

FRED C. RANKINE,
*Department of Education,
University of New Brunswick,
and*
JAMES T. ANGUS,
*Faculty of Education,
Lakehead University.*

IDEAL AND EXPECTED ROLES OF SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELORS

ABSTRACT: Ideal role perceptions of New Brunswick counselors were compared with random samples of actual role expectations held for counselors by principals, teachers, parents, and students. Scope of the present study included counselors from the major population centers of the province. The significant role disagreements which were obtained in 82 situations are discussed and tentative reasons for such disagreements are offered.

A previous study (Rankine & Angus, 1971) which examined the counselors' expectations of the other groups compared with the actual role expectations held for counselors by these other groups produced the most role disagreements with students. This study indicates a different pattern, but suggests counselors will be more effective in terms of meeting the students' expectations if they adopt an "ideal" set in relation to conflicts outlined in the Guidance Counselor Role Norm Inventory.

INTRODUCTION

In examining the normative world of the guidance counselor, a previous study (Rankine & Angus, 1971) compared the guidance counselors' expectations of other significant groups with the actual expectation of these groups for fifty specified situations. This was achieved by having the guidance counselor respond to the Guidance Counselor Role Norm Inventory (GCRNI) on five separate occasions, each time assuming a different mental set in connection with the expectations of the group under consideration. As previously reported, the results of these comparisons were somewhat disheartening in that the guidance counselors shared most correspondence with administrators, and least with students. The number of role conflicts identified were as follows: administrators — 6; teachers — 20; parents — 22; and students — 31. These results seemed to indicate the guidance counselor was not accurately perceiving the role expectations desired of him by the significant groups with which he must deal, with the exception of the administrators.

The question arose during the previous study as to the degree of correspondence between the ideal role expectation held by the counselor and the expectation of the other significant groups. Would a different pattern emerge, or would the same relative number of conflicts emerge? In order to assess this possibility the data were re-analyzed through comparisons of ideal counselor role expectations with the expected role expectations of the other groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Approximately the same number of role definitions were in conflict, i.e., 82 in the present study vs. 79 in the previous study. The pattern of role conflicts did, however, undergo a dramatic change. Administrators and teachers each produced 17 conflicts. Students expectations compared with the ideal counselor role only resulted in 18 conflicts, a considerable reduction from the previous 31, but parents registered some 30 conflicts. In view of the substantial number of disagreements in role definition, each group will be dealt with individually, with the relevant mean scores for the groups on the role under discussion being given in parentheses. Each set of comparisons will be dealt with individually, and only differences which achieved significance will be outlined. For each set of comparisons, differences specific to part-time counselors (PTC) will be examined first, then differences specific to full-time counselors (FTC) will be examined; finally the differences specific to all counselors (AC) will be examined. Relevant tables outlining all three sets of comparisons for each group will be presented. The mean scores reported were obtained by arbitrarily assigning values of one to five inclusive in the following manner: definitely should — 1; preferably should — 2; may or may not — 3; preferably should not — 4; and definitely should not — 5.

PRINCIPALS

Counselors ideal role expectations were compared with the principals' perceptions on the GCRNI. The means, standard deviations, and *t* values are in Table I.

Part-time Counselors

Role 15 (request the advice of committees of parents in planning the guidance program). Principals (3.00) were undecided about this particular function of the guidance counselor, but PTC (2.25) tended to favor such a course of action. No doubt further involvement on the part of the parents would serve a liaison function which is unfortunately lacking in many schools today.

Role 34 (give instruction in sex education to high-school students). Principals (3.24) were mildly opposed to this function being performed by the counselor, yet PTC (2.35) tended to slightly favor this activity. Although only just significant, it is suspected that value-laden areas of curriculum will generally be opposed by principals.

Full-time Counselors

FTC were significantly different on Role 6 (require teachers to send all "problem students" to the guidance counselor for corrective guidance sessions). Principals (3.48) were mildly opposed to this role while FTC (4.40) presumably saw this role as one that infringed on their ability to deal with students in a true counseling relationship. It

is suspected that some principals saw this activity as a legitimate role for their guidance counselors.

All Counselors

AC comparisons between ideal counselor role and principals' perception of the guidance counselor role were significantly different on fourteen distinct roles.

Role 1 (inform a teacher that a student has admitted to cheating on the teacher's examination). Principals (2.81) tend to see this role as one in which the counselors act as part of the administrative machinery within the school, while AC (3.88) are reacting to the possibility of the counseling relationship being destroyed.

Role 4 (report persistent student criticism of a new teacher's instructional methods to the principal). Principals (2.00) think their counselors preferably should report such criticism, whereas AC (3.00) choose the may or may not category. This seems to be a role that is determined by the situational conditions. If the counselor thinks he is acting as an informant, then it is suspected that he would fail to report, whereas if the new teacher can benefit from such comments, then perhaps situations of this nature should be reported.

Role 16 (advise parents if their child has admitted to a minor criminal offence). This role description seems to hinge on the confidentiality of the counseling relationship. AC (3.43) tend to prefer not to inform the parents, while Principals (2.71) feel that this responsibility is part of the counselor function.

Role 21 (discourage a student from expressing personal criticism of other teachers). AC (2.98) are undecided on this role description yet Principals (1.81) sense that this activity will be useful. It would appear that students so discouraged might completely "turn off" whereas if they were encouraged to express themselves without fear of evaluation, a more honest relationship would result. Perhaps the AC's in this situation feel that possession of such information might well place them in an embarrassing situation.

Role 25 (criticise a student concerning a school offense admitted to during a counseling session). AC (4.00) look upon this role as one requiring evaluation of the student. Principals (3.14) are again seeing the counselor as an extension of the administration and feel that in some cases at least, the counselor should undertake to evaluate students' behavior.

