UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

SCHOOL COUNSELORS' LEADERSHIP PARTICIPATION AND THE IMPACT

OF INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHICS AND SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL

CHARACTERISTICS IN OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

SHELLY MUNCRIEF ELLIS
Norman, Oklahoma
2017

SCHOOL COUNSELORS' LEADERSHIP PARTICIPATION AND THE IMPACT
OF INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHICS AND SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL
CHARACTERISTICS IN OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

_____
Dr. Jeffrey Maiden, Chair

_____
Dr. William Frick

_____
Dr. Gregg Garn

_____
Dr. Leslie Williams

_____
Dr. Rockey Robbins

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my family with whom I've been incredibly blessed. To my children, Gabrielle and Jacob Coleman, being your mother is my most precious accomplishment. Thank you for believing in me, even when I did not believe in myself. Thank you for understanding that being a PhD student sometimes meant not being as present as I would have liked as your mom. I love you both with my whole heart. To my bonus children, Kylie and William Ellis, thank you for your love and support. To my father, Arnold Muncrief, and mother, Betty Vaughn Muncrief, thank you for always believing in me and teaching me the importance of hard work, dedication, and unconditional love. To my sister, Tammy Muncrief Odom, thank you for being my biggest cheerleader, loving me, and sharing your family with me. And last, but not least, to my husband, Nathan Ellis. Thank you for everything, your love, support, and unending faith in me. I love you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have been instrumental in the completion of my PhD work.

Dr. Jeffrey Maiden, thank you so much for stepping in as my chair through the final

push of my dissertation work. I appreciate your mentorship, guidance, and willingness

to listen to my concerns and still move me forward. Dr. William Frick, thank you for

being a part of my journey from my first class at The University of Oklahoma until the

completion of my degree. Your passion for my topic and continuous guidance and

support are so appreciated. Dr. Gregg Garn and Dr. Leslie Williams, thank you not only

for your support and guidance, but in being instrumental in my professional growth as I

learned from you both in my time at the K20 Center. Thank you to Dr. Rockey Robbins

for coming on board my committee and serving as such a positive presence during the

completion of my degree.

Dr. Brook Meiller and Dr. Nicole Watkins, thank you for everything. Your texts,

emails, and phone calls kept me moving forward. Your willingness to read my work and

offer critical and important feedback were so valuable and appreciated. I admire you

both so much and appreciate your unending support, love, laughter, and encouragement.

I'm honored to be your friend.

Alex Stroukoff, thank you for providing a last push across the finish line. I would also

like to thank the school counselors of Oklahoma. The work you do every day is so

meaningful and impactful. You inspire me. Also, I would like to acknowledge my

colleagues at the Oklahoma State Department of Education who work tirelessly for

Oklahoma's children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the perceptions of Oklahoma school counselors' participation in school leadership and the effect their individual demographics or school organizational characteristics have on these perceptions. Previous research calls for school counselors to play a role in the leadership of the school and indicates the relationship with the building principal plays a significant role in their participation. The School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS), developed by Dr. Anita Young and Dr. Julia Bryan (2015), was used to survey 399 school counselors in Oklahoma. Descriptive statistics and multiple variate analysis (MANOVA) were used to analyze the data. Findings indicate school counselors' leadership perceptions are independent of their demographics and the characteristics of their school organization. This study advances our understanding of Oklahoma school counselors' perceptions of their leadership within their schools and provides implications for practicing school administrators and school counselors, university school administration and school counselor preparatory programs, and for State Departments of Education.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

Educational accountability places schools under the public microscope. State and national mandates require that school districts meet high standards on annual achievement tests, employ highly qualified teachers, meet annual progress requirements, and organize programs of parent involvement. Although periodic changes in the political winds may bring differing legislative approaches to school accountability, the characteristics necessary for strong school leadership will continue to play a defining role in actual success. For schools to effectively meet these requirements, school leaders must possess a variety of managerial and leadership skills as well as provide strong curricular and instructional leadership.

Leadership in the realm of education has morphed in conjunction with educational changes in policy, expectations, limitations, and outcomes. However, one thing has remained constant, leadership does matter (Bush & Glover, 2003; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Traditionally, leadership models have been top-down where one person, typically the principal, was perceived as the leader or "hero" of their organization (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2006). This approach led to a bureaucratic way of organization for school systems, a hierarchical authority structure designating superiors and subordinates (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; O'Hair, McLaughlin, & Reitzug, 2000). Leadership was "romanticized" due to the belief that the leader's traits were the inherent reason for success or reform of the school (Elmore, 2000, p. 13).

However, "the days of the principal as the lone instructional leader are over" (Lambert, 1998, p. 37).

A philosophy has emerged in the organization, management, and leadership of schools. Leadership by the many rather than the few is the characteristic of effective leadership in schools today (Mujis & Harris, 2003). No longer can principals rely on themselves to meet the leadership needs in schools. Wide scale improvement requires a multitude of skills which means leaders must be able to recognize those skills among stakeholders and provide "guidance and direction" (Elmore, 2000, p. 15) to individuals to achieve a common mission.

Distributed leadership seeks to spread leadership roles and responsibilities to multiple persons rather than just one and goes beyond the single leader and looks at the interactions of leaders, followers, and the aspect of their situations (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2006). The identified leader is responsible for the overall performance of the organization, but also creates a culture around a shared mission, helps hold the organization together by fostering relationships among stakeholders, and holds individuals accountable for their role in the collective leadership of the school.

Many stakeholders are ready to be active participants in distributed leadership to facilitate making improvements in schools today. One such group poised on the precipice of leadership is school counselors. In recent years, school counselors have been called to step into roles of leadership and are positioned to do so in their school and districts (American School Counseling Association, 2005). Hines (2002) cites the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) as calling for school counselors to

"be facilitators of the change needed to remove the systemic barriers that keep all children from achieving academic success" (2002, p. 192). The American School Counseling Association (ASCA) National Model® for School Counseling Programs says this about leadership:

> School counselors serve as leaders who are engaged in system-wide change to ensure student success. They help every student gain access to rigorous academic preparation that will lead to greater opportunity and increased academic achievement. Working as leaders, advocates and collaborators, school counselors promote student success by closing the existing achievement gap whenever found among students of color, poor students or underachieving students and their more advantaged peers. School counselors become effective leaders by collaborating with other professionals in the school to influence system-wide changes and implement school reforms. In this way, school counselors can have an impact on the student, the school, the district and the state (ASCA, 2005, p. 24).

Because school counselors wear many hats in their school and community, fostering leadership in school counselors can prove beneficial to students and families. Reese House and Richard Hayes boldly state, "In their role as school leaders, counselors are the "eyes and ears" of the school. An effective school counselor hears more, knows more, and understands more about teachers, parents, students, and the community than anyone else in the school" (2002, p. 253).

Even though many research articles as well as the ASCA recommend counselors serve in a leadership role in schools, there is still a chasm between those recommendations and school counselors' actual role. "Historically, many school counselors spent much of their time responding to the needs of a small percentage of their students…The ASCA National Model® recommends the majority of the school counselor's time be spent in direct service to all students so that every student receives maximum benefits from the program" (ASCA, 2005, p. 13).

From the time of the inception of the term "guidance" there has been debate over the roles and responsibilities of school counselors. Whether school counselors should participate in leadership activities in schools has been scrutinized since the 1930s. Although much research has been devoted to the area of school counselors in a leadership role, few have explored this trend through the lens of distributed leadership.

Problem Statement

Principals can no longer lead schools alone. Traditional, bureaucratic educational leadership in schools today will not allow them to effectively respond to the increasing demands of standards based reform (Elmore, 2000). Distributed leadership seeks to take the specialized knowledge of individuals in the organization, distribute leadership to them in their respective areas of expertise, and organize the diverse competencies into a coherent whole (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2006). School counselors are poised to take a leadership role in this framework of leadership. The ASCA encourages school counselors to take on a leadership position in their schools through their National Model (ASCA, 2005) which consists of four interrelated

components that infuse leadership, advocacy, and collaboration throughout the components to help foster systemic school change. While ASCA advocates for school counselors to take an active leadership role in schools, there remains a wide chasm between the expectations and the reality of school counselor's role.

Purpose

School leadership is evolving from traditional, singular leadership to that of shared or distributed leadership (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Mujis & Harris, 2003; Spillane, 2006). Principals can effectively lead by providing guidance and direction to other members of the school team to best utilize their unique skills to meet the varied needs of students (Elmore, 2000). One group that possesses a multitude of skills are school counselors. Effective school counselors can be viewed as the "eyes and ears" of schools, due to their relationships with teachers, parents, students, and the community (House & Hayes, 2002). Due to the range of impact school counselors can potentially have in regards to school improvement and student achievement, this quantitative study will investigate Oklahoma school counselors' perceived leadership role through the lens of distributed leadership, seeking (i) to understand how Oklahoma school counselors perceive their participation in school leadership, (ii) if individual school counselor demographic characteristics are related to their perceived leadership, and (iii) to understand if there is a correlation between school organizational characteristics and school counselors' leadership perceptions. Understanding the leadership role that school counselors assume is important for various reasons. Looking at effective school leadership through the lens of distributed or shared leadership encourages researchers

5

and practitioners alike to look at all school stakeholders and how they contribute to the leadership of the school for effective student improvement. This study can inform university school counselor preparation programs and guide in the development of professional learning for practicing school counselors in the state of Oklahoma in the necessary areas of leadership.

Research Questions

This study will seek to investigate the work of school counselors and the relationship of that work on the overall leadership capacity of a school organization. The central research questions are:

1. To what extent do Oklahoma School Counselors perceive their participation in school leadership?

2. Are school counselor individual demographic characteristics related to their perceived leadership practices?

3. Are school organizational characteristics related to their respective counselor perceived leadership practices?

Context for Study

James Spillane's framework of distributed leadership moves away from top down heroic leadership to multiple leaders. However, this is only one small part of the framework. His framework for studying leadership from a distributed perspective includes not just the actions of multiple leaders, but "the interaction of leaders, followers, and their situation" (2006, p. 14), as illustrated in Figure 1.

Distributed Leadership Practice

Figure 1. Spillane's Distributed Leadership Theory

Spillane's framework looks not just at the person in a leadership position but how they interact with followers, routines and tools. Routines are events that take place in our daily lives and tools are those tangible objects, such as curriculum maps and faculty meeting agendas. Spillane looks at the way in which leaders utilize these tools as a part of their practice.

The distributed perspective of leadership involves two aspects, "the leader plus aspect" and the "practice aspect" (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). The leader plus aspect considers all leaders, those formally designated as well as those that are not. The practice aspect is "leadership that is stretched across a web of leaders, followers, and their situations that gives form to leadership practice" (Spillane & Diamond, 2007, p. 7).

Spillane believes that situations do not just occur. This theory of leadership subscribes to the belief that the situation is "constitutive of leadership and management practice" (Spillane & Diamond, 2007, p. 10). Situations refer to the day to day operation of the school; for example, teaching class, attending an IEP meeting, or revising the

mission of the school. Organizational tools or artifacts, such as meeting agendas, assessment data, and curriculum maps, are tangible items that are an integral defining element of practice of this theory. Intangible tools such as the school's vision and mission are also a part of artifacts. This framework of distributed leadership examines tasks that were enacted, who was involved in the task, and the use of artifacts to measure how leadership was distributed among school personnel. Spillane is clear that the central concern of distributed leadership in education should be teaching and learning; the focus of leadership activities and practice should be those that directly impact these two things.

The ASCA developed its National Model® to provide a framework for school counseling programs. The model is research based and "written to reflect a comprehensive approach to program foundation, delivery, management and accountability" (Association, 2005, p. 13). Figure 2 shows the ASCA National Model®, which consists of four interrelated components that infuse leadership, advocacy, and collaboration throughout the components to help foster systemic school change (ASCA, 2005).

Figure 2. ASCA National Model®

Specifically, the infusion of leadership calls for counselors to engage in systemic change to ensure student success. This framework charges counselors to be leaders in their schools and district by helping to close the achievement gap and offering opportunities for students to gain access to rigorous curriculum so all students maximize their opportunities. The ASCA also promotes counselor collaboration with other professionals to widen the impact on students, the school, the district, and the State (ASCA, 2005).

Significance of the Study

Prior to 2015, there had not been a survey formulated specifically to determine the perceived leadership traits of practicing school counselors. Nor had there been a

school counselor leadership study conducted based specifically on Oklahoma school counselor participants. Due to these two factors, this study has the potential to contribute significantly to the overall literature concerning school counselor leadership, inform universities that train future school counselors, and provide critical information for the professional learning needs of practicing school counselors in Oklahoma.

Overview of the Method

The research design utilized for this study will be a quantitative survey method examining school counselors' perceived participation in the leadership of their school. The study will use a simple descriptive research design utilizing the School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) as the tool. This survey instrument, developed by Dr. Anita Young and Dr. Julia Bryan (2015), consists of 32-items rated on a 7-point Likert scale, one open-ended question, and various demographic questions. Both a descriptive analysis and multivariate analysis (MANOVA) of the variables will be provided. Participants of the study were recruited school counselors in the state of Oklahoma. Participant contact information was extracted from the database of Oklahoma public school personnel found on the Oklahoma State Department of Education's website. Potential participants were contacted through email. Those that agreed to participate used a link in the email to direct them to the survey which was administered through Qualtrics. The first page of the survey was an online consent form.

Definition of Terms

1. *Distributed leadership* – a practice of leadership framed in a very particular
   way, as a product of the joint interactions of school leaders, followers, and

aspects of their situation such as tools and routines (Spillane, 2006). It seeks to utilize multiple sources of guidance and direction to benefit from combined expertise in an organization (Elmore, 2000). A leadership practice in which members of the organization pool their expertise and initiative to assist in a better outcome for the greater whole (Gronn, 2002).

2. *Situations* – the context within which leadership practice unfolds as well as a defining element of leadership practice (Spillane, 2006).

3. *Artifacts* – the programs, policies, or procedures leaders use to influence the practice of others, the primary tools school leaders use to shape new practices, such as faculty meeting agendas, academic calendars, or professional development plans (Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

4. *Leaders* – those who exert or attempt to exert influences on school-based instructional practices (Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

5. *Collaborated distribution* – characterizes leadership practice that is stretched over the work of two or more leaders who work together in place and time to execute the same leadership routine, such as facilitating a faculty meeting (Spillane, 2006, p. 60).

6. *Collective distribution* – characterizes practice that is stretched over the work of two or more leaders who enact a leadership routine by working separately but interdependently (Spillane, 2006, p. 60).

7. *Coordinated distribution* – leadership routines that are performed in a sequence (i.e. using assessment data to influence instruction) (Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

8. *School counselor* – certified/licensed educators with a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling making them uniquely qualified to address all students' academic, personal/social and career development needs by designing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes and enhances student success (ASCA, 2005).

9. *ASCA* – American School Counseling Association. Professional association for school counselors (ASCA, 2005).

10. *SCLS* – School Counselor Leadership Survey (Young & Bryan, 2015).

11. *Systemic Collaboration* – Actively working with stakeholders to initiate new programs that have a systemic impact (Young & Bryan, 2015).

12. *Resourceful Problem Solving* – School counselors' and supervisors' perceptions about how they search for innovative methods to advocate for positive change, promote student achievement, and solve problems to accomplish goals as well as the ability to secure resources to promote change, to exceed expectations, and to remain goal oriented (Young & Bryan, 2015).

13. *Professional Efficacy* – The belief in oneself to lead and the confidence in one's ability to lead and affect positive change (Young & Bryan, 2015).

14. *Social Justice Advocacy* – The perception of a school counselors' practice of challenging the status quo to advocate for all students (Young & Bryan, 2015).

15. *Interpersonal Influence* – One's perceptions about practices that influence colleagues to promote the instructional vision and share innovative ideas,

motivating others and promoting positive change through building relationships

(Young & Bryan, 2015).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 2 provides a review of literature divided into three parts. Part I includes

a historical overview of the evolution of the school counselor and the emergence of

their role from early inception to today. Part II contains a review of the literature

analyzing the relationship between the school principal and school counselor to show

the effect this relationship plays on a school counselor's ability to participate in a shared

leadership role in their school. Finally, Part III provides a review of recent theoretical

literature pertaining to school counselor leadership. Together, this literature review

provides context for this study and helps to identify the lacuna.

Historical Overview

Norman C. Gysbers' book *Remembering the Past, Shaping the Future* (2010),

provides a comprehensive look at the history of school counselors. As a profession,

school counseling dates back over 100 years, with its roots in the industrial revolution

of the United States. During the late 1800s and early 1900s, a need arose for vocational

guidance. Yesterday's forerunners of guidance counselors proved to be instrumental

laying the foundation for the profession we know today.

Early Pioneers

Lysander Richards published a book titled, "Vocophy: The New Profession."

