
27. I do not have the freedom to make my own decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
28. I receive too many meaningless instructions from my immediate supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5
29. I like the people with whom I work. 1 2 3 4 5
30. I receive full recognition for my successful counseling. 1 2 3 4 5
31. I am indifferent towards counseling. 1 2 3 4 5
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32. My immediate supervisor provides assistance for improving counseling. 1 2 3 4 5
33. Working conditions in my school can be improved. 1 2 3 4 5
34. My colleagues provide me with suggestions for feedback about my counseling. 1 2 3 4 5
35. I am not responsible for my actions. 1 2 3 4 5
36. My immediate supervisor does not back me up. 1 2 3 4 5
37. I am not interested in the policies of my school. 1 2 3 4 5

SECTION II

The statements listed below will describe some specific characteristics about your particular job in your school. Rate how true each statement is for your job according to the following scale:

Definitely Not True Extremely of my job 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 of my job

Read each statement carefully and circle the number that best reflects your opinion. Please answer all statements.

1. I have clear, planned goals and objectives for my job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. I have to do things that should be done differently. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I know I have divided my time properly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. I receive an assignment without the assistance to complete it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Section II (cont.)

5. I know what my responsibilities are. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. I have to circumvent a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I know exactly what is expected of me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I feel certain about how much authority I have. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not by others. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to complete it. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. Explanation is clear of what has to be done. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. I work on unnecessary things. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SECTION III

Please answer the following questions to allow for better understanding of the participants.

Number of years counseling in CCSD: ______________

Number of years at current school assignment: ______________

Current school level assignment: Elementary ____________
                                    Junior High/Middle School ______________
                                    Senior High School ____________
SECTION IV

We invite overall comments regarding this survey, or about issues critical to school counseling in general. Your comments will remain anonymous.

Thank you for your time in completing and returning this questionnaire.

Return address:
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dept. of Ed. Admin. and Higher Ed.
Box 453002
Las Vegas, NV 89154-3002
October 20, 1994

Mr. John Doe
Gibson Middle School
3900 W. Washington
Las Vegas, NV 89107

Dear Mr. Doe,

As the Clark County School District increases in size, the Counseling and Guidance Department also continues to grow. This growth has resulted in increased mobility and staff transfers within the counseling ranks. The addition of new counselors as well as the burgeoning growth of the Clark County School District presents a variety of new situations and concerns for counselors in the district.

The counselors within the district have been chosen to provide their opinions on issues critical to school counselors. In order for the results to truly represent the views of the Clark County School District counselors, it is vital that each questionnaire be completed and returned. You may be assured complete confidentiality. The return envelope has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire and your cooperation is voluntary.

The research results will be made available to representatives of the Clark County School District, and all interested parties. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call (702) 895-3491.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Lynne A. Herman
October 27, 1995

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about counseling concerns in Clark County was mailed to you.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of Clark County counselors it is extremely important that yours also be in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of Clark County counselors.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced please call me right now at (702) 895-3491 and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Lynne Herman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031*</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035*</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>036*</th>
<th>037*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** "*" indicates items that were recoded for statistical analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>DEFINITELY NOT TRUE</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>EXTREMELY TRUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012*</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** "*" indicates items that were recoded for statistical analysis.
APPENDIX 3

APPROVAL OF HUMAN SUBJECTS USE
DATE: September 14, 1995

TO: Lynne Herman (EAHE)
M/S: 3002

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze
Director, Office of Sponsored Programs

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol entitled:
"Issues Critical to School Counselors:
A Clark County Perspective"

OSP # 303s0995-047

This memorandum is official notification that the protocol for the project referenced above has been approved by the Social Behavioral Committee of the Institutional Review Board. This approval is approved for a period of one year from the date of this notification, and work on the project may proceed. At the end of the year, you must notify this office if the project will be continued.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond a year from the date of this notification, it will be necessary to request an extension.

If you have any questions or require any assistance, please give us a call.

cc: Lloyd Bishop (EAHE-3002)
OSP File
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