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ABSTRACT

Professional School Counselors (PSCs) have been called to be leaders for educational reform to support the academic, career, and personal/social development of all students through the coordination and facilitation of their comprehensive, developmental school counseling program (American School Counselor Association [ASCA], 2005; National Model©). The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the contributions of PSCs’ values and leadership practices to their programmatic service delivery (counseling, coordinating, consulting, and curriculum). The three constructs and instruments investigated in this study were: (a) Schwartz Value Theory (the Schwartz Value Survey [SVS]; Schwartz, 1992), (b) the Leadership Challenge Theory (the Leadership Practices Inventory [LPI]; Posner & Kouzes, 1988), and (c) school counselors’ programmatic service delivery (the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale [SCARS]; Scarborough, 2005). The findings of this study contribute to the school counseling, counselor education, and leadership literature.

The sample size for this study was 249 certified, practicing school counselors (elementary school, \( n = 83 \); middle school, \( n = 76 \); high school, \( n = 74 \); multi-level, \( n = 8 \)) in the state of Florida (35% response rate). The participants completed an on-line surveys including a general demographic questionnaire, the SVS (Schwartz, 1992), the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988), and the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). The statistical procedures used to analyze the data included (a) structural equation modeling (path Analysis), (b) confirmatory factor analysis, (c) simultaneous multiple regression, (d) Pearson product-moment (2-tailed), and (e) Analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The primary research hypothesis for the study was that practicing school counselors’ values and leadership practice scores would contribute to their levels of programmatic service delivery.
delivery. The statistical analyses of these data identified several significant findings. The path analysis models testing the contribution of school counselors’ values and leadership practices on their service delivery did fit for these data. Specifically, the results indicated that values contributed minimally to the model fit (less than 1%); however, leadership practices made a significant contribution (39%) to the school counselors’ service delivery. Additionally, 31% of the participants reported that their current school counseling program was consistent with how they perceive a successful school counseling program should be implemented, yet only 29% of the school counselors reported feeling comfortable in challenging their involvement in non-counseling related duties. Further, although these data indicated that the majority of the school counselors valued self-transcendence (accepting of rules and appreciating others); structural equation modification re-specification procedures revealed that the model fit supported the value type, self-enhancement (self-direction and personal success) as a more significant contributor in promoting leadership practices and effective service delivery. Implications for professional school counseling and counselor education are presented, along with areas for future investigation.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Professional School Counselors (PSCs) are important contributors to education and serve a vital role in the academic, social/personal, and career development of all students (American School Counselor Association, [ASCA], 2004). PSCs are asked to promote the comprehensive school counseling program as advocated by the ASCA (2005) National Model based on the following four categories: (a) Foundation (clear understanding of personal beliefs about meeting the needs of all students), (b) Delivery (providing services to all students through curriculum development, planning, and other services), (c) Management (development of tools and processes to ensure program is reflective of the needs of the school), and (d) Accountability (demonstration of the effectiveness of the comprehensive plan). Therefore, PSCs work to coordinate and deliver a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program that supports educational reform and systemic change.

Education reform involves recognition of the quality of current educational systems in meeting the needs of students (Schlechty, 1997). Education reform also includes improving educational systems in order to bolster student outcomes (Levitt, 2008). Moreover, educational reform ensures high quality education that is fair, equal, and significant to the needs of a diverse population of students (U. S. Department of Education, 2004) and is based on systematic accountability by all educators. The sustainability of education reform depends on leaders committed to systemic change (Fullan, 2006; Siu, 2008). Leadership entails taking risks and communicating and collaborating for systemic change and improvements. The need exists for PSCs as leaders (ASCA, 2005; Bemak, 2000; Dollarhide, 2003; Education Trust, 2007) to support educational reform through coordination of the comprehensive school counseling
program because of the numerous concerns encountered by students. Student educational concerns include, but are not limited to (a) absenteeism (Kearney & Bensaheb, 2006), (b) lower academic performance (Bemak, Chung, & Siroskey, 2005), (c) school drop-out (Stanard, 2003), (d) low graduation rates (Neild, Stoner-Eby, & Furstenberg, 2008), (e) school violence (Fein, Carlisle & Isaacson, 2008; Greene, 2008), (f) substance abuse, and (g) low career aspirations of minority students (Constantine, Kindaichi, & Miville, 2007). Therefore, in advancing education reform and systemic change, the varied needs and concerns of students and their families may be addressed.

In order to further the advancement of educational reform, PSCs should be proactive in identifying and promoting their roles as leaders (Studer, Oberman, & Womack 2006). However, the roles and activities of the PSC have been inconsistent and ambiguous (Lambie & Williamson, 2004), with school administrators (Zalaquett, 2005), teachers (Amatea, Bringman, & Daniels, 2004), and even school counselors themselves (Lambie & Williamson) unsure of the appropriate school counseling activities.

There is a need for self-actualization and self-awareness (Rokeach, 1973) among PSCs in understanding their role as agents of change (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). In essence, PSCs need to become aware of their values and the influence they have on their school counseling behaviors (Schwartz, 1996). Values, which are beliefs that guide actions, attitudes, and behaviors (Rokeach, 1972; Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004), are influential in identifying roles, activities, and objectives of organizational systems (Kouzes & Posner, 1999) and in promoting effective leadership practices. Therefore, it is important to determine how an amalgamation of the PSCs’ values and leadership practices may influence the effective implementation of school counseling
services in order to advance educational reform and increase student outcomes.

Background of the Study

Leadership roles of PSCs are paramount to their effective engagement not only in facilitating the increase in student outcomes, but also in addressing the myriad of student concerns and crises which potentially affects the school community. School crises, including shootings, stabbings, bullying, and physical altercations (National School Safety Center, [NSSC], 2006), remain an enduring concern for school professionals (Schellenberg, Parks-Savage, & Rehfuss, 2007). The NSSC reported that in 2005, 28% of students between 12 and 18 years old described being bullied at school; 24% of these victimized students expressed being physically injured as a result of bullying. School shootings such as the Columbine High School massacre in 1999, the 2005 Redlake High School shootings, and the Amish Schoolhouse shooting in 2006 (NSSC, 2008) have outraged and troubled educators and the general population over the past decade. In fact, acts of violence by students have not only doubled over the past two decades but have become more dangerous (McAdams, 2002; McAdams & Keener, 2008; McAdams & Lambie, 2003). Also alarming is students’ involvement in gang-related activities and substance abuse. The NSSC (2006) reported that in 2005, 43% of students were engaged in substance abuse. At-risk student behaviors affirm the need for assessing the training and preparation of PSCs in providing positive counseling support to at-risk students.

Furthermore, ongoing crises in schools warrant reviewing the preparation of PSCs’ for leadership roles in mediating school crisis. However, a review of recent research published in the Professional School Counseling journal, the Journal of Counseling and Development, and the
Education Leadership journal, indicated a gap in the literature on the preparation of PSCs for leadership roles.

Leadership in the school counseling profession is needed not only in addressing critical student concerns but also in focusing on the impact of the history of the profession on role function and service delivery. School counseling has a long history of growth and change (Dahir, 2004). From the onset of vocational guidance (Gysbers, 2001), several societal events have influenced the process of change in the school counseling profession (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). Examples of influential events include: (a) the launching of Sputnik in 1957 (Lambie & Williamson, 2004), which created a demand for school counselors to focus their services in identifying and preparing Math and Science gifted students for scientific careers; (b) an increase in social concerns such as substance abuse and violence in schools (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001); and (c) an increase in diversity in schools (Davis, 2006). As each shift in educational events occurred (Jarvis & Keeley, 2003), additional roles were designated to school counselors with none being eliminated (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The significant and influential education events contributed to role confusion for PSCs.

As educational policies and overall change occurred, much emphasis was placed on the position of the counselor and not on the program of school counseling, thus creating a negative view of the PSC as providing nominal support to education (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). According to Gysbers and Henderson, PSCs’ minuscule practices reinforced the pattern of school counselors providing clerical and other non-counseling related duties. Additionally, the PSC role was further encumbered by the decrease in school enrollment in the 1970’s, which created budgetary constraints and consequently decreased the number of school counselors in schools (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). The remaining counselors were obligated to take on
additional administrative tasks. Role confusion within the school counseling profession was further increased by these inappropriate administrative duties.

As the guidance movement shifted from vocational awareness (1913 – 1950’s) to a more comprehensive program (1950’s to present), a need arose for PSCs to undertake roles parallel to today’s social concerns (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Additionally, the need for PSCs to promote their leadership roles in order to appropriate their professional identity arose. Further examination of the preparation and training of PSCs for their numerous roles may provide insight as to the necessity for enhancement and utilization of effective leadership skills and practices. The ASCA (2008) position statement on school counselor preparation suggested the need for PSCs to be adequately prepared for leadership roles in order to significantly contribute to an increase in student outcomes. Additionally, the Education Trust (2007) has suggested that PSCs develop effective leadership practices in order to disambiguate their roles in schools. Therefore, it appears that PSCs engagement in more operational leadership practices may be beneficial in (a) delivering appropriate services to meet the needs of the students, (b) addressing school community concerns (e.g., school crises), (c) demystify their roles, and (d) promote their professional identity.

Statement of the Problem

The literature suggests that leaders are deemed as such, primarily because they are recognized by others as leaders (Fiedlers & Chemers, 1974). Effective leaders are supported by others towards meeting organizational goals (Howard, 2005). The organizational goals are clearly stated and understood by the leader in order to enable others to follow (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Furthermore, role clarity contributes significantly to the attainment of the goals and function of the organization (Lieberman, 2004). Therefore, for a system to function effectively,
an organizational leader needs clear and consistent goals, as well as established roles in order to foster productivity. In light of the tenets of leadership mentioned, several problems have emerged in aligning the PSC as a leader. Some may argue that there are no clear expectations on the role of the PSC which of itself is a barrier to effective leadership. According to the ASCA (2005) *National Model* © however, the roles of the PSC have been identified and clarified and clear expectations do exist. Therefore, it appears that although current guidelines have been implemented by ASCA to assist PSCs in understanding their roles in delivering effective services, internal and external barriers subsist that have hindered the progress of the profession. Subsequently, several problematic issues have emerged: (a) role ambiguity has interfered with PSCs efficient service delivery (e.g., counseling, coordinating, consulting, and curriculum), (b) extraneous demands made on the PSC by systemic paradigms (e.g., ASCA and school administrators) have interfered with PSCs effective service delivery, (c) some PSCs have been unsuccessful in challenging work paradigms which influence their service delivery, and (d) implementation of leadership practices in improving service delivery have been stagnant in the school counseling profession. To address these four problematic concerns, this study sought to explore the contributions of PSCs’ internal motivation (values) and leadership practices to their programmatic service delivery in hopes of providing implications for progression of the profession.

**Justification of the Study**

One of the primary factors identified in the research which influences behavior choices is the personal value that the individual places on his or her roles and functions (Brown, 2002; Feathers, 1999; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974). The findings from this study contribute to the research on the influences of PSCs values and leadership practices to their service delivery.
Increased understanding of values and leadership may facilitate the evaluation of school counselors’ current practice as well as the graduate preparation for leadership made available to PSCs by counselor educators and related graduate programs.

Counselor educators and supervisors may be encouraged to prepare PSCs for effective leadership by ensuring that their curricula include practical and experiential aspects of counseling, coordinating, consulting, and curriculum development. Counselor educators may also be instrumental in exploring students’ values and the influence of their values on their school counseling activities. These explorations may be via individual values awareness assessments and class discussions. It may also be important for counselor education supervisors to observe the leadership practices and values awareness of students during their practicum and internship experiences and assist students in channeling their internal locus of control towards role efficiency. Additionally, the results of the study are beneficial to counselor education supervisors in placing school counseling interns with practicing PSCs who (a) are aware of the influence of their values-laden practices, (b) maintain unambiguous school counseling roles, (c) advance towards appropriate school counseling visions and goals, (d) are effectively implementing the comprehensive school counseling program, and (e) are exhibiting successful leadership practices.

Leadership in school cultivates determination, motivation, and persistence. Values awareness promotes alignment with the mission of the organization as well as, satisfaction and motivation (Mok, 2002). PSCs can benefit from further understanding of the value of their position as agents of change in schools in an era of educational reform (Lieberman, 2004). Leadership leads to the development of collaborative partnership with school administrators in refining their appropriate counseling roles (Fitch & Marshall, 2004). Thus, an empirical
investigation of the contributions of values and leadership practices of PSCs’ to their effective service delivery may provide PSCs, administrators, counselor educators, and other related professionals a clearer understanding of the importance of the PSC role, and their involvement in promoting systemic change and ultimately implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program.

Theoretical Framework

This study was grounded in the leader attributes model of Zaccaro (2007) and an integration of Schwartz’s Value Theory (Schwartz, 1992) and the Leadership Challenge Model (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Zaccaro determined that individuals possess particular traits which are foundational in nature. Primary traits include personality, cognitive ability, and values. Zaccaro contended that each of these traits contributes to the other in such a way to influence leader performance. Thus, in evaluating leadership, an understanding of the influence of values is important in capturing the totality of the leadership practice.

Zaccaro (2007) also included a second aspect to the leadership model which incorporated the skills that the leader possesses in order to be effective. Effective leadership skills include expertise and knowledge, problem solving, and social appraisal skills. He contended that the leader’s traits serve as a platform for the development and utilization of skills in different situations. Zaccaro’s leadership model supports the notion of Fiedler and Chemer (1974) that affective leaders are flexible and adaptive and recognize their individual values as well as the values of others. An integration of distal traits and professional skills produces leader effectiveness, leader performance, and leadership advancement (Zaccaro, 2007). Thus, in translating Zaccaro’s leadership model to the school environment, it may be fitting to conclude
that the individual values of the PSC and the appropriate facilitation of their counseling skills should result in more operational leadership practices and school counseling activities.

This study focused on the contributions of values and leadership practices of the PSCs on the successful execution of appropriate school counseling activities as well as the relationship between values and professional school activities. Values comprise both personal values and work values (Brown, 2002), whereas school counseling activities examined the role activities performed by the PSC (Scarborough, 2005). The expected outcome of the investigation was an effective portrayal of how values and appropriate role implementation influences the successful leadership practice of challenging, inspiring, enabling, modeling, and encouraging others in order to promote the comprehensive school counseling program for systemic change.

Values

Petrie, Lindauer, and Tountasakis (2000) contended that self-awareness leads to values awareness. Values are fundamental to one’s beliefs and guide such aspects as decision-making (Zaccaro, 2005). Values also influence individuals’ feeling, thinking, and behaving (Rokeach, 1972) and are thought to impact work performance and satisfaction (Feathers, 1999). Values impact the importance that individuals place on work demands and the interpretation one gives to particular life experiences (Brown, 2002). Life experiences may include overwhelming workloads and anxiety due to unclear organizational goals (Culbreth et al., 2005). Furthermore, an individual who is aware of his or her values is in a better position to make more informed decisions about life choices (Mosconi & Emmett, 2003). Therefore, PSCs need to understand what their individual values are and further appreciate how these values may influence the
decisions they make, the role activities that they perform, and the execution of their comprehensive school counseling program.

In reviewing the research on the contributions of one’s values on his or her professional behaviors, no studies were found related to the evaluation of PSCs’ values or the influence of values on their leadership practices (Ebscohost, Education, Psychinfo, Proquest). According to Fiedler (1966) however, effective leaders take into consideration the values of others and capitalize on the shared values between the leaders and the follower for effective leadership practice. Few studies have been conducted and lend support to the theory of values and the influences of values on counselors’ behaviors. For example, Mitchell and Bryan (2007) discussed the importance of PSCs recognizing the values of immigrants from the Caribbean. They contended that individuals from the Caribbean value family and religion foremost. Decision-making and problem-solving are considered to be personal, and thus assistance outside of the family network is not highly recommended. Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) explored the role of values in decision-making of college students (N = 3,570) based on gender and culture. Their findings indicated differences in values and behaviors amongst race and gender. African Americans (n = 371) as well as Asians (n = 478) valued financial stability and job security as opposed to Caucasian individuals (n = 2,124), who valued autonomy. Males (n = 1,782) were also found to value finance and job security whereas the females (n = 1,788) valued building relationships with others. Invariably, these values affect not only an individual’s behaviors but also the importance placed on particular goals and decisions (Rokeach, 1973). Based on Duffy and Sedlacek’s findings, it may be concluded that PSCs’ values may be related to demographic difference such as gender and race and resulting behaviors such as decision making. It may be further construed that value differences may be influential in the leadership practices and
behaviors of PSCs. Therefore, a review of PSC behavior in relation to leadership behaviors is warranted.

Leadership

Leadership involves taking risks in challenging an identified process with the goal of promoting change (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders develop a vision based on the goals of their organization and their particular program such as, the four components of the ASCA (2005) National Model and the school improvement plan. Effective leaders collaborate with others and motivate them to share an inspired vision (Fiedler, 1993). According to Avolio and Bass (2002), leaders understand their vision and lead others to work towards developing new, innovative ideas to solve problems and challenges that may be hindering the process of change. Leaders develop clear descriptions of their goals and positively communicate and interact with others in order to facilitate the implementation of these goals (Fiedler, 1993). Furthermore, leaders understand and appreciate the values and beliefs of their followers and possess the skills to effectively support these needs (Avolio, 2007).

Typically, the school administration and district personnel create the role and function of all positions within their schools (Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, & Myers, 2007). However, PSCs are also guided by the role statements of the ASCA (2005) National Model© and state models of school counseling. When the stakeholders (e.g., administrators, teachers, students, parents/caregivers) do not understand the role of the PSC, research indicates that unrelated duties may be imposed upon the PSC (Dollarhide, 2003; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Additionally, when PSCs themselves are uncertain of their roles, this role confusion may lead to stress and dissatisfaction (Culbreth, et al., 2005) as well as disconnect between the goals of the school counseling program and the mission of the school (Colbert, Vernon-Jones, & Pransky, 2006).
Young and Lambie (2007) discussed the role stress that PSCs experience when they work in schools where they have little control over their roles and/or conflicting expectations. When role confusion exists, program effectiveness is questioned (Lieberman, 2004). Gysbers (2001) expressed concerns for the fragmentation of the school counseling profession due to role confusion. He referred to the need for accountability (results-based guidance), advocacy (inclusion in educational reform), support for all students (understanding students culture and background), and vision (an organized and implemented guidance program). Thus, in order for PSCs to promote leadership practice, there needs to be an awareness of the role ambiguity which exists as well as a willingness to challenge this role inconsistency between PSCs, administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders.

The following section reviews research studies that investigated role ambiguity among PSCs and educators. Monteiro-Leitner and colleagues (2006) found disparity in role perception between administrator \((n = 33)\) and practicing PSCs \((n = 49)\), and school counselors-in-training \((n = 20)\). In exploring the perceptions of these professionals, it was found that the administrators regarded unrelated activities (e.g. scheduling) as appropriate roles for PSC. The findings also identified differences between PSCs’ perceptions of time allotted to small group and individual counseling and that of the administrators. It may be concluded that incongruence in role perception of the PSC and the school administration may be negatively affecting the effectiveness of the school counseling program and further creating a need for PSC leadership practices.

Beesley (2004) explored teachers’ perceptions \((N = 188)\) of the effectiveness of the school counseling program and found that teachers perceived the role of middle and high school PSCs to be “somewhat” to “extremely” unsatisfactory in several areas, most significantly in
career counseling (48%), academic planning (45%), community referrals (43%), and parent education (40%). These findings were significant as the identified areas (Career Development, Coordination of Services) represent crucial components recommended by ASCA (2005) to be included in the service delivery of the PSC. The findings supported the need for PSCs to restructure their comprehensive programs to reflect academic, social/personal, and career developments of all students and also to advocate their services to all stakeholders.

In investigating counselors’ perspectives on leadership in counseling, West, Bubenzer, Osborn, Paez, and Desmond (2006) and Dollarhide, Gibson, and Saginak (2008) found that school counseling program effectiveness required clear goals and responsibilities. West and colleagues admonishment supported the need for role clarity by the PSC, administrators, and other stakeholders. The PSC needs to be a leader in identifying student needs, planning and developing supportive programs, and evaluating for school counseling program effectiveness (Stone & Hanson, 2002). Essentially, the effectiveness of the comprehensive school counseling program may depend upon the harmonious understanding of the goals and responsibilities of the PSC by all stakeholders.

Dollarhide and colleagues (2008) investigated the school counselors’ \( N = 5 \) perspectives and practices of leadership and found significant differences among those who practice effective leadership and those who did not. For example, PSCs who were most successful in implementing leadership practices reported having a clear sense of what their tasks and roles consisted of and were effective in overcoming challenges such as systemic barriers. PSCs unsuccessful in leadership practices reported being fearful of failure and taking risks.

Furthermore, Berry (2006) examined PSC \( N = 231 \) leadership practices based on successful implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program through counseling,
coordinating, consultation, and curriculum development. Berry found that PSCs considered as successful leaders were those who were risk takers in communicating and exemplifying the appropriate roles of the PSC through collaboration with administrators and other stakeholders. Effective PSC leaders were those who were delivering supportive school counseling services to students and families. Additionally, Berry found that successful PSCs were deliberate in proportioning their time in appropriate school counseling activities. These results support the ASCA (2005) National Model© component of Management which advocates for PSCs to use their time appropriately in providing services to student and families. The results of Berry’s study also confirm the need for PSCs to be leaders in promoting and modeling appropriate school counseling activities.

In reviewing the findings of studies on role perceptions and activities of PSCs, it becomes apparent that there is a need for congruence between the role perception of the PSC and that of their administrators and other stakeholders. According to leadership theorists (Avolio & Bass, 2002; Fiedler & Chemers, 1974), leaders have a clear description of their goals and activities and are able to inspire others to recognize and contribute to the implementation of these goals. Therefore, in order for PSCs to be viewed as leaders, it may be necessary to be risk takers and articulate and model appropriate counseling activities to facilitate a new, shared vision for systemic change and program effectiveness.

Service Delivery

The role of the PSC has been questioned immensely (Culbreth & Scarborough, 2005; Dollarhide, 2003; Lambie & Williamson, 2004), especially with the increase in accountability in education (Linn, Sherman, and Gill, 2007). ASCA (2005) provided guidelines for PSC’s in developing a comprehensive school counseling program through four main components: (a)
foundation, (b) delivery, (c) management, and (d) accountability. These four guiding components may be best captured through the delivery of services via (a) counseling students, (b) consulting with stakeholders, (c) coordinating of services, and (d) curriculum instruction (ASCA, 2004; Scarborough, 2005).

**ASCA (2005) National Model**

The ASCA (2005) National Model provides a framework by which a consistent identity and values system may be developed for PSCs (Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007). The model provides a structure for effective practice (Dimmitt & Carey, 2007). The foundational aspects of the model were established on the works of various leaders such as: (a) Gybers and Henderson (2000; comprehensive programs), (b) Johnson and Johnson, (2003; results-based guidance), and (c) Myrick (1993; developmental guidance). Currently, the amalgamation of these three original school counseling program models has created new direction for PSC in advocating and publicizing comprehensive school counseling programs through the four model components: foundation, delivery, management, and accountability.