The intent of Vocophy was to help individuals find a vocation. Richard's goals were to

establish related programs of study in this area at colleges and universities and to have

vocophers in every city and town (Gysbers, 2010). George A. Merrill organized the California School of Mechanic Arts in 1894, in which students would spend their first two years in exploratory academic pursuits and the last two years in specialized trade preparation culminating in job placement and follow up. Jesse B. Davis was a teacher and principal in Detroit and was documented as saying that he was "responsible for their [students]…planning of their individual programs of study…" (Gysbers, 2010, p. 4). He then moved to Grand Rapids, Michigan, and "organize[d] an entire school for systemic guidance" (2010, p. 4), using his assistant principals as guidance counselors. Eli Weaver is credited for printing materials on occupational information during this time period and Frank Parsons opened the Vocation Bureau of Boston, issuing the Bureau's first report on May 1, 1908, which used the term vocational guidance for the first time in print. Parsons also published a book, "Choosing a Vocation" in 1909, in which he stressed the scientific approach to choosing a profession or occupation. Vocational guidance in schools was the subject of many conferences and presentations during this time period. Due to this spotlight on vocational guidance, teachers in Boston served as vocational counselors in schools, and in 1915 a Department of Vocational Guidance was formally established.

Early Twentieth Century

The 1920s was a decade in which the scope of the field was broadened with the addition of terms such as "educational guidance" and "social guidance" to the still used term of "vocational guidance." During this decade, guidance activities in school were centered on occupational surveys, individual counseling, courses in occupations, and

guidance units concerning different vocations. Organizational concerns of vocational

guidance in schools began to surface, including how to assign duties to the teachers who

were serving as counselors without the benefit of a structure for this work. Despite the

concerns of this decade, the addition of intelligence and personality testing represented

great strides in the growth of vocational and educational programming (Gysbers, 2010).

Gysbers refers to the 1930s as a turbulent time in guidance (2010). Ironically, he

discusses the issues of clerical work assigned to counselors and the dual role of

counselor and disciplinarian, two issues that continue to resonate today. With the

concern over these duties also came concerns about the ways in which counselors were

being trained and who specifically was being assigned the duties of the counselors. The

pupil personnel service was created during this time to provide structure to those who

were given guidance responsibilities. There was still no official job position for

counselors; their role was still considered to be additional duties that would be carried

out by teachers and administrators (Gysbers, 2010).

Two landmark pieces of legislation in the 1940s and 1950s added both the

attention and support for the selection and training of school counselors; The Vocational

Education Act of 1946 and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. The

NDEA provided monies for training counselors through yearlong and/or summer

institutes. The NDEA also provided funding to establish testing programs in public

secondary schools to help meet the security needs of the United States "through the full

development of the mental resources and technical skill of its young men and women"

(Gysbers, 2010, p. 89). While these acts provided for an expansion of counseling in

schools, there continued to be debate during the 1940s and 1950s concerning the role of

school counselors and the framework under which they should be organized. During

these two decades, debate also surfaced concerning the physical space of counselors

within a school building, specifically whether counselors should be closer to principals

or closer to teachers. Were counselors to be part of the administrative team or as a part

of the instructional team? These two decades also gave rise to a conversation about the

different needs of elementary school counselors as opposed to secondary school

counselors. An added significant development for school counselors during this time

was the formation of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) in 1952,

finally providing school counselors a professional association with their own scholarly

journals, and a voice in national affairs.

Late Twentieth Century

Many of the concerns addressed today by counselors first emerged and became

points of discussion during the 1960s and 1970s. A significant debate over the primary

purpose and role of school counselors arose: were they to provide psychological

counseling or were they to provide educational counseling? At the same time,

conversations concerning the need for school counselors to have teaching certification

waged in dichotomous fashion. A major change in school counseling was the

burgeoning field of elementary school counseling and its distinct differences from the

field of secondary school counseling. Leadership and supervision of school counselors

continued to be an on-going debate throughout these two decades.

Conversations in previous decades became actions in the 1980s and 1990s. State models of guidance counseling were developed to implement comprehensive school guidance and counseling programs, and numerous books and articles were published concerning various aspects of guidance and counseling, including a curriculum for the formal training of guidance counselors. The American School Counseling Association (ASCA) and the American Counseling Association (ACA) became increasingly more active, with political advocacy emphasized in scholarly writings. The role and function of guidance counselors continued its evolution and gained some generally unwelcome attention as feelings emerged that parents were being replaced by the guidance counselor. Supervision of counselors was firmly put in place during these decades and elementary counseling received a great deal of attention.

Summary

While great strides have been made over the 100+ year history of the school guidance counselor, some of the same issues that permeated the field throughout the decades remain concerns today. There is still debate on where a school counselor fits in the organization of a school: should school counselors serve in an administrative role or an instructional role? Also, while ASCA recommends a 250 to 1 ratio of students to school counselors, most states are well over the recommended number. ASCA reported that in 2014-2015, Oklahoma had a ratio of 427 to 1 (Retrieved from: https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/home/Ratios14-15.pdf). This brief overview of the history of school counseling from the late 1800s to the 1990s allows us

to cross the threshold to today's view of school counselors and their roles and responsibilities.

<div align="center">**Principal/School Counselor Relationship**</div>

American School Counseling Association

The largest, most organized advocacy entity for school counselors in the United States is the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). The ASCA developed a National Model® to provide a framework for school counseling programs. It is a research based model "written to reflect a comprehensive approach to program foundation, delivery, management and accountability" (ASCA, 2005, p. 13). The ASCA National Model (Association, 2005), shown in Figure 3, consists of four interrelated components that infuse leadership, advocacy, and collaboration throughout each of the components to help foster systemic school change. School counselors can offer a unique perspective to the daily operation of the school, because effective school counselors develop and foster relationships between themselves and students, staff, parents, school and district administration, as well as community members. Counselors also have access to differing forms of data and information concerning students, which places them in a key position to help generate and maintain school reform and systemic change that can benefit all students (Dahir & Stone, 2012; R. M. House & P. J. Martin, 1998; Christopher Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008; C. Janson, Stone, & Clark, 2009).

Figure 3. ASCA National Model[®]

Counselor Perceptions

While the ASCA provides a National Model® to guide comprehensive

counseling programs, much of the research concerning the role and function of today's

school counselor revolves around the principal's perception of that role and how it

should be implemented on a day-to-day basis. Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell (2009)

conducted a study in which they examined the relationships between school principals

and school counselors using Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, which provides

a framework used to assess the influence of superior-subordinate relationships. This

study was prompted by the non-existence of previous empirical data evaluating the

impact the relationship the school counselor had with the school principal on the school

counselor's ability to work cooperatively with all stakeholders. The study consisted of 161 licensed or credentialed school counselors from twenty-three randomly selected school districts across three Southeast states. The researchers used seven research instruments, all consisting of Likert scale questions, and a demographic questionnaire to gather data.

The purpose of the Clemens, Milsom, and Cashwell 2009 study was "to assess the relevance of LMX theory as the foundation for explaining variance in important school counselor outcomes: role definition, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions" (p 76). The findings of the study were consistent with the applications of LMX theory in other fields. They found that a "principal-school counselor relationship and school counselors' use of advocacy skills had a significant effect on how school counselors' roles were defined and programs implemented at the building level" (p. 76). Positive relationships led to positive school counselor role definition, increased job satisfaction, and lower turnover intentions. The study went on to suggest that positive principal-school counselor relationships can lead to increased leadership roles for school counselors as they have the trust and respect of their principal, a necessary component for school counselors to feel safe in engaging in leadership roles.

In another study by Janson (2009), a Q Methodology investigation looked at high school counselors' view of their own leadership behaviors. This study was conducted because "…this story of school counselor leadership is mostly being told about school counselors, not by them" (2009, p. 96). Forty-nine high school counselors participated in the study in which they sorted forty leadership behavior statements into a

forced distribution ranging from "least representative of my leadership behavior in the school" to "most representative of my leadership behavior in the school" (2009, p. 97). Participants worked in five different states and had varying amounts of experience. Most participants described themselves as Caucasian. There were twenty-three participants that described their work setting as suburban, thirteen as rural, and thirteen as urban.

Q methodology was used "to identify, describe, and examine high school counselors' perspectives of their leadership behaviors" (p. 97) as "Q methodology factors participants and their perspectives or viewpoints on a given topic…[which] provides researchers with a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining subjectivity" (p. 97). Janson (2009) found "four distinct viewpoints of how high school counselors perceive their leadership behaviors…(a) Self-Focused and Reflective Exemplar, (b) Ancillary School Counseling Program Manager, (c) Engaging Systems Change Agent, and (d) Empathetic Resource Broker" (p. 97-98). The highest percentage of counselors resonated with viewpoint (a) Self-focused and Reflective Exemplar. While this study provided some insight to counselors' perceptions of their leadership behaviors, the study included only a small number of participants and all were employed in a high school setting. This aspect of the study could limit the general implications for counselor leadership training as those counselors in elementary and middle levels may have a different perspective of leadership in their setting.

Principal Perceptions

A study that focused specifically on principals' perceptions of elementary school counselors' role and functions was conducted by Zalaquett in 2005. Five-hundred elementary principals in the state of Florida participated in the study. They completed a 140-item Likert scale questionnaire concerning the way in which they view school counselors. There was an overall positive perception about school counselors with a high correlation of importance to roles and activities that are appropriate for school counselors. In similar research conducted earlier (Fitch, Newby, Ballestero, et al., 2001), perceptions of the school counselor's role by future school administrators was studied. Eighty-six students in an educational administration master's level program participated. A fifteen-question survey containing Likert scale questions was given to first and second year students. The statements were based on school counselor appropriate activities as defined by the ASCA and the Kentucky Educational Standards Board. Future administrators' perceptions of school counselors' role were most consistent with appropriate roles. These studies emphasize the importance of collaboration between the school counselor and building principal to not only implement an effective school wide guidance program, but also to foster leadership in school counselors.

Another study that looked at the principal's perceptions of school counselors was conducted by Leuwerke, Walker, and Shi (2009). The purpose of their study was "to examine principals' exposure to the ASCA National Model® and to explore the impact of different information sets on principals' perceptions of school counselors" (p.

264). These researchers hypothesized that most principals had not been exposed to the ASCA National Model®; principals that had been exposed to the model and/or school counseling research would support counselors in allocating their time for appropriate school counselor duties' and would feel that appropriate school counselor duties were more important than inappropriate school counselor tasks.

Participants in the Leuwerke, Walker, and Shi study were practicing school principals in the state of Iowa. A survey was sent via e-mail to 1,415 principals and 337 principals completed the survey. Participants were asked to provide data about "gender, race/ethnicity, number of years as principal, grades supervised, building enrollment, number of counselors supervised, rating of counselor performance, awareness of the ASCA National Model®, and how they had been exposed to the model" (p. 264) on a demographic questionnaire. Participants also completed a survey about principals' perceptions of the school counselor. The survey contained twenty-two roles or activities performed by school counselors; twelve were appropriate school counselor activities and ten were inappropriate items. Principals were also asked to estimate the amount of time school counselors spent engaged in certain activities.

The study found that over half of the principals had no exposure to the ASCA National Model®, while 20.2% reported having very little exposure. The principals who reported as having been exposed to the model were asked in what manner they were exposed. Seventy-three had learned of the model through discussions with a school counselor, forty-three learned of the model at a conference or meeting, eighteen through continuing education and six through pre-service training.

Exposure to information concerning the professional school counselor and their appropriate roles and responsibilities did positively affect the principal's perception of time that should be allotted to those responsibilities. The results of this empirical study supported the call for school counselors to advocate for themselves and to provide information to their principal about their appropriate roles and responsibilities as a school counselor (Fitch, Newby, Ballestero, & Marshall, 2001; C. P. Zalaquett, 2005).

Principal and Counselor Perceptions

A Q-Methodology study investigating how school counselors and principals perceive their professional relationship was conducted by Janson, Militello, and Kosine (2008). The purpose of the study was to "identify and describe distinct viewpoints held by professional school counselors and by principals regarding their professional relationship" (p. 353). The study was comprised of thirty-nine participants from five states. Of the thirty-nine, twenty-two were school counselors and seventeen were principals. Participants were asked to sort forty-five opinion statements into a forced distribution range of "least characteristic of your relationship" to "most characteristic of your relationship." Participants were also asked a series of questions concerning their decision-making process during the card sorting.

Upon analysis of the data, the researchers found four opinion groupings representing four different principal and counselor viewpoints. The four factors were named; "(A) Working Alliance, (B) Impediments to Alliance, (C) Shared Leadership, and (D) Purposeful Collaboration" (p. 354). The findings of this study were in line with the importance of professional collaboration between school counselors and other

stakeholders and their emerging role as leaders in schools. They found that "Purposeful Collaboration" was the grouping most in-line with the position of the ASCA National Model® (2005) urging that school counselors educate principals in the appropriate role of the counselor, and was the viewpoint that valued collaboration to improve schools. Janson (2008) and his colleagues added empirical evidence to the importance of the principal-school counselor relationship in school reform and in school counselor leadership development.

Another study was conducted in which the researchers analyzed the perceptions of counselors, counselors-in-training, and principals regarding the role of rural school counselors (Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, Milde, Leitner, & Skelton, 2006). A survey instrument was developed using a list of twenty-six activities in which a school counselor might participate, two open-ended questions and demographic information. A total of 102 surveys were returned of 313 administered or mailed. Participants consisted of twenty counselors-in-training, forty-nine professional school counselors, and thirty-three principals. Results showed that there was discrepancy among the three groups as to the amount of time that counselors should engage in certain activities. Principals indicated that counselors should engage in administrative type duties more frequently than school counselors and counselors-in-training. There were also discrepancies in actual time on task in activities between the counselors and the principals, as well as the counselors-in-training. The most noticeable discrepancies found in this study were time that should be devoted to small group and individual counseling and time spent writing Individualized Education Plans (IEP). Counselors

and counselors-in-training indicated 5 to 6 hours more per week should be dedicated to individual and group counseling than principals. Principals believed that 4 hours per week should be devoted to the writing of IEPs while counselors and counselors-in-training indicated that no time be spent in this activity.

New Counselor Perceptions

A year-long qualitative study was conducted by a group of counselor educators (Dollarhide, Gibson, and Saginak, 2008) concerning new counselors' leadership efforts in school counseling. Five new counselors agreed to engage in leadership and participated in interviews for this year-long study. The participants of the study were recent graduates and first year school counselors, three of whom worked at an elementary school and two that worked at a high school. The participants were four women and one man, all Caucasian and in their late 20's to early 30's in age.

Data were collected via interviews by two of the three researchers using "in-depth structured phenomenological interview methodology" (2008, p. 262). To provide a non-biased perspective, the third researcher did not participate in the interview process and had no personal knowledge of the participants. The participants were asked preplanned questions by phone with notes taken and later transcribed by the interviewer. Three of the five participants felt they had positive leadership experiences as they met their intended goals. One participant felt she did not had a positive leadership experience as she did not meet her predetermined goal for the year. The fifth participant did not complete the study and withdrew after six months, at which time she had not met her predetermined goal for the year.

The researchers found many similarities in the three participants who felt they had successfully engaged in leadership activities during their first year of school counseling. "Leadership attitudes involved a clear sense of responsibility for bringing about improvements in whatever challenges the program faced" (2008, p. 263) for those successful in leadership endeavors. Also, "…goals were clear and focused, and included primarily school-based change" (p. 263). The successful counselors were also able to persevere during times of self-doubt and challenges and were dedicated to the attainment of their individual goals for the students' well-being. Successful counselors also felt support from the administration and other school stakeholders and felt they had latitude in defining their role as a school counselor. The information garnered from the two counselors whom felt they were unsuccessful was almost exactly opposite of the findings of the successful counselors. The counselors who felt they were unsuccessful had their leadership efforts stifled from a "lack of control over the necessary conditions for change" (p. 263). They had set more global, district goals which they had limited capability to change on their own. They also felt there was no latitude in defining their role as a school counselor, and that rigid ideas as to what a school counselor should do and accomplish were firmly in place. While worthy qualitative data were collected during this study, the researchers admit there was a small pool of participants who were not very diverse. However, findings did support the theoretical literature that calls for school counselors to take a role in leadership and for school counselor training programs to include leadership training as part of their curriculum.

Dollarhide and Gibson (2008) also offered a different perspective with the data used above in their article *Individual Psychology in School Counselor Leadership: Implications for Practice*. They took the data from the three "successful" counselors described above and conducted case studies in which they examined the data for "Adlerian themes in the leader style of the participants" (2008, p. 471). Six Adlerian themes emerged, "social interest and encouragement, holism and systems thinking, striving for significance, goal orientation, private logic, and fictional goals" (2008, p. 474). The researchers discussed that the information garnered from looking at the data through this different lens provided "several Adlerian themes that [could] be used to inform and refine program transformation leadership by school counselors" (2008, p. 478).