Role 26 (punish a student for committing a school offense admitted to during a counseling session). The difference here is one of degree and not kind. AC (4.85) are more emphatic in rejecting this as a legitimate role than Principals (4.52).

Role 29 (advise a student if his behavior is troublesome to other students). Principals (1.38) tend to be more emphatic regarding this role description than AC (1.90) yet both groups feel that information of this nature should be transmitted to the students concerned.

Role 30 (advise a student if his behavior is troublesome to other

teachers). The same situation as Role 29 obtains for this role description. Principals (1.33) feel that AC should so inform the students concerned while AC (1.93) are not quite so definite.

Role 31 (inform the police if a student confesses that his gang has committed a criminal offense). Principals (2.91) slightly favor this role description but again AC (3.60), although not as definite as one might expect, tend to see the destruction of the confidential relationship existing between student and counselor.

Role 40 (show films to students on the effects and use of LSD and alcohol). Both Principals (1.95) and AC (1.53) see this role task as desirable, with the counselors being slightly in favor of the role description.

Role 42 (inform the principal if students express general dissatisfaction with the administration of the school). Principals (1.62) are understandably in favor of this role description believing possibly that the situation might well be improved if such knowledge comes to their attention. AC (2.75) tend to be cautious with this information perhaps fearing in some situations that reprisals might be directed against the students.

Role 43 (give the principal the names of students who confess to breaking a "no-smoking" rule in the washroom). Both groups are

TABLE 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and *t* Values Between Role Perceptions of Counselors by Principals, and Counselors' Ideal Role Expectations

Role	Principals		Counselors		<i>t</i> — Principals (<i>df</i> = 20) and		
	\bar{x}/sd	$\frac{PT}{\bar{x}/sd}$	$\frac{FT}{\bar{x}/sd}$	$\frac{AC}{\bar{x}/sd}$	PTC <i>df</i> = 19	FTC <i>df</i> = 19	AC <i>df</i> = 39
1	2.8/1.2	3.9/0.9	3.8/1.3	3.9/1.1	-3.18***	-2.65**	-3.45***
4	2.0/1.1	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.3	-2.43**	-2.69**	-2.91***
6	3.5/1.4		4.4/1.0			-2.38*	
15	3.0/1.0	2.2/0.8			2.66**		
16	2.7/1.2		3.7/1.2	3.4/1.2		-2.72***	-2.26*
21	1.8/1.2	3.0/1.3	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.3	-3.04***	-2.89***	-3.39***
25	3.1/1.1	4.0/0.9	4.0/1.3	4.0/1.1	-2.69**	-2.24*	-2.83***
26	4.5/0.6		4.9/0.4	4.8/0.5		-2.26*	-2.30*
29	1.4/0.5		2.1/0.8	1.9/0.8		-3.32***	-2.68***
30	1.3/0.5	1.8/0.7	2.0/1.0	1.9/0.8	-2.51**	-3.08***	-3.01***
31	2.9/1.0		3.7/1.3	3.6/1.3		-2.16*	-2.20**
34	3.2/1.2	2.4/1.4			2.18*		
40	2.0/0.9	1.4/0.6		1.5/0.7	2.48**		2.01*
42	1.6/0.8	2.8/1.3	2.7/1.0	2.8/1.1	-3.55***	-3.87***	-4.08***
43	3.4/1.2	4.2/0.9	4.6/1.0	4.4/0.9	-2.60**	-3.45***	-3.67***
44	3.1/1.3	4.4/1.0	4.4/0.9	4.4/1.0	-3.66***	-3.60***	-4.48***
49	1.6/0.8	2.6/1.4	2.1/0.8	2.3/1.1	-2.88**	-2.12*	-2.73***

****p* < .01; ***p* < .025; **p* < .05.

Note: Means and standard deviations have been rounded to one decimal place in all tables

opposed to the counselor undertaking this task. AC's (4.40) are more positive than principals (3.38) however.

Role 44 (provide the principal with a written summary after counseling sessions with all "problem students"). AC's (4.43) saw this activity as an infringement on the confidential relationship but Principals (3.10) were essentially undecided, presumably feeling that in many cases information respecting problem students would be of value from an administrative point of view.

Role 49 (ask the principal to transfer a non-achiever from the college preparatory program). Principals (1.57) accurately perceived this as a proper role while AC (2.33) tended to be a bit more reluctant in assuming this as a totally legitimate role.

TEACHERS

Counselors' ideal role expectations were compared with the teachers' perceptions on the GCRNI. The means, standard deviations, and *t* values are in Table 2.

There were no unique role conflicts for PTC.

Full-time Counselors

One role description was unique for FTC, i.e. Role 48 (ask the superintendent to hire an assistant guidance counselor despite the objection of the principal). FTC (4.10) were reluctant to undertake this activity presumably as it would violate the chain of command within the school. Teachers (3.54) obviously thought that in some situations FTC should press their view in spite of the principal's wishes.

All Counselors

AC comparisons between ideal counselor role and the teachers' perception of the guidance counselor role were significantly different on sixteen distinct roles.

Role 1 (inform a teacher that a student has admitted to cheating on the teacher's examination). Teachers (2.86) tended to expect counselors to act as disciplinarians, at least in some instances. The large standard deviation (1.42) reflects the divergence of within-group opinion respecting this activity. AC (3.88) were more cohesive in their responses and tended to respect the confidential nature of the counseling relationship.

Role 3 (provide a student's home-room teacher with confidential information about the student's home environment). Teachers (2.00) feel that this information would assist them in their relationships with their home-room students. AC (2.65) although not disagreeing with this role description tend to be slightly more reluctant.