Dimmitt and Carey (2007) provided a depiction of the four components (Foundation, Delivery, Management, Accountability) of the ASCA (2005) National Model in relation to transitioning students to elementary school. The component foundation in the elementary transition may include developing and clarifying program goals for orienting and connecting with new students and families in order to promote family-school collaboration. The school counseling foundation also includes PSCs understanding the values, beliefs, and philosophies of students and their families in order to develop a comprehensive counseling program promoting student achievement (Villalba, Akos, Keeter, & Ames, 2007). Therefore, the component
foundation incorporates the PSC awareness of values and goals associated with the effective implementation of the school counseling program.

The second component, program delivery, involves understanding the academic, social/personal, and career needs of students. According to Dimmitt and Carey (2007), delivery includes providing support through curriculum development and coordination of services. Villalba and colleagues (2007) suggested that delivery services include relationship building (Schwallie-Giddis, ter Maat, & Pak, 2003) with students, being especially mindful of cultural differences among students and the influences of culture on seeking counseling services. Thus, program delivery includes the development of supportive services through curriculum and systematic planning.

The third component, management, involves intentionality in order to avoid inappropriate counseling roles. Management includes collaboration with administrators and other stakeholders in the developing of a feasible counseling program capable of meeting the diverse needs of students (Dimmitt et al., 2007; Baggerly & Borkowski, 2004). Additionally, management of the comprehensive school counseling program involves organization of a counseling advisory council to review student data (attendance, achievement) in order to collaboratively promote success among students (Villilba, et al., 2007). Therefore, effective school counseling management includes appropriate execution of the school counseling program through collaboration and systemic planning.

The fourth component, program accountability, recognizes the effectiveness of the counseling program through data gathering and evaluation (ASCA, 2005). PSCs are to implement accountability measures focused on student achievement and progress in the counseling program. Program accountability provides credibility and legitimacy (Schwallie-
Giddis, et al., 2003) to the profession of school counseling. Hence, program accountability involves continuous evaluation of the effectiveness of the counseling program through immediate and long range data collection and performance evaluation.

Scarborough and Luke (2008) investigated the perceptions of school counselors (N = 8) who had been successful in implementing their comprehensive school counseling program. The researchers sought to determine the personal beliefs, characteristics, and competencies which were instrumental to the school counseling program implementation. Scarborough and colleague found that PSCs who were successful in their program implementation reported having: (a) a strong commitment to motivate and encourage others, (b) a belief in the mission of the school counseling program, (c) a clear vision of the appropriate role of the PSC, and (d) a willingness to be leaders in collaborating with others to implement a successful school counseling program for positive student and school outcomes. Consequently, effective school counseling program implementation may be possible based on PSCs’ personal and professional perspectives and commitment to their programs.

Sink and Yillik-Downer (2001) explored PSCs (N = 1033) perceptions of the implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program and found that a relationship existed between the value that PSCs assign to the school counseling program and their ultimate engagement in the program. PSCs immersed in the varied aspects of planning through the implementation of the school counseling program were more successful in collaborating and completing appropriate school counseling tasks than PSCs who engaged in program implementation. Sink and Yillik-Downer suggested that PSCs with greater involvement in the program reform process were less concerned about other program tasks. The results indicated the need for counselor educators and school administrators to support PSCs in recognizing the
importance of implementing the comprehensive school counseling program. The findings also provided evidence for the need for PSCs to collaborate and communicate their vision and goals to stakeholders in order to enable others to successfully manage a comprehensive school counseling program.

**Related Professional Activities**

Following the guidelines of the ASCA (2005) *National Model* as illustrated above, it is expected that comprehensive school counseling programs be valuable in increasing student achievement, and promoting a positive school climate. ASCA has provided guiding principles as to counseling roles which are appropriate in advancing the components of the *National Model*. These related counseling roles may be best expressed in terms of PSC engagement in counseling, consulting, coordinating, and curriculum (Scarborough, 2005). Related counseling activities include counseling students on: (a) school behaviors (Forbes, 2003; Scarborough, 2005), (b) crisis (Fein, Carlisle, & Isaacson, 2008), and (c) family issues (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007). Additionally, related counseling activities include consulting with family/caregivers (Amatea, Daniels, & Bringman, 2004), teachers (Holcomb-McCoy & Mitchell, 2005), and administrators. PSCs are also counseled to coordinate services with administrators and other stakeholders as well as develop curriculum activities (Scarborough, 2005) to promote student achievement and fuel systemic change.

**Unrelated Professional Activities**

Unfortunately, amidst the recommendations of the ASCA (2005) *National Model*, PSCs often engaged in unrelated school counseling activities (Dollarhide, 2003). Unrelated school counseling activities include clerical duties (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001), disciplinary duties (Monteiro-Leitner et al. 2006), and course scheduling (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). These
unrelated activities contributes to (a) roles stress (Culbreth et al., 2005), (b) role confusion (Lieberman, 2004), (c) marginalization of the school counselor (House & Hayes, 2002; Johnson, 2000; Kaffenberger, Murphy, & Bemak, 2006), and (d) deficient professional identity (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Significance in related and unrelated professional school counseling activities was supported by several researchers. For example, in exploring role perception of school counselors and administrators ($N = 102$), Monteiro-Leitner et al. (2006) found that there were significant differences in perception of time spent on appropriate school counseling activities and inappropriate activities. A discrepancy was found between school administrators’ and PSCs perceptions of the time PSCs should spend engaged in unrelated school counseling activities such as testing, hall duty, and lunch room duty. In fact, administrators reported that these unrelated activities were acceptable and should be given a significant amount of time for engagement. PSCs, however, felt that a minimal amount of their time should be spent on these unrelated duties. The results of Monteiro-Leitner and colleagues study on role confusion between PSC and administrator relates to the results found by Kirchner and Setchfield (2005), which investigated perceptions of PSCs ($n = 23$) and administrators ($n = 42$) on the role of the school counselor. Kirchner and colleague (2005) found that although perceptions of role congruence were consistent among both groups of professionals, perceptions of role incongruence were significantly different between PSCs and administrators.

Consequently, in order to promote the professional identity of the PSC and strengthen the school counseling profession, it is important for PSCs to collaborate with administrators and other stakeholders in identifying appropriate and related school counseling activities. Engaging in more appropriate, related, counseling activities contributes to more positive outcomes;
therefore, a review of PSCs’ engagement in appropriate counseling activities (counseling, consulting, coordinating, & curriculum) is warranted. In assessing appropriate counseling practices of PSCs as guided by ASCA (2005), an exploration of the PSCs awareness and beliefs of their role in educational reform is necessitated.

Definition of Terms

*Professional School Counselor (PSC)*: An individual who possess a master’s degree or above, and is licensed and/or certified in school counseling and works in a school setting.

*Leadership*: The process of communicating with others through motivating, directing, and supporting (Howard, 2005).

*Leadership Practice*: The approach that an individual takes in motivating, directing, and supporting others. Leadership practices may change based on the situation (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974).

*Values*: Beliefs that guides an individual’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors (Rokeach, 1972). In this study, values incorporate cultural values, social values, and work values.

*American School Counselor Association (ASCA)*: A professional association which influences the work of the professional school counselor through leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change.

ASCA (2005) *National Model*: A framework for professional school counselors which reflects through the comprehensive guidance plan, program foundation, delivery, management, and accountability.

*Service Delivery*: The activities that professional school counselors engage in based on their identified roles in schools. These activities typically include counseling, consulting, coordinating, and curriculum (Scarborough, 2005).
Roles: A description of tasks and responsibilities of an individual. The PSC role is to ultimately maximize student achievement and development (ASCA, 2004).

Role Confusion: Lack of clarity regarding the function and expected behavior patterns of individuals.

School Reform: Implementation of educational policies and practices in order to promote systemic change and improve the quality of education for all students.

Stakeholders: A person, persons, or group within an organization that is affected by behaviors, actions, and decisions of the organization.

Comprehensive School Counseling Program: A school counseling program which is structured and focused on the academic, personal/social, and career development of all students in K-12 grades.

Research Hypotheses

Research Hypothesis One: PSCs’ values (as measured by Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) and their leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale [Scarborough, 2005]). (See Figure 1. below)
Research Hypothesis Two: School counselors’ values (as measured by the Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) contribute to their leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]). See Figure 2 Below.
Research Hypothesis Three: School counselors’ values (as measured by the Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale [Scarborough, 2005]). See Figure 3 below.
Research Hypothesis Four: School counselors’ leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale [Scarborough, 2005]). See Figure 4 below.

Figure 4: Path Diagram: Leadership and Service Delivery

Research Hypothesis Five: School counselors’ leadership practices as measured by the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) and demographic information (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership) contribute to their service delivery, as measured by the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). See Figure 5 below.
Research Design

This descriptive, correlational study was designed to investigate the relationship between
(a) values, as measured by Schwartz’s *Schwartz Value Survey* (SVS, 1992); (b) leadership
practices, as measured by Posner and Kouzes’s *Leadership Practice Inventory* (LPI, 1988); and
(c) PSCs’ school counseling service delivery as measured by Scarborough’s *School Counselor
Activity Rating Scale* (SCARS, 2005). Correlational research seeks to determine relationships
between two or more variables and may also be useful in exploring direct and indirect effects
(Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Additionally, descriptive research involves (a) formulating and
testing a hypothesis, (b) methods of inductive-deductive reasoning for generalization, (c)
randomization, and (d) accurate description of variables for replication of study (Best & Kahn, 2006).

The correlational design was appropriate for this study as it sought to determine the relationship and directionality between three variables (values, leadership, and service delivery). Furthermore, this study included the formulation of five distinct hypotheses, based on theoretical conclusions, randomization of sample, and precise indications of the variables to be tested.

Data Analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS; version 17) and the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS version 17; 2008) were used to analyze the information collected from the demographic questionnaire and the three data collection instruments (LPI, Posner & Kouzes, 1988; SVS, Schwartz, 1992; & SCARS, Scarborough, 2005). Data from the demographic questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive frequencies.

Correlational data analyses such as Structural Equation Model (SEM; Path Analysis), Simultaneous Multiple Regression, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation ($r$; two-tailed), and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used in this study. The first four hypotheses were analyzed using Structural equation modeling and Pearson’s $r$, while hypothesis five was analyzed using Simultaneous Multiple Regression. SEM describes directional relationships among latent variables (unobserved) and provides coefficients for the endogenous and exogenous variables (Olobatuyi, 2006). Furthermore, SEM includes varied types of analyses, including path analysis for observable variables and confirmatory factor analysis for observing underlying factors (Ullman, 1996). AMOS 17 provides simple methods for developing, analyzing, and translating path diagrams as well as presenting hypothesized relationships between various variables (SPSS, 2008), and as such was used to analyze the path associations. SEM was ideal for use in this study.
as it allows for the exploration of directionality and correlational strength between values, leadership practices, and service delivery of PSCs. Additionally, SEM may be instrumental in allowing the researcher to either reject or fail to reject the hypothesized theoretical relationships between values, leadership, and service delivery.

Simultaneous multiple regression, another form of correlational analysis was used to explore the relationships between PSCs’ values (as measured by *Schwartz Value Survey* [Schwartz, 1992]), demographic variables (e.g., ethnicity/race, length of employment, graduate preparation for leadership, and school level), and leadership practices (as measured by the *Leadership Practices Inventory* [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]). Simultaneous multiple regression examines the relationship between a dependent variable (e.g., service delivery) and multiple independent variables (e.g., values and leadership) (Creswell, 2002). Furthermore, simultaneous multiple regression was considered for this study as it identifies the variance of the independent variables by explaining any variation in the dependent variable and by allowing the researcher to determine the order of each variable included in the analysis. Additionally, simultaneous multiple regression allows the researcher some control of the independent model.

Pearson’s product-moment correlation (Pearson $r$; two-tailed) was used to test the strength and direction of the relationship between the three constructs: values (SVS; Schwartz, 1992), service delivery (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005), and leadership practices (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) which compares mean scores between groups to determine the variance between the groups was useful in the current study. One-way ANOVA involves one independent variable with numerous levels and advises as to whether significant differences exist between groups (Pallant, 2007). For the current study, one-way ANOVA was
deemed to be beneficial in exploring significant differences between groups such as, school level.

Research Methodology

Population and Sample

The population of interest was practicing PSCs within the state of Florida. Stratified random sampling was used to assure representation of the school counselors from the general population (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Stratified sampling identifies subgroups or *strata* which exist in the total population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The strata for this study included a random sample of PSCs based on school level (Elementary, Middle, and High). In order to secure a 95% confidence level, at least 359 participants were required (Gay & Airisian, 2003). In determining the sample size, four components were reviewed: (a) confidence level, which is the amount of risk involved in representing the true population value within a given range (95% confidence indicates a normal distribution across the true population) (Creswell, 2002); (b) sampling error, which represents the estimated range within which the true value of the population falls and is displayed using percentages (generally, a sampling error of ± .05 is used [Creswell, 2002]) (Gay & Airisian, 2003); (c) the degree of variability, which indicates the distribution of attributes of interest (degree of variability is often selected as .5 as it represents the maximum variability of the population [Gay & Airisian, 2003]); and (d) the total population of school counselors in the state of Florida, which was approximately 5000 (Florida Department of Education, 2007).

According to a review of research published in the *Professional School Counseling* journal (Clemens, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnson, 2008; Simmons, 2008), it appeared that the probable survey research response rate among school counseling professionals was at about 30%. Additionally, Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2008) indicated even lower
response rates associated with online surveys. Therefore, because of the low response rate of school counselors and on-line surveys, a sample of 795 practicing school counselors was targeted to secure the anticipated sample size of 359 ($n = 265$ elementary; $n = 265$ middle; $n = 265$ high).

Data Collection

The data collection process adhered to Dillman’s (2007) Tailored Design Method. Email addresses for certified school counselors in the state of Florida were provided by the Florida Department of Education’s, Office of Information Database. The State of Florida’s educational database reports approximately 5,000 certified school counselors. Dillman (2007) cautions against coverage error; therefore, caution was taken to only send emails to practicing PSCs in the State. Dillman and colleagues (2008) suggested implementation methods to increase response rate, which include ensuring that the instruments being used are legible with clearly understood directions. This method assists in reducing measurement error of the instruments (Dillman, 2007). Therefore, a review of the research packet was conducted using all four measurement instruments identified for this study.

Participants in the research packet review were 10 Counselor Education Doctoral level students. Students were asked to complete and give feedback as to the readability and clarity of the survey instruments, including the demographic questionnaire. Students were also asked to report on the amount of time necessary to complete the survey packet.

Upon completion of the research packet review, the demographic questionnaire was revised to include appropriate suggestions for clarity and conciseness. Additionally, the demographic questionnaire was reviewed by experts in the field of counseling for face validity. Subsequently, permission was requested from the researcher’s dissertation committee and the
Dillman and colleagues (2008) suggested another aspect of increasing the response rate of surveys by implementing multiple contacts with participants. An invitation email was sent to all potential participants randomly selected from the state’s school counselors’ database. Included in the invitation email was a link to a secured website where respondents were asked to complete the survey. Upon entry to the website (SurveyMonkey), participants received a copy of the informed consent form which included a thorough explanation of the purpose of the study. At that time, participants were also informed that (a) their participation was voluntary and they could withdraw from participation at any time, (b) their participation would remain anonymous, and (c) they could use the provided information to contact the researcher and the IRB with questions or concerns. The IRB’s Waiver of Informed Consent form was used for this study; therefore, participants’ signatures were not required. A secured link was used for this study and included an encrypted format managed by the website’s Verisign program so that only the researcher was able to view participants’ responses.

Permission was granted by the survey developers and/or copyright publishers to use the instruments electronically. For the Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) permission was granted by the office of copyright services for Jossey-Bass (personal communication, August 26, 2008). Permission to use the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992) electronically was granted by the instrument developer (personal communication, August 21, 2008). Permission was granted by the instrument developer for the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale (Scarborough, 2005) by personal communication on August 24, 2008. Only surveys which indicated participant agreement were included in the study.
In accordance with the multiple contacts method by Dillman and colleagues (2008), one week into the data collection period, a thank you/reminder email (Dillman, 2007) was sent to participants thanking those who had already responded and reminding those who had not yet completed the surveys. Dillman and colleagues (2008) suggested including the link to the surveys in the reminder email. One week later, another reminder was sent to the participants. Four weeks after the original email was sent, the web link was terminated with the fourth and final contact thanking participants for their time in completing the surveys. For participants who were unable to navigate comfortably through technology, Dillman (2007) suggested providing an alternate method whereby participants could print out the surveys and mail them directly to the researcher. This alternate method was made available to participants. Additionally, Dillman and colleague’s (2008) implementation method for increasing the response rate included offering an incentive for participation. Each school counselor who was invited to participate in the study was offered a gift certificate for $5.00 off one of four professional development workshops offered by the Florida School Counselors Association. Invited participants were able to access the gift certificate from the survey website and were encouraged to print and utilize it regardless of their participation in the study. Upon completion of the surveys, participants were also given the opportunity to participate in future aspects of the study by indicating their corresponding information.

The guidelines for this study adhered to the University of Central Florida’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB provides federal regulations as guided by ethical principles based on the Belmont Report and Federal Policies for the Protection of Human Subjects (Department of Health & Human Services, 2008). Additionally, the study was guided by the expertise of the researcher’s dissertation chairperson and other committee members.
Instruments

Four data collection instruments were used in this study: (a) a demographic questionnaire developed by the researcher, (b) the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992), (c) the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 1995), and (d) the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005). The following section introduces the data collection instruments, provides support for their use in this study, and reviews research regarding the instruments’ psychometric properties.

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire, a one-page document, was developed by the researcher and contained items requesting information from participants such as (a) ethnicity/race, (b) school level (elementary, middle, high), (c) length of employment, and (d) gender. Additionally the demographic questionnaire consisted of five-point Likert scaled questions investigating school counselors’ perceptions of their professional service. Face validity of the demographic questionnaire was supported by the research packet reviewers and the dissertation chair and other committee members.

Schwartz Value Survey

The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992) was also used in this study. The SVS (Schwartz, 1992) consisted of 56 Likert scaled items which measures the guiding values of an individual and include (a) Universalism, (b) Benevolence, (c) Conformism, (d) Tradition, (e) Security, (f) Power, (g) Achievement, (h) Hedonism, (i) Stimulation, and (j) Self-Direction. Furthermore, Schwartz categorized the 10 value types into four value dimension: (a) openness to change, (b) conservatism, (c) self-transcendence, and (d) self-enhancement. Alpha coefficients reported for this instrument ranged from .60 (tradition) to .74 (stimulation). Schwartz (1992)
reported that the low reliability of the value type “tradition” is due to the limited number of items in the factor. Strong validity of the SVS has been established by various cross-cultures studies conducted over the past decades (e.g., Burgess, Schwartz, & Blackwell, 1994; Feathers, 1995; Sawyerr, Strauss, & Yan, 2005; Schwartz & Sagie 2000; Spini, 2003; Stern, Dietz, & Guagnano, 1998; Struch, Schwartz, & van der Kloot, 2002). A comprehensive description of the psychometric properties of the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) is provided in Chapter Three.

*Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI-Self)*

*Leadership Practices Inventory- Self (LPI)* was developed by Posner and Kouzes (1988) and consists of 30 Likert scaled items. The instrument focuses on five leadership practices thought to be common among leaders: (a) Challenging the Way, (b) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (c) Enabling Others to Act, (d) Modeling the Way, and (e) Encouraging the Heart. The LPI has two versions: the LPI-Self and the LPI-Observer. Cronbach alpha for the LPI-Self was reported to be strong with scores ranging from .70 to .85 (Kouzes & Posner, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 1987). Original test reliability study reliability yielded results ranging from .93 to .95.

Adams (2007) reported Cronbach alpha of .82 for the LPI-Self in a study exploring factors which influence nurses to pursue leadership positions. In reviewing the psychometric properties of the LPI, Leong (1995) examined the principal factor analysis of the 30 items and reported that the five factors of the LPI accounted for 60.2% of the variance, indicating the positive structure of the LPI in predicting leadership behaviors. Evidence to support the validity of the LPI has been established over numerous studies (e.g., Fields & Herold, 1997; Knab, 1998; Leong, 1995; Posner & Kouzes, 1993; Posner & Kouzes, 1988; Webster & Hackett, 1999). Further supportive information on the psychometric properties of the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) is provided in Chapter Three.
School Counselor Activity Rating Scale

The third instrument, the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS), was developed by Scarborough (2005). The SCARS is a 48-item instrument and includes school counseling activities such as (a) Counseling, (b) Consultation, (c) Curriculum, and (d) Coordination. In addition, there was a category for “Other”, which included unrelated activities such as hall duty and master scheduling by PSCs. The SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “Never” engage in this activity to “Routinely” engage in this activity. The SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) examines PSCs’ actual activities versus their preferred role activities. For the purpose of the present study, permission was granted by the developer to modify the SCARS to include only the actual practice of the counselors. Scarborough (2005) reported alpha coefficients as .93 (curriculum), .84 (coordination), .85 (counseling), and .75 (consultation). Additionally, convergent construct validity as well as discriminant validity was established by further examination of the subscales (Scarborough, 2005). Support for the reliability and validity of the SCARS was established in recent studies (e.g., Berry, 2006; Clark, 2006; Hebert, 2007). Further information on the psychometric properties of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) is provided in Chapter Three.

Limitations of the Study

Several potential limitations were associated with this study:

1. The survey packet consists of four data collection instruments which may take 30-45 minutes for completion. This may contribute to low return rate.

2. Participant responses may be from those PSCs who are proactive in leadership, so responses may not be generalized to all PSCs.
3. Participants who respond to email surveys may be different from those who respond to mail surveys.

4. Participants who volunteer may be different from non-volunteers.

5. The potential exists for inadequate responses due to misinterpretation of directions on self-report surveys.

6. The study included school counselors in only one state.

Assumptions of the Study

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. The information provided by participants was accurate.

2. A stratified sample collected represented the general professional school counseling population in the state of Florida.

3. A difference exists between participants who volunteer (respondents) to complete the survey packet and those who do not (non-respondents).

4. Potential relationships exist among the variables of values, programmatic activities, and leadership practices.

Ethical Guidelines

Several ethical considerations were adhered to in this study:

1. Data collected were anonymous.

2. Participation was voluntary.

3. The informed consent clearly stated the purpose of the study and other pertinent information.

4. Permission to use the instruments on-line was granted by the developers and copyrighters.
5. Permission to conduct the proposed study was granted by the dissertation chair, other committee members, and the University of Central Florida’s Institutional Review Board.