Pre-Service Counselors and Principals Perceptions

While many empirical studies focused on the perceptions of school counselors' role by principals and school counselors themselves, Shoffner & Williamson (2000) conducted a study in which they engaged pre-service school counselors and principals in dialogue and collaboration. This study was conducted in the form of a seminar course at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Students in the school counseling program as well as students in the educational administration program enrolled in the 8-week, bi-weekly seminar. The purpose of each seminar was to provide a "collaborative learning experience that involved discussion of roles, expectations, and perspectives; the identification of potential areas of conflict; discussion of standards; and collaborative problem solving using case studies" (Shoffnerr & Williamson, 2000, p.

128). The outcomes, expressed in the form of a summative evaluation, showed that both groups found the course helpful and the ability to have open, informed dialogue and collaboration to be an effective element in the training of future school counselors and principals.

Personal Perspectives

Lewis and Borunda (2006) offered their personal experience as school counselor colleagues in the same high school as a unique type of empirical data, specifically, on participatory leadership of school counselors. The method of this study was:

> reflect[ion] on the "storied" nature of their professional development and [to] define participatory leadership in school counseling as emerging from engagement and participation in collaborative efforts to bring about systemic change in schools by advocating for all students, especially those who have been traditionally marginalized (2006, p. 406).

The authors offer three anecdotes in which they exhibited participatory leadership.

The first story was one of student success in which the counselor changed her view of self-esteem education for students based on a conversation held with a teacher on staff. Through this dialogue, the counselor came to understand the benefits of self-esteem development via accomplishments of personal goal setting and attainment. Through participatory leadership, the counselor and teacher lobbied for updated technology and software to help prepare students for potential successful employment, a tangible increase to a student's self-esteem.

The second story focused on the reality of counselor student ratios. To contribute to the success of all students, the counselors began to analyze data to determine patterns of needs in the student body. This effort brought about the realization that 25% of freshmen were failing English and/or math in their first semester, contributing to a high dropout rate. Through participatory leadership, the counselors lobbied with the math department to add faculty to decrease freshmen math class sizes, a proven method to increasing math success. The counselors voted to not replace a retiring counselor to increase math faculty, thus increasing collegiality and fostering participatory leadership.

The final story was one of participatory leadership that included counselors, administrators, teachers, students and the community. To improve an ever changing and volatile school climate, the author developed a diverse student committee to lead a "Power of Unity" (2006, p. 410) group to improve communication, tolerance, and appreciation of diversity of the student body. This resulted in improved school climate and a sharing of leadership among many school stakeholders. The method in which this anecdotal data was presented provided an easily relatable look at school counselors and their efforts to participate in and foster leadership.

Summary

Whether the study focused on principal perspectives, counselor perspectives, or a combination of both, with limited experience or several years' experience, the literature shows the relationship of the principal and school counselor impacts the role the school counselor takes in the school. A strong, collaborative relationship proves to

be critical in a school counselor's leadership self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and willingness to contribute new ideas for student success and systemic change. Principal knowledge of the ASCA National Model® and the intended roles and responsibilities of a school counselor are important elements in contributing to a mutually respectful relationship. Although much research has been conducted in this area, additional studies focus on the role in which school counselor leadership contributes to successful, proactive school counseling programs. Prior to discussion of the role of the school counselor in leadership, a summary review of leadership theory is important to provide context to those studies.

Review of Leadership Theory

The term leadership conjures many images, beliefs and philosophies. It arouses passion in many people due to its effect on policies, procedures, individuals, and organizations, as well as the success or failure of these. Substantial research has been conducted around leadership, from the individual leader and their traits and personalities to organizational leadership and its effectiveness or lack thereof. Leadership in the realm of education has morphed in conjunction with educational changes in policy, expectations, limitations, and outcomes. In their book, Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice (2008), Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel provide several definitions from various authors. Some of these include, "leadership is like beauty-it is hard to define, but you know it when you see it" (p. 11) from Bennis and a more technical definition from Martin M. Chemers, "Leadership is a process of social influence in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of

others in the accomplishment of a common task" (p. 12). In their report for the National College for School Leadership, Tony Bush and Derek Glover provide a review of educational leadership literature (2003). They discuss the lack of agreed upon definition of leadership throughout the literature but discuss the commonalities of leadership as influence, the values of leadership, and leadership and vision. As a result, they provide this working definition of leadership:

> Leadership is a process of influence leading to the achievement of desired purposes. Successful leaders develop a vision for their schools based on their personal and professional values. They articulate this vision at every opportunity and influence their staff and stakeholders to share the vision. The philosophy, structures, and activities of the school are geared towards the achievement of this shared vision (2003, p. 8).

Through these and many other definitions have come much research that describes key educational leadership theories such as trait approach leadership, situational leadership, behavioral leadership, instructional leadership, shared leadership, transactional and transformational leadership.

Historically, school leadership fell to the principal or superintendent who was held accountable for the management of all facets of schools and the educational process (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Gronn, 2002). This top-down approach led to a bureaucratic way of organization for school systems, a hierarchical authority structure designating superiors and subordinates (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Gronn, 2002). Along with this delineation in structure came a clear-cut division of labor, well-defined systems of

rules, regulations, and procedures and impersonal relationships to ensure objective

application of these rules along with objective rewards (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; O'Hair,

McLaughlin, & Reitzug, 2000). Critics of this model or organization in schools cite

many drawbacks such as the perception that those in positions of authority have greater

knowledge and perspectives than those with lesser authority and can also foster an

impersonal nature (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; O'Hair, et al., 2000). This bureaucratic model

of organization complemented those theories of leadership in which traits of the

individual were the focus of study and the impetus for placing persons in positions of

leadership.

Trait Approach Theory

The trait approach theory of leadership dates to Aristotle and the belief leaders

were born. After an extensive literature review, Ralph M. Stodgill classified the

personal factors associated with leadership in five general categories: capacity,

achievement, responsibility, participation, and status (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). He also

learned certain traits were consistently found in leaders rather than non-leaders, such as

above-average intelligence, dependability, participation, and status, which led him to

determine "that trait approach by itself has yielded negligible and confusing results

(Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 422). Stodgill then added a sixth factor, situational

components, because he determined "the impact of traits varies widely from situation to

situation" (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 422). His further reviews of leadership led him to

characterize leaders by the following traits:

A strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in

pursuit of goals, venturousness and originality in problem solving, drive to

exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal

identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, readiness

to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and delay,

ability to influence other persons' behavior, and capacity to structure interaction

systems to the purpose at hand (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, pp. 423).

Situational Leadership Theory

Situational leadership theory arose from the negative perception of trait

approach leadership theory. Researchers began looking at the setting in which

leadership occurred to see if they could identify distinctive characteristics and attempt

to "isolate specific properties of the leadership behavior and performance" (Hoy &

Miskely, 2008, p. 427). Critics of situational leadership theory and trait approach theory

believe that these approaches to the study of leadership are too narrow and do not

consider the "personal nature of leadership" (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 429). Thus, these

two theories are overshadowed by other leadership theories.

Behavioral Leadership Theory

Focusing on the behavior of the leader in interaction with followers is the

concept of the behavioral approach to leadership (Rossow & Warner, 2000). Lipitt and

White classified leadership behavior into three styles: "autocratic, democratic, and

laissez-faire" (Rossow & Warner, 2000, p. 5). Autocratic leadership style lends itself to

close supervision and punishment of inadequate work performance. This type of

leadership has been found to have poor results in terms of the quality of work but

produces the greatest results in terms of work quantity (Rossow & Warner, 2000). Democratic style of behavioral leadership engages the group in decision making. All stakeholders participate in the management of the organization and are given responsibility to help shape the environment. It is defined as "facilitating processes that engage members of the school community in inquiring into and discussing issues, dilemmas, goals, and directions" (O'Hair, et al., 2000). O'Hair, McLaughlin, and Reitzug (2000) describe the practice of leadership as "rather than being embodied in a position, leadership in democratic schools is viewed as being embodied in acts that may come from anyone in an organization" (p. 405). Unlike conventional leadership in which the principal tries to influence others to pursue his or her goal, democratic leadership encourages all stakeholders to participate in the leadership process through "asking, challenging, forming discussion/study groups, creating community spaces, initiating collaborative events" (O'Hair, et al., 2000, p. 405). This is a direct contradiction of the bureaucratic method of organization. Of the three styles, this one seems to produce the highest quality and quantity of product (Rossow & Warner, 2000). The last, laissez-faire, is a hands-off approach to leadership in which all parties are responsible for supervising and monitoring themselves. While this style allows freedom within the group, it tends to produce results of poor quantity and poor quality. Hoy and Miskel state that, "…laissez-faire leaders avoid expressing their views or taking action on important issues, fail to make or at least delay decisions, ignore responsibilities, provide no feedback, and allow authority to remain dormant" (2008, p. 445). While the

previously mentioned theories isolate one area in which leadership is studied, later theories included components of each.

Contingency Models of Ladership

There are multiple contingency models of leadership that incorporate "traits of leaders, characteristics of the situation, behaviors of the leaders, and effectiveness of the leaders" (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 443) which "emphasize the 'fit' between situations and personalities" (Rossow & Warner, 2000, p. 8). One such theory is the Path-Goal Theory, initially developed by Robert House in the early 1970's and overhauled in the mid-1990s. The fundamental idea of this theory is employees will be motivated to do what is necessary if they believe that they can accomplish given task(s) and that they will be rewarded sufficiently upon completion of said task(s) (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Another contingency model of leadership is instructional leadership in which the improvement of teaching and learning is the primary emphasis. While many different positions within a school can provide instructional leadership, historically studies focused on instructional leadership placed emphasis on the role of the principal and their "heroic" actions that resulted in positive change for school improvement (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Transactional and Transformational Theory

Transactional and transformational leadership theory development is usually credited to James MacGregor Burns. His application of this theory occurred in the area of politics and was expanded upon by Bernard M. Bass and introduced in social organizations (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Transactional leadership theory is one in which

leaders reward followers in exchange for completing tasks. This type of leader hopes

that these "transactions" will motivate their employees to do what is necessary to ensure

the success of the organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). There are three purported

components to transactional leadership:

1. Contingent reward leadership occurs when the leader provides a reward to
   the subordinate for completing an assigned task and the performance of said
   task;

2. Active management–by-exception is a micro-management of workers in
   which leaders actively monitor progress and the meeting of standards. This
   component incorporates the consequences of not meeting stated objectives;
   and

3. Passive management-by-exception in which there are no corrective measures
   taken but instead intervention and consequences occur after there is a
   problem that has been brought to the attention of the leader (Hoy & Miskel,
   2008).

Despite the fact that transactional leadership seems to be a mutually beneficial

relationship between supervisor and subordinate, not all are equitable (Kuhnert &

Lewis, 1987). While transactional leadership appeared on its face to be an effective

leadership practice, augmenting this practice with transformational leadership resulted

in "enhanced effort, effectiveness, and job satisfaction" (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 446).

Transformational leadership reaches beyond the transactional theory of merely

exchanging works for rewards. "Transformational leaders are proactive, raise the

awareness levels of followers about inspirational collective interests, and help followers achieve unusually high performance outcomes" (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 446). This theory is based on four I's: Idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Riggio, as cited by Hoy & Miskel, 2000). Idealized influence is the perception of followers in terms of the leader's charisma, self-confidence, power, and focus on ideals and ethics. Inspirational motivation attempts to motivate followers to adhere to a common vision and believe that this vision can be attained as an organization. Intellectual stimulation encourages followers to move outside of their box and look at old situations in new, innovative ways. Finally, individualized consideration takes all individual followers' needs into account, providing mentoring to help everyone reach their own achievement and growth. The transformational leadership approach seeks to transform or cause change in individuals and social systems through the leader's personal beliefs and values. "Transformational leaders build commitment to the organization's objectives and empower followers to achieve these objectives (Yukl, 2002, as cited by Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Shared Leadership

Another leadership theory is shared leadership. Shared leadership emerged in the realm of public education, in part to the response to increased accountability (Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008). No longer should school leadership lie solely in the hands of the building principal. It takes a full team of dedicated educators to meet these requirements while always being concerned with the individual student and their

learning. "Shared leadership occurs when all members of a team are fully engaged in the leadership of the team and are not hesitant to influence and guide their fellow team members in an effort to maximize the potential of the team as a whole" (Pearce, 2004). According to Linda Lambert, "…leadership is about learning together, and constructing meaning and knowledge collectively and collaboratively" (1998, p. 5). This theory is a departure from the belief that effective leadership in a school came only from the building or district supervisor.

Distributed Leadership

Multiple models exist concerning leadership best practices and how such practices can improve student achievement and lead to high achieving school. For these best practices to move beyond the traditional view of formal, legally-sanctioned, bureaucratic office and enjoin teachers, support personnel, staff, parents and students as co-leaders, a form of shared leadership must be implemented (O'Hair, et al., 2000). Distributed Leadership attempts to spread leadership roles and responsibilities to multiple persons rather than just one, but there is more to this theory than multiple persons taking on leadership responsibilities. In his report compiled for The Albert Shanker Institute, *Building a New Structure for School Leadership*, Richard F. Elmore discussed standard based reform and the changes that need to occur in school leadership practices in order to meet these higher standards (2000). He speaks of leadership being "romanticized" (2000, p. 13) in America due to the large scale belief that leaders are successful due to their personal traits. Elmore goes on to discuss the "de-romanticizing" (2000, p. 13) of leadership in which one person, typically the building principal, is

heralded as a hero if a school shows improvement or meets educational standards,

Elmore further advocates for distributed leadership in schools in order to meet the

requirements of standards based reform and to earn back the faith of the American

citizenry in public schooling. Wide scale improvement requires a multitude of skills

which means that leaders must be able to recognize those skills among stakeholders and

provide "guidance and direction" (2000, p. 15) to individuals to achieve a common

mission. Elmore emphasizes this distributed approach to leadership does not preclude

responsibility for the overall performance of the organization but,

> It means, rather, that the job of administrative leaders is primarily about
> enhancing the skills and knowledge of people in the organization, creating a
> common culture of expectations around the use of those skills and knowledge,
> holding the various pieces of the organization together in a productive
> relationship with each other, and holding individuals accountable for their
> contributions to the collective result (2000, p. 15).

Elmore goes on to offer five principles that lay the foundation of distributed leadership

focused on large scale improvement:

1. The purpose of leadership is the improvement of instructional practice and
   performance, regardless of role.

2. Instructional improvement requires continuous learning.

3. Learning requires modeling.

4. The roles and activities of leadership flow from the expertise required for
   learning and improvement, not from the formal dictates of the institution.

41

5. The exercise of authority requires reciprocity of accountability and capacity (Elmore, 2000, pp. 20-21).

Elmore's theory is one developed for use in large scale school improvement efforts. He goes on to state that,

> Improvement at scale is largely a property of organizations, not of the pre-existing traits of the individuals that work in them. Organizations that improve do so because they create and nurture agreement on what is worth achieving, and they set in motion the internal processes by which people progressively learn how to do what they need to do in order to achieve what is worthwhile (2000, p. 25).

This statement reinforces the need for distributed leadership rather than top down leadership by a fearless individual or principal to effectively lead a school to improvement.

Another proponent of Distributed Leadership is James Spillane. He conducted a multiyear study in fifteen Chicago schools in which he used a variety of research methods in order to build theory in the distributed leadership arena (Spillane, 2006). His framework for studying leadership from a distributed perspective included not just the actions of multiple leaders, but "the interaction of leaders, followers, and their situation" (2006, p. 14). He goes on to state that, "leaders work in interaction not just with followers but also with aspects of the situation, including routines and tools" (2006, p. 17). Routines are events that take place in our daily lives and tools "are externalized representations of ideas that are used by people in their practice" (Spillane,

2006, p. 18). Further, "the critical issue, then, is not whether leadership is distributed but how leadership is distributed" (Spillane, 2006, p. 15). The distributed perspective of leadership involves two aspects, the leader plus aspect and the practice aspect (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). The leader plus aspect considers all leaders, those formally designated as well as those that are not. The practice aspect is,

> A product of the interactions of school leaders, followers, and aspects of their situation…it shifts focus from school principals and other formal and informal leaders to the web of leaders, followers, and their situations that gives form to leadership practice (Spillane & Diamond, 2007, p. 7).

Spillane believes that situations do not just occur. This theory of leadership subscribes to the belief that the situation is "constitutive of leadership and management practice" (Spillane & Diamond, 2007, p. 10). Situations refer to the day to day operation of the school. Organizational tools or artifacts, such as meeting agendas, assessment data, and curriculum maps, are tangible items that are an integral defining element of practice of this theory. Intangible tools that are also a part of artifacts are the school's vision, mission, and goals. This framework of distributed leadership examines tasks that were enacted, who was involved in the task, and the use of artifacts in order to measure how leadership was distributed among school personnel. Spillane is clear that the central concern in distributed leadership in education should be teaching and learning; the focus of leadership activities should be those that directly impact these two things.