Role 6 (require teachers to send all "problem students" to the guidance counselor for corrective guidance sessions). AC (4.05) prob-

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and *t* Values Between Perceptions of Counselors by Teachers and Counselors' Ideal Role Expectations

Role	Teachers		Counselors		<i>t</i> — Teachers (<i>df</i> = 71) and		
	\bar{x}/sd	$\bar{PT}/x/sd$	$\bar{FT}/x/sd$	$\bar{AC}/x/sd$	PTC <i>df</i> = 19	FTC <i>df</i> = 19	AC <i>df</i> = 39
1	2.9/1.4	3.9/0.9	3.8/1.3	3.9/1.1	-3.10***	-2.82***	-3.92***
3	2.0/1.1	2.7/1.2	2.6/1.3	2.6/1.2	-2.53**	-2.10*	-2.91***
6	3.1/1.3	—	4.4/1.0	4.0/1.3	—	-4.09***	-3.73***
9	2.3/1.1	3.2/1.4	3.1/1.2	3.2/1.3	-3.28***	-2.83***	-3.81***
10	3.3/1.3	4.0/1.1	—	3.9/1.2	-2.13*	—	-2.26*
11	3.9/1.3	—	—	4.5/0.9	—	—	-2.40**
13	3.7/0.9	—	3.2/1.0	3.3/0.9	—	2.07*	1.98*
14	3.4/1.4	—	4.2/1.1	4.1/1.1	—	-2.46**	-2.76***
15	3.0/1.1	2.2/0.8	—	2.5/1.0	2.71***	—	2.24*
16	2.8/1.2	—	3.7/1.2	3.4/1.2	—	-2.87***	-2.52*
17	2.2/1.3	—	1.5/1.2	1.7/1.1	—	2.14*	2.12*
21	2.0/1.0	3.0/1.3	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.3	-3.58***	-3.39***	-4.31***
23	1.4/0.7	—	2.0/0.9	1.8/0.8	—	-3.13***	-2.19*
26	4.2/1.2	4.8/0.5	4.9/0.4	4.8/0.5	-2.29*	-2.69***	-3.45***
43	3.8/1.1	—	4.6/1.0	4.4/0.9	—	-2.80***	-2.97***
44	3.1/1.4	4.4/1.0	4.4/0.9	4.4/1.0	-4.13***	-4.00***	-5.45***
48	3.5/1.1	—	4.1/1.1	—	—	-2.08*	—

****p* < .01; ***p* < .025; **p* < .05.

ably see this task as an infringement on the role of the teacher, while teachers (3.10) indicate that they are undecided in respect to this task.

Role 9 (suggest to a teacher an appropriate method for disciplining an unruly student). Teachers (2.31) consider this task as part of the responsibility of the guidance counselor, perhaps in terms of a staff specialist. AC (3.18) while not drastically opposed feel perhaps that only advice requested by a teacher should be responded to.

Role 10 (inform a teacher that students report community disapproval of her personal behavior outside of school). Neither teachers (3.31) nor AC (3.88) favor this role task, however, in both cases there is a fair degree of uncertainty.

Role 11 (allow a parent to see all school records concerning his own child). AC (4.48) are more sensitive to the confidential nature of school records than teachers (3.92) appear to be.

Role 13 (intervene in a conflict between a pupil and his parents). AC (3.33) see this activity as a possibility in some instances which may well benefit the counselee. Teachers (3.69) are of the opinion that the counselor should preferably not extend his sphere of activity outside the school.

Role 14 (inform a parent that his daughter is pregnant despite the girl's request that the counselor not do so). AC (4.08) see this role description as one involving trust, indicating that a breach of this trust might well jeopardize their effectiveness. Teachers (3.35)

feel that in some instances, the parents should be informed in spite of the wishes of the counselee.

Role 15 (request the advice of committees of parents in planning the guidance program). Both groups slightly favor this task. However, teachers (2.96) tend to be slightly more undecided about its usefulness than AC (2.50).

Role 16 (advise parents if their child has admitted to a minor criminal offense). Teachers (2.83) slightly favor this role task while AC (3.43) are slightly opposed. The relatively large standard deviations suggest considerable variability in both groups.

Role 17 (be available for counseling parents). Both groups see this role as one which should preferably be undertaken by counselors. Teachers (2.19) and AC (1.68) differ only in degree.

Role 21 (discourage a student from expressing personal criticism of other teachers). AC (2.98) are undecided on the resolution of this role. Teachers (2.00) on the other hand tend to be a bit defensive.

Role 23 (suggest suitable occupational choices for a student). AC (1.78) appear a bit more reluctant to disseminate such information than teachers (1.44). Both groups however favor this role description and see it as one helping the student come to wise choices concerning his future life.

Role 26 (punish a student for committing a school offense admitted to during a counseling session). Teachers (4.19) are not as emphatic as AC (4.85) who obviously see this role as one that violates the confidential and non-evaluative nature of the counseling session.

Role 43 (give the principal the names of students who confess to breaking a "no-smoking" rule in the washroom). AC (4.40) reject the role of disciplinarian while teachers (3.78) although supporting AC in this regard, are not quite so emphatic.

Role 44 (provide the principal with a written summary after counseling sessions with all "problem students"). AC (4.43) are confident that a breach of trust such as this role describes would not enhance their effectiveness with students. Teachers (3.08) are still inclined to see the counselor functioning as a disciplinarian in some cases.

PARENTS

Counselors' ideal role expectations were compared with the parents' perceptions of the counselors' role on the GCRNI. The means, standard deviations, and *t* values are in Table 3. The comparisons in this area represent the greatest number of role conflicts between a significant group and the ideal role definition given by the counselors. There were no role conflicts unique to PTC.

Full-time Counselors

Role 23 (suggest suitable occupational choices for a student). Parents (1.61) and FTC (2.05) both feel that students should be

assisted with their vocational plans. There does appear a suggestion that FTC tend to give more responsibility to the students in regard to this role.