Summary

PSCs are called to be leaders in promoting education reform and systemic change. Education reform includes improving and changing the educational system in order to increase and improve student outcomes. PSCs are engaged in multiple tasks throughout the school day, and they are often tasks unrelated to those encouraged by the ASCA (2005) *National Model*. Engagement in unrelated counseling tasks may be due to several factors, like ambiguous and inconsistent roles. Therefore, there is a need for PSCs to become more aware of their beliefs and contributions to educational reform through values awareness and appropriate role engagement. Values are influential in identifying roles, activities, and organizational objectives. Role clarity enhances leadership behaviors and effective leadership promotes effective service delivery, enhancement of educational reform, and ultimately, improved student outcomes.

This research study examined the contributions of PSCs values and leadership practices to their service delivery. The findings from this study contribute to further analysis of the role of the PSC and factors which influences their abilities to be leaders in the field. The following chapter presents a comprehensive literature review on these variables.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the potential relationship between Professional School Counselors’ (PSCs) values, leadership practices, and their service delivery. A thorough review of the literature is presented with supporting empirical research on the fundamental theories of values, such as (a) Rokeach’s Theory of Values (Rokeach, 1973), (b) Schwartz’s Value Theory (Schwartz, 1992), and (c) Brown’s Value-Based Theory (Brown, 2002); a comprehensive representation of three leading models of leadership, (a) The Leadership Challenge Model (Kouzes & Posner, 1987), (b) Contingency Model of Leadership (Fiedler, 1966), and (c) Transformational Model of Leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2000); and professional school counseling service delivery as promoted by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA [2005] National Model).

Theories of Values

Numerous studies have examined human behaviors (e.g., Adler & Adler, 2008; Al-Yagon, 2008; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2008), human traits such as personality (e.g., Ng, Ang, & Chan, 2008; Hetland, Sandal, & Johnsen, 2008; Pozzebon, 2007), and human values (e.g., Brown, 2002; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). This section of the chapter examined the theoretical construct values as presented by Rokeach (1973), Schwartz, (1992), and Brown (2002). Additionally, substantial empirical support is provided for the appropriateness of including values as a variable in this study.
Rokeach Value Theory

“A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (Rokeach, 1973, p.5). Therefore, values influence an individual’s thinking, feeling, and behavioral actions (Rokeach, 1972). In essence, values assist people in knowing how to behave correctly in feeling emotional about an issue and in behaving in a particular manner to meet a desired goal (Rokeach, 1973). Values may be distinguished from attitudes in that attitudes are a compilation of beliefs about a specific situation, whereas values are a single belief which guides the individuals’ actions, attitudes, and decisions (Rokeach, 1973). Values may also be distinguished from interests in that interests are those activities whereby values are attained and needs are satisfied (Super & Sverko, 1995). Needs are transformed into values (Rokeach, 1973). In other words, to need something is to value something that one perceives as meeting personal desires (Super & Sverko, 1995). Rokeach (1973) drew the example of the need for sex being a representation of valuing love, intimacy, and spirituality.

According to Rokeach (1973), values may be categorized as instrumental or terminal. He referred to instrumental values as being moral or competent. Moral values are those considered right to do and competent values are the individual’s belief about the most efficient way to do something (Greenbank, 2003). Instrumental values represented a way of behaving, whereas terminal values represented desired goals (Feathers, 1999). Examples of instrumental values are open-mindedness and ambitiousness and examples of terminal values are living an exciting life and social equality. Furthermore, values enhance the cognition of morality; therefore, how an individual behaves may cause him or her to feel moral or immoral (Rokeach, 1973). For example, personal deficiencies (dishonesty) may lead to feelings of shame, whereas politeness
may lead to feelings of being moral and adequate. Rokeach (1973) believed that one value may vary over the other such that an increase in social values may result in a decrease in personal values.

*Schwartz Theory of Values*

Schwartz (1992), expanded upon Rokeach’s value theory (Pozzebon, 2007) by summarizing values as “desirable, transsituational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in peoples lives” (p. 2). Schwartz (1992) believed that values are guiding principles which are ordered in importance and serve as standards for judging and justifying actions. He further suggested individuals acquire values through “socialization to dominant group values and unique learning experiences” (Schwartz, 1994, p. 21). Much like Rokeach (1973), Fountain, Poortinga, Delbeke, and Schwartz (2008) theorized that values guide moral behaviors. Additionally, Fountain and colleagues further indicated that values guide cultural behaviors. Schwartz (2007) suggested that 10 distinct value types serve as motivational goals in the lives of individuals and in essence guides behaviors and behavior choices. Schwartz (2006) further contended that the 10 value types: (a) *hedonism*, (b) *power*, (c) *achievement*, (d) *stimulation*, (e) *universalism*, (f) *self-direction*, (g) *tradition*, (h) *benevolence*, (i) *conformity*, and (j) *security*, are consistent across cultural groups and are differentiated by the motivational goal that each expresses (Table 2 explains each value type and associated motivational goal).

Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) reported that values are cognitive representations of an individuals’ motivation for satisfying his or her biological needs, social interactions, and directions for group functioning. Schwartz (1992) also described a circular structure of the order of the 10 values types and suggested that bipolar dimensions exist among the values. In clarifying the bipolar dimensions, Schwartz categorized each of the 10 values into four distinct dimensions: (a)
Openness to change, which includes stimulation and self-direction; (b) Conservation, which includes security, conformity, and tradition; (c) Self-Enhancement, which includes power and achievement; and, (d) Self-Transference, which includes benevolence and universality (Schwartz, 1994). The value hedonism is shared between Openness to change and Self-Enhancement. Explanation for the concept of opposing values includes the individual who constantly desires originality and change (stimulation) is most likely to challenge preserved customs (tradition) (Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004).

Schwartz (2006) proposed the conceptualization of 10 value types into two dimensions: (a) person-focused, values which regulate characteristics and interests of individuals’ (self-direction, hedonism, power, achievement, and stimulation); and (b) social-focused, values which advance relationships with others (conformity, tradition, security, and benevolence). Schwartz’s (1992) Value Theory provides guidance as to the concept of values and surmises that values are influenced by the motivational goals of an individual. Schwartz’s (1992) 10 value types and corresponding motivational goals are indicated in Table 1.
Table 1: Schwartz’s 10 Value Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Motivational Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power:</td>
<td>Social Status and prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement:</td>
<td>Personal success through demonstrating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism:</td>
<td>Pleasure and self gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation:</td>
<td>Excitement and challenge in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction:</td>
<td>Independent thought and action-choosing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism:</td>
<td>Understanding, appreciating, the welfare of all people and nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence:</td>
<td>True friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition:</td>
<td>Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a particular given culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity:</td>
<td>Restraint of actions or impulses to upset or harm others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security:</td>
<td>Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Schwartz (1992). Ten value types

Brown’s Value-Based Theory

Brown (2002) theorized correlational influences between values on career behaviors.

Brown (2002) presented a value-based model which describes six propositions related to values. This model indicated that (a) individuals with individualistic values (self-direction) pursue high priority careers (Brown & Crace, 1996); (b) individuals with collectivist values (conformity) may be influenced by the group or social network on career choice and decision-making where they maintain a strong sense of commitment to family (Liu, 1998); (c) self-directed individuals
are most effective in making future career choices as they possess a high regard for achievement; (d) career choice is influenced by differences in values based on gender and culture; (e) individuals who are able to use their values, skills, and life experiences in overcoming stressors on the job may be more successful in overcoming demands of the job; (f) perceptions of career importance may differ between values (individualism versus collectivism). Brown’s (2002) Value-Based Theory provides a realistic framework for PSCs in organizing career development programs with individualized activities geared towards respecting and appreciating the differences in cultural values and needs of their students.

Values and Behaviors

Upon further examination of values, it has been determined that values affect both work (Feathers, 1999) and career and educational decision-making (Greenbank, 2003). Work values influence career choice and job performance (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Work values may be classified as intrinsic, extrinsic, social, or prestige (Ros, Schwartz, & Surkiss, 1999; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Ros and colleagues (1999) distinguished between the four categories of values as, (a) intrinsic: importance placed on decision-making (autonomy); (b) extrinsic: financial and career stability; (c) social: interpersonal relationships and societal contributions; and (d) prestige: having an influential occupation. Additionally, values influence one’s interpretation of life experiences (Le, 2008). Munene and Schwartz (2000) regarded values as “shared goals” (p. 12) within a given culture. Shared values are learned within the context of the environment and may influence the normative behaviors of the group members (cultural). Suizzo (2007) investigated the impact of culture on individual goals and values and determined that notable influences exist among cultures such as high level of respect for elders, conformity, politeness, and obedience in the Mexican families; respect for hierarchy in the Chinese culture; and achievement and self-
direction in the African-American families. Park and Kim (2008) established that increased collectivism exists within the Asian culture as opposed to individualism within the European cultures. Collectivistic values like the ones that exist in the Asian cultures affect decision-making and ultimately behaviors are perceived to directly impact those within the group or network (Henderson & Chan, 2005; Hui & Trandis, 1986). Thus, values may be culturally founded and may invariably affect career choice, decision-making within careers, and ultimately work-related behaviors.

Another such influence on values is the moral development of individuals (Lan, Gowing, McMahon, Rieger, & King, 2007). It has been hypothesized that moral development creates an association between values and decision-making (Weber, 1993; Lan et al. 2007). Moral development as outlined by Kohlberg (1981, 1984) includes three levels. The first level is the *pre-conventional morality*, where individuals categorize the good and bad of their actions according to their needs. The pre-conventional level also emphasizes self-interests and the concept of personal consequences associated with actions. The next level, *conventional morality*, explores individuals’ regard for societal views and concern to maintain order. At this level, there is an increased awareness and respect for order and conformity. The final level, *post-conventional morality*, regards the need to conform. However, personal values play a vital role in what aspect of society one considers to be moral and just. At the post-conventional level of morality, it is personal values that may drive the decisions one makes in conforming to societal norms. Values also affect individuals’ outlooks on society and the behaviors which may be considered ethically and morally appropriate.
Research on Values

The following section reviews research findings on the effects of values on organizational and individual behaviors in education and related fields. For example, Duffy and Sedlacek (2007) determined that values play an integral role in decision-making. The purpose of the investigation was to determine whether there were significant differences in work values based on college students’ gender and racial identity (N = 3,570). The researchers distinguished between intrinsic values (autonomy and interest), social values (team work), extrinsic values (financial gain and job security), and prestige values (prestigious occupation). The students were racially Caucasian (59.1%), African-American (10.3%), Asian-American (13.3%), and Latino (5.3%). There was an equal break down in gender (50/50).

The results indicated that intrinsic values (autonomy) were most significant among the students. The findings indicated that males were more receptive to extrinsic values (finance and job security), whereas females were more influenced by social work values (working with others). The differences in values found by Duffy and colleagues (2007) supports Rokeach’s (1973) implication that values are perceived as meeting particular personal needs; hence, the individual whose need is for financial stability may value security (Schwartz, 1992). The results also supported the concept of values representing the motivational goals of an individual in satisfying his or her biological and social needs (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Furthermore, Duffy and colleagues (2007) determined that African-American and Asian-American students were more likely to uphold extrinsic values, whereas Caucasian students were more likely to uphold intrinsic values (autonomy), thus confirming Feather’s (1999) suggestion that values affect career behaviors and choices. This study provided support for the consideration of individuals’ values on their career and life choices. Additionally, the results were significant for counselor
educators involved in the admissions process of incoming school counseling students in understanding their value systems and how values may impact academic, social/personal, and career choices.

Lan and colleagues (2007) examined the relationship between values and moral development of business students \((N = 131)\) at a four year University. Respondents were provided with the *Schwartz Values Survey* (SVQ; Schwartz, 1992) and the *Defining Issues Test 2* (DIT2; Rest, 1979). The researchers hypothesized differences in values based on gender and relationship between moral reasoning and values. Upon completion of the selected instruments, \(t\)-test scores indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between respondents’ values based on gender. However, the findings revealed a significant relationship between values and moral reasoning such that respondents who value career achievement reported increased levels of enjoyment in life. These findings study confirmed concepts of value theories in that: (a) Rokeach (1973) theorized that values enhance moral development; (b) Schwartz (2008) indicated that values guide moral behaviors; and (c) Brown and Trusty (2005) asserted that values play an integral role in individual behaviors and life choices.

An exploration of values and leadership of women executives was conducted by Ledbetter (2005) in order to determine the intersection of values, leadership, and the actualization of values in leadership. Ten business executives were selected for this qualitative study. Ledbetter used surveys and interviews in compiling data for this study. A demographic questionnaire as well as *Rokeach Value Survey* (1973) was used. Furthermore, *Schwartz Value Survey* (1992) was also included in interpreting the results of the RVS. The results indicated that effective executive leaders actualize their values in leadership. For example, the researcher found significant value preferences for value-laden leaders and value type, self-direction and
universalism. These results suggested that although leaders prefer to be reliant upon themselves in decision-making, they may also appreciate the diversity of others. Ledbetter (2005) also found relationships between leadership and the value types, achievement and benevolence. That is, leaders regarded personal success as important but also expressed concern for the welfare of others. Just as self-direction and universalism oppose each other on Schwartz’s quasi-circumplex dimension, so too do achievement and benevolence. Although Schwartz (1992) ascertained that opposing values indicate social conflicts for an individual, such that one may be conflicted between acceptance of others and the pursuit of personal success and dominance. Ledbetter (2005) suggested that these opposing values appear to have been strengths for the study participants. The researcher further indicated that the effective leaders were those who were able to accept and appreciate others and still maintain the pursuit of personal and organizational success.

Kim and Omizo (2003) investigated the impact of Asian students’ (N = 242) values and their decision to seek psychological counseling services. Kim and Omizo (2003) determined that Asian students were less likely to seek psychological counseling and hypothesized that Asian American college students’ cultural values would be directly related to their willingness to seek psychological support. The Asian Values Scale (AVS; Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999) and the Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help Short Form (ATSPPH-SF; Fischer & Farina, 1995) were used as the data collection instruments. The results of a multiple regression analysis indicated a significant relationship between cultural values and seeking psychological counseling. There was not, however, a significant relationship between Asian-American students’ cultural values and their willingness to seek academic or career assistance. The results corroborated with Munene and Schwartz’s study (2000) that values influence cultural behaviors
and decisions as well as Brown’s (2002) assertion that cultural values guide decision making. Furthermore, Kim and Omizo (2003) suggested the need for school counselors to be intentional in understanding the cultural values among their student populations in order to encourage students, particularly those uncertain of the importance of the school counseling program in supporting not only their academic needs but also their social, emotional, and personal needs.

Further examination of Asian cultural values was explored by Gloria, Castellanos, Park, and Kim (2008) when they sought to determine differences and relationships between Asian cultural values adherence, cultural congruity, perceptions of university environment, and help-seeking attitudes of Korean American students ($N = 228$). Although the results of Gloria and colleagues (2008) study indicated significance between Asian females’ cultural congruity (fit) and positive help-seeking attitudes, no significance was found between cultural values (male or female) and students’ help-seeking attitudes. The researchers suggested that whereas female Asian students may be open to redefining their gender roles and move away from traditional beliefs, male Asian students may be less prepared to deviate from traditional practices. Based on these results, it is imperative that counselors be aware of the socialization and acculturation issues that Asian students and students of other cultures may encounter.

Additionally, William and Levitt (2008) recognized the challenges that counselors may face in understanding the differences in cultural values among client and counselor and the potential impact of the client-counselor relationship. The qualitative study included 24 participants (clients, $n = 12$; therapist, $n = 12$) and explored the counseling experiences of clients and counselors from different cultures. William and Levitt (2008) found that participants, although having distinct ethnic and racial differences from their counselors, reported no salient multicultural issues in being counseled by a therapist who was culturally different. These
findings suggested that although clients and students may uphold different values based on their cultural influences (Brown, 2002; Munene & Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz, 2006), there may not be a significant impact on the relationship building between counselor and student or client.

In reviewing the theories of values (Brown, 2002; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992), it has been determined that values are acquired through cultural influences and life experiences (Schwartz, 1994) and serve as moral guides for behaviors (Munene & Schwartz, 2000; Rokeach, 1972; Schwartz, 2006), decision-making (Greenbank, 2003), and even career development (Brown, 2002; Brown & Crace, 1996).

Further research on values was conducted by Feathers (1995) in a study on the influences of individuals’ values on their behavior choices. Feathers found a statistically significant relationship between choice behaviors and the varied value dimensions with graduate students in a psychology graduate program ($N = 239$). Specifically, Feathers found that participants’ choice to accept employment where the opportunity existed for independence, freedom, and creativity, but less security was positively related to value dimension, openness to change ($r = .15, p < .001$) but negatively related to value dimension, self-enhancement ($r = -.17, p < .001$). Thus, values guide the decisions that individuals make towards career and social activities. The research discussed on values provides insight into the significance of values on the professional and personal development of individuals and also serves as support for the awareness and implications of counselors providing effective services to all students/clients.

Theories of Leadership

In characterizing leadership, one may find countless definitions in the literature. According to Bennis (1989):
It seems the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another form to taunt us again with its slipperiness and complexity. So we have invented an endless proliferation of terms to deal with it. (p. 259)

The following section provides a comprehensive review of theories of leadership and the unique definitions ascribed to each theory. Particularly, three theories of leadership are discussed, including (a) the *Leadership Challenge Model* (Kouzes & Posner, 1987), (b) The *Contingency Model* (Fiedler, 1966), and (c) the *Transformational Leadership Model* (Bass, 1985).

*The Leadership Challenge Model*

Kouzes and Posner (1987) described five “fundamental practices that enable leaders to get extraordinary things done” (p. 9). The leadership practices include (a) challenging the process, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way, and (e) encouraging the heart. The following section reviews the primary tenets of these five leadership practices.

*Challenge the process.* Individuals in managerial positions often face challenging situations where prompt or difficult decisions must be made. Leaders who face challenging situations take risks and seek out new adventures (Kouzes & Posner, 2000). Leaders are individuals who are willing to guide their followers into exploring new and innovative opportunities for systematic change (Sudbrack & Trombley, 2007). The leader recognizes the dysfunctional routines (Kouzes & Posner, 1995) and develops more functional routines that are “definable, consistent, measurable, and efficient” (p. 44). Effective leadership does not purport that leaders are the inventors or creators of new ideas but rather that they are instrumental in embracing change (Barker, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Inherently, the leader recognizes a discrepancy in the system, explores the risks and challenges associated, and searches for
opportunities for change (Shoemaker, 1999). The effective leader is sensitive to the needs of others (Davidovitz, Mikulincer, Shaver, Izsak, & Popper, 2007), yet is vigilant in encouraging others to be enthusiastic about progressive change (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). Kouzes and Posner (1995) shared three important aspects of leadership:

People who become leaders don’t always seek the challenges they face. Challenges also seek them. Opportunities to challenge the status quo and introduce change, opens the door to doing one’s best and also, challenging opportunities often bring forth skills and abilities that people don’t know they have. (p. 53)

Thus, leadership practices include recognizing the need for change and challenging the status quo in order to facilitate systemic change in order to improve the functionality of the system.

**Inspiring a shared vision.** Some leaders may recognize the need for change and develop a vision as to what potential organizational change would look like (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). The extraordinary leader does not mandate the commitment of the followers; instead, the leader articulates the vision to others so that they feel motivated to assist in promoting organizational change (Shoemaker, 1999). The leader motivates others in order to enlist them in a collaborative effort in promoting a progressive, organized future (Adams & Keims, 2000). Furthermore, Dess and Picken (2000) implied that the shared vision must be clearly communicated so that others may be inspired to share in a sense of organizational purpose and direction. In essence, inspiring a shared vision suggests that the leader recognizes the contributions of others in changing the status quo in the organizational transformation (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). Thus, leadership signifies visionary thinking based on motivation, commitment, and collaborative transformation.

**Enabling others to act.** Effectively enlisting others in promoting organizational change requires leadership founded on integrity, honesty, and humility (Fry, 2005). Leading others also
requires trust (Kouzes & Posner, 2006; Looman, 2003). Enabling others to act indicates the building of a relationship between the leader and follower through trust and positive communication (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The leader confidently strengthens others (Adams & Keims, 2000) by recognizing their potential and allowing them to feel committed to making changes (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Additionally, the leader focuses on building positive relationships by understanding the needs of others through empathy and open communication (Kouzes & Posner, 2006). Consequently, a collaborative association founded on trust and empowerment between the leader and followers is established in order to promote systemic change.

**Modeling the way.** In order to model the way, the leader needs to: (a) know his or her values; (b) have clearly stated goals; and (c) have unambiguous operational plans (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Kouzes and Posner (2006) suggested that when an individual is unclear about his or her values, it becomes difficult to stand up for what he or she believes. According to Rokeach (1973), values help to understand what one’s needs are and how one can best accomplish these identified needs. Therefore, the effective leader understands his or her values and seeks to understand the values of others (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). When shared values are established, the leader is better able to lead by example (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Modeling the way entails leading by example, which may be comparable to Bandura’s (1974) concept of social modeling. Bandura suggested that people prescribe performance requirements for others and demonstrate these requirements through personal conduct. Likewise, Kouzes and Posner (1995) impressed that by example the leader is instrumental in promoting action from the followers, hence creating an environment of shared productivity. Phelps (2008) referred to effective leaders as innovators who are creative *doers* and not just thinkers. Thus, the leader who is modeling the way has an
integrated value system, communicates with others to enhance cooperation, and proceeds to exemplify the process of change as needed in the organization (Looman, 2003).

*Encouraging the heart.* Kouzes and Posner (1999) suggested seven leadership essentials in encouraging others in collaborative change: (a) set clear organizational standards; (b) expect the followers’ best at all times; (c) support followers by paying attention in order to understand their actions; (d) get to know the followers and recognize them personally when an expected goal is attained; (e) share the productive followers’ stories to others in order to convey that they are valued for their performance; (f) celebrate the followers; successes with the other followers, thus encouraging others to duplicate their behaviors; and (g) encourage followers by setting an example. Encouraging the heart further entails celebrating big and small successes with the hopes of motivating others to continue their commitment to promoting organizational change (Leech & Fulton, 2008). Successful leadership focuses on where the greatest need is in fostering positive outcomes (Mulford & Moreno, 2006). Therefore, it may be said that, leaders recognize the contributions of others and show appreciation for their efforts in being a part of creating meaningful systemic change (Kouzes & Posner, 2006).

Posner and Kouzes (1988) recognized that when leaders are performing at their best, they are in fact demonstrating the five leadership practices of challenging, inspiring, enabling, modeling, and encouraging. In order to conceptualize the effective utilization of leadership skills and abilities for organizational success, Kouzes and Posner (1987) used the five components of the leadership challenge model and developed a standardized measure of leadership known as the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988). The LPI was designed to measure five patterns of leadership behaviors which have been identified as the *Five Practices of Exemplary Leaders*. The five patterns include (a) Model the Way, (b) Inspire the Vision, (c)
Enable Others to Act, (d) Challenge the Process, and (e) Encourage the Heart. The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) consists of 30 items on a 10-point Likert scale. There are two versions available: the LPI Self (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) and the LPI Observer (Posner & Kouzes, 1988). Several studies have been conducted using the five leadership practices of the leadership challenge theory. Similarly, other theorists have developed particular theories of leadership which are also supported in the literature. The Contingency Model of Leadership (Fiedler, 1966) is one such theory.