Peter Gronn proposed a new unit of analysis in distributed leadership (Gronn, 2002). Gronn mirrors Elmore's and Spillane's feelings that top down, bureaucratic

leadership is not as effective as distributed leadership in education. In his article

Distributed Leadership as a Unit of Analysis, Gronn outlines a "framework for

understanding distributed organizational leadership and a taxonomy for classifying

varieties of distributed patterns, based on a range of constituent elements identified in

research studies" (2002, p. 424). Gronn uses this definition of leadership as the basis for

his article, "leadership is defined…as a status ascribed to one individual, an aggregate

of separate individuals, sets of small numbers of individuals acting in concert or larger

plural-member organizational units" (Gronn, 2002, p. 428). Working from this

definition, Gronn discusses the way in which leadership can be distributed, the division

of labor as meaning all tasks and the technological capabilities available to assist in the

completion of said tasks. The combination of these technological capabilities with the

values and interests of the group combine to result in distributed patterns of leadership.

Numerical action of distributed leadership shifts the focused leadership from one

individual to "some, many, or maybe all of the members" (2002, p. 429) of the

organization, which is a standard philosophy in distributed leadership. Gronn added

another action of distributed leadership, concertive action. He describes this as ways in

which members of the organization work together to accomplish the vision or mission

of the organization. Concertive action is further broken down into three areas:

spontaneous collaboration, intuitive working relations, and institutionalized practices.

Spontaneous collaboration occurs without planning across roles within an organization.

For example, a counselor, assistant principal, and attendance secretary could work

together to help improve the attendance of a student. Intuitive working relations occur

over time when two or more organization members work closely together and begin to rely on one another. An example would be a team of sophomore English teachers working together to develop curriculum, common assessments, and share teaching strategies. The third, institutionalized practices are formal structures within a school, such as schedules, teaching assignments, etc. These three forms of concertive action come together in conjoint agency wherein a sharing of leadership occurs, providing opportunity for schools to move from traditional top down bureaucratic organizations to those that link all stakeholders (Gronn, 2002). The result is a broadening of leadership and ideas to provide quality education for all students. This discussion of leadership theories provides context for the discussion of shared or distributed leadership involving school counselors.

School Counselor Leadership

Additional theoretical research provides an insight into leadership as it intersects with the role and function of the school counselor. School counselors must be able to participate in as well as foster shared leadership among all stakeholders to implement a successful school counseling program (Dollarhide, C.T., 2003; House, R.M. & Sears, S.J., 2002; Jackson et al., 2002; Mason, E.C.M. & McMahon, H.G., 2009; Sink, C.A., 2009). Multiple studies call for professional school counselors to "collaboratively lead school transformation at the local, state, regional, and national levels" (Curry & DeVoss, 2009; Shillingford, M.A. & Lambie, G.W., 2010). "Developing and implementing counseling programs designed to enhance student achievement would be a direct way of tying school counseling to the mission of schools and clarifying the role

of school counselors" (House & Hayes, 2002, p. 252). "School Counselors are in a critical position to focus on issues, strategies, and interventions that will assist in closing the achievement gap between low-income and minority students and their more advantaged peers" (Martin, 2002, p. 149). School counselors are now being given the charge to not only lead schools in systemic change (McMahon, Mason, & Paisley, 2009) but also to be advocates and leaders of social justice (Curry & DeVoss, 2009). Amatea and West-Olatunji (2007) call for school counselors to become leaders in high-poverty schools to advocate for low-socioeconomic status students and their families as well as educate staff on reaching this demographic of children. School counselors that are not seen as a leader of reform and an integral part of the education team can negate the attempt a school makes in meeting higher academic standards due to an isolation from decisions being made and programs being implemented (R. House & R. Martin, 1998).

Janson, Stone, and Clark (2009) present a distributed leadership concept for school counselors. They go on to state:

Instead of imposing an individualistic view that the provision of leadership should merely be shifted from principals to other school professionals such as school counselors, distributed leadership offers a perspective in which leadership is stretched across numerous school staff including counselors, thus expanding its potential impact on students while also serving to build a stronger sense of school community. When leadership is distributed among multiple leaders, their collective strengths and talents are better utilized.

Upon reviewing the literature, a positive correlation was found between effective school counselors and increased school and student success, however, there was disparity among the role of the school counselor and the principal's expectations of the role of the school counselor. "Role definition can be conceptualized as the identity of counselors within a school, how they spend their time, and the programs they implement" (Elysia V. Clemens et al., 2009). In order that principals might have a stronger understanding of the school counselor's role, the school counselor must be an advocate for themselves in how they should spend their time and how they can positively contribute to student and school success by demonstrating shared leadership (Fitch, Newby, & Marshall, 2001; Wade C. Leuwerke, Walker, & Qi, 2009; C.P. Zalaquett, 2005). In the absence of true understanding of the school counselor's role, a principal will begin to assign duties in the best way they know. A lack of additional administrative personnel and the overwhelming responsibilities of a school principal can lend itself to the expectation that the school counselor field a more administrative type role than a counseling role (Bemak, 2009; Wade C. Leuwerke et al., 2009). This assigning of non-counselor type responsibilities comes from a lack of understanding by the building principal as to the real role of the school counselor (Dollarhide, Smith, & Lemberger, 2007; Wade C. Leuwerke et al., 2009). Counselors also have access to differing forms of data and information concerning students which places them in a key position to help generate and maintain school reform and systemic change that can benefit all students (R. House & R. Martin, 1998; Christopher Janson et al., 2008; Stone & Clark, 2001; Stone & Dahir, 2006). While counselors have the potential to be

47

effective leaders and change agents in their school, it is imperative that the counselor have a positive and supportive relationship with their principal so that the counseling program can be successful (Wade C. Leuwerke et al., 2009). A critical component of the school counselor's ability to participate in shared leadership in their school is the relationship that the school counselor has with the building principal. A shared vision by the principal and counselor along with a positive working relationship can produce positive effects for students. School counselors have an opportunity to positively impact student learning and success as an advocate for all students regardless of race or socio-economic status (Curry & DeVoss, 2009; House & Hayes, 2002; Sheely & Bratton, 2010; Stone & Clark, 2001)

Future and Current Training of School Counselors

Even as these studies show that it is beneficial for school counselors to emerge as school leaders, it is also apparent that there needs to be a shift in the training of school counselors as well as better defined roles for school counselors. School counselors occasionally feel ill-prepared to provide leadership in their schools as this may not have been a component of their professional training (C. Janson et al., 2009; McMahon et al., 2009). Janson, Stone, & Clark (2009) cite several research articles that conclude while school counselors are positioned to take on the role as school leaders, they are not currently serving their school in this capacity. According to the American School Counselor Association, as cited by Janson, Militello, & Kosine (2008, p. 353) "in order to respond to the pressure to advance student achievement, it has been

suggested that professional school counseling needs to shift to explicitly include the functions of leadership, advocacy, and systemic change."

There are several ways in which school counselors can use their skills and training to position themselves as leaders within their school building and district. One natural avenue for participating in leadership while helping to build knowledge and sustainability in their school would be through professional development (C. Janson et al., 2009). Janson and his colleagues (2009) state that, "…developing and conducting in-service training with other school leaders for teachers and parents in crucial areas such as educational planning, academic motivation, student appraisal and achievement, identification of and interventions for special needs students, and issues of student diversity and related attitudes" can allow school counselors to begin to participate in "distributed leadership" (C. Janson et al., 2009). Janson (2009) goes on to cite other avenues, such as large-group guidance and college readiness and advising, in which school counselors can develop distributed leadership through partnerships and alliances with other members of the school faculty.

Summary

While studies differ in their approach to researching school counselor leadership, whether it be through shared or participatory leadership, collaborative leadership through school counselor and principal relationships, or leadership through relationships and collaboration between the school counselor and the parents/and or community, there appears to be an inherent agreement that school counselors must indeed be leaders. The school counselor is a leader within the educational community

who works with students, teachers, administrators, parents, and other members of the community to build a supportive learning environment that nurtures the development of academic, career, and personal/social competence among students and fosters an appreciation of diversity and a commitment to social justice (Galassi & Akos, 2004, p. 155).

Effective schools today provide a variety of services to students and their families through community schools or through wrap-around services coordinated by the school. The school counselor often takes on the responsibility of coordinating such efforts to meet the needs of at-risk students and their families (Bemak, 2009). School counselors taking the lead in "integrating services" can help to alleviate the redundancy in services as well as help to foster more collaboration among agencies rather than competition which can enhance services to children and their families (Adelman, 2002). School counselors' efforts to coordinate these services can provide leadership in the school and help to close the achievement gap between minority and low-income students as compared to their peers (Bemak, 2009).

The evolution of school counseling over the past 100 plus years, along with the extensive research indicating that school leadership that is distributed or shared is imperative to student success, warrants further study in school counselors' perceptions of their role in the effective leadership of their schools. National research indicates that school counselors are poised on the precipice of displaying strong leadership characteristics that can significantly impact student achievement and school improvement. The ASCA framework posits that counselors should exhibit leadership

traits across all domains of counseling. While there is some research that delves specifically into the leadership of school counselors, there has previously not been an instrument developed to survey such leadership. Not only has this specific instrument previously been lacking but there is no research specific to Oklahoma public schools and school counselors. This quantitative study used the recently developed School Counselor Leadership Survey, an instrument developed specifically to measure the leadership traits of practicing school counselors, and focused on a recruited sample of practicing Oklahoma school counselors to contribute to this specific gap in the research. Information gleaned from this study should inform Oklahoma school counselor preparation programs, state education agencies and district administration of the training and professional learning needs of practicing Oklahoma school counselors.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

School leadership is evolving from traditional, singular leadership to that of shared or distributed leadership (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Mujis & Harris, 2003; Spillane, 2006). Principals can effectively lead by providing guidance and direction to other members of the school team to best utilize their unique skills to meet the varied needs of students (Elmore, 2000). One group that possesses a multitude of skills are school counselors. Effective school counselors can be viewed as the "eyes and ears" of schools, due to their relationships with teachers, parents, students, and the community (House & Hayes, 2002). In acknowledging the range of impact school counselors can potentially have regarding school improvement and student achievement, this study will investigate Oklahoma school counselors perceived leadership role and will seek to understand if there is a difference in perceived leadership among school counselors based on various demographic characteristics and/or school organizational characteristics.

Understanding the leadership role that school counselors assume is important for various reasons. Looking at effective school leadership through the lens of shared or distributed leadership encourages researchers and practicioners to look at all school stakeholders and how they contribute to the leadership of the school for effective student improvement. This study can inform university school counselor preparation

programs and guide in the development of professional development for practicing school counselors in the necessary areas of leadership.

Research Questions and Predictions

To ascertain the perceptions of school counselor leadership participation and the impact school counselor demographics and school organizational characteristics may have on these perceptions, the following three research questions and hypotheses guided this study:

1. To what extent do Oklahoma School Counselors perceive their participation in school leadership?

2. Are school counselor individual counselor demographic characteristics related to their perceived leadership practices?

3. Are school organizational characteristics related to their respective counselor perceived leadership practices?

Null hypothesis 2: Individual school counselor demographics are not related to school counselors' perceived leadership practices.

Alternate hypothesis 2: Individual school counselor demographics are related to school counselors' perceived leadership practices.

Null hypothesis 3: School organizational characteristics are not related to school counselors' perceived leadership practices.

Alternate hypothesis 3: School organizational characteristics are related to school counselors' perceived leadership practices.

Research Design

The research design utilized for this study was a quantitative survey method examining school counselors perceived participation in the leadership of their school. The study used a simple descriptive research design utilizing the School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) as the tool. This survey instrument consists of 32-items rated on a 7-point Likert scale; 1-never; 2-rarely; 3-occasionally; 4-sometimes; 5-fairly often; 6-very often; 7-always. The SCLS, developed by Dr. Anita Young and Dr. Julia Bryan (2015), rates five key dimensions of school counselor leadership: (a) interpersonal influence, (b) systemic collaboration, (c) resourceful problem solving, (d) professional efficacy, and (e) social justice advocacy. The use of this instrument provided the researcher the opportunity to survey school counselors in Oklahoma and infer what Oklahoma school counselors perceived as their participation in the leadership of their school. Information gleaned from this study can inform universities that train future school counselors as well as inform the professional development needs for practicing school counselors.

Participants

Participants of the study were recruited school counselors in the State of Oklahoma. Participant contact information was extracted from the database of Oklahoma public school personnel found on the Oklahoma State Department of Education's website. There were 2,575 personnel designated as a school counselor in this State Directory, which is an open public record. Potential participants represented

elementary, middle school, and high school counselors in rural, urban, and suburban areas.

The researcher is employed by the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) as the Executive Director of School Support and School Improvement and formerly as the Executive Director of Counseling. To address coercion concerns, the email requesting school counselor participation was sent by the author from an email account not associated with the OSDE nor did the researcher add her job title. The recruitment email clearly explained that the willingness to participate was strictly optional.

Instrumentation

The School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) developed by Dr. Anita Young and Dr. Julia Bryan (2015) was used to attempt to answer the three research questions posed in this study. According to Young and Bryan, "leadership is central for transformative visions focused on improved, productive student outcomes" (2015, p. 2) and "The SCLS is intended to provide researchers and school counselors with information about specific school counselor leadership practices" (2015, p. 5). The SCLS was originally a 39-item survey based on a 7-point Likert scale. After factor analysis, 32-items were retained for the final survey instrument as "the exploratory factor analysis of the instrument indicated a five-factor structure that revealed five key dimensions of school counselor leadership: interpersonal influence, systemic collaboration, resourceful problem solving, professional efficacy, and social justice advocacy" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 1).

Interpersonal Influence "captured participants' perceptions about practices that influence their colleagues to promote the instructional vision and share innovative idea. It also focused on motivating others and promoting positive change through building relationships" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 6). Nine items on the SCLS correspond to this dimension. Systemic Collaboration "reflected the participants' self-reported practices about how they actively work with stakeholders to initiate new programs that have a systemic impact" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 6). Six items on the SCLS correspond to this dimension. The third dimension is Resourceful Problem Solving which "assessed the school counselors' and supervisors' perceptions about how they search for innovative methods to advocate for positive change, promote student achievement, and solve problems to accomplish goals. …it also captured school counselors' and school counseling supervisors' perceived ability to secure resources to promote change, to exceed expectations, and to remain goal oriented" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p.6). There are four items in the SCLS that correspond to this dimension. Four items correspond to the fourth dimension of the SCLS, Professional Efficacy, which is described as, school counselors' belief in their ability to lead (Young & Bryan, 2015). The fifth and final dimension, Social Justice Advocacy, has three items that correspond with it on the SCLS. It is described as "participants' perception of their practice of challenging the status quo to advocate for all students" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 6).

Young and Bryan discuss the development of the School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) and its exploratory factor analysis in their article published in the Professional School Counseling Journal (2015). According to the article, the SCLS

underwent a threefold process to develop the final items on the SCLS as well as determine validity and reliability.

Study 1 consisted of the authors developing an initial list of items following a large-scale review of the literature as well as facilitation of three focus groups. School counselor leadership, education leadership, and survey development comprised the topics reviewed. The three focus groups included practicing school counselors as well as graduate students pursuing a degree in school counseling. Seventeen graduate students who were enrolled in a field experience course as well as a school counseling leadership and consultation course were randomly assigned to one of two focus groups. After being asked to "brainstorm behavioral characteristics and practices you believe are necessary for school counselor leadership practices" (Young & Brian, 2015, p.4), students engaged in conversation that was facilitated by Dr. Young and two counselor educators which resulted in 132 items. The third focus group met on a separate occasion and was comprised of ten practicing school counselors with representation from elementary, middle, and high school, as well as a district level school counseling supervisor. An additional 79 items were generated from this focus group resulting in a total of 211 items. A concept mapping process was used to triangulate the 211 items to select the items used on the final survey which resulted in 43 items that were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = occasionally, 4 = sometimes, 5 = fairly often, 6 = very often, 7 = always).

The 43-item survey was administered in Study 2 and then were analyzed using a "factor analysis to reduce the number of items" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 3). Two

convenience samples were used when the surveys were administered on 2 separate

occasions at a professional development training, one in a Midwest school district and

one at large suburban district on the east coast. This resulted in a total of 151

participants completing the survey. The participants were comprised of school

counselors at all Pre-K - 12 levels; 45 elementary school counselors, 38 middle school

counselors, 64 high school counselors, and 4 school counselors that did not identify

which grade level they worked. After conducting both principal component analysis and

principal factor analysis, the authors retained the following five factors from the pilot

study:

Table 1

SCLS Factor Findings

Factor	Number of Items	Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha
Interpersonal Influence	13 items	.82 to .44	.91
Systemic Collaboration	9 items	.78 to .36	.85
Resourceful Problem Solving	10 items	-.78 to -.35	.87
Professional Efficacy	7 items	.80 to .45	.73
Social Justice Advocacy	4 items	.77 to .51	.57

After field testing the SCLS, items were further refined to improve content

validity by using a panel of two counselor education experts and five school

counselors who were tasked with examining the scale items for content validity,

clarity, and relevancy which resulted in the elimination of 4 items, trimming the

SCLS items to 39 which were used in further validation study.