Role 38 (invite members of the clergy to discuss religious problems with students at school). Parents (2.30) are more and more willing to delegate the responsibility for religious instruction of their children to outside agencies. In many cases it is suspected that the parents themselves no longer attend church on a regular basis, and perhaps this might be the reason for their response. FTC (2.90) tend to be ambivalent in respect to this role.

Role 40 (show films to students on the effects and use of LSD and alcohol). FTC (1.70) and parents (1.30) favor this activity with the latter being even more emphatic than the FTC.

All Counselors

AC comparisons indicated an additional twenty-seven role conflicts which were significantly different. The changing or emerging role of the guidance counselors is no doubt responsible for many of these conflicts. Yet if cooperation of parents is deemed advisable, then attempts will have to be made to reduce the conflicts which seemingly exist. An analysis of the role conflicts in this area follows.

Role 1 (inform a teacher that a student has admitted to cheating on the teacher's examination). Parents (2.75) apparently refer to their previous school experience in seeing all adult figures as responsible for discipline. AC (3.86) tended to reject this.

Role 2 (inform a mathematics teacher that his attitude toward a student is a cause of the student's low achievement in mathematics). Parents (1.51) feel any help given their children is a function of the counselor. In this case attitudes are related to achievement. AC (2.60) on the other hand, although slightly in favor tend to be more reluctant.

Role 4 (report persistent student criticism of a new teacher's instructional methods to the principal). AC (3.00) are undecided in this regard. This appears to be related to administrative concerns. Parents (2.09) feel individual counselors should preferably undertake this activity.

Role 5 (advise teachers if the school program is the major cause of the increasing drop-out rate). Both parents (1.39) and AC (1.78) agree counseling would assume this task. Parents are slightly more emphatic.

Role 6 (require teachers to send all "problem students" to the guidance counselor for corrective guidance sessions). Parents (1.97) consider this role description as one which will assist students in difficulty. AC (4.05), however, reject this role presumably as they interpret the corrective guidance session as a form of punishment.

Role 7 (review all report cards before they are sent home to parents). AC (3.90) see this review as an administrative function that they would prefer not undertaken. Parents (3.08) are undecided.

Role 9 (suggest to a teacher an appropriate method for disciplining an unruly student). Parents (2.39) possibly consider that the coun-

selor possesses expertise in this area, thus feeling the school will run more efficiently should the counselor undertake this. AC (3.18) probably would suggest appropriate methods in some cases, if asked.

Role 10 (inform a teacher that students report community disapproval of her personal behavior outside of school). AC (3.88) disapprove of this role while parents (2.99) appear undecided. The standard deviation of parents (1.45) indicated considerable within-group variability.

Role 11 (allow a parent to see all school records concerning his own child). Parents (1.96) want information relating to their child's school progress and obviously see examination of school records an appropriate way to receive this information. AC (4.48) totally reject this concept, thus ensuring the confidentiality of the school records.

TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and *t* Values Between Perceptions of Counselors by Parents and Counselors' Ideal Role Expectations

Role	Parents		Counselors		<i>t</i> Parents (<i>df</i> = 66) and		
	\bar{x}/sd	$\bar{PT}/\bar{x}/sd$	$\bar{FT}/\bar{x}/sd$	$\bar{AC}/\bar{x}/sd$	PTC <i>df</i> = 18	FTC <i>df</i> = 19	AC <i>df</i> = 38
1	2.8/1.4	3.9/0.9	3.8/1.3	3.9/1.1	-3.43***	-3.13***	- 4.33***
2	1.5/0.8	2.4/1.2	2.8/1.1	2.6/1.2	-4.21***	-5.69***	- 5.90***
4	2.1/1.2	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.3	-2.69***	-3.00***	- 3.59***
5	1.4/0.7	2.0/1.5		1.8/1.2	-2.38**		- 2.13*
6	2.0/1.1	3.7/1.4	4.4/1.0	4.0/1.3	-5.71***	-8.59***	- 8.83***
7	3.1/1.3		4.2/1.1	3.9/1.3		-3.25***	- 3.15***
9	2.4/1.3	3.2/1.4	3.1/1.2	3.2/1.3	-2.53**	-2.13*	- 2.99***
10	3.0/1.4	4.0/1.1	3.8/1.3	3.9/1.2	-2.88***	-2.13*	- 3.28***
11	2.0/1.2	4.5/1.0	4.4/0.9	4.5/0.9	-8.34***	-8.32***	-11.05***
14	2.9/1.6	4.0/1.2	4.2/1.1	4.1/1.1	-2.72***	-3.39***	- 4.08***
16	2.2/1.2	3.2/1.1	3.7/1.2	3.4/1.2	-3.16***	-4.89***	- 5.16***
21	2.2/1.3	3.0/1.3	3.0/1.4	3.0/1.3	-2.39**	-2.23*	- 2.94***
23	1.6/0.8		2.0/0.9			-2.07*	
25	3.5/1.4			4.0/1.1			- 2.00*
26	3.8/1.4	4.8/0.5	4.9/0.4	4.8/0.5	-3.11***	-3.44***	- 4.57***
28	1.5/0.9	2.2/1.4	2.1/0.8	2.2/1.1	-2.97***	-2.76***	- 3.53***
29	1.3/0.6	1.7/0.7	2.1/0.8	1.9/0.8	-2.53**	-4.87***	- 4.00***
30	1.4/0.6	1.8/0.7	2.0/1.0	1.9/0.8	-2.42**	-3.57***	- 3.68***
31	2.8/1.2	3.5/1.2	3.7/1.3	3.6/1.3	-2.43**	-2.99***	- 3.46***
33	1.5/1.0		2.2/1.3	2.0/1.1		-2.65***	- 2.26*
37	2.0/1.1			2.5/1.2			- 2.00*
38	2.3/1.1		2.9/1.0			-2.12*	
40	1.3/0.7		1.7/0.8			-2.09*	
41	2.0/0.9	1.4/0.7		1.6/0.7	2.44**		2.20*
42	2.0/1.1	2.8/1.3	2.7/1.0	2.8/1.1	-2.56**	-2.36*	- 3.14***
43	3.6/1.2	4.2/0.9	4.6/1.0	4.4/0.9	-2.23*	-3.24***	- 3.62***
44	2.9/1.4	4.4/1.0	4.4/0.9	4.4/1.0	-4.48***	-4.37***	- 5.93***
45	1.6/0.9	2.8/1.4	3.0/1.4	2.9/1.4	-4.98***	-5.51***	- 6.17***
48	3.2/1.1		4.1/1.1	3.9/1.3		-3.15***	- 2.81***
49	1.8/1.1	2.6/1.4		2.3/1.1	-2.57**		- 2.43**