Contingency Model

Fiedler (1966) developed the Contingency Model of Leadership which focuses on the leader and follower relationship. Fiedler and Chemers (1974) expressed that leaders do not function in isolation but rather require followers who are willing to be a part of a goal-focused relationship. The Contingency Model (Fiedler, 1966) provides an understanding of how particular leaders are able to be more influential than others in similar situations. The Contingency model focuses on the leadership behaviors in varied situations that may be instrumental in building leader and follower relationships (Fiedler & Garcia, 1987).

According to Fiedler and Chemer (1974), relationships are fostered by frequent communication between the leaders and the followers as well as awareness of personality differences and shared values between the leaders and followers. Effective, collaborative leaders are trustworthy and honest (Howard, 2005) and work towards assisting their followers in meeting the goals of the organization as well as individual goals. Howard (2005) further stated that effective leaders possess communication skills that are useful in encouraging the followers towards expected behaviors. Thus, effective leadership involves inclusion of skills and personality of the leader in promoting collaboration with others.
In addition to shared personality traits and values, contingency theory suggests that situations play a vital role in influencing leadership effectiveness (Fiedler & Chermers, 1974). Fiedler and Garcia (1987) indicated three important situational elements of the Contingency Model: (a) the relationship established with others within the organization, (b) the task to be performed by leaders and followers, and (c) the power given to the leaders to accomplish his or her appropriate tasks. These appropriate tasks should include clear descriptions of the organization’s goals and expectations (Fiedler, 1993). In summary, the Contingency Model (Fiedler, 1966) supports shared values among leaders and followers to promote organizational goals over varied situations. The success of the leader and follower relationship is founded on positive interaction and consistent communication, as well as established leader control.

Transformational Leadership

The third model of leadership, Transformational Leadership, was developed by Bass (1985). Transformational leadership empowers the follower to look beyond his or her personal agenda or interests in order to develop a higher level of organizational vision. Avolio and Bass (2002) promoted four central components of leadership: (a) idealized influence, which recognizes leaders as respected and trusted role models to their followers; (b) inspirational motivation, which emphasizes the leader’s ability to motivate and challenge followers; (c) intellectual stimulation, which highlights the leader’s capability in stimulating followers to develop new and creative problem solving skills; and (d) individualized consideration, which encourages the leader to provide individual support to followers based on each of the follower’s needs and potential.

Transformational leaders are considered to be charismatic in nature as they possess the personality traits to motivate change (Lashway, Mozzarella, & Grundy, 2006). Charismatic
leaders are held in high esteem by their followers as they are regarded as trustworthy and confident in their abilities (Bass, 1985). Furthermore, charismatic leaders are aware of their organizational goals and visions and are capable of convincing followers to endeavor to accomplish the identified goals (Vallejo, 2008). Transformational leadership includes task allocation (Bass, 1985). Task allocation is conducted in an appealing manner which encourages followers to align with the organization in increasing production (Berson & Avolio, 2004).

Additionally, task allocation is most effective when the leader is able to generate a vision that aligns with the values of the followers, enabling them to contribute willingly to organizational transformation (Barling, Christie, & Turner, 2008). One positive addendum to transformational leadership is that followers are advanced from personal goals and aspirations to collectively accomplishing organizational goals (Vallejo, 2008). Thus, transformational leadership includes the relational aspects which are instrumental in inspiring and motivating followers to cooperatively engage in organizational tasks with a new and fresh perspective resulting in positive organizational productivity.

Transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) has been measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass, 1985). The MLQ measures transformational as well as transactional leadership attributes. The four transformational characteristics include: Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, and Intellectual Stimulation. Additional categories include: Individual Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by Exception (Active), Management by Exception (Passive), and Laissez-faire leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Pounder, 2008). Consequently, Transformational leadership requires the leaders to appeal to the shared values of followers in order to enable them to see
beyond their individual desires to a more guided organizational coalition (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008).

**Summarization of Leadership Theories**

In reviewing these three major theories of leadership, several similarities have been noted. First, each model recognized the relevance of the follower in formulating the leader to follower relationship (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974). According to Fiedler and Chemers, the leader is recognized as a leader only by the report of his or her followers. A second similarity was the importance of *shared values* between the leader and the follower (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Productivity was increased when these values were congruent between both parties as well as consistent with the recognized values as maintained by the organization (Barling et al., 2008; Herold et al., 2008). The concepts of the three leadership models, (a) *Leadership Challenge Model*, (b) *Contingency Model*, and (c) *Transformational Model* of leadership, recognize the importance of effective skills and competencies of the leader in promoting organizational change (Bass, 1985; Vallejo, 2008; Zaccaro, 2007). Finally, leadership theories included the maintenance of clear understanding of the goals of the organization in order to encourage productivity from others (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Berson, 2004; Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Therefore, in reviewing the three leadership theories introduced, four common factors have been identified in promoting effective leadership practices beneficial to systemic organizational change.

**Leadership in Education**

The following section focuses on the aspects of leadership in the context of education and school counseling. Teachers are faced with the challenges of meeting the statutes set by the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB, 2001; Safier, 2007). The National Center for Educational
Statistics (2007) declared that in 2004-2005, eight percent of teachers had left the profession, indicating a need for educational transformation and leadership. A report by Alliance for Excellent Education (2005) stressed that approximately $2.2 billion were spent annually replacing educators’ positions. Since the onset of the NCLB, schools have been inundated with a narrow focus on measuring achievement based on standardized testing (Batagiannis, 2007). One important concern of school administrators is meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), which signifies that the school has accomplished significant improvements in student achievements. Failure to meet AYP may result in disciplinary measures for school administrators and educators (Batagiannis, 2007).

Based on the high accountability of the educational climate, effective school leadership is required in order to meet data-based demands and maintain a safe, learning environment for a diverse population of students (Linn, Sherman, & Gill, 2007). Yet, research indicates that a shortage of leadership in schools exists (Litchka, 2007). Smith and Piele (2006) provided plausible reasons for this shortage, such as (a) shifting roles and expectations of school administrators, (b) time commitment (longer work days), and (c) stress and anxiety related to the position. Leadership shortages in schools necessitate discussions about current leadership practices in schools.

School administrators are the leaders and subsequently the driving force in the school (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Dollarhide, Smith, & Lemberger, 2007). However, the effective school leader recognizes that by facilitating support for and from their followers (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974), including the school counselor, a more comprehensive program may be developed. According to Dollarhide and colleagues (2007), school principals have the power to shape the school counseling program. These researchers contend that to achieve organizational success, the
principals should recognize the importance of collaborating with their school counselors who are themselves capable of taking on a leadership role in schools (Bemak, 2000). Therefore, it is important that school administrators promote the role of the school counselor as a collaborative leader in fostering changes in school policies towards more heightened accountability measures.

School counselors are ideal educational agents in supporting the needs of students based on complex problems such as cognitive and behavioral disabilities (Shillingford, Lambie, & Walter, 2007), change in family dynamics (Shillingford & Edwards, in press), and high poverty (Ylimaki, Jacobson, & Drysdale, 2007). Amatea and West-Olatunji (2007) reported that students from high poverty homes may exhibit elevated levels of anxiety and depression. Furthermore, high poverty students were at risk for detrimental behavioral and academic problems such as developmental delay, absenteeism (Kearney & Bensaheb, 2006), lower academic performance (Bemak, et al., 2005), decrease in graduation rates, and increase in school dropout rate (Stanard, 2003). Student at-risk conditions create a need for cross discipline collaboration (Bemak, 2000). Bemak suggested the partnering of such organizations as social services, mental health agencies (Brown, Dahlbeck, & Sparkman-Barnes, 2006), religious organizations, housing authorities, and law enforcement to support at-risk student population. ASCA (2004) recommended that school counselors take a leadership role in promoting systematic change in students’ academic and social functioning as well as career development by collaborating with all stakeholders.

Although the role of PSCs has been examined (e.g., Amatea, 2007; Chata & Loesch, 2007; Henderson, Cook, Libby, & Zambrano, 2007), the inclusion of leadership practices has been limited. According to Dollarhide and colleagues (2008), longitudinal studies of school counseling leadership have not been conducted. In fact, an extensive literature review revealed minimal empirical studies on school counselor leadership. Nevertheless, PSCs have recognized
the need to take on the role of leader and communicate and interact (Zaccaro, 2007) with their students to facilitate the program goals as advocated by the ASCA (2005) National Model. In light of the multiple student situations in schools (Britzman, 2005), school counselors should embrace programs that are useful in clarifying the goals of the comprehensive guidance program (ASCA, 2005), as well as the overall objectives of the school, in order to meet the needs of students.

**Roadblocks to School Counselor Leadership**

In spite of the call for PSCs to be leaders in schools (Bemak, 2000; Dollarhide, 2007; Education Trust, 2007), obstacles exist which may hinder the implementation of leadership roles of the school counselor. First, compounding roles creates difficulty in identifying appropriate roles (Lambie & Williamson, 2004); school administrators who are the pinnacle of each school and direct task allocation (Ribek-Rosenthal, 1994) may not fully understand the appropriate roles of the PSC (Chata & Loesch, 2007; Shoffner & Williamson, 2000; Zalaquett, 2005). Zalaquett (2005) referred to notable differences in the role perceptions of school principals and that of their school counselors. Furthermore, although effective leadership involved motivating and convincing others to share a collective vision of organizational change (Bass, 1985; Fiedler & Chermers, 1974, Kouzes & Posner, 1995), teachers, who play a vital role in education reform (Kent, 2004), do not often understand the role of the PSC (Amatea, Bringman, & Daniels, 2004; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006).

According to Dahir (2004), confusion as to the role and function of the PSC increased over the last few decades. PSCs are to maintain their accountability, although the concept of the PSC role still remains ambiguous to administrators, teachers, parents, students, and even PSCs
themselves (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). Research provides limited guidelines on improving school effectiveness, although admonition is given for the clarity of roles and the shaping of school leadership beyond that of the principal (Lieberman, 2004). As referenced by Fiedler and Chemers (1974) and Bass (1985), effective leadership is promoted by having a clear understanding of the expectations as well as organizational goals. Furthermore, Avolio and Bass (2002) viewed the leader as a role-model, coach, and motivator in promoting organizational change. There appears to be a discrepancy between what PSCs are required to accomplish and what is actually being practiced; therefore, it seems that in order for PSCs to perform effectively, support is required in clarifying their roles and developing successful leadership practices which will promote appropriate school counseling activities.

Research (Psyarticles, Psyinfo, Education Full Text, Proquest) contains limited information on the effective utilization of leadership by PSCs and even less in empirical studies on the subject. The following section reviews research on effective leadership in the educational and counseling settings, which may be beneficial to PSCs in developing leadership in schools.

Research on Leadership

Research on leadership in education

According to Fiedler (1966), the leader is only as effective as indicated by the followers. Gentilucci and Muto (2007) investigated the perceptions of students on the leadership practices of their principals. The purpose of this study was to investigate students’ \( N = 39 \) perceptions of what leadership practices their school principals were engaged in. Ethnographic data collection method was used to gather student information about the principals; therefore, two key questions were asked of the students: (a) Do students perceive that leadership behaviors of principals have a direct effect on their earning and academic achievement? (b) If yes, what specific leadership
behaviors do students perceive most positively influence learning and academic achievement in their schools? Through open coding and axial coding, Gentilucci and Muto (2007) found that regardless of student differences (e.g., ethnic/race, socioeconomic background), students perceived that the visibility and availability of their administrators to both students’ and staff were effective in increasing student achievement. These results were supportive of Fiedler and Chemers’ (1974) suggestion that effective leaders interact and communicate positively with their followers on a regular and consistent basis. Additional support was also given for Kouzes and Posner’s (2003) assertion that effective leaders are trustworthy and open as well as Lashway and colleagues’ (2006) contention that effective leaders are held in high esteem by others.

Korkmaz (2007) investigated the impact of the school principals leadership style (transformational versus transactional) on the job satisfaction of the teachers and the general organizational health of schools in Turkey. Korkmaz’s (2007) study consisted of 636 high school teachers. A Likert-type questionnaire, which was adapted from Bass’ (1985) Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), was used. The results indicated a preference to the transformational style of leadership, which promoted tolerance, motivation, understanding, and relationship building. Furthermore, the results were consistent with the leadership concepts of inspiring a shared vision (Dess & Pickens, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Shoemaker, 1999) by expressing genuineness and open communication in order to enlist others in promoting organizational productivity (Adams & Keims, 2000) and modeling the way by motivating others to focus on progress through collaboration and team-building (Barling et al., 2008; Berson & Avolio, 2004; Looman, 2003).

Ylimaki, Jacobson, and Drysdale (2007) investigated the leadership influences and perception of the role of school principals in high-poverty schools in the United States, England, 61
and Australia. The researchers identified these schools as having poor student achievement, crime, poor nutrition, and depleting health services. The three geographic locations were selected because they were all under mandates of educational reform. A case study method was used to investigate the perceptions of principals from 13 schools. By conducting interviews with principals, teachers, students, and parents, Ylimaki and colleagues (2007) found that particular leadership traits were consistent among principals such as empathy, passion, persistence, and flexibility. Additionally, it was found that principals recognized the value of each student in terms of their cultural, social, and spiritual backgrounds and collaborated with stakeholders in promoting student differences and academic progression based on the mission and goals of the school. The concept of value recognition in leadership in Ylimaki and colleagues’ study corroborated with Kouzes and Posner's (2006) suggestion that effective leaders are those who are instrumental in understanding the values of followers in order to encourage their collaboration in organizational transformation. Thus, it may be inferred that effective leadership in education includes educators who are willing to (a) recognize the value and beliefs of others; (b) communicate openly; (c) inspire and motivate others in promoting change; and (d) enhance and utilize traits such as empathy, passion, and persistence. In doing so, systemic growth and change may be observed in student achievement and school climate (Dollarhide et al., 2008; Scarborough, 2005; Villalba et al., 2007).

Research on leadership in counseling.

Mason (2008) examined the relationship between school counselors ($N = 305$) leadership practices and their comprehensive program implementation. Multiple regression was used to analyze the leadership practices scores collected from the leadership practices inventory (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988) and the results revealed several significant findings. Mason found
school counselor experience predicted program implementation ($F [1, 286] = 8.50, p < .01), leadership practices of *modeling* the way ($t = 3.65, p < .001$) and *enabling* others ($t = 2.28, p < .05$) predicted program implementation. The findings suggested that varied leadership practices may be instrumental contributors to successful implementation of the ASCA (2005) National Model©.

The practice of leadership in counseling was examined by West, Bubenzer, Osborn, Paez, and Desmond (2006). West and colleagues noted that although the need for leadership in counseling exists, limited research had been conducted to address this issue. The researchers conducted telephone interviews with leaders in the counseling profession which focused on three themes, including (a) consideration in understanding leadership, (b) consideration in developing a vision, and (c) consideration in implementing action. Upon analysis of the data, West and colleagues found that (a) leadership included a value-laden, shared vision communicated between leader and team members (Adams & Keims, 2000; Dess & Pickens, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 2006); (b) leaders consider the diversified perspectives of their group members (Davidovitz et al., 2007; Fiedler & Chermers, 1974; Kouzes & Posner, 1995); (c) leaders think outside the box (Kouzes & Posner, 2006); (d) leaders listen and observe for problems and challenges and develop appropriate resolutions (Kouzes & Posner, 2000; Shoemaker, 1999); (e) leaders are diligent, courageous, and creative in developing organizational vision (Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Phelps, 2008); (f) leaders evaluate for strengths and weakness (Kouzes & Posner, 2006; Mulford & Moreno, 2006); and (g) leaders maintain continuity of the vision by empowering others to embrace the change (Leech & Fulton, 2008). These results were consistent with the models of leadership presented, which delineated effective leaders to facilitate change, to develop visions, and to be risk-takers in sharing those visions. West and colleagues’ (2006)
study, although limited to a non-diversified population and restricted to Q method analysis, represented the ideologies of counselor educators in respect to leadership practices of counselors, and it should be considered as an introduction to a growing need for this practice today.

Dollarhide and colleagues (2008) investigated the perspective of counselor educators concerned with the need for leadership of school counselors. In light of the transformation of schools, these researchers referred to the collaboration of stakeholders in ensuring student achievement. They recognized the need for leaders to build trust, positive relationships, and effective communication in order to facilitate change. Dollarhide and colleagues noted that although the need for research exists, to date, no long-term studies have been conducted. A qualitative approach was used for this study, whereby the three researchers contacted novice school counselors (recent graduates) who were interested in leadership ($N = 5$). Participants were asked to provide their long-range vision for their program, their overall leadership goals, and challenges faced. Data was analyzed using open coding as well as axial coding for themes and consistency.

Dollarhide and colleagues (2008) found significant differences among perceived leaders and non-leaders. Three of the participants made it to the end of the year and successfully considered themselves to be leaders. Two participants were not able to complete the leadership process. The school counselors who reported successful leadership indicated (a) having a clear sense of their responsibilities and task of being a leader, (b) having clear, focused goals in meeting the diverse needs of students; and (c) having positive self-reflections. Furthermore, the successful school counselors as leaders reported the challenge they faced in “selling” their program (Kouzes & Posner, 1995) to administrators and others. However, the school counselors’ clear sense of purpose and direction assisted them in modeling functional leadership by
delivering an effective school counseling program which was recognized by the stakeholders. The unsuccessful participants reported hindrances such as (a) lack of control over school policies, (b) resistance to change by stakeholders, (c) personal fears of failure, and (d) perceptions of inadequacy in being leaders. These results were consistent with the concept of leaders as creative risk-takers who challenge the status quo for progressive change. Although the successful individuals had comparably limited leadership skills, they were able to overcome challenges through collaboration, empowerment, and determination.

In further investigation of school counseling leadership, Berry (2006) explored PSCs’ perceptions of their leadership practices within their schools based on the activities they perform, the school setting, and the amount of time spent on each activity \( (N = 231) \). Berry (2006) found that PSCs who perceived themselves as leaders were more likely to share the school counseling goals with others, such as teachers and administrators (Adams & Keims, 2000; Dess & Pickens, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2003, Shoemaker, 1999). Furthermore, the results indicated that leaders were those who performed their school counseling tasks, such as delivering supportive services to students (e.g., classroom guidance lessons and family consultation), appropriately. Similar to the Dollarhide and colleagues’ (2008) study, the results of Berry (2006) study suggested there may be internal (e.g., fear of failure) and external factors (e.g., lack of administrative support), which may contribute to the effective or ineffective leadership practices of PSCs. Effective leadership involves exploring and identifying risks and challenges associated with systemic change and seeking creative and innovative methods of overcoming potential systemic and individual barriers (Kouzes & Posner, 2006; Shoemaker, 1999; Sudbrack & Trombley, 2008).

Sebera (2005) used the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988) to investigate the frequency with which PSCs \( (N = 114) \) engaged in leadership practices. The
results suggested that a greater number of PSCs engaged in Modeling the Way ($M = 46.83$, $SD = 6.06$), Inspiring a Shared Vision ($M = 42.76$, $SD = 8.69$), and Encouraging the Heart ($M = 47.82$, $SD = 6.86$). However, Enabling Others to Act ($M = 49.59$, $SD = 5.12$), the highest rated construct, was reported to be the usual practice by PSCs. The results of Sebera’s study suggested that PSCs have the ability to collaborate with others in meeting the needs of the school community.

Finally, Grant (2002) explored the leadership practices and perceptions of counseling center directors ($N = 20$) in a qualitative study. The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was used to gain additional insight into the leadership practices of the participants. Grant also utilized Q-sorts and interviews for triangulation of the data. The result indicated that the majority of the participants were highly engaged in the leadership practice of enabling ($M = 52.6$), followed by encouraging ($M = 50.0$), modeling ($M = 48.6$), challenging ($M = 45.8$), and finally inspiring ($M = 43.6$). Furthermore, Grant found that leadership practices in counseling were beneficial in fostering appropriate decision-making, goal-setting, risk-taking, and resolving conflicts. The findings from Grant’s study suggested that effective leadership practices are important in promoting professionalism among counselors. As the research provided information on the influences of effective leadership on professional performance, an examination of the benefits of leadership on the service delivery of PSCs is warranted.

Professional School Counseling Service Delivery

The following section reviews pertinent aspects in the development and management of the school counseling profession. The role of the ASCA (2005) National Model is discussed as
well as related and unrelated school counseling activities of PSCs. Finally, substantial studies are reviewed related to concerns and barriers to effective and ineffective school counseling practices.

Traditionally, the role of leader has been a solitary task mandated to the school administrator (Amatea, Bringham, & Daniels, 2004). PSCs were not included as leaders in educational reform (House & Hayes, 2002). However, with the increased scrutiny on school accountability (NCLB, 2001) and the rise in teacher anxiety and stress (Fitch & Marshall, 2004), administrators are increasingly recognizing the impact PSCs play in promoting the school climate (Fitch & Marshall, 2004). Unfortunately, most school administrators do not understand the role their PSCs are to undertake within their schools (Beale & McCay, 2001). Lambie and Williamson (2004) noted that PSCs themselves are concerned with their roles and activities.

When PSCs are unclear about their roles, the school administrator and other stakeholders may create a role for the PSC according to their own role perceptions (House & Hayes, 2002). When these roles are ambiguous (Culbreth & Scarborough, 2005), the school climate is affected (Fitch & Marshall, 2004). Essentially, the role of the PSC is ambiguous to those with whom PSCs are to collaborate, thus indicating a barrier to systemic change.

Just as role clarity positively impacts leadership (Lieberman, 2004), role ambiguity supports the need for PSCs to be leaders in order to evaluate school counseling programs and eliminate inappropriate counseling activities (Dollarhide, 2003). Additionally, role clarity advances consistency among PSCs (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). According to Dollarhide (2003), effective leadership is displayed when PSC leadership is centered on developing counseling competencies geared towards meeting the needs of all students. Amidst the constraints of the PSC’s role (Lewis & Borunda, 2006), the Education Trust (2007) identified leadership as primary in competence effectiveness of PSCs. Thus, further guidance is required in
identifying appropriate school counseling roles in order for PSCs to achieve leadership in schools.

**History, Growth, & Change of the School Counseling Profession**

School counseling has a long history of growth and change (Dahir, 2004) and it has shifted from its original vocational guidance movement (Gysbers, 2001) to accommodate the rigor and change of today’s society (Burnham & Jackson, 2000). Lambie and Williamson (2004) discussed the evolution of the school counseling movement as being affected by historical events such as the launching of the Sputnik space capsule in 1957, which created a demand for school counselors to pay particular attention in identifying gifted students for scientific careers. Other notable changes in the school counseling role have been (a) the increase in student related problems such as substance abuse (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001), (b) student diversities (Davis, 2006), and (c) school crises (Allen et al. 2002). Hence, the school counseling program has made strides in shifting from a vocational guidance program to a more comprehensive, data-driven, and developmental program. Significant changes have been made by the dedication and professional commitment of leaders in the school counseling profession (Clemens, 2008).