In Study 3, the 39-item SCLS was administered to school counselors and counseling supervisors who were members of the American School Counseling Association to conduct an exploratory validation study. A total of 1,577 school counselors completed the survey after receiving an email asking them to do so. The authors of the SCLS then split the 1,577 completed surveys into two samples using computer-generated random assignments, with one of the samples to be used in the validation study and the other reserved for later confirmatory factor analysis. The sample used in the validation study yielded 801 participants comprised of 24.7% elementary school counselors, 13.0% middle school counselors, 27.2% high school counselors, 6.7% multi-level school counselors, 5.9% school counseling supervisors, and 22.5% who did not indicate their school setting. In order to determine the number of factors to be retained, the authors used three criteria: Kaiser's criterion, Catell's scree test, and the comprehensibility of the factor solution. "The reliability or internal consistence of each factor scale was determined by computing the coefficient alpha (i.e. Cronbach's alpha) for items retained on the scale" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 5). One-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to compare the means of elementary, middle, and high school counselors, as well as those who did not identify a grade level, multi-grade level and school counseling supervisors on each of the leadership traits as well as ANOVAs to compare elementary, middle and high school counselors alone. To examine the differences between leadership factors by school location, additional one-way ANOVAs were conducted. The combination of these three studies concluded that "the Likert items were reliable and an effective measure for

school counselors and school counseling supervisors leadership practices" (Young, Dollarhide, & Baughman, 2015, p. 38).

Along with the 32 Likert Scale items, there is one open ended question in the SCLS; "List two characteristics that you believe are essential for school counselor leaders" (Young, Dollarhide, & Baughman, 2015, p. 38). After qualitative analysis of the responses, the researchers determined there were five major themes that emerged; Leadership Attributes, Relationship Attributes, Communication and Collaboration, Exemplary Program Design, and Advocacy (Young, Dollarhide, & Baughman, 2015, p.40). The researchers used NVivo and hand coding in a six-step qualitative analysis using phenomenological concept mapping (Young, Dollarhide, & Baughman, 2015). According to Young, Dollarhide, & Baughman, "The findings of this study not only confirm existing characteristics and behaviors of the school counselor literature, but the large data set also contributes to the uniqueness of the participants" (p. 42). The rigorous process the SCLS underwent by the authors demonstrates it is both a reliable and valid instrument to determine the perceived leadership traits of counselors and an ideal survey instrument for this study.

Procedures

Upon IRB approval, Oklahoma school counselors that appeared in the Oklahoma State Department of Education's open personnel record information received an email from the researcher explaining the purpose of the study and requesting that he/she participate in the study (Appendix A). A link to the survey was provided. If the school counselor elected to participate in the study, they used the link and were directed

to the survey instrument in Qualtrics. The first page of the survey was an online consent form (Appendix B), further explaining the study and asking their permission to participate. If they chose yes, they were directed to the online format of the School Counselor Leadership Survey (Appendix C). Permission to use the SCLS as the survey instrument was provided in writing by the first author (Appendix D). Additionally, the first author, Dr. Anita Young, provided permission to adjust the demographic numbers on the SCLS in the areas of approximate number of students enrolled in your district and how many school counselors are in your district, to more adequately reflect the demographical information in Oklahoma, where the study was situated (Appendix E).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data was collected online via Qualtrics and will be stored for one year following the analysis of data and completion of the dissertation. The researcher attempted to minimize response bias (Cresswell, J., 2009) by sending every potential participant the same email (script), by following up with those that were asked to participate by sending weekly reminder emails, and by using the SCLS which has been tested for both reliability and validity.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data collected for research question 1 to describe the basic features of the data, present the data in a manageable form, and to simplify the large amount of data in a manageable way (Trochim, 2006). Because there are five dimensions in the School Counselor Leadership Survey (Young & Bryan, 2015), it is important to have clear definitions and understandings of those due to the use of descriptive statistics (Babbie, 2004). So that the data was not distorted nor was there a

loss of important detail, there was not just a single indicator reported to describe the data set (Trochim, 2006). Tables are provided to describe the data sets in multiple ways. Data was analyzed using SPSS to report the findings of the mean, standard deviation, and frequency. Data from all participants were reported in all the five dimensions.

To enable the researcher to determine the simultaneous or collinearity relationships among several dependent and independent variables, multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was used to analyze data collected from research questions 2 and 3 (Babbie, 2004). Use of this method allowed the researcher to not only understand the overall effect the independent variables could have on the five dimensions of school counselor leadership, but also understand the relative contribution of each of the independent variables in explaining the variance in a collinearity format. Although the dependent variable is measured on a 7-point Likert Scale, they were continuous as a composite score was used for each of the five dimensions. Therefore, a MANOVA was used and analyzed in SPSS. Each of the school counselor demographic variables and school organizational variables were correlated to each of the five dimensions of the SCLS (Young & Bryan, 2015).

For research question 2 and 3, there are five continuous dependent variables; Interpersonal Influence, Systemic Collaboration, Resourceful Problem Solving, Professional Efficacy, and Social Justice Advocacy. Each of these have 7 categories: 1 - Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Occasionally, 4-Sometimes, 5-Fairly Often, 6-Very Often, and 7- Always. For research question 2, there are seven independent variables; gender, highest education level, race/ethnicity, currently employed as a school counselor or school

counselor supervisor, years' experience, prior teaching experience, and counseling training area. Research question 3 had six dependent variables; school setting, level of counseling, type of school, number of students enrolled in the district, number of counselors employed by the district, and whether there as a designated school counselor supervisor employed by the respondents' district.

Following analysis, the researcher provided an interpretation of the results by reporting on statistical significance within the MANOVA analysis, how results supported or contradicted what was expected, a possible explanation of the results, and the implications for practice and future research (Cresswell, J., 2009). The one open ended question responses will be retained for future study.

Summary

This quantitative study used the School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS), a 32-item survey with a 7-point Likert scale, to explore the following research questions: To what extent do Oklahoma School Counselors perceive their participation in school leadership? Are school counselor individual counselor demographic characteristics related to their perceived leadership practices? Are school organizational characteristics related to their respective counselor perceived leadership practices? Data was collected online for one month using Qualtrics. Participants were recruited school counselors whose information was found on the Oklahoma State Department of Education's website in their open personnel record data. A recruitment email explaining the study was sent with directions to the survey if a subject chose to participate. Online consent was gained prior to the redirection to the online survey.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which Oklahoma school counselors perceive their participation in school leadership and to analyze the effect individual school counselor demographics and school organizational characteristics may have on those perceptions. The previous three chapters provide background information, an overview of existing literature as it relates to the research questions, and the methodology used for this study. Chapter 4 includes an overview of descriptive statistics along with the results of the multiple regression tests as they relate to the research questions.

The School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) was used to collect data. The instrument includes 43 items measured on a 7-point Likert scale:

1	Never
2	Rarely
3	Occasionally
4	Sometimes
5	Fairly Often
6	Very Often
7	Always

The SCLS measures 5-dimensions of school counselor leadership: Systemic Collaboration, Resourceful Problem Solving, Professional Efficacy, Social Justice Advocacy, and Interpersonal Influence.

Descriptive Statistics

There were 537 counselors that logged into the survey with 399 participants answering all questions. The following demographic and school organizational information was asked of participants: gender, highest level of education, race/ethnicity, school setting, if the counselor currently works in a school counselor position, level of counseling, years' experience, student enrollment size, number of school counselors in district, whether or not the participant had teaching experience prior to becoming a school counselor, whether there was a designated school counselor leader in the participant's district, and the area in which counseling training occurred.

The frequencies and percentages of the counselor demographic information are presented in Table 2. Most of the respondents were female (373, 93.5%) with the majority earning a masters' degree (372, 93.2%). The respondents' race/ethnicity was primarily White/European (331, 83.0%), while 45 (11.3%), identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native. Almost all the respondents (395, 99.0%) were currently working in a school counseling or school counseling supervisory position while only 4 (1.00%) were not. These numbers well represent the population of school counselors in Oklahoma. There was a fairly even distribution of years' experience among those that responded to the survey with the highest number, 84 (21.1%) having 6-10 years and the lowest number, 45 (11.3%), having 20+ years' experience. Of the 399 total responses, 281 (70.4%), had teaching experience prior to becoming a school counselor. There were an overwhelming number of responders, 279 (69.9%), that received their training in school counseling as opposed to mental health (87, 21.8%) or social work (19, 4.8%).

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of School Counselor Demographical Data

Counselor Demographic	n	%
Gender		
Male	26	6.5
Female	373	93.5
TOTAL	399	100
Education		
Masters	372	93.2
Specialists	7	1.8
Doctorate	13	3.3
Other	7	1.8
TOTAL	399	100
Race/Ethnicity		
White/European	331	83
Hispanic/Latino	3	0.8
Black or African American	10	2.5
American Indian or Alaskan Native	45	11.3
Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander	6	1.5
Did not wish to respond	4	1
TOTAL	399	100
Currently Work as a School Counselor or School Counselor Supervisor		
Yes	395	99
No	4	1
TOTAL	399	100
Years' Experience		
0-2	58	14.5
3-5	83	20.8
6-10	84	21.1
11-15	76	19
16-20	53	13.3
20+	45	11.3

TOTAL	399	100
Teaching Experience Prior to Counseling		
Yes	281	70.4
No	118	29.6
TOTAL	399	100
Counseling Training Area		
Educational School Counseling	279	69.9
Mental Health Counseling	87	21.8
Social Work	19	4.8
Other	14	3.5
TOTAL	399	100

The frequencies and percentages of the school organizational demographic information are presented in Table 3. There was a fairly even distribution of school settings represented by the respondents with 90 (22.6%) urban, 139 (34.8%) suburban, and 170 (42.6%) rural. The largest number of respondent school counselors work in an elementary school setting, 147 (36.8%), with the fewest, 1 (0.3%), working in a school based counselor supervisory role. Almost all, 395 of 399, work in a public-school setting with the remaining 4 working in a charter school. The number of students enrolled in the districts in which the responding counselors worked were most evenly distributed among 1,000-4,999 students, 106 (26.6%) and >15,000 students, 92 (23.1%), with the fewest responders working with less than 199 students district wide, 13 (3.3%). Most counselors worked with 1-5 counselors district wide (164, 41.1%), while the remaining categories were more evenly dispersed with the next highest representation being 11-20 counselors district wide (67, 16.8%) and the lowest working with >100

counselors district wide (16, 4.0%). There was a surprisingly even distribution of those

respondents who indicated there was a designated school counselor leader in their

district, 189 (47.4%), as opposed to those who responded there was no designated

school leader in their district, 210 (52.6%).

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages of School Organizational Demographic Data

School Organization Demographic Information	n	%
School Setting		
Urban	90	22.6
Suburban	139	34.8
Rural	170	42.6
TOTAL	399	100
Grade Level		
Elementary School	147	36.8
Middle School	68	17
K-8 School	10	2.5
High School	123	30.8
Alternative School	12	3
School Based Counselor Supervisor	1	0.3
District School Counselor Supervisor	16	4
Other	22	5.5
TOTAL	399	100
Type of School Setting		
Public	395	99
Charter	4	1
TOTAL	399	100

Number of Students Enrolled in District

<199	13	3.3
200-499	58	14.5
500-999	65	16.3
1,000-4,999	106	26.6
5,000-9,999	43	10.8
10,000-14,999	22	5.5
>15,000	92	23.1
TOTAL	399	100

Number of Counselors in District

1-5	164	41.1
6-10	43	10.8
11-20	67	16.8
21-39	45	11.3
40-59	44	11
60-99	20	5
>100	16	4
TOTAL	399	100

Designated School Counselor Leader in District

Yes	189	47.4
No	210	52.6
TOTAL	399	100

Research Question One

Research question one asked to what extent do Oklahoma School Counselors perceive their participation in school leadership? The SCLS, developed by Dr. Anita Young and Dr. Julia Bryan "… is intended to provide researchers and school counselors with information about specific school counselor leadership practices" (2015, p. 5). The SCLS indicated a five-factor structure that revealed five key dimensions of school counselor leadership: (a) interpersonal influence, (b) systemic collaboration, (c)

resourceful problem solving, (d) professional efficacy, and (e) social justice advocacy"

(Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 1). Table 4 provides descriptive data of the number of

respondents, the minimum score, the maximum score, the mean and the standard error

in each of the 5 leadership dimensions as measured by the SCLS.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of 5 Leadership Dimensions

Domain	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Error
Systemic Collaboration	399	1.00	7.00	4.66	.326
Resourceful Problem Solving	399	1.00	7.00	5.62	.230
Professional Efficacy	399	1.00	7.00	5.90	.296
Social Justice Advocacy	399	1.00	7.00	5.90	.28
Interpersonal Influence	399	1.00	7.00	5.79	.225

Systemic collaboration (SysColl) is defined as school counselors fostering

relationships with other stakeholders to persuade buy-in for and implementation of new

school counseling programs and initiatives (Young & Bryan, 2015). Table 5 provides an

overview of the descriptive statistics for this domain as well as the 6 Likert scaled items

that make up this domain. A total of 399 responded to all six questions. The mean score

for Systemic Collaboration was 4.94 with a Standard Deviation of 1.01. Statement 6

(SysColl_6), which stated, "I work collaboratively with stakeholders to accomplish

goals" had the highest mean score for that dimension at 5.56 with a standard deviation

of 1.18. The systemic collaboration statement with the lowest mean score was item one

(SysColl_1), "I initiate new programs and interventions in my school/district." The mean score was 4.24 with a standard deviation of 1.50.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Systemic Collaboration Dimension

Systemic Collaboration	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
SysColl_1	399	1	7	4.24	1.50	2.25
SysColl_2	399	1	7	4.34	1.66	2.76
SysColl_3	399	1	7	4.84	1.51	2.29
SysColl_4	399	1	7	5.26	1.19	1.42
SysColl_5	399	1	7	5.40	1.19	1.42
SysColl_6	399	1	7	5.56	1.18	1.39
SysColl	399	1.00	7.00	4.94	1.01	1.01

Resourceful Problem Solving (ResProbSolv) "reflects the multidimensional skills and understanding proposed in distributed leadership" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 11). Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics of this domain which included 399 respondents. The mean score was 5.61 with a standard deviation of .70. Resourceful Problem Solving item six (ResProbSolv_6), "I am goal oriented." had the highest mean score in this domain with a 6.18 and a standard deviation of .89. Conversely, item four (ResProbSolv_4), "I read current school counseling research to help promote positive change for students", had a mean of 5.00 and a standard deviation of 1.32.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Resourceful Problem Solving Dimension

Resourceful Problem Solving	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
ResProbSolv_1	399	1	7	5.70	.95	.90
ResProbSolv_2	399	1	7	5.45	1.18	1.39
ResProbSolv_3	399	1	7	5.92	.91	.83
ResProbSolv_4	399	1	7	5.00	1.32	1.74
ResProbSolv_5	399	1	7	5.24	1.22	1.51
ResProbSolv_6	399	1	7	6.18	.89	.79
ResProbSolv_7	399	1	7	5.85	.94	.88
ResProbSolv_8	399	1	7	5.40	1.18	1.39
ResProbSolv_9	399	1	7	5.76	1.01	1.02
ResProbSolv	399	1.00	7.00	5.61	.70	.49

The Professional Efficacy domain, which includes four questions, is described as a professionals' confidence and self-efficacy which is an important leadership trait necessary for school counselors to help transform vision and goals into actions and outcomes (Young & Bryan, 2015). Table 7 provides descriptive data for this domain and the four items that comprise Professional Efficacy. The overall mean score for Professional Efficacy (ProfEffi) was 5.70 with a standard deviation of .90. The individual means on the four items that made up this domain were very similar, with the highest being item three (ProfEffi_3), which had a mean of 5.93 and a standard deviation of 1.12. Item three stated, "I consider myself a leader." Item two (ProfEffi_2), "I am a change agent," was the lowest with a 5.44 mean and a 1.22 standard deviation.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of Professional Efficacy Dimension

Professional Efficacy	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
ProfEffi_1	399	1	7	5.71	1.17	1.38
ProfEffi_2	399	1	7	5.44	1.22	1.49
ProfEffi_3	399	1	7	5.93	1.12	1.25
ProfEffi_4	399	1	7	5.74	1.04	1.10
ProfEffi	399	1.00	7.00	5.70	.90	.82

The dimension of Social Justice Advocacy (SocJustAdv) is couched in "promoting academic achievement, identifying social-emotional barriers, developing school-family partnerships, and increasing college and career readiness to seek socially just outcomes and challenge inequitable patterns facing students, schools, and districts" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 11). Descriptive statistical data of this domain can be found in Table 8. Three items made up this dimension which overall had a mean score of 5.84 with a standard deviation of .87. "I ask for help when needed to advocate on behalf of students and parents", item one (SocJustAdv_1) had the highest mean score in this domain, 6.07, with a standard deviation of 1.07. The other two items, were similar in mean with item two (SocJustAdv_2), "I respond to social justice inequities that may affect the future of students' academic achievement", having a mean of 5.83 and standard deviation of 1.08, while item three (SocJustAdv_3) had a mean of 5.63 and a standard deviation of 1.15 and stated, "I challenge status quo to advocate for all students."