****p* < .01; ***p* < .025; **p* < .05.

Role 14 (inform a parent that his daughter is pregnant despite the girl's request that the counselor do not do so). AC (4.08) prefer to hold the information in confidence while parents (2.88) are only slightly in favor of the counselor violating the girl's request. Again the standard deviations of the parents (1.63) indicates the within-group variability.

Role 16 (advise parents if their child has admitted to a minor criminal offense). Parents (2.16) are seeking useful sources of information concerning their children's behavior. AC (3.43) however, slightly favored preserving the nature of the counselor relationship.

Role 21 (discourage a student from expressing personal criticism of other teachers). Parents (2.21) felt that expression on the part of the student might result in some form of retaliation. AC (2.98) appear undecided, yet a student who is not discouraged might well expand and elaborate his comments to the counselor.

Role 25 (criticise a student concerning a school offense admitted to during a counseling session). AC (4.00) appear ambivalent on this role. Parents (3.48) are defensive and are not prepared to encourage the counselor's criticism of students in this situation.

Role 26 (punish a student for committing a school offense admitted to during a counseling session). Both parents (3.81) and AC (4.85) reject this role description. The counselors, however, are much more emphatic.

Role 28 (discourage an honor student in grade eleven from taking full-time employment). Parents (1.48) see this as a worthwhile attitude on the part of the guidance counselor. AC (2.18) although slightly more reluctant would appear to be permitting the student an opportunity to participate in this decision-making process.

Role 29 (advise a student if his behavior is troublesome to other students). Parents (1.31) support this role description possibly to insure that the learning conditions are facilitated. AC (1.90) although in favor, tend perhaps to see this role conflicting with that of disciplinarian.

Role 30 (advise a student if his behavior is troublesome to other teachers). The same arguments relating to the previous role description, Role 29, apply in this case. Parents (1.40) and AC (1.93) both support this attitude.

Role 31 (inform the police if a student confesses that his gang has committed a criminal offense). Parents (2.75) are apparently undecided in respect to this counseling role. AC (3.60) tended to be mildly opposed obviously in view of the implications relating to their confidential role.

Role 33 (assist local industries in filling job vacancies). Both parents (1.54) and AC (2.00) support this attitude. The slight reluctance on the part of the counselor is, no doubt, due to a desire on the part of the counselors to see the students mature and participate in their own decision making.

Role 37 (provide counseling services to unemployed youth in the community). Parents (2.05), envisage this role as worthwhile. AC

(2.50) while not rejecting this role possibly see their primary area of responsibilities as that of the in-school student.

Role 41 (ask the principal to confer with him respecting the non-promotion of over-age students). Parents (1.96) and AC (1.58) both consider the advancement of over-age students an area of concern to the counselor.

Role 42 (inform the principal if students express general dissatisfaction with the administration of the school). Parents (2.05) consider information which may assist school-student relations should be transmitted to the appropriate authority. AC (2.75) are quite a bit more hesitant in regards to this administrative function.

Role 43 (give the principal the names of students who confess to breaking a "no-smoking" rule in the washroom). Parents (3.60) and AC (4.40) both reject this role description. Breaking of a no-smoking rule is a minor misdemeanour.

Role 44 (provide the principal with a written summary after counseling sessions with all "problem students"). AC (4.43) totally reject this situation presumably because the counseling session involves private comments between counselor and students. Parents (2.93) are more undecided in this situation and in some cases feel this summary should be provided.

Role 45 (ask the principal to call a meeting of all teachers to discuss the reasons for the teachers' indifference to the school guidance program). AC (2.93) are apparently willing to advise the principal; however, their score seems to suggest a reluctance in some cases. Parents (1.57) support the counselor undertaking this role description.

Role 48 (ask the superintendent to hire an assistant guidance counselor despite the objection of the principal). AC (3.88) are reluctant to violate the existing lines of authority within the school. Many parents (3.21) seem to be aware of the ramifications of such action; however in some cases they are apparently willing to suggest that the counselor go directly to the superintendent.

Role 49 (advise the principal on appropriate procedures for dealing with a student who steals habitually). Parents (1.78) perceive the counselor as a specialist in student behavior and are prepared to endorse this activity in the hope that the situation will be alleviated. AC (2.33) concur, but appear in some situations to be slightly hesitant. Perhaps AC prefer to be asked by the principal.

STUDENTS

Counselors' ideal role expectations were compared with the students' perception on the GCRNI. The means, standard deviations, and *t* values are in Table 4.

Part-time Counselors

PTC comparisons resulted in two unique differences. Role 5 (advise teachers if the school program is the major cause of the increasing

drop-out rate). Students (1.41) and PTC (1.95) both see this role as appropriate for counselors. The difference here is one of degree only.

Role 50 (ask the principal to transfer a non-achiever from the college preparatory program). PTC (2.10) favor this role description, possibly feeling that the interests of the student will be helped. Students (2.80) are only slightly in favor which is rather surprising if they give credence to the judgements of their counselors.

Full-time Counselors

FTC comparisons resulted in one unique difference.