Important contributors include leaders and collaborators of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2004) and collaborators from the Education Trust organization.

*ASCA (2005) National Model ©*. ASCA (2005) has contributed significantly to the advancement of the school counseling profession by providing guidelines for PSCs in developing a comprehensive school counseling program through four main components: (a) foundation, (b) delivery, (c) management, and (d) accountability. These four components may be ideally captured through delivery of services via related school counseling activities, such as counseling, consulting, coordinating, and curriculum development (Scarborough, 2005), and unrelated
school counseling activities such as clerical duties (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001). The foundational aspects of the National Model were established on the works of (a) Gysbers and Henderson (2000; comprehensive guidance program), (b) Johnson and Johnson (2003; results-based guidance), and (c) Myrick (1993; developmental guidance program). The amalgamation of these three models has resulted in the development of an effective school counseling framework for advocacy, leadership, and systemic change as promoted by the ASCA (2005) National Model©.

Education Trust. Another noteworthy contributor to the progress of the school counseling profession is the Education Trust, Inc. (Perusse & Goodnough, 2001), which operates under a grant from the Dewit Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund. In examining the functions of the school counseling profession, the Education Trust conducted a series of focus groups with school counselors, counselor educators, school administrators, and school counseling graduate students (Alexander, Zagelbaum, & Ramariz, 2003). Guerra (1998) reported on the results of the focus groups and noted two observations: (a) school counselors were significantly focused on working with the severe emotional problems of students and not enough on their academic needs, and (b) counselor education programs were not providing school counseling students with the skills and knowledge necessary to function effectively in their schools. These findings created the groundwork for the development of the Education Trust’s Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI; Martin, 2002). The TSCI has since emerged nationally in promoting a new vision for the school counseling program focused on school counselor preparation and the school counselor’s role in providing academic, social/emotional, and career development for all students (Donegan, Goodnough, & Perusse, 2004).
School counselor preparation. ASCA (2008) recently added a position statement in recognition of the importance of PSCs’ preparation for leadership roles in order to provide significant contributions to student outcomes. This new position statement expresses the need for school counselors to be adequately trained in meeting the diverse needs of students, families, schools, and communities. In examining the preparation of school counselors for their roles in schools, it is vital to also include the challenges that students face that necessitate the professional services of the PSC. Allen and colleagues (2002) mentioned the need for PSCs to be adequately prepared to support students in school crises, including shootings, stabbings, bullying, and other verbal and physical altercations (National School Safety Center; [NSSC], 2006). The NSSC reported that in 2005, 28% of students between the ages 12 and 18 described being bullied. The report further recounted school shootings such as the Columbine High School massacre in 1999, the Redlake High school shooting in 2005, and the Amish Schoolhouse shooting in 2006 (NSSC, 2008). Allen and colleagues reviewed the preparation of PSCs in mediating school crises and found that at least 47% of the school counselors ($N = 236$) reported having received crisis training in their graduate program compared with 55% during practicum and internship. The significant number of students who reported being prepared for managing crises in schools is comforting. However, there still remain a vast number of school counselors who reported not being prepared to confront crisis in schools.

Another crucial challenge in education that warrants school counselor preparation is the increase in the number of students identified with disabilities (Milsom, 2007; Milsom, 2006; Scarborough & Gilbride, 2006; Taub, 2007). Milsom (2006) reported on the stigmatization that students experience because of their disabilities. Additionally, Myers (2005) noted the increase in conduct disorder, substance abuse, and depression that these marginalized students may face.
It is therefore imperative that school counselors be prepared to meet the needs of students with disabilities. ASCA (2004) admonishes PSCs to be diligent in providing services to students with special needs. Milsom (2002) examined the preparation of PSCs ($N = 100$) for providing services to students with special needs and found that 82.8% of school counselors reported having provided counseling services to this student population. However, in spite of the PSCs’ engagement in providing special services, they reported being only somewhat prepared to provide these special services. These findings suggested that while PSCs may receive some training in exceptional education services, additional preparation may be necessary in adequately meeting the special needs of students who are disabled.

With the myriad of student concerns which exists such as (a) disabilities (Milsom, 2006), (b) academic difficulties (Day-Vines, Patton, & Baytops, 2003; Edwards & Daire, 2006; Mitchell & Bryan, 2007), (c) cultural and racial inequalities (Bemak & Chung, 2008), and (d) family challenges (Adams, Benshoff, & Harrington, 2007; Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Mitchell & Bryan, 2007), PSCs must assess the effectiveness of the comprehensive school counseling program in meeting the needs of students and families. ASCA (2005) emphasizes the need for accountability and program evaluation. In exploring the preparation of PSCs ($N = 28$) for program evaluation, however, Astramovich, Coker, and Hoskins (2005) found that at least 54% of participating school counselors reported not being trained in program evaluation in their graduate program. Furthermore, 78.5% of the PSCs reported not having received training from district professional development or staff training workshops. The findings provided by Astramovich et al. (2005) presented concerns for the ability of PSCs to adequately evaluate their counseling program and ensure the effective delivery of services to students.
PSCs preparation and training for their roles in schools is necessary in assisting them in promoting systemic change and growth within the school counseling profession (McGlothlin & Miller, 2008; Shenker, 2008). Although counselor education programs, especially those guided by the Council for Accreditation and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009) provide standards to enhance the preparation of school counselors, there appears to be disparity between their preparation and their actual roles in schools (Allen et al., 2002; Astramovich et al., 2005; Milsom, 2002).

Related Service Delivery Activities.

The following section reviews the activities of PSCs in schools and presents research concerning the practice of school counselors in related and unrelated school counseling activities. Under the guidelines of the ASCA (2005) National Model®, PSCs are admonished to engage in providing (a) counseling services to all students (Fein, Carlisle, & Isaacson, 2008; Forbes, 2003; Scarborough, 2005), (b) consultation services to administrators, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders (Amatea, Daniels, & Bringman, 2004; Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Holcomb-McCoy & Mitchell, 2005; Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006), (c) coordination of services for effective program management, and (d) appropriate school counseling curriculum for delivery of services (Fitch & Marshall, 2004; Scarborough, 2005). Also important in the implementation of these related school counseling activities is the time that PSCs spend on each task (Fitch & Marshall, 2004). For example, in exploring the perceptions of school counselors and principals regarding appropriate roles of school counselors, Monteiro-Leitner and colleagues (2006) found that the differences in perceptions of time spent on unrelated tasks like hallway duty and testing were most salient. Whereas PSCs felt that they should not be engaging in those unrelated activities, school administrators felt that these activities were appropriately aligned.
with the school counselor role. ASCA (2005) stated that PSCs should devote at least 80% of their time to appropriate delivery of school counseling services. The results of Monteiro-Leitner et al. (2006) study indicated the need for PSCs to collaborate with administrators in identifying their appropriate roles as delineated by ASCA as well as the awareness of the importance of time management in implementing their school counseling activities.

*Unrelated service delivery activities.*

In spite of the recommendation by ASCA (2005) to engage in suitable school counseling activities, PSCs often engage in unrelated activities (Dollarhide, 2003). Unrelated school counseling activities include clerical duties (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001), disciplinary duties (Monteiro-Leitner et al., 2006), and course scheduling (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). These unrelated school counseling activities may potentially contribute to (a) role stress (Culbreth et al., 2005), (b) role confusion (Lieberman, 2004), (c) marginalization of the school counselor (House & Hayes, 2002; Johnson, 2000; Kaffenberger, Murphy, & Bemak, 2006), and (d) defiant professional identity (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Clarity of role and function is imperative to the effectiveness of the schools in helping students achieve (Lieberman, 2004). Lieberman noted that it is important for school leaders to be vigilant in positively shaping the school environment. PSCs should be leaders in promoting school effectiveness (ASCA, 2005). Adams and Keim (2000) suggested that school counselors be risk takers and search for opportunities for change in the related role activities. Several other professionals in school counseling have also urged PSCs to be leaders in promoting change in effective use of their time and activities in schools for student success (Curtis & Sherlock, 2006; Holowiak-Urquhart & Taylor, 2005; Leech & Fulton, 2008; Militello & Janson, 2007; Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007). In order to promote the identity of PSCs and strengthen the school counseling profession, PSCs need to act as leaders by
engaging in more appropriate school counseling activities, such as counseling, consulting, coordinating, and curriculum development (Scarborough, 2005).

Research Related to Roles and Service Delivery of the PSC

This section focuses on research supporting the role of PSCs and their function as leaders in schools. For example, Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) recognized the on-going discrepancy between actual and preferred counseling practices of school counselors. The researchers sought to determine variables contributing to the discrepancy between time PSCs \((N = 361)\) actually spent on appropriate tasks and their preference in spending their time. Based on a review of research, Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) identified several variables which may potentially contribute to the school counseling activity discrepancy. Identified variables include: (a) school level of employment (elementary, middle, and high), (b) years of school counseling experience, (c) number of students per caseload, (d) amount of time spent on non-guidance related activities, and (e) effective incorporating of the National Standard for School Counseling Program (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008).

Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) found that several of the identified factors did indeed significantly relate to role discrepancy. The following were determined: (a) school counselors had a preference for engaging in more school counseling related activities associated with student outcomes; (b) elementary school counselors were most likely to be practicing in their preferred school counseling activities, whereas high school counselors were least likely; (c) more experienced school counselors were more likely to be practicing their preferred school counseling activities; and (d) school counselors who reported an attempt to include the National Standards for School Counseling Programs were more likely to be practicing their preferred school counseling activities. However, the number of students on the school counselor’s caseload
appeared to have no significant contribution to role activity discrepancies. Essentially, the results of Scarborough and Culbreth’s (2008) study indicated discrepancies exist between the theories and practice of school counseling, which supports the need for PSCs to be aware of the activities which contribute to increasing student outcomes as well as factors which may impede their ability to effectively engage in appropriate school counseling activities. Additionally, based on the results, caution should be given to counselor educators in fostering the awareness of school counseling students in familiarizing themselves with best practices through successful implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program.

Furthermore, Scarborough and Luke (2008) conducted a study to investigate the perceptions of school counselors ($N = 8$) in effectively implementing the comprehensive school counseling program. The researchers sought to determine the personal beliefs, characteristics, and competencies that were instrumental in the school counseling program implementation. Scarborough and Luke found that PSCs who were successful in their program implementation reported having (a) a strong commitment to motivate and encourage others, (b) belief in the mission of the school counseling program, (c) a clear vision of the appropriate role of the PSC and (d) a willingness to be leaders in collaborating with others to implement a successful school counseling program for positive student and school outcomes. Thus, effective school counseling program implementation may possibly be based on the PSC’s personal and professional perspective and commitment to the program.

Hebert (2007) explored how PSCs spend their time and reported statistical significance in the time, task, and knowledge of PSCs ($N = 301$). Using the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale (Scarborough, 2005), the results indicated that PSCs preferred duties that were aligned with the ASCA (2005) National Model© but were often engaged in non-guidance related
activities. Mean scores indicated difference in PSCs actual ($M = 3.10$) and preferred ($M = 2.40$) engagement in non-guidance related activities. Hebert also found differences in the knowledge of PSCs based on the school level and school location. For instance, elementary school counselors were found to be more knowledgeable in counseling issues, whereas, high school counselors were more knowledgeable in school to work issues ($F [6, 298] = 51.367, p < .001$). Based on these results, it may be concluded that PSCs most often engaged in activities where they were most knowledgeable. However, it appear that although the PSCs may prefer to spend more time with related student activities, they may often be found engaged in activities unrelated to their role as school counselors.

Clark (2006) examined the relationship between PSCs ($N = 118$) use of the ASCA (2005) National Model© and their self-efficacy. The scores from the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005) and the School Counselors Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE; Clark, 2006) indicated statistically significant correlations between use of the National Model and the self-efficacy of the participants. For example, counseling and consultation services were found to correlate significantly to self-efficacy. However, Clark reported that there were statistically significant correlations between other services (e.g., hall duty, clerical duties) and self-efficacy. Additionally, knowledge of the ASCA (2005) National Model© explained at least 17% of the variance in self-efficacy. Thus, it appears that knowledge and appropriate utilization of the National Model may be predictive of the self-efficacy of PSCs.

Sink and Yillik-Downer (2001) explored PSCs’ ($N = 1,033$) perceptions of the implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program and found that a relationship existed between the value that PSCs assigned to the school counseling program and their ultimate engagement in the program. PSCs immersed in the varied aspects of planning through
implementation of the school counseling program were more successful in collaborating and completing appropriate school counseling tasks than PSCs who were only engaged in program implementation. Sink and Yillik-Downer (2001) suggested that PSCs with greater involvement in the program reform process were less concerned about other program tasks. The results indicated the need for counselor educators and school administrators to support PSCs in recognizing the importance of implementing the comprehensive school counseling program. The results also provided evidence of the need for PSCs to collaborate and communicate their vision and goals to stakeholders in order to enable others to successfully manage the comprehensive school counseling program.

In determining the new directions for school counseling and the appropriate delivery of the comprehensive school counseling program, Walsh, Barrett, and DePaul (2007) investigated novice school counselors with experience in the field ranging from one to five years. Walsh and colleagues found that 17% of these novice school counselors’ activities were programmatic (staff & agency support), 23% of their activities were on prevention and advocacy, and 60% of their activities were devoted to collaborative delivery of services. It was not surprising that with the increase in advocacy by CACREP (2009) for improvement in school counselor preparation, novice school counselors were able to significantly engage in appropriate school counseling activities. However, a concern still remained for the number of experienced school counselors who may not be prepared for the challenges in schools today.

Beesley (2004) investigated teachers’ perceptions (N = 188) of the effectiveness of their school counseling programs. Their focus was on the teachers’ satisfaction with counseling services, the schools counselor’s areas of strengths as perceived by the teachers, and suggestions for improvement. The results indicated that 67% of teachers were “somewhat” to “extremely
satisfied” with the school counseling program; 33% reported being “somewhat satisfied” to “dissatisfied”. Also, more than one-third of the participants reported that specific areas of service were “somewhat” to “extremely inadequate” such as the career counseling services provided by their schools PSC. Beesley (2004) indicated that teachers were in an ideal position to evaluate PSC services. Beesley’s concept was aligned with the indication of Fiedler and Chemers (1974) that leaders should not function in isolation but rather should consider the values and philosophies of others. These results supported the need for program evaluation in order to procure accountability (Kouzes and Posner, 1995).

Most recently, Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) explored the readiness of PSCs ($N = 1,244$) in delivering a comprehensive school counseling program. Dahir and colleagues used a 56 question survey, which solicited PSCs involvement in advocacy, leadership, use of data, consultation, collaboration, and counseling. The researchers found that elementary school counselors placed higher priority on classroom guidance ($M = 3.89$) and small group counseling ($M = 3.64$). Furthermore, Dahir and colleagues reported that middle school counselors delivery services were closer aligned with the ASCA (2005) National Model© than elementary or high school counselors. Conversely, high school counselors were found to score lowest in service delivery except in delivering career development services to students. Therefore, based on the results of Dahir et al. (2009), school level differences exist in the perceived readiness of school counselors in delivering successful school counseling services.

Promoting change includes engaging in more appropriate school counseling activities (Forbes, 2003; Gysers, 2001; Scarborough, 2005), taking risks (Adams & Keim, 2000; Holowiak-Urquhart, 2005), and communicating a clear vision of the school counseling program (Leech & Fulton, 2008; Militello & Janson, 2007) through collaborative leadership (Dollarhide,
Finally, promoting change means awareness of the need for change and the potential that PSCs have in making a difference in education. Kouzes and Posner (1995) indicated that by initiating change, individuals may become aware of abilities and skills that they did not know they possessed. Therefore, promoting change includes knowing one’s self and recognizing one’s potential to succeed.

Summary of the Literature Review

This chapter reviewed three models of leadership: Leadership Challenge, Contingency Model, and Transformational Leadership. A review of leadership in education and school counseling was also presented. Research on leadership was reviewed as support for the need for further examination of leadership in counseling. Additionally, a review of the theories of value was presented as developed by Rokeach (1973), Schwartz (1992), and Brown (1996). Research revealed consistent findings in support of the need for further examination of the impact of values in education and counseling. The final factor, school counseling service delivery was presented with a thorough discussion on role discrepancies among practicing school counselors. Research was also presented in order to reveal obstacles to effective leadership roles in schools.

The review of the literature of Values, Leadership, and Service Delivery revealed the need for school counselors to be leaders in order to facilitate a change in the ambiguous nature of the school counseling program. The concept of values in school counseling, although limited in current educational research, appears to be influential in fostering effective collaboration amongst organizational stakeholders. Values in school counselor behavior choices merit further investigation in reorganizing role activities for a more collaborative alignment with educational
reform policies. The following chapter reviews the research procedures and methodologies used for this study.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The following chapter describes the research methodology of this study, which includes: (a) population and sample, (b) data collection method, (c) instruments used, (d) research design, (e) methods of data analysis, (f) research hypotheses, and (h) ethical considerations.

Population and Sample

The population of interest for this study was practicing professional school counselors (PSCs) within the state of Florida. Stratified random sampling was used to assure representation of the school counselors from the general population (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Stratified sampling identifies subgroups or strata which exist in the total population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The strata for this study were a random sample of PSCs from each school level (Elementary, Middle, and High). In order to secure a 95% confidence level, at least 359 participants were required. In determining the sample size, four components were reviewed: (a) confidence level, which is the amount of risk involved in representing the true population value within a given range (Creswell, 2002); (b) sampling error, which represents the estimated range in which the true value of the population falls and is represented in percentages (Gay & Airasian, 2003), where, a sampling error of ±.05 is used (Creswell, 2002); (c) the degree of variability, which indicates the distribution of attributes of interest and is often selected as .5 as it represents the maximum variability of the population (Gay & Airasian, 2003); and (d) population of school counselors in the state of Florida, which was approximately 5000 (Florida Department of Education, 2007).

According to a review of research published in the Professional School Counseling journal (e.g., Clemens, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnson, 2008; Simmons, 2008), it appeared that the survey research response rate among school counseling professionals
was at about 30%. Additionally, Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2008) indicated even lower response rates associated with online surveys. Therefore, because of the low response rate associated with school counselors and online surveys, a targeted sample of 795 potential participants were invited to participate in this study in the hopes of securing the anticipated 359 participants ($n = 265$ elementary; $n = 265$ middle; $n = 265$ high).

Data Collection

The data collection process adhered to Dillman’s (2007) Tailored Design Method. Email addresses for certified school counselors in the state of Florida were provided by the Florida Department of Education, Office of Information Database. The State of Florida’s educational database reports 5,000 certified school counselors. Dillman (2007) cautions against coverage error; therefore, emails were only sent to practicing PSCs in the State. Additionally, caution was given to increase the low response rates associated with email surveys (Dillman, et al. 2008; Foster, Young, & Hermann, 2005). Dillman and colleagues suggested various implementation methods to increase response rate. The first implementation method entailed decreasing measurement error by ensuring that the instruments being used were legible and that the directions were clearly understood. Therefore, a review of the research packet was conducted using all four data collections instruments identified in this study.

Participants involved in the research packet review were counselor education doctoral level students. An email was sent to all potential participants who verbally agreed to participate in the research review process. Students were asked to complete the questionnaire and give feedback as to the readability and clarity of all the survey items including, the demographic
questionnaire. Students were also asked to report on the amount of time that it took to complete the questionnaire.

Upon completion of the research packet review, any other instrumental issues which may have potentially affected the outcome of the study were addressed. For example, the demographic questionnaire was revised to include beneficial suggestions for clarity and conciseness. The demographic questionnaire was also reviewed by experts in the field of counseling for face validity. Subsequently, permission was requested and granted from the dissertation chair and committee members as well as the University of Central Florida’s Institutional Review Board for the commencement of the study.

Another implementation method suggested by Dillman and colleagues (2008) in increasing response rate is multiple contacts with participants. An invitation email was sent to all potential participants randomly selected from the state’s school counselors’ database. Included in the invitational email was a link to a secured website (SurveyMonkey), where respondents were able to access the surveys for completion. The secured link transferred participant information in an encrypted format managed by the websites Verisign program whereby only the researcher was able to view participants’ responses. Upon entry to the website, participants received information on the informed consent form, which included a thorough explanation of the purpose of the study. Participants were also informed that (a) their participation was voluntary and they could withdraw from completing the surveys at any time, (b) their participation would remain anonymous, and (c) their email addresses were obtained from the Florida Department of Education. The IRB Waiver of Informed Consent form was used in this study; therefore, participants’ signatures were not required.
Permission was granted by the survey developers and/or copyright publishers to use the instruments electronically. For the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) permission was granted by the office of copyright services for Jossey-Bass (personal communication, August 26, 2008). Permission to use the *Schwartz Value Survey* (Schwartz, 1992) electronically was granted by the instrument developer (personal communication, August 21, 2008). Permission was granted by the instrument developer for the *School Counselors Activity Rating Scale* (Scarborough, 2005) by personal communication on August 24, 2008. Only surveys that indicated participant agreement were included in the study.

In accordance with Dillman and colleagues (2008) suggestion of multiple contacts, a “thank you”/”reminder email” was sent to participants one week into the data collection period, thanking those who had already responded and reminding those who had not yet completed the surveys. Dillman and colleagues (2008) suggested including the link to the surveys in the reminder email. One week later, another reminder email was sent to participants with the survey link attached. Finally, four weeks after the original email was sent, the web link was terminated with the fourth and final contact thanking participants for their time in completing the surveys. For participants who were unable to navigate comfortably through technology, Dillman (2007) suggested providing an alternate method whereby participants could print out the surveys and mail them directly to the researcher. This alternate method was made available to participants.

Additionally, Dillman and colleagues (2008) implementation method for increasing the response rate included offering an incentive for participation. Each school counselor who was invited to participate in the study was offered a $5.00 discounted gift certificate to one of four professional development workshops offered by the Florida School Counselor Association. Invited participants had access to the gift certificate on the survey website and were encouraged
to print and utilize the gift certificate regardless of their participation in the study. Upon completion of the surveys, participants were given the opportunity to provide their corresponding information if they wished to participate in future aspects of the study.

The guidelines for this study adhered to the University of Central Florida’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB provides federal regulations as guided by ethical principles based on the Belmont Report and Federal Policies for the Protection of Human Subjects (Department of Health & Human Services, 2008). Additionally, the study was guided by the expertise of the researcher’s dissertation chairperson and other committee members.

Instruments

Four data collection instruments were used in this study: (a) a demographic questionnaire developed by the researcher, (b) the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992), (c) Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 1995), and (d) the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005). The following section provides comprehensive information on the data collection instruments and support for their use in this study. Additionally, research regarding the psychometrics of the instruments is reviewed.