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics of Social Justice Advocacy Dimension

Social Justice Advocacy	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
SocJustAdv_1	399	1	7	5.71	1.17	1.38
SocJustAdv_2	399	1	7	5.44	1.22	1.49
SocJustAdv_3	399	1	7	5.93	1.12	1.25
SocJustAdv	399	1.00	7.00	5.70	.90	.82

The fifth domain, Interpersonal Influence (InterInflu), "allows school counselors to build relationships effectively with key leaders and stakeholders in the school and to understand the influence of the school culture" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 10). Table 9 shows that a total of 399 respondents answered all nine items that make up this domain and had an overall mean of 5.91 and a standard deviation of .69. Means were high on the items that comprised this domain with item five (InterInflu_5) having a mean of 6.38 and a standard deviation of .81. This item stated, "I maintain high expectations for all students." Item 9 (InterInflu_9) which stated, "I navigate through the politics of the school" was lowest with a mean of 5.48 and a standard deviation of 1.16.

74

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics of Interpersonal Influence Dimension

Interpersonal Influence	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
InterInflu_1	399	1	7	5.70	1.30	1.70
InterInflu_2	399	1	7	5.64	1.15	1.34
InterInflu_3	399	1	7	5.77	1.05	1.11
InterInflu_4	399	1	7	6.23	.87	.76
InterInflu_5	399	1	7	6.38	.81	.66
InterInflu_6	399	1	7	6.09	.89	.80
InterInflu_7	399	1	7	5.66	1.01	1.03
InterInflu_8	399	1	7	6.30	.81	.67
InterInflu_9	399	1	7	5.48	1.16	1.35
InterInflu	399	1.00	7.00	5.91	.69	.48

Research Questions Two and Three

Research question two asked, "Are school counselor individual counselor demographic characteristics related to their perceived leadership practices?" School counselor perceived leadership, as measured by the five dimensions of the SCLS, was the dependent variable. There were seven independent variables: gender, highest education level, race/ethnicity, currently working as a school counselor or school counselor supervisor, years' experience, prior teaching experience, and counseling training area. Following are the hypotheses for research question two:

Null Hypothesis 2: Individual school counselor demographics are not related to their perceived leadership practices.

Alternative Hypothesis 2: Individual school counselor demographics are related to their perceived leadership practices.

Research question three asked, "Are school organizational characteristics related to their respective counselor perceived leadership practices?" Question three had the same dependent variables as question two, the five dimensions of the SCLS. There were six independent variables: school setting, level of counseling, type of school, number of students enrolled in the district, number of counselors employed by the district, and whether there was a designated school counselor supervisor employed by the respondent's district. Following are the hypotheses for research question three:

Null Hypothesis 3: School organizational characteristics are not related to school counselor's perceived leadership practices.

Alternative Hypothesis 3: School organizational characteristics are related to school counselor's perceived leadership practices.

To control for collinearity among the dependent variables, multivariate analysis (MANONVA) was used to analyze the data for research question two and three. Tables 10 and 11 illustrate the results of the MANOVA for research questions 2 and 3, respectively. The results of the analyses indicate the only statistically significant relationship was between gender and systemic collaboration (F=7.65, Sig. = .006, η^2=0.020). The resultant effect size of η^2=0.020 was small (Cohen, 1975). Systemic collaboration is defined by Young and Bryan (2015) as actively working with stakeholders to initiate new programs that have a systemic impact. While there were 373 female respondents (93.5%) there were only 26 male respondents (6.5%). Although this can be reasonable because of the large n (Olejnik & Algina, 2003), in consideration of the rest of the results that correlation would be best served in future research goals.

None of the remaining independent variables were significantly related to any of the dependent variables.   Therefore, neither null hypothesis was rejected. Tables 12 and 13 show that all items are significantly correlated to one another.

Bonferroni adjustments were used to reduce the probability of type I error, and the conclusion of maintaining the null was kept (Bland & Altman, 1995). Because of the large number of variables and little assumption, Pillai's Traces was used (Pillai, 1985), yielding all large values, confirming the need to maintain the null. Because there were differences in the n of subgroups, Box's M tests were also conducted. However, since little significance was found it was disregarded (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

Table 10

Test Between Subject Effects for Individual School Counselor Demographic Information.

Source	Dependent Variable	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Gender	SysColl	7.645	.006	.020
	ResProbSolv	1.928	.166	.005
	ProfEffi	2.339	.127	.006
	SocJustAdv	1.908	.168	.005
	InterInflu	2.447	.119	.006
Highest Level of Education	SysColl	1.421	.236	.011
	ResProbSolv	.234	.873	.002
	ProfEffi	.354	.787	.003
	SocJustAdv	.545	.652	.004
	InterInflu	.091	.965	.001
Race/Ethnicity	SysColl	.594	.705	.008
	ResProbSolv	1.383	.230	.018
	ProfEffi	.954	.446	.012
	SocJustAdv	.674	.643	.009
	InterInflu	1.704	.133	.022
Currently work as a School Counselor or School Counselor Supervisor	SysColl	.114	.735	.000
	ResProbSolv	.008	.929	.000
	ProfEffi	.175	.676	.000
	SocJustAdv	.212	.645	.001
	InterInflu	.095	.758	.000
Years Experience	SysColl	1.253	.284	.016
	ResProbSolv	.542	.745	.007
	ProfEffi	1.269	.276	.016
	SocJustAdv	1.651	.146	.021
	InterInflu	.670	.646	.009
Prior Teaching Experience	SysColl	.240	.625	.001
	ResProbSolv	1.835	.176	.005
	ProfEffi	.728	.394	.002
	SocJustAdv	1.290	.257	.003
	InterInflu	.015	.902	.000
Training Area	SysColl	.457	.712	.004
	ResProbSolv	.532	.661	.004
	ProfEffi	1.418	.237	.011
	SocJustAdv	2.271	.080	.018
	InterInflu	1.525	.207	.012

Table 11

Test Between Subject Effects for Individual School Counselor Demographic
Information.

Source	Dependent Variable	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
School Setting	SysColl	1.451	.236	.008
	ResProbSolv	.323	.724	.002
	ProfEffi	1.898	.151	.010
	SocJustAdv	.900	.407	.005
	InterInflu	1.087	.338	.006
Level of Counseling	SysColl	1.554	.148	.028
	ResProbSolv	1.885	.071	.034
	ProfEffi	1.213	.294	.022
	SocJustAdv	.693	.678	.013
	InterInflu	1.678	.113	.030
Type of School	SysColl	.242	.623	.001
	ResProbSolv	1.606	.206	.004
	ProfEffi	.709	.400	.002
	SocJustAdv	.805	.370	.002
	InterInflu	2.575	.109	.007
Number of Students in District	SysColl	.332	.920	.005
	ResProbSolv	.207	.975	.003
	ProfEffi	.877	.512	.014
	SocJustAdv	.552	.768	.009
	InterInflu	.875	.513	.014
Number of School Counselors in District	SysColl	.703	.647	.011
	ResProbSolv	1.101	.361	.017
	ProfEffi	1.034	.403	.016
	SocJustAdv	1.627	.139	.025
	InterInflu	1.387	.219	.022
Is there a Designated School Counselor Leader	SysColl	.104	.748	.000
	ResProbSolv	1.922	.167	.005
	ProfEffi	.698	.404	.002
	SocJustAdv	1.585	.209	.004
	InterInflu	.763	.383	.002

Table 12
Correlations among Individual Questions of 5 Dimensions.

	SysColl_1	ResProbSolv_1	ResProbSolv_2	SysColl_2	ProfEffi_1	SocJustAdv_1	InterInflu_1	SysColl_3	ResProbSolv_3	ProfEffi_2	ResProbSolv_4	ResProbSolv_5	InterInflu_2	InterInflu_3	InterInflu_4	InterInflu_5	SocJustAdv_2	ResProbSolv_6	ProfEffi_3	InterInflu_6	ResProbSolv_7	ResProbSolv_8	SysColl_4	ProfEffi_4	InterInflu_7	SocJustAdv_3	SysColl_5	InterInflu_8	InterInflu_9	ResProbSolv_9
ResProbSolv_1	.345**																													
ResProbSolv_2	.402**	.402**																												
SysColl_2	.540**	.360**	.342**																											
ProfEffi_1	.136**	.544**	.336**	.470**																										
SocJustAdv_1	.183**	.330**	.361**	.183**	.351**																									
InterInflu_1	.252**	.317**	.315**	.308**	.305**	.422**																								
SysColl_3	.427**	.358**	.396**	.407**	.330**	.290**	.377**																							
ResProbSolv_3	.246**	.410**	.322**	.317**	.438**	.245**	.374**	.289**																						
ProfEffi_2	.418**	.321**	.335**	.430**	.459**	.290**	.388**	.375**	.516**																					
ResProbSolv_4	.293**	.242**	.265**	.213**	.226**	.317**	.251**	.391**	.192**	.334**																				
ResProbSolv_5	.385**	.276**	.355**	.272**	.325**	.375**	.426**	.427**	.303**	.419**	.665**																			
InterInflu_2	.241**	.266**	.257**	.205**	.266**	.313**	.397**	.374**	.310**	.339**	.424**	.518**																		
InterInflu_3	.238**	.360**	.268**	.214**	.403**	.355**	.307**	.301**	.427**	.420**	.396**	.503**	.449**																	
InterInflu_4	.204**	.341**	.363**	.193**	.369**	.408**	.505**	.243**	.410**	.451**	.358**	.404**	.429**	.474**																
InterInflu_5	.214**	.381**	.367**	.221**	.397**	.396**	.474**	.250**	.450**	.373**	.311**	.389**	.429**	.435**	.739**															
SocJustAdv_2	.233**	.335**	.386**	.176**	.371**	.351**	.322**	.327**	.366**	.407**	.255**	.392**	.421**	.395**	.544**	.530**														
ResProbSolv_6	.318**	.401**	.291**	.276**	.454**	.321**	.455**	.334**	.448**	.415**	.346**	.429**	.426**	.432**	.512**	.552**	.505**													
ProfEffi_3	.326**	.429**	.218**	.408**	.705**	.287**	.309**	.334**	.388**	.469**	.271**	.360**	.360**	.398**	.411**	.420**	.349**	.614**												
InterInflu_6	.145**	.316**	.204**	.161**	.337**	.235**	.254**	.167**	.444**	.356**	.227**	.263**	.293**	.339**	.419**	.385**	.276**	.371**	.330**											
ResProbSolv_7	.372**	.511**	.280**	.370**	.526**	.337**	.326**	.313**	.459**	.420**	.335**	.364**	.382**	.388**	.418**	.450**	.381**	.568**	.559**	.481**										
ResProbSolv_8	.260**	.342**	.239**	.242**	.400**	.255**	.221**	.226**	.209**	.292**	.322**	.338**	.318**	.275**	.301**	.310**	.266**	.347**	.419**	.343**	.444**									
SysColl_4	.449**	.327**	.360**	.396**	.425**	.314**	.289**	.495**	.364**	.448**	.411**	.446**	.449**	.413**	.353**	.336**	.370**	.395**	.448**	.231**	.477**	.438**								
ProfEffi_4	.270**	.345**	.347**	.367**	.417**	.350**	.364**	.256**	.454**	.532**	.308**	.377**	.333**	.411**	.471**	.400**	.327**	.377**	.451**	.298**	.412**	.272**	.506**							
InterInflu_7	.325**	.350**	.439**	.311**	.400**	.445**	.422**	.377**	.482**	.557**	.409**	.549**	.460**	.501**	.532**	.486**	.475**	.462**	.424**	.406**	.493**	.319**	.516**	.591**						
SocJustAdv_3	.343**	.366**	.343**	.224**	.412**	.411**	.365**	.345**	.381**	.548**	.412**	.524**	.453**	.433**	.546**	.499**	.562**	.476**	.418**	.285**	.355**	.355**	.486**	.499**	.658**					
SysColl_5	.404**	.485**	.403**	.431**	.485**	.329**	.472**	.478**	.491**	.540**	.350**	.448**	.399**	.373**	.476**	.475**	.410**	.496**	.475**	.335**	.354**	.354**	.530**	.519**	.548**	.615**				
InterInflu_8	.164**	.287**	.231**	.147**	.319**	.361**	.325**	.213**	.359**	.288**	.203**	.266**	.362**	.327**	.313**	.508**	.385**	.410**	.317**	.428**	.406**	.264**	.275**	.366**	.421**	.402**	.320**			
InterInflu_9	.209**	.261**	.312**	.258**	.344**	.256**	.344**	.254**	.427**	.351**	.133**	.248**	.366**	.247**	.467**	.342**	.330**	.343**	.283**	.334**	.402**	.201**	.349**	.359**	.365**	.312**	.412**	.373**		
ResProbSolv_9	.252**	.337**	.371**	.128**	.325**	.366**	.258**	.272**	.362**	.359**	.343**	.430**	.349**	.487**	.313**	.396**	.590**	.435**	.312**	.379**	.423**	.317**	.392**	.331**	.511**	.529**	.379**	.459**	.381**	
SysColl_6	.305**	.261**	.272**	.306**	.275**	.240**	.399**	.607**	.307**	.344**	.311**	.375**	.427**	.375**	.347**	.349**	.370**	.406**	.381**	.198**	.420**	.288**	.410**	.316**	.434**	.435**	.482**	.292**	.407**	.367**

80

Table 13

Correlations among 5 Dimensions.

		SysColl	ResProbSolv	ProfEffi	SocJustAdv	InterInflu
SysColl	Pearson Correlation	1	.71[**]	.67[**]	.54[**]	.61[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
ResProbSolv	Pearson Correlation	.71[**]	1	.71[**]	.72[**]	.79[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
ProfEffi	Pearson Correlation	.67[**]	.718[*]	1	.614[**]	.68[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
SocJustAdv	Pearson Correlation	.54[**]	.72[**]	.61[**]	1	.73[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
InterInflu	Pearson Correlation	.61[**]	.79[**]	.68[**]	.73[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceived leadership practices of

Oklahoma School Counselors and to determine the effect certain individual school

counselor demographics and school organizational traits may have on their perceived

leadership. Chapter four presented the findings of the data analyses. Descriptive

statistics, correlations among variables, and results of multiple regression tests were

used to answer the three research questions presented in this study. The null hypothesis

for both research question two and research question were not rejected. Chapter five

will include an overview of the study, a review of the primary research elements that framed this study, as well as a brief review of the methodology and the results and will conclude with conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future practice and future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Chapter Five includes an overview of the study, a review of the primary research elements that framed this study, as well as a brief review of the methodology and the results. Chapter Five concludes with findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future practice and future research.

Traditional, bureaucratic educational leadership can no longer meet the demands of educational reform (Elmore, 2000). Thus, principals must distribute leadership across individuals in their school, so they can use their areas of expertise to provide diversity for organizational coherence (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Spillane, 2006). School Counselors are poised to take a leadership role in this framework. Therefore, the purpose of this quantitative study was to ascertain the extent to which school counselors in Oklahoma perceive their participation in school leadership and to determine if there was a correlation between school counselors' demographics or school organizational characteristics on those perceptions of leadership practices.

Summary of the Findings

In an effort for the researcher to add to existing literature concerning the perceptions of school counselors' leadership as well as to explore any correlations between school counselors' individual demographics and school organizational characteristics to their perceived leadership practices, the data were used to examine the following three research questions:

1. To what extent do Oklahoma School Counselors perceive their participation in school leadership?

2. Are school counselor individual demographic characteristics related to their perceived leadership practices?

   Null Hypothesis 2: Individual school counselor demographics are not related to their perceived leadership practices.

   Alternative Hypothesis 2: Individual school counselor demographics are related to their perceived leadership practices.

3. Are school organizational characteristics related to their respective counselor perceived leadership practices?

   Null Hypothesis 3: School organizational characteristics are not related to school counselor's perceived leadership practices.

   Alternative Hypothesis 3: School organizational characteristics are related to school counselor's perceived leadership practices.