Role 16 (advise parents if their child has admitted to a minor criminal offense). In some instances the students (2.93) feel the counselors should act as an informant. FTC (3.70) seem to take the opinion that such activity places them in the role of an informant, a role that is not particularly facilitative according to some counselors.

All Counselors

AC comparisons resulted in fifteen significant differences on the GCRNI. These will be discussed below.

Role 2 (inform a mathematics teacher that his attitude toward a student is a cause of the student's low achievement in mathematics). Students (2.09) feel that information so transmitted will improve the classroom climate resulting in improved achievement for the student concerned. AC (2.60) are just slightly more reluctant to undertake this activity.

Role 6 (require teachers to send all "problem students" to the guidance counselor for corrective guidance sessions). Students (2.34) consider this role description a useful alternative while AC (4.05) apparently do not consider this part of their responsibility. Perhaps this role is a mechanistic application of the counselor's function which, if so in fact, should be rejected.

Role 7 (review all report cards before they are sent home to parents). Students (3.01) appear undecided. AC (3.90) reject this role presumably on the grounds that it is an administrative function requiring a good deal of time and thought.

Role 11 (allow a parent to see all school records concerning his own child). Students (2.10) are not sensitive to the confidential nature of school records, perhaps feeling their parents would better understand their actions if they had access thereto. AC (4.48) are almost unanimous in rejecting this role for obvious reasons.

Role 13 (intervene in a conflict between a pupil and his parents). Students (3.94) do not consider counselors to have a very significant role to play outside the school in relation to parental conflicts. However, AC (3.33) although appearing undecided are prepared in some instances to intervene.

Role 19 (advise parents on suitable occupational choices for their children). Both students (2.14) and AC (1.73) accept this role

description as being a worthwhile activity. Counselors are more definite in their response, perhaps suggesting that, in their opinion, the students are reluctant to participate in decisions of this nature.

Role 26 (punish a student for committing a school offense admitted to during a counseling session). Both students (4.20) and AC (4.85) appreciated the confidential relationship existing during the counseling session with the counselors being more idealistic.

Role 34 (give instruction in sex education to high school students). Students (2.07) suggest counselors assume responsibility for sex education. AC (2.68) are a bit more reluctant possibly in view of the moral implications and controversial nature of the curriculum.

Role 35 (supply information on birth control to high school students on request). Students (2.44) in some cases consider the counselor as an authoritative figure or at least an information giver on matters relating to birth control. AC (3.18) are ambivalent because of the controversial problems involved. The student standard deviation of (1.44) and AC (1.55) indicate that both groups expressed considerable within-group variability in responding to this description.

Role 37 (provide counseling service to unemployed youth in the community). In this situation students (2.06) supported the contention that counselors should operate within the wider community. AC (2.50) were slightly in favor of this activity.

TABLE 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and *t* Values Between Perceptions of Counselors by Students and Counselors' Ideal Role Expectations

Role	Students		Counselors			<i>t</i> — Students (<i>df</i> = 70) and		
	\bar{x}/sd	$\frac{PT}{\bar{x}/sd}$	$\frac{FT}{\bar{x}/sd}$	$\frac{AC}{\bar{x}/sd}$	PTC <i>df</i> = 19	FTC <i>df</i> = 19	AC <i>df</i> = 39	
2	2.1/1.3	—	2.8/1.1	2.6/1.2	—	-2.12*	-2.12*	
5	1.4/0.8	2.0/1.5	—	—	-2.15*	—	—	
6	2.3/1.2	3.7/1.4	4.4/1.0	4.0/1.3	-4.35***	-7.00***	-7.11***	
7	3.0/1.4	—	4.2/1.1	3.9/1.3	—	-3.44***	-3.41***	
11	2.1/1.5	4.5/1.0	4.4/0.9	4.9/0.9	-6.88***	-6.82***	-9.25***	
13	3.9/1.0	—	3.2/1.0	3.3/0.9	—	2.84***	3.08***	
16	2.9/1.4	—	3.7/1.2	—	—	-2.25**	—	
19	2.1/1.1	1.6/0.8	—	1.7/0.9	2.06*	—	2.02*	
26	4.2/1.1	4.8/0.5	4.9/0.4	4.8/0.5	-2.34*	-2.75***	-3.51***	
34	2.1/1.1	—	3.0/1.1	2.7/1.3	—	-3.42***	-2.67***	
35	2.4/1.4	—	3.5/1.4	3.2/1.6	—	-2.95***	-2.52**	
37	2.1/1.0	2.6/1.1	—	2.5/1.2	-2.15*	—	-2.16*	
41	2.3/1.1	1.4/0.7	1.8/0.7	1.6/0.7	3.37***	2.02*	3.62***	
42	2.0/1.2	2.8/1.3	2.7/1.0	2.8/1.1	-2.59**	-2.39**	-3.21***	
44	3.5/1.4	4.4/1.0	4.4/0.9	4.4/1.0	-2.87***	-2.74***	-3.77***	
45	1.9/0.9	2.8/1.4	3.0/1.4	2.9/1.4	-3.71***	-4.25***	-4.74***	
48	3.2/1.3	—	4.1/1.1	3.9/1.3	—	-2.64**	-2.41**	
50	2.8/1.2	2.1/1.0	—	—	2.44**	—	—	

*** $p < .01$; ** $p < .025$; * $p < .05$.

Role 41 (ask the principal to confer with him respecting the non-promotion of over-age students). AC (1.58) expressed willingness to undertake this role description. Students (2.28) concur but are not quite so definite.

Role 42 (inform the principal if students express general dissatisfaction with the administration of the school). Students (2.03) feel that if their dissatisfaction is transmitted to the administrative officer, then conditions will improve. AC (2.75) were more reluctant although they did slightly endorse this activity.