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire, a one-page document, was developed by the researcher and contains items requesting information from participants’ such as (a) ethnicity/race, (b) school level (elementary, middle, high), (c) length of employment, and (d) school location (rural, urban, suburban). Additionally, the demographic questionnaire included five-point Likert scaled statements investigating school counselors’ perceptions of their professional service.
**Schwartz Values Survey (SVS)**

The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) was developed by Schwartz (1992) and was founded on Schwartz’s value theory. Schwartz suggested that values are desirable, trans-situational goals that vary in importance and serve as guiding principles in the lives of individuals. The SVS consists of 57 items, each based on values which serve as guided principles. Each of the 57 items represents 10 value domains: (a) achievement, (b) power, (c) security, (d) conformity, (e) tradition, (f) tradition, (g) benevolence, (h) universalism, (i) self-direction, (j) stimulation, and (k) hedonism (Schwartz, 1995). Schwartz further categorized each of the 10 values into four main dimensions: (a) Openness to change (stimulation and self-direction), (b) Self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence), (c) Conservatism (conformity, tradition, and security), and (d) Self-enhancement (power and achievement) (Schwartz, 1992). Hedonism is thought to be shared with both openness to change and self-enhancement.

The SVS was determined to be a useful instrument for measuring values in this study as it has been empirically tested in over 200 studies from over 60 countries (Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004). Additionally, the SVS has been translated into 46 different languages for use in numerous studies with different cultures. Consideration for choosing the SVS was supported by several components:

1. The SVS is an ideal tool for studies relating to correlations between variables (Barnea & Schwartz, 1998) and has sufficient reliability and validity.

2. The SVS is widely used in social and psychological studies, particularly in examining behaviors patterns (Schwartz, 1992). The SVS has been used to measure values in relation to eating disorders (Pollack, 2003), self-esteem (Feathers, 1991), and vocational choices (Sagiv, 2002).
3. The subscales of the SVS allow participants to express their beliefs about measures such as social power that are often viewed as negative and inappropriate in public conversations (Schwartz, 1992).

4. The SVS uses the rating method rather than ranking. Braithwaite and Law (1985) reported that the ranking method is deficient in reporting the priorities or representation of the general public.

In completing the SVS (Schwartz, 1992), respondents were asked to rate each of the 57 items based on its importance as a guiding principle in their lives. Items are scored on a nine-point Likert scale ranging from 7 (of supreme importance), 6 (very important), 3 (important), 0 (not important), and -1 (opposed to my values). Participants were asked to indicate the number on the 9-point Likert scale in order of importance of each value. Although respondents were informed that it may be possible to use a particular number more than once based on the perceived importance of the values, Schwartz (1992) surmised that a rating of seven indicated that the identified value is of supreme importance as a guiding principle and that ordinarily, there are no more than two such high priority values (Schwartz, 2003).

The SVS (Schwartz, 1992) items are categorized into three sections. The first section includes 30 principles in the form of nouns, such as social power and freedom. The next section consists of the remaining 27 principles in the form of adjectives such as loyal and honest. The third section consists of statements soliciting background information of respondents. For this study, only the first two sections comprising the 57 guiding principles were used. The third section contains information like marital status and religion, which were deemed inappropriate for this study.
Items on the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) were scored by calculating the total score on all the items and then dividing by the total number of items (57). Schwartz (2007) referred to the final score as the MRAT or Mean Rating score of a participant. Additionally, raw scores for the 10 value types were calculated using an item scale. Table 2 indicates the scoring keys for the 10 value item scales. Higher scores are indicative of stronger orientation towards the value, whereas low scores are indicative of weaker orientation toward the value (Schwartz, 1992).

**Table 2: Scoring Keys for 10 Value Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Item Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>34, 39, 43, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>3, 12, 27, 46, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>5, 16, 31, 41, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>9, 25, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>4, 50, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>11, 20, 40, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>18, 32, 36, 44, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>8, 13, 15, 22, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>33, 45, 49, 52, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>1, 17, 24, 26, 29, 30, 35, 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Alpha coefficient reliability for the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) was reported as follows: (a) *universalism* (.74), (b) *self-direction* (70), (c) *tradition* (.60), (d) *security* (.70), (e) *benevolence* (.70), (f) *conformity* (.72), (g) *stimulation* (.72), (h) *hedonism* (.74), (i) *achievement* (.72), and (j)
power (.68) (Schwartz, 2005). Schwartz reported that the reliability for the subscale value, tradition, remained low as it contains only two factors which fit the model. However, the instrument remains adequate for use in research as it has been tested and remains consistent in over 23 studies. Ary and colleagues (2002) indicated that alpha coefficients as low as .60 may be considered acceptable, particularly when the instruments are measuring personality traits or predicting behaviors.

Numerous studies have indicated the SVS to be reliable and valid in measuring individual values (Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Sagie, 1995). Brandlmayr (2007) found reliability coefficients ranging from .72 to .84 for the four dimensions (openness, self-transcendence, self-enhancement, and conservatism) in investigating perceptions of values in dating couples ($N = 359$). It was further found that perceptions of dimensions of self-transcendence and self-enhancement opposed each other, further supporting Schwartz’s values dimensional model. These results confirm the structure and psychometric properties of the SVS.

The reliability of the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) was further supported when Bacinelli (2006) found alpha coefficients ranging from .60 to .80 among 292 participants while investigating the impact of values on selective adoptive resource services. Bacinelli’s study also reported that respondents scored higher on the value benevolence (ensuring the well-being of others) and lowest on power (social status & prestige), thus lending support to Schwartz’s theory of opposing dimensions of self-transcendence and self-enhancement. Bruursema (2007) found alpha coefficients ranging from .61 to .83 in investigating contributions of individuals’ values and trait boredom in relation to job characteristics and job boredom ($N = 211$).

Construct validity for the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) was supported when Schwartz and Sagiv (2000) examined value consensus and value importance across cultures in terms of
socioeconomic development ($N = 7,856$). A statistically significant positive correlation was found between socioeconomic development and the importance of self-direction ($r = .56$), stimulation ($r = .52$), benevolence ($r = .53$), and hedonism ($r = .41$). A positive correlation ranging from .30 to .50 is considered to be moderate and a positive correlation of .50 to 1.00 is considered to be large (Cohen, 1988). Therefore, Schwartz and Sagiv’s (2000) results indicated moderate to large strength and direction of the relationship between the two variables. A comparison between individuals’ values as measured by the SVS and influences on attitudes about the diversity of others who are different (age, gender, race, and religion) found significant relationships between openness to change and self-transcendence and diversity attitudes. Individuals who scored higher on these two value dimensions had more significantly positive diversity attitudes (Sawyerr, Strauss, & Yan, 2005).

Struch and colleagues (2002) explored differences in cross-cultural meaning that men and women place on values as measured by the SVS ($N = 11,244$). The researchers found that values were displayed identically for both men and women across the eight cultures. These findings supported the validity of the SVS in measuring potentially differing values of individuals across cultures. These results were vital to the current study as the examination includes racial differences among PSCs, which may contribute to their leadership practices.

Although the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) has been used extensively in research, it appears that very few studies examined the contributions of values to education. For example, Fagan (1996) and Hollway (2003) both examined the values of graduate students; however, in reviewing research in educational databases (Ebscohost, Education, Psychinfo, Proquest), no studies were found investigating the contributions of values to educational leadership. Few studies were found that examined values and leadership in related fields; Rendall (2004) used the SVS (Schwartz,
1992) to compare values among different types of leaders (social enterprising and leaders of non-profit and for profit business) and found statistically significant differences between the values shared among the groups. For example, Rendall found statistical significance between social enterprise leaders and business leaders on openness to change/conservative value scale ($t = 2.01; p < .05$). The results of this study suggested that there may indeed be differences in leadership practices based on the values of individuals. However, Rendall’s study was limited by a low response rate ($N = 36$). Nevertheless, the results are useful in further examining other potential significant contributions of values as measured by the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) to leadership practices. However, Johnson (2002) used the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) to measure the values of 93 first level business supervisors. It was found that there was no linear relationship between supervisors’ values and their behaviors. The data from both Rendall’s study and Johnson’s study suggested systemic differences in investigating values among business professionals. Therefore, exploration of potential differences in values among practicing PSCs may be beneficial in contributing to their leadership practices and effective service delivery.

*Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)*

The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) was developed by Posner and Kouzes (1988) and consists of 30 Likert scaled items. The LPI is available in two versions: the LPI-Self (Posner & Kouzes, 1988), which focuses on the self-report of potential leaders, and the LPI-Observer (Posner & Kouzes, 1988), which focuses on the reports of observers on the potential leaders’ practices. Observers may include co-workers, managers, and others working in close proximity with the individual in the leadership position. The *Student Leadership Practices Inventory* (SLPI; Posner & Brodsky, 1992) was derived from the LPI and is a useful tool for measuring student
leadership practices. For the purposes of this study, the LPI-Self was used to measure leadership practice of PSCs.

The LPI-Self (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was the instrument of choice for this study as its constructs captures the essence of school counselors in terms of motivating and empowering others towards reaching an identified goal. The five factors of the LPI include: (a) Challenge the Process, which measures the individual’s ability to make systemic changes and set appropriate goals; (b) Modeling the Way, which measures the individual’s ability to lead by example; (c) Inspiring a Shared Vision, which measures the ability to motivate other to attain organizational goals; (d) Enabling Others to Act, which measures the individual’s ability to allow others to join in a collaborative partnership for change; and (e) Encouraging the Heart, which measures the ability of the individual’s to evaluate progress and celebrate the successes of others. Other leadership instruments like the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass, 1985) were considered. Although the MLQ (Bass, 1985) maintains strong reliability and validity, its constructs (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) appeared more managerial in nature and was therefore deemed inappropriate for the purposes of the present study. Another leadership instruments considered was the Leadership Competency Inventory (Kelner, 1993), but was found to lack a sound theoretical framework (Pearson, 2004). Still other leadership instruments were investigated and were found to either be more appropriate for the corporate industry or were too lengthy for this study. Permission to use the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was granted by the authors.

The LPI-Self (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was originally developed based on a sequence of case studies which involved over 1,100 managers and other professionals across various professional organizations (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). The case studies focused on these
professionals detailed experiences of their most effective leadership experiences. From the data produced by the case studies, the five leadership practices emerged. The original LPI (Self and Observer) consisted of 30 items measured on a 5-point Likert scale. However, after modifications to strengthen the sensitivity of the instrument, the measurement scale was changed to a more robust 10-point Likert scale (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The scale includes the following value ranges: (a) Almost never, (b) Rarely, (c) Seldom, (d) Once in a while, (e) Occasionally, (f) Sometimes, (g) Fairly Often, (h) Usually, (i) Very frequently, and (j) Almost always. A higher score on any scale indicates more frequent leadership practices (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Table 3 displays the five leadership practices and corresponding 30 items.

**Table 3: Leadership Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Item Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Kouzes and Posner, (2003)

The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) is scored by linking responses from the 30 items to the items scales depicted on Table 1. After the itemization, the mean scores are calculated for each of the five leadership practices measured on the instrument (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). The higher the mean score, the greater the leadership practices. The clarity of the scoring and interpretation of the scores on the LPI promotes the usefulness of this instrument in this study.
Further utilization of the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) in research has supported the psychometric properties of the instrument. The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was administered to over 350,000 managers and other professionals across varied professions and disciplines (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and was analyzed through factor analysis and principle component analysis of the 30 items. The reported internal reliability consistency ranges from .75 to .87 for the LPI-Self and .81 to .92 for the LPI-Observer (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Test-retest reliability ranged from .93 to .95. As the LPI continues to be refined, varied forms of the instrument have been developed to use with other populations. The LPI-Individual Contributor (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) has been developed for use with individual contributors and non-managers, and the LPI-Team (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) has been developed for use with college students.

The reliability of an instrument refers to its consistency in measuring its stated constructs (Kubiszyn & Borich, 2006). Several other researchers have reported comparable degrees of reliability and validity in studies using the LPI to measure leadership practices across various professions. For example, Fields and Herold (1997) used the LPI to measure transformational and transactional leadership and found alpha coefficients ranging from .82 to .92. Additionally, Fields and Herold reported that confirmatory factor analysis of the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was consistent with the model structure reported by Posner and Kouzes (1993). These substantial results lend support for the psychometric strength of the LPI. Upon investigation of the leadership constructs measured by the LPI, Leech and Fulton (2008) investigated teachers’ perceptions (N = 646) of the leadership behaviors of their principals and their perceptions of the decision-making practices in their schools. Using Pearson’s product-moment correlation, statistically significant relationships were found between leadership behaviors of the principals and their level of decision-making. The results of Leach and Fulton’s study indicated that
principals who maintain strong leadership practices as measured by the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) were thought to display more impressive decision-making practices, thus, supporting the validity of the LPI.

Further examination of leadership practices in education was determined when Halloran (2007) found alpha coefficients ranging from .89 to .90 in investigating the perceptions of leadership practices among male and female superintendents ($N = 121$). Halloran also determined that the five factors on the LPI explained 73.7% of the variance of the 30 items on the LPI. These results were supportive of the psychometric strength of the five leadership practices measured on the LPI in investigating leadership practices among educators.

The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) has also been used in the counseling profession to determine the influences of numerous variables on the leadership practices of counselors. Webster and Hackett (1999) reported alpha coefficients ranging from .92 to .96 in a study investigating aspects of burnout and leadership behaviors in community mental health counselors ($N = 151$). The researchers also found a statistically significant relationship between the LPI scales and emotional exhaustion of counselors. Webster and Hackett (1999) determined that effective leadership practices may contribute to better working environments for counselors and others, especially when the process of change is challenged. Sebera (2005) investigated the frequency with which PSCs ($N = 114$) engage in leadership practices. The results suggested that a greater number of PSCs engaged in Modeling the Way ($M = 46.83$, $SD = 6.06$), Inspiring a Shared Vision ($M = 42.76$, $SD = 8.69$), and Encouraging the Heart ($M = 47.82$, $SD = 6.86$). However, Enabling Others to Act ($M = 49.59$, $SD = 5.12$), the highest rated construct, was reported to be the usual practice by PSCs. The results of Sebera’s study suggested that PSCs have the ability to collaborate with others in meeting the needs of the school community.
Sebera’s report was consistent with Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) assertion that *Enabling Others to Act* is the most common practice among leaders.

Validity of an instrument is “that quality that enables it to measure what it is supposed to measure” (Best & Kahn, 2006; p. 289). The LPI contains excellent face validity and construct validity (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) maintained strong discriminant validity when examined with the *Leadership Effectiveness Scale* (Posner & Kouzes, 1988), which was developed for the researchers for the LPI validity study. The *Leadership Effectiveness Scale*, which measured managers’ abilities to meet the needs of their subordinates, produced alpha coefficients of .98. When a multiple regression procedures were conducted with the five practices of the LPI, a strong prediction for the *Leadership Effectiveness* scale was found ($F = 318.9, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .756$). These results confirmed the strong evidence of the discriminant validity of the LPI; in other words, the constructs of the LPI were able to stand against the strong reliability of the opposing instrument (Posner & Kouzes, 1988). Numerous researchers have used the LPI in studies relating to education, business, and other professions (e.g., Barr, 2007; Braue, 2008; Halloran, 2007; Koh, 2008) and have determined acceptable validity in measuring the constructs of leadership. The results of the studies noted in this section support the appropriateness of using the LPI in examining the leadership practices of PSCs.

*School Counselors Activity Rating Scale (SCARS)*

The *School Counselors Activity Rating Scale* (SCARS) was developed by Scarborough (2005) in order to provide a data collection process in describing the role activities of PSCs. Scarborough sought to develop a standardized instrument where-by best practices of PSCs could be measured. As reported by Scarborough, previous studies investigating the activities of PSCs (e.g. Carroll, 1993; Mustaine, Pappalardo, & Wyrick, 1996; Scarborough, 2005) have resulted in
discrepancies among the actual practices of PSCs. Furthermore, previous researchers who have investigated PSCs’ roles have provided minimal reliability and validity information about the instruments they used (Scarborough, 2005). In fact, a lack of psychometrically sound instruments to measure PSC service delivery exists (Scarborough, 2005). Scarborough developed the SCARS in order to provide researchers with a psychometrically sound instrument for measuring school counselor activity.

The SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) was developed in two phases. The first phase included the developer compiling a list of work activities of PSCs as advocated by ASCA (2004). Additionally, a literature review was conducted to verify appropriate design and measurement for instrument on PSC activities. The second phase included pretest to appraise for mistakes, readability, and appropriate construction of the instrument. Finally, the instrument was reviewed by five professionals in the field of school counseling. The SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) was then revised based on feedback received from the school counseling experts. Through this analysis, face validity was confirmed.

The SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) confirmatory study was conducted using 600 school counselors (elementary, middle, and high) from two southern states. Although the sample included a diversified representation of the school counseling population, the majority of the participants were European American (87.4%) females (89.7%). Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to identify factors and to establish validity of the SCARS. Additional statistical methods were used to assess the instrument including factor analysis, ANOVA, and correlations on demographic variables. The resulting version of the SCARS included PSCs’ Actual Practice and Preferred Practice in school counseling activities. The results yielded five subscales: (a) Curriculum (alpha coefficient .93 actual and .90
preferred); (b) Coordination (alpha coefficients .84 actual and .85 preferred); (c) Counseling (alpha coefficients .85 actual and .83 preferred); (d) Consultation (alpha coefficient .75 actual and .77 preferred); and (e) Other, which included clerical, administrative and other non-guidance duties (alpha coefficients .84 actual and .80 preferred).

Construct validity of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) was established by the examination of group differences among PSCs \((N = 360)\) based on their levels of employment (elementary, middle, and high). A significant difference was found between grade levels and the subscales of the SCARS. Furthermore, correlations between the subscales of the SCARS and a demographic assessment were used to establish discriminant validity. Two significant correlations were found between Coordination \((r = .21, p < .001)\) and Consultation \((r = .19, p < .001)\) and years of experience (demographic information). Based on Cohen’s (1988) guidelines for correlations, Scarborough’s results suggested very small effect size between PSCs’ years of experience and their self-report of Consulting and Coordinating.

The present version of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) consists of 48 items that describe the school counseling activities of PSCs. These 48 items are categorized as five subscales: (a) *Counseling*, which consists of 10 items and describes counseling activities such as individual and small group counseling, (b) *Consultation*, which consists of seven items and describes consultative activities that the PSC may engage in such as consult with school staff concerning student behavior, (c) *Curriculum*, which consists of eight items and describes activities in classroom guidance and curriculum development, (d) *Coordination*, which consists of 13 items and includes statements such as “Conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs”; and the final subscale, (e) “*Other Services*”, which consists of 10 items and describes unrelated counseling activities that the PSC may participate in such as handle discipline of students.
Participants completing the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) are asked to rate their Actual and Preferred activities on a 5-point Likert scale. This Likert scale solicits responses based on frequency of participation in each activity and includes ratings: (a) Never, (b) Rarely, (c) Occasionally, (d) Frequently, and (e) Routinely. Data collected from the SCARS may be reported as total scores by calculating the total score for each of the five subscales or by calculating mean scores. Mean scores may be calculated by dividing the total by the number of items in each subscale (Scarborough, 2005). Higher scores in each subscale suggest higher levels of engagement in each school counseling activity. For the purpose of this study in investigating PSCs’ leadership styles, permission was granted by the instrument developer through personal communication, to modify the SCARS to only include the Actual practice of the respondents.

Various studies have been conducted supporting the reliability and validity of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). For example, Hebert (2007) reported alpha coefficients ranging from .61 to .96 when examining school counselors (N = 305) time spent on varied tasks. The researcher reported low reliability for the Coordination subscale due to missing data. Clark (2006) explored school counselors’ self-efficacy in relation to the ASCA (2005) National Model and used the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) to measure the activities of 118 school counselors. Alpha coefficients were found to range from .78 to .91. Clark’s study provided evidence of significant positive relationships between the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) and the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale (SCSE; Clark, 2006) further supporting the validity of the SCARS. Furthermore, significant correlations were found between PSCs’ self-efficacy and understanding of the ASCA (2005) National Model©. In analyzing PSC leadership behaviors based on school counseling activities, Berry (2006) reported Cronbach alphas ranging from .71 to .91 for the subscale of the
SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) and found statistical significance between level of employment (elementary, 87%) on one of the items on the curriculum subscale and on 13 of the coordination activities. The significant findings indicate the accuracy of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) in examining school counseling activities of PSCs in relation to other variables such as their level of experience and level of instruction. Berry (2006) found that PSCs were spending much of their time on non-counseling activities like participation in school administrative committees. Additionally, significant differences were found between the leaders and non-leaders in that those who were considered leaders placed greater importance on both the particular activities they engaged in and on the length of time they spent on each activity. These findings suggest that the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) had sufficient strength in identifying school counseling activities which may promote leadership practices of PSCs.

Research Design

This descriptive, correlational study was designed to investigate the relationship between PSCs’ values as measured by Schwartz’s *Schwartz Value Survey* (SVS, 1992), leadership practices as indicated by Posner and Kouzes’s *Leadership Practice Inventory* (LPI, 1988), and service delivery as measured by Scarborough’s *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* (SCARS, 2005). Correlational research seeks to determine relationships between two or more variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Additionally, descriptive research involves (a) formulating and testing a hypothesis, (b) methods of inductive-deductive reasoning for generalization, (c) randomization, and (d) accurate description of variables for replication of study (Best & Kahn, 2006).
The correlational design was appropriate for this study as it was used to determine the relationship and directionality between three variables (values, leadership, and service delivery). Furthermore, this study included the formulation of five distinct hypotheses, based on theoretical conclusions, randomization of sample, and precise indications of the variables to be tested.

Research Hypothesis

In examining the relationship between leadership practices, values, and service delivery, this study investigated five research hypotheses.

*Research Hypothesis One*: PSCs’ values (as measured by Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) and leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale [Scarborough, 2005]). (See Figure 6. below)
Research Hypothesis Two: School counselors’ values (as measured by the Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) contribute to their leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]). See Figure 7 below.
Research Hypothesis Three: School counselors’ values (as measured by the *Schwartz Value Survey* [Schwartz, 1992]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the *School Counselor Activity Rating Scale* [Scarborough, 2005]). See Figure 8 below.
Research Hypothesis Four: School counselors’ leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale [Scarborough, 2005]). See Figure 9 below.
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Figure 9: Path Diagram: Leadership and Service Delivery

Research Hypothesis Five: School counselors’ leadership practices as measured by the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) and demographic information (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership), will contribute to their service delivery, as measured by the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). See Figure 10 below.
Data Analysis

Data collected from the demographic questionnaire and the three instruments [a] (LPI, Posner & Kouzes, 1988; [b] SVS, Schwartz, 1992; & [c] SCARS, Scarborough, 2005) were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS; version 17) and the Analysis of Moment Structure (AMOS; version 17, 2008). AMOS 17 provides simple methods for developing, analyzing, and translating path diagrams as well as presenting hypothesized relationships between various variables (SPSS, 2008). Data from the demographic questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive analysis. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM; Path Analysis), Simultaneous Multiple Regression, Pearson’s Product-Moment correlation (two-tailed) and,
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to analyze the data. Alpha was set at .05 for data analysis and statistical significance. An alpha of .05 indicates a probability that at least 95% of the differences found between the variables will be due to the actual relationship between variables and not sampling error (Best & Kahn, 2006).