From the inception of the position of the school counselor, there has been debate over where school counselors fit in the organization of a school and what their role should be, especially in terms of shared leadership within the school organization (Gybsers, 2010; ASCA, 2005; Jackson, et al., 2002; Curry & DeVoss, 2009; House & Hayes, 2002; Janson, Stone, & Clark, 2009). Using the School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) to assist the researcher in answering these questions (Young & Bryan, 2015), the author disseminated the survey to 1,566 school counselors across the state of Oklahoma via email. There were 537 counselors that logged into the survey with 438 to

447 participants answering questions. Once those who responded to less than 100% of the survey questions were removed, 399 surveys remained for analysis. The respondents represented a range of elementary, middle, and high school counselors with varying years of experience and represented urban, suburban, and rural districts with varying amounts of total district student enrollment.

The SCLS is a 32-item survey instrument that reveals "five key dimensions of school counselor leadership: (a) interpersonal influence, (b) systemic collaboration, (c) resourceful problem solving, (d) professional efficacy, and (e) social justice advocacy" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 1). The survey consists of 31 statements in which the respondents rated their behaviors on a 7-poing Likert scale: 1-Never; 2-Rarely; 3-Occasionally; 4-Sometimes; 5-Fairly Often; 6-Very Often; and 7-Always. Item 32 asks respondents to list two characteristics that he/she believes are essential for school counselor leaders. The final part of the survey consists of multiple demographic and school organizational data questions.

The data were analyzed by SPSS version 24.0 for Mac. Descriptive statistics were utilized to look at trends in the variables. Frequencies and percentages were used to analyze individual school counselor demographic data as well as school organizational characteristics. A multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was used to answer research questions 2 and 3.

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA), is the largest, most organized entity for school counselor advocacy in the United States. ASCA's National Model® provides a framework for school counseling programs with the leadership

piece calling for school counselors to serve in leadership positions in their schools to promote systemic change and ensure student success (ASCA, 2005). Specifically, the ASCA states that, when implemented successfully, school counseling leadership:

- Supports academic achievement and student development

- Advances effective delivery of the comprehensive school counseling program

- Promotes professional identity

- Overcomes challenges of role inconsistency (ASCA, 2012, p. 1)

Multiple research studies have been conducted to seek to define the role of the school counselor within a school system as well as define their leadership roles and/or practices (see Jackson, et al, 2002; Curry & DeVoss, 2009; House & Hayes, 2002; Martin, 2002; McMahon, Mason, & Paisley, 2009; Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; House & Martin, 1998). However, research has not been conducted correlating individual school counselor demographic information nor school organizational characteristics to the perceptions of school counselors' leadership practices. Nor has there been a study that focuses on School Counselors in the State of Oklahoma

Research Question 1 Findings

To answer research question one, "To what extent do Oklahoma School Counselors perceive their participation in school leadership?", descriptive statistics were used to provide a composite score and simple summary in each of the five dimensions that measured school counselors' perceptions of their leadership characteristics. It is important to note that the authors of the SCLS (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 10), state that "although this study does not determine what constitutes a high

86

or low score on each leadership dimension, it is possible for a school counselor or supervisor to report higher frequency or involvement on one dimension only, on more than one dimension, or on all five leadership dimensions". Therefore, there is no mean score from these data results that will be categorized as "high" or "low" leadership participation. However, mean scores can be used to determine the perceptions of how frequently School Counselors participate in leadership in their schools.

Overall, results show that school counselors in Oklahoma perceive Interpersonal Influence, the ability to effectively build relationships with key stakeholders and to understand the influence of the school culture (Young & Bryan, 2015), to be their highest perceived dimension of leadership with a 5.93 mean score. Conversely, Systemic Collaboration, the ability of "school counselors to foster relationships and persuade buy-in for the implementation of new school counseling programs and initiatives" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 11), had the lowest mean score with a 4.96, almost a full point lower than Interpersonal Influence.

The means for the remaining three dimensions, Resourceful Problem Solving, Professional Efficacy, and Social Justice Advocacy, were very close to Interpersonal Influence with a 5.62, 5.70, and 5.86, respectively. Considering the Likert-scale employed by the SCLS, 1-never, 2-rarely, 3-occassionally, 4-sometimes, 5-fairly often, 6-very often, and 7-always, the answer to research question 1 is: School counselors in Oklahoma perceive that, on average, they participate in these five dimensions of leadership ranging from sometimes to fairly often, bordering on very often.

Additional descriptive data were provided for each individual statement that made up the composite whole of the dimension. Systemic Collaboration was the lowest rated dimension overall. SysColl 1 and 2 are the lowest with mean scores of 4.24 and 4.31. SysColl_1 which states, "I initiate new programs and interventions in my school/district" and SysColl_2 which says, "I am often chosen to lead school-wide/district initiatives, committees, or councils" (Young & Bryan, 2015), were over a full point lower than SysColl_6 which stated, "I work collaboratively with stakeholders to accomplish goals." Table 14 illustrates all six statements that comprise Systemic Collaboration.

Table 14

Systemic Collaboration Statements

Statement Number	Statement
1	I initiate new programs and interventions in my school/district.
2	I am often chosen to lead school-wide/district initiatives, committees, or councils.
3	I actively work with stakeholders to implement comprehensive school counseling programs.
4	I can be persuasive to gain buy-in for implementation of new school counseling programs.
5	I accomplish goals that have school-wide/district impact.
6	I work collaboratively with stakeholders to accomplish goals.

The next dimension reflects Resourceful Problem Solving, "The multidimensional skills and understanding proposed in distributed leadership" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 11). Resourceful Problem Solving item six (ResProbSolv_6), "I am goal oriented", had the highest mean score in this domain with a 6.20. Conversely, item

four (ResProbSolv_4), "I read current school counseling research to help promote

positive change for students", had a mean of 4.96. Resourceful problem solving

statements 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9, had similar means ranging from 5.23 to 5.93. The

Resourceful Problem Solving statements are found in Table 15.

Table 15

Resourceful Problem Solving Statements

Statement Number	Statement
1	I accomplish goals with certainty and confidence.
2	I find resources to secure what is needed to improve services for all.
3	I solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.
4	I read current school counseling research to help promote positive change for students.
5	I search for innovative ways to improve student achievement.
6	I am goal oriented.
7	I exceed expectations when assigned a task.
8	I am comfortable with change.
9	I know how to recognize social justice inequities.

Four statements comprise the Professional Efficacy dimension, described as a

professionals' confidence and self-efficacy. This is an important leadership trait

necessary for school counselors to help transform vision and goals into actions and

outcomes (Young & Bryan, 2015). The overall mean score for Professional Efficacy

(ProfEffi) was 5.70. The individual means on the four items that made up this domain

were very similar, with the highest being item three (ProfEffi_3), which had a mean of

5.94. Item three stated, "I consider myself a leader." Item two (ProfEffi_2), "I am a

change agent", was the lowest with a 5.43 mean. Table 16 provides the statements that

comprise this dimension.

Table 16

Professional Efficacy Statements

Statement Number	Statement
1	I have confidence in my ability to lead.
2	I am a change agent.
3	I consider myself a leader.
4	I have the power to affect positive change.

Young & Bryan define Social Justice Advocacy as "promoting academic achievement, identifying social-emotional barriers, developing school-family partnerships, and increasing college and career readiness to seek socially just outcomes and challenge inequitable patterns facing students, schools, and districts" (2015, p. 11). Three items made up this dimension which overall had a mean score of 5.86. "I ask for help when needed to advocate on behalf of students and parents", item one (SocJustAdv_1) had the highest mean score in this domain, 6.09. The other two items, were similar in mean with item two (SocJustAdv_2), "I respond to social justice inequities that may affect the future of students' academic achievement", having a mean of 5.87, while item three (SocJustAdv_3) had a mean of 5.65 and stated, "I challenge status quo to advocate for all students." Statements that inform the Social Justice Advocacy dimension are found in Table 17.

Table 17

Social Justice Advocacy Statements

Statement Number	Statement
1	I ask for help when needed to advocate on behalf of students and parents.
2	I respond to social justice inequities that may affect the future of students' academic achievement.
3	I challenge status quo to advocate for all students.

Finally, Interpersonal Influence (InterInflu), "allows school counselors to build relationships effectively with key leaders and stakeholders in the school and to understand the influence of the school culture" (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 10). Means were high on the items that comprised this dimension. Item five (InterInflu_5), "I maintain high expectations for all students." had a mean of 6.39 while item 9 (InterInflu_9), "I navigate through the politics of the school" was lowest with a mean of 5.50. The Interpersonal Influence dimension was made of nine statements that are collectively found in Table 18.

Table 18

Interpersonal Influence Statements

Statement Number	Statement
1	I know and promote my school's instructional vision.
2	I encourage my colleagues to share their new ideas.
3	I am knowledgeable about communication styles.
4	I promote positive change for all students.
5	I maintain high expectations for all students.
6	I remain calm when facing difficult situations.
7	I use creative strategies to foster positive relationships.
8	I use compassion when problem solving.
9	I navigate through the politics of the school.

Research Questions 2 and 3 Findings Summary

Research question two asked, "Are school counselor individual counselor demographic characteristics related to their perceived leadership practices?" The SCLS contained five dimensions of leadership representing the five dependent variables used:

- Systemic Collaboration

- Resourceful Problem Solving

- Professional Efficacy

- Social Justice Advocacy

- Interpersonal Influence

 The seven independent variables were the following individual school counselor demographics:

- Gender

- Highest education level

- Race/ethnicity

- Currently working as a school counselor or school counselor supervisor

- Years' experience

- Prior teaching experience

- Counseling training area

Research question three asked, "Are school organizational characteristics related to their respective counselor perceived leadership practices?" Question three had the same dependent variables as question two, the five dimensions of the SCLS. The six

independent variables for research question 3 were the following school organizational characteristics:

- School setting

- Level of counseling

- Type of school

- Number of students enrolled in the district

- Number of counselors employed by the district

- If there was a designated school counselor supervisor in the respondent's district

For both Research Question 2 and 3, a multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was utilized to analyze the data to control for collinearity among the dependent variables. The results of the analyses indicate the only statistically significant relationship was between gender and systemic collaboration (F=7.765, Sig. = .006, η^2=0.020). None of the remaining independent variables were significantly related to any of the dependent variables. Therefore, despite the one area of significance, the large body hypotheses of insignificance determine that neither null hypothesis should be rejected.

Conclusions

Research Question 1 Conclusions

The findings from Research Question 1 are significant because school counselors are called to participate in and foster shared leadership among all stakeholders to implement successful school counseling programs (Dollarhide, C.T., 2003; House, R.M. & Sears, S.J., 2002; Jackson, et al., 2002; Mason, E.C.M. &

McMahon, H.G., 2009; Sink, C.A., 2009) and to collaboratively lead school transformation at the local, state, regional, and national levels (Curry & DeVoss, 2009; Shillingford, M.A., & Lambie, G.W., 2010). Because the SCLS five leadership dimensions align to the ASCA National Model® emphasis of school counselor leadership through advocacy, use of data, collaboration, and systemic change (ASCA, 2012; Byran & Young, 2015), these results show Oklahoma School Counselors do perceive themselves as participating in leadership activities directly related to the role of counselors sometimes to fairly often, as defined by the 7-point Likert scale.

Studies also show that students' needs are more fully met if leadership is shared and each member of the team uses their unique skills to work collaboratively to meet those needs (see Elmore, 2000; Mujis & Harris, 2003; Hines, 2002; Gronn, 2002, Spillane, 2006). The dimension of Systemic Collaboration speaks to this research. The lower score in this dimension may be a direct result of what previous research has shown, that there is confusion on what the role of the school counselor is and should be (Clemens, Milsom, & Cashwell, 2009; Gybsers, 2010; Leuwerke, Walker, & Shi, 2009; Zalaquett, 2005). Given the difference in mean of Systemic Collaboration to the other dimensions, different perception ratings may be due to statement 6 speaking to what counselors can do or initiate as opposed to being "chosen" to lead initiatives as is stated in SysColl_2 and feeling they have autonomy to start new programs and interventions as stated in SysColl_1. Therefore, it may be difficult for School Counselors in Oklahoma to engage stakeholders to initiate new programs when there is little

understanding of what the School Counselor can provide students and school organizations.

Research Questions 2 and 3 Conclusions

The MANOVA results indicate there was no statistically significant relationship between the five dimensions of leadership from the SCLS to any of the individual school counselor demographics nor any of the school organizational characteristics except gender and systemic collaboration (F=7.765, Sig. = .006, η^2).

The overall results of these data are important and show that school counselors can participate in shared or distributed leadership regardless of the organization of the school or specific individual characteristics. While prior research studies focused on the school counselor and principal relationship being a primary determinant in whether a school counselor participated in leadership (Clemons, Milsom, & Cashwell, 2009; Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008: Jansen, 2008; Leuwerke, Walker, & Shi, 2009), this study focused on demographic characteristics of individuals and schools using a new survey instrument that was "normed on school counselors and is the first known scale designed specifically to measure leadership behaviors and practices of school counselors and school counselor supervisors (Young & Bryan, 2015, p. 8).

<div align="center">

Implications for Policy and Practice

</div>

Implications for Practicing School Administrators and Prep Programs

School administrators should build strong relationships with their counselors and encourage their engagement in leadership in the school. This study demonstrates that school counselors in Oklahoma do perceive themselves as participating in

leadership. Inviting and encouraging more leadership roles could provide more opportunity for School Counselors to use the skills in which they were trained. Administrators should familiarize themselves with the ASCA National Model® so they can clearly define the expectations of the School Counselor and help dispel the uncertainty around the role of the School Counselor.

School administrator programs should provide aspiring administrators a knowledge base in the roles of a School Counselor and specialized training received by School Counselors. This could help facilitate the professional relationship between counselors and principals as well as better define the responsibilities and expectations the principal may have of their School Counselor. This could also help encourage distributed and shared leadership in terms of their counseling team. Administrators, both practicing and aspiring, should be cognizant of the position and role of the School Counselor in stakeholder groups.

Implications for Practicing School Counselors and Prep Programs

School Counselors must advocate for themselves and the roles in which they should participate. Data from this study show that School Counselors have no barriers in terms of individual demographics or school organizational characteristics on their ability to participate in school counselor leadership, therefore, all counselors should be able to advocate for themselves and grow into a leadership role. They should engage in professional growth by reading and staying current with the latest school counselor literature to stay abreast of changes in policy and practice for School Counselors. This

could provide greater self-efficacy resulting in expanded leadership roles for counselors as they are more clearly able to define appropriate duties and responsibilities.

School Counselor preparatory programs should incorporate not just a leadership class, but the infusion of different dimensions of leadership throughout their programs. Providing future school counselors with the tools necessary to engage in leadership activities with confidence could potentially improve job satisfaction, engagement, and longevity in the field through the understanding of the role of the School Counselor, the ways in which they can participate in shared leadership, and how they can advocate for both. This could lead to a systemic change in school counseling with skills such as these being infused into schools with brand new practicing counselors.

Implications for State Departments of Education

The results of these studies and the framework of the SCLS can inform State Departments of Education of the areas of leadership in which professional learning should be provided to practicing school counselors, specifically the role of the counselor in Systemic Collaboration. This could also inform the way in which school counselors could be evaluated for their work, focusing on the defined role of the School Counselor. It could also provide guidance in rewriting School Counselor standards to meet the needs of today's students to include the ASCA's National Model® standards of counselor leadership.

Recommendations for Future Research

While there was strong participation in this study and some insights were gained to inform literature, policy, and practice, there were as many continuing questions asked as answers gleaned. Future research in this area should include:

- Due to statistically significant relationship only found in gender and Systemic Collaboration, along with an uneven distribution of males and females participating in the study, future research could focus on the perception of empowerment of male counselors who have male administrators versus female administrators;

- Conducting qualitative research with a sample population of those who participated in the survey to explore personal relationships and experiences;

- Replicating the study outside the State of Oklahoma to determine if these results mirror or contrast with other states or nationally;

- Replicating the study with principals in Oklahoma to determine the perceptions they have regarding the leadership characteristics of their counselors and where similarities and differences may lie; and,

- Conducting qualitative research to determine the different roles that school counselor supervisors may have and if the varying roles impacts school counselor leadership perceptions.

- Conducting research to correlate school culture and climate with perceived School Counselor leadership characteristics and try to discern if it has an impact on school performance.

Limitations of the Study

Although there was good response to the survey, with a diverse representation of school level counselors, years' experience, and school size, there are limitations to the study. Limitations include the pool of participants were restricted to a single state. Also, the survey was disseminated to only currently practicing School Counselors restricting the voices of retired or aspiring School Counselors or those who have left the profession. Another limitation could be the only method used to gather the data was self-reporting. Howard (1990) contended that the best way to manage imperfections of any measurement is to use "methodological pluralism" (p. 292). However, it's also been determined that self-reported measures can have strong construct validity (Howard, 1994). Another limitation could be those who self-selected to participate in the study were more engaged in their work as a School Counselor and therefore would rate higher on self-perceptions of leadership participation than those less engaged.