Role 44 (provide the principal with a written summary after counseling sessions with all "problem students"). AC (4.43) rejected this role as one which violates the nature of the counseling relationship. Students (3.48), although not as definite, were of the same opinion.

Role 45 (ask the principal to call a meeting of all teachers to discuss the reasons for the teachers' indifference to the school guidance program). Students (1.89) were quite definite in favoring this role description presumably because of their desire to experience a viable guidance program. AC (2.93) appear undecided perhaps seeing this role activity as one that criticises teachers within the school.

Role 48 (ask the superintendent to hire an assistant guidance counselor despite the objection of the principal). AC (3.88) are aware of the lines of communication existing within the school and they tend not to wish to violate this. Students (3.25) partially reject this role. Again both groups showed considerable within group variability.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the school setting, the counselor has two points of reference for the resolving of any conflicts that might arise. The counselor's expectations of the other significant groups with which he must deal is obviously one point of reference. Comparisons regarding the counselors' expectation of the other significant groups with the actual expectations of these groups was reported in an earlier study (Rankine & Angus, 1971). In this study, the counselors' ideal role expectations were compared with the actual expectations of the other significant groups. Here a different pattern emerged.

Counselors when compared with principals and with teachers differ significantly on 17 of the 50 role descriptions. Each of these categories represents the least amount of role conflict. To further reduce the conflicts in these areas, counselors must inform their colleagues concerning the areas of disagreement. This would imply in-service work such as a workshop or the dissemination of such information relating to counseling activities at a staff meeting. Only if communication is extended to other colleagues will a reduction occur in these areas.

Parents' expectations and counselors' ideal role expectations were significantly different on 30 roles. Again this is due to the relatively recent emergence of the counselor in the Province of New Brunswick. More contact between counselor and parent is essential if an apprecia-

tion of the counselor role is to be obtained by parents. Parent-counselor interviews, counselor-aid programs (using parents), and an open invitation to parents to visit the school might well reduce the numbers of conflicts in this area.

The students' expectations of the counselor role when compared with the ideal counselor expectations resulted in 18 conflicts. This represents a considerable reduction from the previous study, and indicated that the students are far more realistic than counselors give them credit for. It would appear from the two studies that counselors would be far more effective in terms of meeting the students' expectations if they adopted an "ideal" set in relation to the conflicts listed in the GCRNI. The areas of role conflict that have emerged here are not as serious as the previous study indicated.

In the many and varied situations which counselors are faced with every day, there is considerable agreement concerning execution of their responsibility. It is hoped that the analysis of role conflicts in this study and in the previous study will improve the counselors' effectiveness in relations with colleagues, parents, and especially students.

RESUME: On a comparé, au moyen d'échantillonnages, les perceptions que les conseillers du Nouveau-Brunswick ont de leurs fonctions avec les attentes que s'en font les directeurs d'écoles, les instituteurs, les parents et les élèves. Les conseillers de cette étude provenaient des principaux centres de la population de la province. On a observé un nombre significatif de désaccords dans 82 situations et on présente une discussion et des hypothèses susceptibles de les expliquer.

Dans une étude antérieure (Rankine et Angus, 1971), les résultats avaient mis en relief que les désaccords relatifs aux fonctions des conseillers étaient les plus évidents dans le cas des étudiants. Les résultats de la présente étude sont différents, mais ils n'amènent pas moins à penser que les conseillers seront plus en mesure de satisfaire aux attentes des étudiants s'ils adoptent, à l'égard des conflits, les suggestions exposées dans le Guidance Counsellor Role Norm Inventory.

REFERENCE

- Rankine F. C., & Angus, J. T. The normative world of the school guidance counselor. *Canadian Counsellor*, 1971, 5(2) 83-99.

C.G.C.A. RESEARCH AWARDS

Dr. HARVEY W. ZINGLE, *Chairman, Research Committee.*

Your Executive has approved plans for the establishment of the CGCA Research Awards, the first of which, it is hoped, will be presented at the 1973 Conference of the Association. The following information will be of assistance to those wishing to apply for one of the awards.

1. *Description of the Awards*

Three research awards will be presented:

- (a) "The Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association Outstanding Thesis Award" will be presented for the outstanding Master's Thesis by a student in a graduate program in counselling and guidance, or working under a professor in this field;
- (b) "The Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association Outstanding Dissertation Award" will be presented for the outstanding Doctoral Dissertation by a student working in the area of counselling and guidance, or under a professor in this field;
- (c) "The Canadian Guidance and Counselling Association Outstanding Research Article Award" will be presented for the top research article in a Canadian publication by a CGCA member.

2. *Who is eligible to apply for the Awards?*

The Master's and Doctoral awards are open to individuals who completed their dissertation/thesis at a Canadian university. The Outstanding Research Article Award is limited to CGCA members. Members of the Board of Directors will not be eligible for these awards.

3. *How often will the Awards be made?*

The Awards will be presented during the Association's national conference, which is currently held on alternate years.

4. *What form will the Awards take?*

- (a) The Awards will not include a cash prize.
- (b) An appropriate citation will be presented to recipients of the Awards during the Association Banquet.
- (c) Recipients will be invited to make a presentation of their research at the Conference.
- (d) The Association will publish or reprint the recipients' papers (in the case of dissertation/theses, a 2500-word abstract).
- (e) Supervisors of Outstanding Dissertations and Theses will receive a special recognition.

5. *What are the deadlines for applications?*

Entries should be in the hands of the Awards Committee by February 1st, 1973. Dissertations, Theses, and research articles completed since the 1971 Conference are eligible. Finalists should be prepared to supply copies of their dissertations/theses by April 1st, 1973.

6. *How should entries be submitted?*

Authors of research articles should submit nine (9) reprints or Xerox copies of their articles. Master's and Doctoral applicants should submit nine (9) copies of a 2500-word dissertation abstract, following *APA Publications Manual* specifications, and suitable for publication. Abstracts should be typewritten and double-spaced, and may be in either French or English.