Correlational data analyses were used in this study. SEM, which was used to analyze hypotheses one through four, is a form of correlational analysis which examines correlations between latent variables (e.g. values, school counseling activities, and leadership) and classifies possible directional relationships (Olobatuyi, 2006). Furthermore, SEM incorporates theoretical constructs with existing data in order to determine directionality between variables (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). For SEM, factors can be either exogenous or endogenous variables and include varied types of analyses, including path analysis for measurable variables and confirmatory factor analysis for testing models (Ullman, 1996). AMOS 17 which provides simple methods for developing, analyzing, and translating path diagrams as well as presenting hypothesized relationships between various variables (SPSS, 2008), is useful in analyzing path associations. Interpretation of the SEM for model fit includes observation of the Chi-square. According to Hu and Bentler (1998), a statistically significant chi-square indicates a lack of model fit. However, due to the sensitivity of Chi-square to sample size, consultation with other fit indices has been recommended (Olobatuyi, 2006). Additional fit indices include the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Tucker and Lewis Index (TLI), and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). Satisfactory model fit includes a RMSEA less than .06, CFI greater than .95, and TLI greater than .95 (Hu & Bentler, 1998).

SEM was an ideal method for analysis in this study in assessing the directional contributions of the four value dimensions as measured by the Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz,
Simultaneous Multiple Regression, another form of correlational analysis, was used to explore the relationships between values as measured by the Schwartz Values Survey (Schwartz, 1992), demographic variables such as race/ethnicity, length of employment, graduate preparation for leadership, and school level, and leadership practices as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Kouzes, 1988). Simultaneous Multiple Regression examines the relationship between a dependent variable (e.g., service delivery) and multiple independent variables (e.g., values, school level, and length of employment [Creswell, 2002]). Furthermore, simultaneous multiple regression considers the variance of the independent variables as explaining any variance in the dependent variable and allows the researcher to enter all variables in the model simultaneously. Simultaneous multiple regression was chosen as a method of analysis for this study as it provides significant information on possible relationships between variables.

Pearson’s product-moment correlation (Pearson r; two-tailed) was also used to test the strength of the relationship between the variables’ three constructs: values (SVS; Schwartz, 1992), school counseling activities (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005), and leadership practices (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988). Pearson’s r is beneficial in describing the strength and direction of possible relationships between two continuous variables (Pallant, 2007). Additionally, partial correlation analyses, a form of Pearson’s product-moment correlations, is useful in observing relationships between continuous variables while controlling for the effects of another variable.
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) compares mean scores between groups to determine the variance between the groups. One-way ANOVA involves one independent variable with a numerous level and advises as to whether there are significant differences between each group (Pallant, 2007). Although the F ratio in the one-way ANOVA may tell mean differences, it may not indicate which groups were different. Therefore, post-hoc tests were included with the ANOVA procedure to determine which specific comparisons between groups. For the current study, one-way ANOVA was deemed to be beneficial in exploring significant differences between groups such as, school level.

Dependent & Independent Variables

Independent Variables

The independent variables indicated in this study were based on a review of the literature related to factors which contribute to the leadership practices of individuals. The independent variables (exogenous) identified were:

1. **Values**: The 10 variables of values were: (a) Achievements, (b) Power, (c) Security, (d) Tradition, (e) Conformity, (f) Self-Direction, (g) Stimulation, (h) Hedonism, (i) Universalism, and (j) Benevolence. These 10 values represented desirable end-states or goals of individuals based on their needs. The 10 value types were further categorized into four, quasi-circumplex dimensions namely; (a) openness to change, (b) conservatism, (c) self-transcendence, and (d) self-enhancement. The scores from the four dimensions will be used to analyze value preferences for the data collected from participants for this study.
2. **Leadership Practices**: Leadership practices represented the five practices measured by the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) (Challenge, Inspire, Enable, Model, and Encourage). Leadership practices were chosen as an independent variable since it is a theoretical predictor of effective school counseling activities.

3. Demographic variables were also entered as independent variables. Demographic variables include: (a) ethnicity/race, (b) school level (elementary, middle, and high), (c) length of employment, and (d) graduate preparation for a leadership role.

**Dependent/ Endogenous Variable**

**Professional School Counseling Service Delivery**: This dependent variable represented the five role categories as indicated by the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) and included: (a) counseling, (b) consulting, (c) coordinating, (d) curriculum, and (e) other unrelated activities. Each of these five categories consists of statements which more specifically describe activities that the PSC may engage in. This variable was chosen as the dependent variable as it represented the criterion which may be most affected as the independent variables (values and leadership) were manipulated (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

**Ethical Considerations**

The following ethical considerations were included:

1. All data collected were anonymous.

2. Participation in this study was voluntary. All respondents were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.
3. The purpose of the study was clearly stated on the informed consent form and the cover-letter.

4. Permission to conduct this study was approved by the dissertation chairperson, other committee members, and the Institutional Review Board of the University of Central Florida.

5. Permission to use the research instruments was granted by the developers, publishers, and/or copywriters of each instrument.

Limitations of the Study

Several potential limitations were associated with this study:

1. The survey packet consists of four data collection instruments which may take 30 - 45 minutes for completion. The time constraint in completing the instruments may contribute to low return rate therefore incentives were offered in an attempt to increase the potential for high response rate.

2. Participant responses may be from those PSCs who are proactive in leadership; therefore, responses may not be generalized to all PSCs.

3. Participants who respond to email surveys may be different from those who respond to mail surveys.

4. The potential exists for inadequate responses due to misinterpretation of directions on self-report surveys.

5. The study included responses from school counselors in only one state.
Summary

This chapter presented the research methods employed in this study to examine the relationship between values, leadership practices, and service delivery of school counselors. The research methods presented included population sample, data collection, instrumentation, research hypotheses, and research design. Also included in this chapter was a description of the independent and dependent variables, as well as ethical considerations recognized during the research process.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This study investigated the contributions of professional school counselors’ values and leadership practices to their service delivery. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics as well as Pearson’s product-moment correlations (2-tailed), simultaneous multiple regression, structural equation modeling (path analysis and confirmatory factor analysis), and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results are presented in this chapter in the following format: (a) Sampling Procedures, (b) Descriptive Data Results, and (c) Data Analysis for Hypotheses.

Sampling Procedures

The targeted population in this study was practicing professional school counselors (PSCs) in the state of Florida. Email addresses of all certified school counselors within the state were provided by the Florida Department of Education. The researcher obtained approval from the University of Central Florida’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to data collection. Stratified random sampling was conducted in order to identify participants for this study. Stratified sampling identifies subgroups or strata which exist in the total population (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The strata for this study included a random sample of PSCs based on school level; \(N = 795\); (Elementary \([n = 265]\), Middle \([n = 265]\), & High \([n = 265]\)). An invitation email was sent to all potential participants inviting them to participate in the study. Included in the invitational email was a link to a secured website where respondents were to find the survey packet. The survey packet consisted of (a) a demographic questionnaire, (b) the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992), (c) the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988), and (d) the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005).
The data collection ran from October 29, 2008 to November 27, 2008. To increase the response rate, Dillman’s (2007) Tailored Design method was used. The Tailored Design method included (a) multiple contacts, (b) reduction of potential measurement errors, and (c) incentives. For this study, multiple contact were as follows: approximately one week after the initial, invitational email was sent, another email was sent to the potential participants and served as a “thank you” note to those who had already completed the surveys and also served as a reminder to those who had not yet completed the surveys. A third reminder was sent two weeks after the initial email was sent, again reminding participants to complete the surveys and also thanking those who had previously completed the surveys. A final reminder email was sent to the potential participants three weeks after the initial invitation to participate was sent. Each reminder email contained the informed consent form and secured link to the surveys. Additionally, invited participants were given the option to print and complete the surveys manually (Dillman, 2007). Mailing information for the researcher was provided for participants who chose the written version of the surveys.

In order to reduce measurement error, and increase the response rate; first, the research survey packet was reviewed by 10 doctoral students, in the Counselor Education program at the University of Central Florida, as well as members from the researchers dissertation committee. The questionnaire was reviewed and revised based on the recommendations of the student reviewers and committee members. The revisions enhanced the quality of the demographic questionnaire by eliminating ineffective items and including Likert scaled items pertinent to the current study. The revisions also transformed the questionnaire into a more concise, readable document.
Last, to increase participant response rate, an incentive was offered to all invited data collection participants. Each academic year, four professional development workshops are offered to school counselors by the Florida School Counselors Association. A five dollar gift certificate to attend one of the professional development workshops was offered to all invited participants regardless as to whether they chose to complete the surveys or not. Data collection began on October 29, 2008, and the on-line survey link was terminated on November 27, 2008.

Descriptive Data Results

Of the 795 professional school counselors invited to participate in this study, 25 emails were returned as undeliverable, 15 participants indicated that they were not practicing school counselor, and 12 indicated time constraints in completing the surveys. Additionally, one district indicated that permission would need to be granted by their district office in order for their PSCs to participate in the study. The researcher chose to eliminate the identified district due to the time-line considerations.

The exclusions resulted in a total of 718 invited participants of which 249 school counselors responded to the study yielding a return rate of 35%. However, the total number of PSCs who completed all data collection instruments was 163, yielding a 23% usable response rate. According to a review of research published in the Professional School Counseling journal (e.g., Clemens, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnson, 2008; Simmons, 2008), it appeared that the probably survey research response rate among school counseling professionals was at about 25% to 30%. Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2008) indicated even lower response rates associated with on-line surveys. As previously mentioned, in order to increase the response rate for this study, Dillman’s (2007) Tailored Design method was utilized.
**Professional School Counselors’ Demographics**

Descriptive analyses of the data collected from the demographic questionnaire revealed that of the 249 school counselors who responded to the surveys, 209 (84%) were females, 39 (16%) were male. Ethnicity and race of the participants were reported as: 181 (73%) Caucasian, 39 (16%) African American, 24 (10%) Hispanic, 2 (.8%) Pacific Islander, and 1 (.4%) Native American. Two participants did not indicate their ethnicity. The mean age of the participant was 45.95 years \((SD = 11.43)\), with a range of 24 to 72 years of age.

Additional analysis of the descriptive data revealed school level of participants to be 33% elementary \((n = 82)\), 31% middle \((n = 75)\), 30% high \((n = 73)\), 3% multilevel \((n = 8)\). Eighty-four percent of the participants \((n = 207)\) reported having earned a master’s degree in counseling or related field, 11% reported a specialist degree \((n = 27)\), and 4% having earned a doctoral degree \((n = 10)\). The participants length of employment ranged from one year to thirty-six years with the mean reported to be 11.33 \((SD = 8.55)\).

**Leadership Preparation**

In order to measure participants’ perceptions of their involvement in leadership practices and service delivery at their schools, five-point Likert scaled statements were included on the demographic questionnaire (Shillingford, 2008). A review of the data collected indicated that 40% of the participants \((n = 100)\) reported that they were “strongly prepared” in their graduate program to take on leadership in their role as a school counselor, 30% reported “average preparation” \((n = 75)\), and 8% \((n = 22)\) reported being either “fairly prepared” or having received “limited preparation”. It should also be noted that 12% of the school counselors \((n = 31)\) reported receiving “advanced leadership preparation” as part of their graduate program. Mean score for leadership preparation was 3.39 \((SD = 1.09)\) and median score was 4.00; thus, according to the
results, although on average the participants reported being prepared for leadership in their graduate program, most of the participants indicated “strong” leadership preparation. Table 4 displays percentages reported of leadership preparation.

**Table 4: Leadership Preparation in Graduate Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 249*

*Level of Influence on School Counseling Activities*

To attain participants’ perceptions of their influence on school counseling activities in their schools, five-point Likert scale statements were included on the demographic questionnaire (Shillingford, 2008). A review of the data indicated that 54% (*n* = 134) of the school counselors reported having a “strong level of influence” on the school counseling activities at their school. Additionally, 23% (*n* = 56) of the participants indicated “advanced influence” on school counseling activities and 18% (*n* = 45) indicated “average influence”. Only 4% of the participants reported “fair” or “limited influence” on their related activities (fair = 2.8%, *n* = 7; limited = 2%, *n* = 5). Mean rating for school counselor influence was reported to be 3.93 (*SD* = 0.84), a median score 4.00. Thus, on average, the majority of participants reported having “strong influence” on school counseling activities.
**Level of Involvement in Administrative Duties**

In terms of involvement in administrative duties such as lunch duty, test administration, and student discipline, a mean rating of 3.84 (SD = 1.14) and median score of 4.00 was reported. A review of the data collected revealed that 39% of the school counselors (n = 98) indicated their involvement with administrative duties, 28% (n = 70) reported being “somewhat involved”, and 3% (n = 8) reported “not being involved” with administrative duties. Therefore, it appears that the majority of participants reported having “strong involvement” in administrative duties at their school.

**Level of Comfort in Challenging Assigned Duties**

Five-point Likert scaled statements were included on the demographic questionnaire (Shillingford, 2008) in order to determine participants’ perceived level of comfort in challenging their involvement in assigned duties that they felt may not be appropriate for their role as school counselors. When asked how comfortable the participants were in challenging their involvement in duties they felt were unrelated to their school counseling role, 29% of the participants (n = 73) indicated that they were “comfortable” and 26% (n = 65) reported being “somewhat comfortable” with challenging their involvement. However, 31% of the participants reported being “not very comfortable” or “not comfortable” in challenging their involvement in unrelated assignments. Mean rating was reported at 3.12 (SD = 1.22) and median score at 3.0, suggesting that on average, most participants perceived themselves to be “somewhat” comfortable in challenging their involvement in unrelated activities.

**Principal Support**

To measure participants perceptions of the level of support they receive from their principals in allowing them to engage in related school counseling activities such as classroom
guidance and small group counseling, five-point Likert scaled statements were included on the demographic questionnaire (Shillingford, 2008). A review of the results indicated that principals’ support ranged from 48% (very supportive) to .8% (not supportive). The majority of the school counselors (n = 120) indicated “strong support” from their principals and 16% (n = 40) indicated principals being “somewhat supportive” in their delivery of school counseling services. Mean rating for principal support was reported as 4.23 (SD = .89) and median score was 4.0, suggesting that the average participants perceived their principals to be supportive of their counseling activities.

*Program Consistency with PSC Beliefs*

In order to assess participants’ perceptions of the consistency of their school counseling program with their values and beliefs as school counselors, participants were asked to rate their current program based on their ideal school counseling program on a five-point Likert scale. Thirty-seven percent of the participants (n = 91) reported that their school counseling program was “somewhat consistent” with their beliefs, whereas, 31% (n = 78) indicated that their program was “consistent” with their beliefs of how a school counseling program should be implemented. Additionally, 11% of the participants (n = 28) reported that their school counseling program was “not very consistent” with their beliefs of what an effective school counseling program should look like, and 6% (n = 14) reported their current school counseling program was “not consistent” with their beliefs of what a school counseling program should be. Mean ratings were reported to be 3.39 (SD = 1.05) and median score was 3.0, suggesting that on average, participants perceived that their current school counseling program was “somewhat consistent” with how they believe an effective school counseling program should be.
Values

The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992) was used to measure participants’ value types. Reliability analysis was conducted using SPSS (version 17) to determine measurability of the SVS for the current study and to identify the consistency of values measure (SVS). Overall ratings of the four subscales of the SVS were deemed to be highly reliable for measuring participants’ values, with an overall alpha coefficient of .825 (Cohen, 1988). Reliability of the four dimensions of SVS ranged from .728 to .835. One hundred and sixty-three participants completed the SVS which measures 10 value subscales (power, achievement, stimulation, hedonism, self-direction, security, tradition, conformity, universalism, benevolence). The 10 subscales were further categorized into Schwartz’s (1992) four quasi-circumplex dimensions: (a) openness to change, (b) conservatism, (c) self-enhancement, and (d) self-transcendence.

Further analysis of the four quasi-circumplex value types of the SVS using measures of central tendency scores reported highest value mean scores were Conservatism \( (M = 65.90; SD = 9.33) \) and Self-Transcendence \( (M = 65.07, SD = 7.13) \) and lowest value mean scores being Openness to Change \( (M = 49.58, SD = 9.44) \) and Self-Enhancement \( (M = 44.64, SD = 10.05) \). The results suggest that participants place high value on doing good and appreciating others and less value on social status and prestige. Table 5 displays the measures of central tendency for the SVS scores of participants.

Table 5: Results from SVS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>44-84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership practices of participants were measured by analyzing the scores collected from the *Leadership Practice Inventory* (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988) using reliability scaling and measures of central tendency. Reliability of the LPI was examined using reliability scaling in SPSS (version, 17) in order to determine the psychometric consistency of the instrument with the data collected. Overall reliability of the LPI was found to be .927. Reliability of the four subscales ranging from .903 to .917 and was deemed to be highly reliable for measuring the leadership practices of the participants (Cohen, 1988).

The mean scores from the five subscales of the LPI, (a) *Challenging*, (b) *Inspiring*, (c) *Enabling*, (d) *Modeling*, and (e) *Encouraging* represented high and low leadership practices of each value type. Higher mean scores are indicative of increased leadership practices in each category. A review of the data collected from 163 participants indicated that the leadership practice of *Enabling*: “I develop cooperative relationships among people I work with,” had the highest mean of 48.68 ($SD = 6.15$), followed by *Modeling*: “I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make” ($M = 46.91; SD = 6.43$), and *Encouraging*: “I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities” ($M = 46.05; SD = 8.65$). The lowest mean scores were indicated for *Challenging*: “I challenge people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work,” ($M = 42.46; SD = 8.82$), and *Inspiring*: “I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like“(*$M = 40.99; SD = 10.05$). The results suggest that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Transcendence</td>
<td>65.07</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>47-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Change</td>
<td>49.58</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>27-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Enhancement</td>
<td>44.64</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>17-69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 163*
participants reported high collaborative and modeling practices and low risk-taking practices.

Table 6 displays the measures of central tendency for the LPI scores of participants.

**Table 6: Results of Leadership Practices of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practices</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>33 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>29 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>26 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>42.53</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>20 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>41.02</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>14 - 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 163*

**Service Delivery**

School counseling activities of participants were measured using the scores collected from the *School Counseling Activities Rating Scale* (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005). Reliability of the SCARS with the data collected was analyzed for measurement consistency using reliability scaling (SPSS, version 17). Overall alpha coefficient for the SCARS was good with a reported overall reliability score of .729. Reliability of the five leadership subscales ranged from .605 to .782.

One hundred and sixty-three participants completed the SCARS. A review of the raw scores of each subscale reflected that the lowest mean score for participants was in the curriculum development subscale (e.g., “Conduct classroom lessons on personal safety”) with a mean of 22.40 (*SD* = 8.05). The highest mean scores were represented by coordination of services (*M* = 39.34; *SD* = 8.86), counseling services (e.g., “Counseling with students regarding behavior”), (*M* = 33.41, *SD* = 6.95) and “other” unrelated school counseling activities (e.g.,
“Handle discipline of students”) $M = 32.08, SD = 6.56$). The measures of central tendency for the SCARS are represented in Table 7. The results suggested that the average participant was more engaged with coordination of services and counseling and least engaged with delivery of curriculum services and consultation.

**Table 7: Results of Service Delivery Scores of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>18 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>16 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>14 - 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>14 - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>8 - 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

**Data Analysis for Hypotheses**

The following section reports the results of the analyses of data collected based on the five research hypotheses. Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 17) and the Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS, version 17).

Prior to the data analysis procedures, preliminary analyses were conducted to confirm the absence of any violations of assumptions such as linearity and normality. The analyses included observations of linearity by looking at scatterplot scores. A straight line indicated that the relationship between the variables were linear. Furthermore, frequency analyses were conducted to observe for missing data, outliers, homoscedasticity, and normality of the data distribution using histograms, normal Q-P plots, and scatterplots. When all assumptions of normality of the data were met, data analyses was initiated based on the hypotheses.
The first four hypotheses were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) and Pearson’s product-moment correlations. SEM incorporates theoretical constructs with existing data to determine directionality between variables and to assess the goodness of fit of the model (Hu & Bentler, 1998). SEM was ideal for use in this study as it allows for the exploration of directionality and correlational strength between values, leadership practices, and service delivery of PSCs. To determine overall goodness of fit, the Chi-square was observed (Kline, 2005). However, Chi-square may be sensitive to sample size; therefore, goodness of fit indices such as Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Tucker and Lewis Index (TLI) were examined. Satisfactory model fit includes a RMSEA less than .06, CFI greater than .95, and TLI greater than .95 (Hu & Bentler, 1998).

Additionally, Pearson’s Product-Moment analysis (2-tailed) was used to substantiate the results of the SEM for hypothesis three, by reporting on the strength, direction, and significance of possible correlations. The strength of correlational relationship can range from -1.00 to 1.00, with a correlation of zero indicating no relationship and a correlation of 1.0 indicating a perfect relationship (Pallant, 2007). Additionally, a correlational value of 1.0 suggests a positive relationship, whereas, a correlational value of -1.0 suggests a negative relationship. Cohen (1988) highlighted levels of correlations for interpretations such that correlations ranging from .10 to .29 are considered as small, correlations ranging from .30 to .49 are considered to be moderate or medium, and large correlations ranging from .50 to 1.0.

Research Hypothesis One

Professional school counselors’ values, as measured by the four value dimensions of the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992) and leadership practices as measured by the five leadership subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988),
contribute to their service delivery, as measured by the five subscales of the *School Counselors Activities Rating Scale* (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005).

Structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis were conducted to investigate the contribution of values and leadership practices to service delivery. The maximum likelihood method of covariance structure analysis was used. To determine overall goodness of fit, the Chi-square was observed (Kline, 2005). However, Chi-square may be sensitive to sample size; therefore, goodness of fit indices such as Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Tucker and Lewis Index (TLI) were examined. Satisfactory model fit includes a RMSEA less than .06, CFI greater than .95, and TLI greater than .95 (Hu & Bentler, 1998).