Summary

School Counselors in Oklahoma are poised to take a greater role in the shared or distributed leadership in their schools. The ASCA calls for school counselors to engage in leadership activities to positively impact students. Multiple studies call for principals to engage in distributed or shared leadership to better meet the needs of students (see Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002: Mujis & Harris, 2003; and Spillane, 2006). The purpose of

this study was to assess the extent to which Oklahoma school counselors perceive their participation in school leadership and to analyze the effect individual school counselor demographics and school organizational characteristics may have on those perceptions.

The findings indicated that School Counselors in Oklahoma perceive their participation in all 5 dimensions of the SCLS in the range of "sometimes" to "fairly often." The analysis of the data indicated there were no statistically significant barriers to school counselor perceived leadership practices in terms of individual school counselor demographics and school organizational characteristics. This study informs the school counselor leadership literature by addressing the lacunas of a study that is based in Oklahoma, the analyzation of the correlation between demographic and school organizational characteristics to perceived leadership of school counselors, and by using a new survey, the SCLS, that is the first known survey to be normed on School Counselors and designed to specifically measure the leadership behaviors and practices of school counselors and school counselor supervisors.

REFERENCES

Adelman, H. S. (2002). School counselors and school reform: new directions. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 235-248.

Amatea, E. S., & West-Olatunji, C. A. (2007). Joining the conversation about educating our poorest children: Emerging leadership roles for school counselors in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(2), 81-89.

American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2012). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

Babbie, Earl. (2004). *The practice of social research.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bemak, F. (2009). Transforming the role of the counselor to provide leadership in educational reform through collaboration. *Professional School Counseling, 3*(5), 323-336.

Bland, J.M. & Altman, D.G. (1995). Multiple significance tests: the Bonferroni method. *The bmj,* 310(6973), 170.

Bryan, J.A. & Griffin, D. (2010). A multidimensional study of school-family-community partnerships involvement: School, school counselor, and training factors. *Professional School Counseling*, 14(1), 75-86.

Bryan, J. & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2007). An examination of school counselor involvement in school-family-community partnerships. *Professional School Counseling,* 10(5), 441-454.

Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2003). School leadership: Concepts and evidence (Vol. Spring): National College for School Leadership.

Clemens, E. V., Milsom, A., & Cashwell, C. S. (2009). Using leader-member exchange theory to examine principal-school counselor relationships, school counselors' roles, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. [Article]. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 75-85.

Cohen, J. (1973). Eta-squared and partial eta-squared in fixed factor ANOVA designs. *Educational and psychological measurement,* 33(1), 107-112.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences.* Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbabum Associates.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2003). *Applied multiple Regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3 ed.). Mahawah, NJ: Lawrence Elbaum Associates, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. New Delhi, India: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Curry, J. R., & DeVoss, J. A. (2009). Introduction to special issue: The school counselor as leader. [Article]. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 64-67.

Dahir, C. A., & Stone, C. B. (2012). *The transformed school counselor*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Dollarhide, C.T. (2003). School counselors as program leaders: Applying leadership contexts to school counseling. *Professional School Counseling,* 6(5), 2003, 304-308.

Dollarhide, C. T., & Gibson, D. M. (2008). Individual psychology in school counselor leadership: Implications for practice. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 64*(4), 468-479.

Dollarhide, C. T., Gibson, D. M., & A., S. K. (2008). New counselors' leadership efforts in school counseling: Themes from a year-long qualitative study. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(4), 262-271.

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

Donaldson, G.A. *Cultivating leadership in schools* (2nd ed.). (2006). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

DuFour, R., & Marzano, R.J. (2009). High-leverage strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership,* 66(5), 62-68.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. In A. S. Institute (Ed.), (pp. 1-40). Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute

Fitch, T., Newby, E., Ballestero, V., & Marshall, J. L. (2001). Future school administrator's perceptions of the school counselors' role. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*, 89-99.

Galassi, J. P., & Akos, P. (2004). Developmental advocacy: Twenty-first century school counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82*, 146-157.

Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 423-451.

Gysbers, N. C. (2010). *Remembering the past, shaping the future: A history of school counseling*. Alexandria, VA: ASCA.

Hanson, C. & Stone, C. (2002). Recruiting leaders to transform school counseling. *Theory Into Practice,* 41(3), 163-168.

Hines, P. L. (2002). Transforming the rural school counselor. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(3), 192-201.

Hines, P., & Lemon, R. (2011). *Poised to lead: How school counselors can drive college and career readiness.* Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust. Retrieved from https://edtrust.org/resource/poised-to-lead/

House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 249-261.

House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 249-261.

House, R. M., & Martin, P. J. (1998). Advocating for better futures for all students: A new vision for school counselors. *Education, 119*(2), 284-291.

House, R.M., & Sears, S.J. (2002). Preparing school counselors to be leaders and advocates: A critical need in the new millennium. *Theory into practice,* 41(3), 154-162.

Howard, G.S. (1990). On the construct validity of self-reports: What do the data say? *American Psychologist,* 45, 292-294.

Howard, G.S. (1994). Why do people say nasty things about self-reports? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 399-404.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Jackson, C. M., Snow, B., M., Boes, S. R., Phillips, P. L., Stanard, R. P., Painter, L. C., & Wulff, M. B. (2002). Inducting the transformed school counselor into the profession. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(3), 177-185.

Janson, C. (2009). High school counselors' views of their leadership behaviors: A Q methodology study. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 86-97.

Janson, C., Militello, M., & Kosine, N. (2008). Four Views of the Professional School Counselor-Principal Relationship: A Q-Methodology Study. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(6), 353-361.

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

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building Leadership Capacity in Schools* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Leithwood, K.A. (1992). The move toward transformational leaderhip. *Educational Leadership. 49*(5), 8-12.

Leuwerke, W. C., Walker, J., & Shi, Q. (2009). Informing principals: The impact of different types of information on principals' perceptions of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(4), 263-271. doi: 10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.263

Lewis, R. E., & Borunda, R. (2006). Lived stories: Participatory leadership in school counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 84*(4), 406-413.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, P. J. (2002). Transforming school counseling: A national perspective. *Theory Into Practice, 41*(3), 148-153.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Mason, E.C.M. & McMahon, H.G. (2009) Leadership practices of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling,* 13(2), 107-115.

McMahon, H. G., Mason, E. C. M., & Paisley, P. O. (2009). School Counselor Educators as Educational Leaders Promoting Systemic Change. [Article]. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(2), 116-124.

Monteiro-Leitner, J., Asner-Self, K. K., Milde, C., Leitner, D. W., & Skelton, D. (2006). The role of the rural school counselor: Counselor, counselor-in-training, and principal perceptions. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3), 248-251.

Mujis, D., & Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership--improvement through empowerment? An overview of the literature. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 31*(4), 437-438.

O'Hair, M. J., McLaughlin, H. J., & Reitzug, U. C. (2000). *Foundations of democratic education*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt College.

Olejnik, S., & Algina, J. (2003). Generalized eta and omega squared statistics: Measures of effect size for common research designs. *Psychological Methods,* 8(4), 434-447.

Pillai, K.C.S. (1985). Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences.* 5, 176-181.

Rossow, L.F., & Warner, L.S. (2000). *The principalship: Dimensions in instructional leadership.* Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sheely, A. I., & Bratton, S. C. (2010). A strengths-based parenting intervention with low-income African American families. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(3), 175-183.

Shillingford, M.A. & Lambie, G.W. (2010). Contributions of professional school counselors' values and leadership practices to their programmatic service delivery. *Professional School Counseling,* 13(4), 208-217.

Shoffnerr, M. F., & Williamson, R. D. (2000). Engaging preservice school counselors and principals in dialogue and collaboration. *Counselor Education & Supervision,* 40(2), 128-136.

Sink, C.A. (2009). School counselors as accountability leaders: Another call to action. *Professional School Counseling,* 13(2), 68-74.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J.B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher,* 30(3), 23-28.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (Eds.). (1987). *Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stone, C., & Clark, M. A. (2001). School counselors and principals: Partners in support of academic achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 85*(264), 46-53.

Stone, C., & Dahir, C. (2006). *The transformed school counselor.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Tabachnick, B.G., Fidell, L.S., & Osterlind, S.J. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics, 5th ed.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Trochim, W.M.K. (2006). Research methods knowledge base. Retrieved from: https://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/statdesc.php.

Young, A. & Bryan, J. (2015). The school counselor leadership survey: Instrument development and exploratory factor analysis. *Professional School Counseling:* 2015-2016, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 1-15.

Young, A., Dollarhide, C., & Baughman, A. (2015). The voices of school counselors: Essential characteristics of school counselor leaders*. Professional School Counseling:* 2015-2016, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 36-45.

Young, A. & Kaffenberger, C. (2011). The beliefs and practices of school counselors who use data to implement comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling,* 15(2). 67-76.

Young, A. & Kneale, M.M. (2013). *School counselor leadership: The essential practice.* Alexandria, VA. American School Counselor Association.

Young, A.A., Millard, T., & Kneale, M.M. (2013). Enhancing school counselor instructional leadership through collaborative teaming: Implications for principals. *NASSP Bulletin,* 93(3), 253-269.

Zalaquett, C. P. (2005). Principals' perceptions of elementary school counselors' role and functions. *Professional School Counseling,* 8, 451-457.

Appendix A

Email Requesting Participation in Study

Dear Oklahoma Public School Counselors,

I am asking for your help as I conduct my final research for my PhD. The purpose of the study is to examine Oklahoma School Counselor leadership traits. There will be no identifying information reported in the findings. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey that will take approximately 20-30 minutes. The survey can be found at the following link (INSERT LINK HERE). The University of Oklahoma is an equal opportunity institution.

Thank you,

Shelly Ellis
saellis@ou.edu

Appendix B

Online Consent Form

Online Consent to Participate in Research

Would you like to be involved in research at the University of Oklahoma?

I am Shelly Ann Ellis from the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department and I invite you to participate in my research project entitled School Counselor Leadership. This research is being conducted at The University of Oklahoma. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a School Counselor in Oklahoma. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate in this study.

Please read this document and contact me to ask any questions that you may have BEFORE agreeing to take part in my research.

What is the purpose of this research? The purpose of this research is to examine the perceptions of school counselors as it pertains to their leadership.

How many participants will be in this research? About 2,600 school counselors will be invited to take part in this research.

What will I be asked to do? If you agree to be in this research, you will complete an online survey.

How long will this take? Your participation will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes.

What are the risks and/or benefits if I participate? There are no risks and no benefits from being in this research. Willingness to participate or not will have no direct impact on services from the Oklahoma State Department of Education to your district and/or school site.

Will I be compensated for participating? You will not be reimbursed for your time and participation in this research.

Who will see my information? In research reports, there will be no information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be stored securely and only approved researchers and the OU Institutional Review Board will have access to the records.

Data are collected via an online survey system that has its own privacy and security policies for keeping your information confidential. Please

note no assurance can be made as to the use of the data you provide for purposes other than this research.

Do I have to participate? No. If you do not participate, you will not be penalized or lose benefits or services unrelated to the research. If you decide to participate, you don't have to answer any question and can stop participating at any time.

Who do I contact with questions, concerns or complaints? If you have questions, concerns or complaints about the research or have experienced a research-related injury, contact me at

Shelly Ellis, saellis@ou.edu or Dr. Jeff Maiden, maiden@ou.edu. (Faculty Advisor)

You can also contact the University of Oklahoma – Norman Campus Institutional Review Board (OU-NC IRB) at 405-325-8110 or irb@ou.edu if you have questions about your rights as a research participant, concerns, or complaints about the research and wish to talk to someone other than the researcher(s) or if you cannot reach the researcher(s).

Please print this document for your records. By providing information to the researcher(s), I am agreeing to participate in this research.

£   I agree to participate

£   I do not want to participate

This research has been approved by the University of Oklahoma, Norman Campus IRB.

IRB Number: 7997   **Approval date:** May 9, 2017

Appendix C

School Counselor Leadership Survey

School Counselor Leadership Survey

Part I: Please respond to each statement as it relates to your current position. Answer the statements realistically and based on whether you engage in the described behavior or practice. Do not answer the statements based on what you would like to do.

1-Never   2-Rarely   3-Occasionally   4-Sometimes   5-Fairly Often 6 Very Often 7 -Always

1. I initiate new programs and interventions in my school/district.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I accomplish goals with certainty and confidence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I find resources to secure what is needed to improve services for all students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I am often chosen to lead school-wide/district initiatives, committees, or councils.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I have confidence in my ability to lead.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I ask for help when needed to advocate on behalf of students and parents.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I know and promote my school's instructional vision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I actively work with stakeholders to implement comprehensive school counseling programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I am a change agent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I read current school counseling research to help promote positive change for students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I search for innovative ways to improve student achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I encourage my colleagues to share their new ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I am knowledgeable about communication styles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I promote positive change for all students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I maintain high expectations for all students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I respond to social justice inequities that may affect the future of students' academic achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I am goal oriented.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I consider myself a leader.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. I remain calm when facing difficult situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I exceed expectations when assigned a task.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I am comfortable with change.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I can be persuasive to gain buy-in for implementation of new school counseling programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I have the power to affect positive change.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I use creative strategies to foster positive relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I challenge status quo to advocate for all students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I accomplish goals that have school-wide/district impact.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I use compassion when problem solving.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I navigate through the politics of the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. I know how to recognize social justice inequities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I work collaboratively with stakeholders to accomplish goals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part II: List two characteristics that you believe are essential for school counselor leaders.

1._____2._____

Part III: Demographic Data - Click the box to indicate your response to each item.

Please indicate your gender.

- o Female
- o Male

What is your highest level of educational training?

- o Master's degree (MEd, MS, MA
- o Specialist's degree (Ed.S.)
- o Doctorate (EdD, PhD, PsyD)
- o Other

Which category best describes your racial/ethnic background?

- o White/European
- o Hispanic, Latino
- o Black or African American (including African and Afro-Caribbean)
- o American Indian or Alaska Native
- o Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander
- o I do not wish to respond

Do you work in a _____ school setting? ____Yes ____No If yes, what type of district?

- o Urban
- o Suburban
- o Rural

Do you currently wok as a school counselor or school counselor supervisor?

- o Yes
- o No

If so, which level do you work?

- o Elementary school counselor
- o Middle school counselor
- o K-8 survey
- o High school counselor
- o Alternative school counselor
- o School based school counselor supervisor
- o District school counselor supervisor
- o State school counselor supervisor
- o Graduate school counseling student
- o _____Other

Do you work in a _____ school?

- o Public
- o Private
- o Charter

How many years experience do you have as a school counselor?

- o 0 -2 years
- o 3-5 years
- o 6- 10 years
- o 11 – 15 years

- 16- 20 years
- 20 + years

Indicate the approximate number of students enrolled in your district

- < 4,999
- 5,000 – 9,999
- 10,000 – 49,999
- 50,000 – 99,999
- 100,000 – 149,999
- 150,000 – 199,999
- Over 200,000

How many school counselors are in your district?

- < 50
- 51 – 100
- 101 – 200
- 201 – 300
- 301 – 400
- 401 – 500
- 501 – 600
- > 600

Young & Bryan, 2016

Appendix D

Permission to use School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS)

April 20, 2017

Hello Ms. Ellis,

You have permission to use the survey, School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS) for your
research study. In order to maintain the integrity of work related to the SCLS, I grant permission
for you to use the SCLS on the conditions that:

(1) your study is approved by the Institutional Review Board at your university and
(2) you describe the development and cite the SCLS appropriately

Please feel free to contact me with any questions about the SCLS, its development, and factor
structure. I wish you success in your research.

Best Regards,

Anita Young

Anita Young, Ph.D.

Appendix E

Permission to Modify School Counselor Leadership Survey (SCLS)

Anita Young <aayoung@jhu.edu>

Reply all|
Tue 5/2, 9:40 AM
Ellis, Shelly A.;
Maiden, Jeffrey

Action Items

I do not have a problem with you revising the demographic questions/statements. Could you please send me your revised statements so that I have information for my record? Also, be sure to note in your manuscript any revisions to the survey and the rationale.

Take care,
Anita

Anita Young, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Counseling & Human Services
Johns Hopkins University
9601 Medical Center Drive
Rockville, MD 20850
301-315-2891
301-294-7106 (fax)

EA

Ellis, Shelly A.

|
Mon 5/1, 8:29 PM
Dr. Young,

In the demographics portion of your SCLS, there are 2 questions that I wanted to seek permission to adjust. The two questions are: number of counselors in the district and number of students in the district. There are multiple rural schools in Oklahoma. With the breakdown of demographics the way they currently are in the survey, almost every counselor that participates would fall under the first increment. Would it be ok for me to adjust those incremental choices?

Thank you!
Shelly Ellis