7. *Dissertation abstract title page.*

The title page should include the following information: (a) Name of applicant; (b) address of applicant; (c) telephone number of applicant; (d) title of dissertation/thesis in full; (e) name of institution granting degree; (f) address of institution; (g) examining committee: names and addresses of chairman and members; (h) date on which oral examination was held; (i) date on which the university conferred the degree.

8. *To whom should abstracts/articles be submitted?*

Dr. Harvey W. Zingle
Chairman, Research Committee, CGCA
Dept. of Educational Psychology
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

9. *What is the procedure for judging the entries?*

- (a) The Awards Committee will be composed of the CGCA President, President-elect, and the Co-chairmen of the Research Committee.
- (b) Each abstract/article will be read by at least three CGCA members selected by the Awards Committee.
- (c) A small group of entries rated "excellent" by the judges will be chosen as finalists in each of the three Awards categories. The Awards Committee will then ask three CGCA members to form three small committees comprised of members not serving on the thesis committees of any of the finalists. One committee will choose an Outstanding Thesis, a second committee will choose an Outstanding Dissertation, and a third committee will choose an Outstanding Research Article from among the finalists.

PRIX DE RECHERCHE SCOC

Dr. HARVEY W. ZINGLE, *Président, Comité de Recherche.*

Votre comité exécutif a approuvé les plans de l'établissement de prix de recherche SCOC qu'on espère attribuer pour la première fois à l'occasion du Congrès 1973 de la Société. Les informations qui suivent seront utiles à ceux qui souhaiteraient soumettre leur candidature à l'un de ces prix.

1. *Description des prix.*

Trois prix de recherche seront attribués :

- (a) "Le Prix de la Société Canadienne d'Orientation et de Consultation pour le meilleur mémoire" sera attribué à un étudiant de niveau maîtrise inscrit à un programme d'études supérieures en counseling et en orientation, ou travaillant avec un professeur dans ce domaine;
- (b) "Le Prix de la Société Canadienne d'Orientation et de Consultation pour la meilleure thèse" sera attribué à un étudiant de niveau doctorat en counseling et en orientation, ou travaillant avec un professeur dans ce domaine;
- (c) "Le Prix de la Société Canadienne d'Orientation et de Consultation pour le meilleur article de recherche" sera attribué à un membre de la SCOC qui sera l'auteur du meilleur article de recherche publié dans une revue canadienne.

2. *Qui est éligible à soumettre sa candidature?*

Les prix pour le mémoire et la thèse sont attribuables à des personnes qui ont complété leur mémoire ou leur thèse dans une université canadienne. Le prix pour le meilleur article de recherche ne peut être attribué qu'à des membres de la SCOC. Les membres du conseil d'administration ne seront pas éligibles pour ces prix.

3. *A combien de reprises se feront les attributions?*

Les prix seront attribués à l'occasion du Congrès National de la Société. Ce Congrès a habituellement lieu à tous les deux ans.

4. *De quelle nature seront les prix?*

- (a) Les prix ne comprendront pas une récompense monétaire;
- (b) Durant le banquet de la Société, un bref hommage sera rendu aux récipiendaires des prix;
- (c) On invitera les récipiendaires à faire une présentation de leur recherche durant le Congrès;
- (d) La Société publiera ou assumera la réimpression des travaux des récipiendaires (dans le cas des mémoires et des thèses, il s'agira d'un résumé d'environ 2,500 mots);
- (e) Une mention spéciale sera attribuée aux directeurs des meilleurs mémoires et des meilleurs thèses.

5. *Quelles sont les échéances pour la soumission des candidatures?*

Les applications devront être transmises au Comité des Prix avant le 1er février 1973. On retiendra les thèses, les mémoires et les articles de recherche complétés depuis le Congrès 1971. Les finalistes devront être en mesure de procurer des copies de leur mémoire ou de leur thèse avant le 1er avril 1973.

6. *Comment soumet-on une candidature?*

Les auteurs d'articles de recherche devront soumettre neuf (9) tirés-à-part ou photocopies de leurs articles. Les auteurs de mémoires ou de thèses devront soumettre neuf (9) copies d'un résumé de 2,500 mots effectué selon les normes de publication indiquées dans le *APA Publication Manual*. Ce résumé devrait être tel qu'il pourrait être publié. Tout résumé devrait être dactylographié à double interlignes, soit en français ou en anglais.

7. *La page titre du résumé de la thèse.*

La page titre devrait inclure les informations suivantes (a) le nom du candidat; (b) son adresse; (c) son numéro de téléphone; (d) le titre complet du mémoire ou de la thèse; (e) le nom de l'institution où le grade est obtenu; (f) l'adresse de l'institution; (g) les noms et adresses du président et des membres du jury; (h) la date de la soutenance orale; (i) la date d'attribution du grade par l'université.

8. *A qui doit-on faire parvenir les résumés ou les articles?*

Dr. Harvey W. Zingle
Président, Comité de la Recherche, SCOC
Dept. of Educational Psychology
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta.

9. *Quelle sera la procédure d'évaluation des candidatures?*

- (a) Le Comité des Prix sera composé du président de la SCOC, du président élu et des co-présidents du Comité de la Recherche;
- (b) Chacun des articles ou résumés sera lu par au moins trois membres de la SCOC choisis par le Comité des Prix;
- (c) Les finalistes de chacune des trois catégories de prix seront constitués par le petit groupe de candidats dont les travaux auront reçus la cote "excellent". Le Comité des Prix demandera alors à trois membres de la SCOC de former trois petits comités de membres qui ne faisaient pas partie des comités de thèse des finalistes. Un comité verra à la sélection du meilleur mémoire, un second choisira la meilleure thèse et un troisième comité choisira le meilleur article de recherche parmi ceux soumis par les finalistes.