*Model One:* Two-step confirmatory factor analysis was constructed to observe goodness of fit statistics for each variables and also to allow each variable to correlate freely. Standardized factor loadings for *Values* ranged from .49 (self-transcendence) to .91 (openness to change); *Leadership*, from .83 (modeling) to .90 (inspiring); and *Service Delivery*, .15 (other) to .83 (coordination). All loadings were acceptable except for “other” unrelated services, which was particularly low. However, the factor loadings reported significant Chi-square goodness of fit (see Figure 11), indicating the model did not fit for this data ($\chi^2 = 222.47, df = 77, p = < .05$). Table 8 displays unattached confirmatory factor analysis.
In step two, modification indices were consulted for re-specification. Modification indices are used to adjust the model for a better fit based on theoretical rationalizations (Garson, 2009). Re-specification included the inclusion of path associations between the variables (service, values and leadership).
Covariance matrices also indicated that three variables did not load adequately for the specified model fit. Modification included exclusion of Value type, self-transcendence, Service subscale, other unrelated services, and Leadership practice, encouraging. Additionally, although all five leadership practices contribute individually to the model, some item factors loadings appeared to share common variance across more than one factor. Upon the adjustment of factor loadings as specified by the covariance matrix and based on a review of the literature, a re-specified model indicating adequate model fit ($\chi^2 = 65.337$, $df = 50$, $p = .071$) was found. Model fit was supported by RMSEA less than .06 (.044), CFI and TLI greater than .95 (CFI = .987; TLI = .983). Therefore, the underlying factor loadings of all three instruments were acceptable for the analyses of these data. Table 9 displays the final confirmatory factor analysis model and Figure 12 displays the path diagram.
Figure 12: Path Diagram of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Table 9: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

_Model Two:_ Next the structural equation modeling (see Figure 5) was constructed based on the final factor analysis and theories of values, leadership and service delivery. *Value* was defined as an exogenous variable whereas *Leadership* and *Service* were defined as endogenous. Examination of the initial path model (See Figure 13) indicated an acceptable goodness of fit model ($\chi^2 = 65.337, df = 49, p = .059$). Inspection of the RMSEA, CFI, and TLI supported an adequate fit of the model, suggesting that *Values* and *Leadership* practices did contribute to the *Service Delivery* of participants for these data (see Table 10). Further inspection of the standardized regression weights revealed that leadership contributed at least 40% of the variance in service delivery ($r = .63$). Values appear to contribute to less than 1% of the variance in service delivery service delivery ($r = -.01$). Therefore, although *Values* may contribute to the acceptable fit of the model, *Leadership* appeared to make the most significant contributions to *Service Delivery* for these data.

Table 10: Path Diagram Model Fit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.337</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$
Research Hypothesis Two

School counselors’ values, as measured by Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992) contribute to their leadership practices, as measured by Posner and Kouzes’s Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI, 1988).

Structural equation modeling was conducted to investigate the directionality of the relationship between values and leadership for the data. The path analysis diagram (Figure 14) displays the path results for hypothesis one.
Based on maximum likelihood, the results of the path analysis revealed non-statistically significant Chi-square goodness of fit for the model ($\chi^2 = 29.155; df = 21; p = .110$), indicating that the model did fit the data, further suggesting that values did contribute significantly to leadership practices for these data (see Table 11). A review of additional goodness-of-fit indices supported the model fit. Table 8 displays the statistical results of the path diagram to include the fit indices.

Table 11: Path Analysis Fit Indices for Values to Leadership Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.155</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$
Research Hypothesis Three

Professional school counselors’ values as measured by the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) contribute to their service delivery as measured by the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005).

Based on maximum likelihood, the results of path diagram reported a non-significant Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 31.49; df = 22; p = .086$), indicating a model fit for these data (see Figure 15). The results of the path diagram suggest that, for these data, values did contribute to service delivery of the participants. Table 12 displays the statistical results of the path diagram to include the fit indices.

Table 12: Path Analysis Fit Indices for SVS and SCARS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.894</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$
School counselors’ leadership practices, as measured by the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) contribute to their service delivery as measured by the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005).

Figure 3 presents path analysis modeling of the data for hypothesis three. The fit indices for the path diagram revealed a non-statistically significant Chi-square ($\chi^2 = 20.103, df = 19; p = .388$), indicating that the model fits for these data. Additional fit indices were observed and were found to indicate acceptable model fit for the data (see Table 13). The results of the path diagram suggest that the model fits these data, therefore, leadership practices contributed to service delivery for these data. Figure 16 displays the path diagram.

Figure 15: Path Diagram of SVS and SCARS

Research Hypothesis Four
Table 13: Path Diagram of Leadership Practices and Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>TLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.103</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

Figure 16: Path Diagram of LPI and SCARS

Pearson product-moment correlation was used to further explore the direction and strength of potential correlations which may exist between leadership practices (as measured by the LPI) and service delivery (as measured by the SCARS). Several positive correlations were found between the variables within the leadership and service delivery constructs.
Coordination Services: There were strong positive correlations between leadership practices, modeling and encouraging to service delivery, coordination. The results indicated that the practice of encouraging contributed 26% ($r = .51, p < .05$) of the variance in coordination, whereas, the practice of modeling contributed 25% ($r = .50, p < .05$) of the variance. Additionally, moderately positive correlations were found between coordination of services and leadership practices, challenging, which explained 22% ($r = .47, p < .05$) of the variance in coordination; inspiring, which explained an additional 22% ($r = .47, p < .05$) of the variance, and enabling, which explained the smallest amount of the variance in coordination (18%; $r = .42, p < .05$). The results suggest that for these data, participants who were engaged in the leadership practice of encouraging others and modeling the way had stronger effects on the coordination of services.

Consultation Services: The results of the correlational analyses between leadership practice and service delivery (consultation) indicated moderate, positive, correlations between consultation and leadership practices (encouraging). For these data, encouraging others was found to explain 17% ($r = .41, p < .05$) of the variance in consultation. Furthermore, it was found that the leadership practice of inspiring explained 10% ($r = .32, p < .05$) of the variance in consultation whereas, challenging ($r = .30, p < .05$) and enabling ($r = .31, p < .05$) respectively explained at least 9% of the variance in consultation. Modeling the way was found to contribute to only 8% ($r = .29, p < .05$) of the variance in consultation services. The results suggest that, for these data, participants who were engaged in encouraging others had stronger effect on the delivery of consultative services than participants were engaged in modeling the way.

Counseling Services: Pearson’s product-moment analysis (2-tailed) revealed that the leadership practice of encouraging explained the largest amount of the variance (14%; $r = .37, p$
The four remaining leadership practice subscales respectively explained at least 9% of the variance in counseling services (challenging \( r = .31, p < .05 \)), (inspiring \( r = .31, p < .05 \)), (enabling \( r = .31, p < .05 \)), and (modeling \( r = .31, p < .05 \)). The positive correlations found between leadership and counseling, though statistically significant, were considered to be small correlations. The results suggests that, for these data, participants who were most engaged in the leadership practice of encouraging others had a stronger effect on the delivery of counseling services than those who engaged in the leadership practices of challenging, inspiring, enabling, or modeling.

**Curriculum Services:** The results of correlational analyses indicated that leadership practice, encouraging, had a small correlation to curriculum and explained 14.4% \( (r = .38, p < .05) \) of the variance in curriculum delivery. Furthermore, the leadership practices of challenging and inspiring resulted in small, positive correlations with curriculum services. For the data, challenging explained 12% \( (r = .35, p < .05) \) of the variance in curriculum, whereas, inspiring explained 11% \( (r = .33, p < .05) \) of the variance. However, it was found that the two leadership practices of enabling and modeling were found to have only small, positive correlations with curriculum services. Modeling the way explained 8% \( (r = .29, p < .05) \) of the variance and enabling other to act explained 6% \( (r = .25, p < .05) \) of the variance. The results suggest that encouraging had stronger effects on the delivery of curriculum services than did the leadership practice of enabling.

**Other Unrelated Services:** The results of Pearson’s product-moment analysis (2-tailed) indicated that, for these data, small, positive, correlations were found between leadership practice and other, unrelated services. Encouraging \( (r = .20, p = .012) \) the heart and challenging \( (r = .19, p = .013) \) respectively explained at least 4% of the variance in unrelated services, whereas,
inspiring \((r = .15, p = .05)\) explained only 2% of the variance. Furthermore, the results indicated that for the data, leadership practices of enabling \((r = .12, p = .12)\) and modeling \((r = .14, p = .08)\) explained small, positive, yet non-significant correlations to the variance in the other unrelated services. The results suggest that participants who engaged in the leadership practices of challenging, inspiring, and encouraging made statistically significant contributions to engagement in unrelated school services. However, there was found to be non-statistically significant correlations between other unrelated services and the practice of enabling and modeling. Table 14 provides a representation of the correlation results.

Table 14: Correlations Between Service Delivery and Leadership Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Challenging</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Enabling</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Encouraging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>(r = .31)</td>
<td>(r = .31)</td>
<td>(r = .31)</td>
<td>(r = .31)</td>
<td>(r = .37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>(r = .47)</td>
<td>(r = .47)</td>
<td>(r = .42)</td>
<td>(r = .50)</td>
<td>(r = .51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>(r = .30)</td>
<td>(r = .32)</td>
<td>(r = .31)</td>
<td>(r = .29)</td>
<td>(r = .41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>(r = .35)</td>
<td>(r = .33)</td>
<td>(r = .25)</td>
<td>(r = .29)</td>
<td>(r = .38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>(r = .19)</td>
<td>(r = .15)</td>
<td>(r = .12)</td>
<td>(r = .14)</td>
<td>(r = .20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>(p = .124)</td>
<td>(p = .081)</td>
<td>(p &lt; .05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 163\)
Research Hypothesis Five

Professional school counselors’ leadership practices as measured by the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) and demographic information (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership) contribute to their service delivery, as measured by the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005).

Simultaneous multiple regression was used to predict the influences of the five subscales of leadership practices (challenging, inspiring, enabling, modeling, encouraging) and demographic information (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership), to the service delivery of participants in the study. Each analysis was observed for violations of assumptions which may potentially affect the results of regression analyses. Multicollinearity analysis was conducted by observation of the variance inflation factors (VIF). VIF greater than 10 is an indication of a multicollinearity violation (Pallant, 2007). Outliers, normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were addressed by observation of normal p-p plots and residual scatterplots (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Scatterplots and p-p plots did not reveal any violations of the data. Separate simultaneous multiple regression analyses were conducted per each of the five service delivery subscales (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005). One-way ANOVA was also used to further analyze mean differences between groups such as school level. ANOVA calculates the F ratio which represents the variance between groups (Pallant, 2007). Large F ratio supports increased variance between groups. Additionally, post-hoc tests provided a better indication of significant differences between groups.

Consultation Services: In assessing the relationship of the independent variables (leadership, graduate preparation, school level, and length of employment) to the dependent variable, consultation services, all independent variables were entered simultaneously. Overall,
the linear composite of the independent variables entered into the regression procedure explained 21% of the variation in the consultation services scores ($N = 163; F[8, 150] = 5.066, p < .05$) obtained from the SCARS. See Tables 15 and 16 below.

Furthermore, closer inspection of the b weights suggested that with every unit increase in leadership practice (encouraging), there was a .199 unit increase in consultation services and also, for every unit increase in school level, there was a -.97 unit decrease in consultation services. The b weights for the remaining subscales were not examined because the results were not statistically significant for these data. While the values of the b weights were useful in understanding unit changes between service delivery (consultation) for every unit change in the independent variable, they did not relate the effect of each independent variable on consultation services.

The beta weights provided a clearer indication of unique contributions made by each independent variable (e.g., leadership subscales, school level, graduate preparation, length of employment) to consultation services. Thus, the beta weights were consulted (see Table 17 below). Beta weights revealed that a standardized unit change in consultation scores with respect to leadership practice, ($\beta = .339$) was significantly higher than a standardized unit change in consultation scores in respect to school level ($\beta = -.175$). Therefore, scores from leadership practice, encouraging, explained a significant amount of the variance in the consultation scores than scores from school level. Additionally, consultative services were found to decrease based on school level.
Table 15: Model Summary: Consultation Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.066</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 163 \)

Table 16: ANOVA: Consultation Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>807.176</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.89</td>
<td>5.066</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2987.354</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3794.530</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 163 \)

Table 17: Coefficients: Consultation Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>2.573</td>
<td>( p = .011 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>-.965</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>-2.370</td>
<td>( p = .019 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 163 \)

Inspection of the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each of the independent variables suggested that multicollinearity was not problematic. The VIF for all three predictors do not exceed 10.00. Additionally, inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against predicted values revealed no nonlinear trends or heteroscedasticity, and the distribution of the standardized errors sufficiently approximated normality.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the effect of school levels (elementary, middle, and high) on the consultative services of data collected. There was found to be a statistically significant difference in consultation for the school levels \( F [3, 156] = \)
School level was found to explain at least 10% of the variance in consultation services. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey’s test indicated that the mean scores for elementary school counselors ($M = 27.80, SD = 4.511$) were significantly different from middle school ($M = 26.46, SD = 4.902$) and high school counselors ($M = 24.23, SD = 4.670$). Therefore, based on these data, elementary school participants contributed more significantly to consultation services than middle and high school participants. That is, for these data, the level of consultative services decreased across participants from elementary to middle to high school.

**Coordination Services:** The linear composite of the predictor variables, length of employment, school level, graduate preparation, and leadership practices, when entered into the regression procedure simultaneously, was able to explain 32% of the variation in coordination of services ($F [8, 150] = 8.965, p < .05$). Closer inspection of the b weights suggested that with every unit increase in leadership practice (modeling), there was a .364 unit increase in service delivery (coordination) and for every unit increase in leadership (encouraging) there is a .257 unit increase in service delivery (coordination). The b weights for the remaining subscales of leadership or the other demographic variables were not examined because the results were not statistically significant for these data. Tables 18, 19, and 20 below displays the regression results.

While the values of the b weights were useful in understanding unit changes between service delivery (coordination) for every unit change in an independent variable, they did not relate the effect of each independent variable on coordination. The beta weights provide a clearer indication of unique contributions made by each independent variable. Thus, the beta weights were consulted. Beta weights revealed that a standardized unit change in coordination scores with respect to leadership practice, *modeling* ($\beta = .271$), was higher than a standardized unit change in coordination scores in respect to leadership practice, *encouraging* ($\beta = .248$).
Therefore, scores from leadership practice, *modeling*, explained a greater amount of the variance in the coordination scores than scores from leadership practice, *encouraging*.

Table 18: Model Summary: Coordination Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>7.283</td>
<td>8.965</td>
<td><em>p &lt; .05</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N* = 163

Table 19: ANOVA: Coordination Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th><em>F</em></th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3803.871</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>475.484</td>
<td>8.965</td>
<td><em>p &lt; .05</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7955.715</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>53.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11759.587</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N* = 163

Table 20: Coefficients: Coordination Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th><em>t</em></th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>2.035</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N* = 163

Inspection of the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each of the independent variables suggested that multicollinearity was not problematic. The VIF for all three predictors do not exceed 10.00. Additionally, inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against predicted values revealed no nonlinear trends or heteroscedasticity, and the distribution of the standardized errors sufficiently approximated normality. Therefore, based on these data, leadership practices (encouraging and modeling) did contribute to coordination services.
Curriculum Services: In assessing the relationship of the independent variables (leadership, graduate preparation, school level, and length of employment) to curriculum services, all independent variables were entered simultaneously. The linear composite of the independent variables entered into the regression procedure explained 25% of the variation in the curriculum service scores \( n = 163; F [8, 150] = 6.194, p < .05 \) obtained from the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). Tables 21 and 22 display the regression results.

Closer inspection of the b weights suggested that with every unit increase in school level, there was a 2.72 unit decrease in service delivery subscale, curriculum. The b weights for the remaining subscales were not examined because the results were not statistically significant for the data. Furthermore, Beta weights (see Table 23) revealed that there was a standardized unit change in curriculum scores with respect to school level \( (\beta = -.300) \). Therefore, the results suggested that school level contributed significantly to the variance in service delivery (curriculum) scores. However, the results indicated that contributions to curriculum decreased across school level.

Table 21: Model Summary: Curriculum Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>7.191</td>
<td>6.194</td>
<td>( p &lt; .05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 163 \)
Table 22: ANOVA: Curriculum Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2562.553</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>320.319</td>
<td>6.194</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7757.562</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>51.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10320.115</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

Table 23: Coefficients: Curriculum Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>-2.718</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>-4.143</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

Inspection of the variance inflation factor (VIF) of each of the predictor variable suggested that multicollinearity was not problematic as the VIF does not exceed 10.00. Inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against predicted values revealed no nonlinear trends or heteroscedasticity, and the distribution of the standardized errors sufficiently approximated normality.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore the effect of specific school levels (elementary, middle, and high) on the curriculum delivery of the data. There was found to be a statistically significant difference in curriculum delivery based on school levels ($F[3, 156] = 8.825, p = < .05$). School level was found to explain 15% of the variance in curriculum services. Post-hoc comparisons using Tukey’s test indicated that the mean scores for elementary school counselors ($M = 25.91, SD = 8.631$) was significantly different from middle school ($M = 20.81, SD = 7.823$) and high school counselors ($M = 18.32, SD = 6.246$). Therefore, based on
these data, elementary school counselors contributed significantly more to curriculum development than did middle or high school counselors for this data.

*Counseling Services:* The linear composite of the predictor variables (length of employment, school level, graduate preparation of leadership, leadership practices) entered into the regression model explained approximately 17% of the variation in the dependent variable, counseling ($F[8, 150] = 3.790, p < .05$). However, beta weights revealed that none of the independent variables entered made a uniquely statistically significant contribution to counseling service delivery. Tables 24 and 25 displays the regression results.

**Table 24: Model Summary: Counseling Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>6.517</td>
<td>3.791</td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

**Table 25: ANOVA: Counseling Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1287.759</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>160.970</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6371.393</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>42.476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7659.152</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 163$

Inspection of the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each of the independent variables suggested that multicollinearity was not problematic. The VIF for all three predictors do not exceed 10.00. Additionally, inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against predicted values revealed no nonlinear trends or heteroscedasticity, and the distribution of the standardized errors sufficiently approximated normality. Therefore, based on the data collected, there was no
statistical relationship between counseling services and leadership practices or demographic variables (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership).

*Other Unrelated Services:* The linear composite of the predictor variables entered into the regression model explained 8% of the variation in other unrelated activities ($F [8, 150] = 1.670, p = .110$) at a non-significant level. Beta weights revealed that none of the independent variables contributed significantly to school counselors’ engagement in other unrelated service delivery. See Tables 26 and 27 below.

**Table 26: Model Summary: Other Unrelated Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>6.572</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>$p = .110$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 163*

**Table 27: ANOVA: Other Unrelated Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>577.264</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.158</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>$p = .110$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6480.103</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>43.201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7057.367</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 163*

Inspection of the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each of the independent variables suggested that multicollinearity was not problematic. The VIF for all three predictors did not exceed 10.00. Additionally, inspection of the plot of the standardized residuals against predicted values revealed no nonlinear trends or heteroscedasticity, and the distribution of the standardized errors sufficiently approximated normality. Therefore, based on these data, there was no statistical relationship between “other” non-guidance services and leadership practices or
demographic variables (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership).

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the data analysis procedures and included, (a) descriptive analysis, (b) Pearson’s product-moment correlations (two-tailed), (c) Simultaneous Multiple Regression, (d) Path Analysis and (e) Structural Equation Modeling. A thorough review and discussion of the results was presented in the following chapter with possible implications and limitations.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter includes a brief introduction to the study and a review of the research methodology. Next, a discussion is presented on the results of the research hypotheses as presented in Chapter 4. The results from Chapter 4 are reviewed in comparison to the research findings presented in Chapter 2 with explanations of congruency and inconsistency of findings. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of potential limitations to the study, as well as implications for professional school counseling and counselor education, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the contributions of Professional School Counselors’ (PSCs’) values and leadership practices to their programmatic service delivery (counseling, coordinating, consulting, and curriculum). The three constructs and instruments investigated in this study were: (a) Schwartz Value Theory (the Schwartz Value Survey [SVS]; Schwartz, 1992), (b) the Leadership Challenge Theory (the Leadership Practices Inventory [LPI]; Posner & Kouzes, 1988), and (c) school counselors’ programmatic service delivery (the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale [SCARS]; Scarborough, 2005). Previous studies have investigated school counselors’ leadership practices and service delivery; however, a review of the research (e.g., Ebscohost, Education Full Text, Psychinfo, Proquest) on values identified a gap in the literature on the contributions of school counselors’ values and leadership practices to their service delivery.
The sample for the demographic analysis of this study was 249 certified, practicing school counselors (elementary school, \(n = 83\); middle school, \(n = 76\); high school, \(n = 74\); multi-level, \(n = 8\)) in the state of Florida (35% response rate). However, 163 participants successfully completed all data collection instruments, resulting in a usable response rate of 23%. The participants completed on-line surveys including a general demographic questionnaire (Shillingford, 2008; [Appendix E]), the SVS (Schwartz, 1992; [Appendix F]), the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988; [Appendix G]), and the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005; [Appendix H]). The statistical procedures used to analyze the data included (a) structural equation modeling (path analysis), (b) confirmatory factor analysis, (c) simultaneous multiple regression, (d) Pearson product-moment (2-tailed), and (e) analysis of variance (ANOVA). An alpha level of .05 was used in the data analyses.

The data collection process adhered to Dillman’s (2007) Tailored Design Method. The Tailored Design method is useful in increasing survey response rate and included (a) multiple contacts, (b) reduction of potential measurement errors, and (c) incentives. Email addresses for certified school counselors in the state of Florida were provided by the Florida Department of Education’s, Office of Information Database. For this study, multiple contact were as follows: (a) approximately one week after the initial invitational email was sent, (b) another email was sent to the potential participants and served as a “thank you” note to those who had already completed the surveys and also served as a reminder to those who had not yet completed the surveys, and (c) two subsequent reminder emails were sent at one week increments.

To reduce measurement errors, a research packet review was conducted by 10 students in the Counselor Education doctorate program at the University of Central Florida and by the researcher’s dissertation committee members. As a result of the research packet review,
appropriate revisions were made to the demographic questionnaire and online survey completion procedures. Finally, to increase participant response rate, an incentive was offered to all invited data collection participants. A five dollar gift certificate to attend one of the Florida School Counselor Association’s professional development workshops was offered to all invited participants regardless of their participation in the study. Data collection began on October 29, 2008 and the on-line survey link was terminated on November 27, 2008.

Discussion

The following section contains a discussion of the research findings with regard to the instrumentation properties, descriptive analyses of the demographic information and the five research hypotheses.

Participants

Descriptive analyses of the data collected from the demographic questionnaire revealed that of the 249 school counselors who responded to the surveys, 209 (84%) were females, 39 (16%) were male. Ethnicity and race of the participants were reported as: 181 (73%) Caucasian, 39 (16%) African American, 24 (10%) Hispanic, 2 (.8%) Pacific Islander, and 1 (.4%) Native American. Two participants did not indicate their ethnicity. The mean age of the participant was 45.95 years ($SD = 11.43$) with a range of 24 to 72 years of age.

Additional analysis of the descriptive data revealed school level of participants to be 33% elementary ($n = 82$), 31% middle ($n = 75$), 30% high ($n = 73$), and 3% multilevel ($n = 8$). Eighty-four percent of the participants ($n = 207$) reported having earned a master’s degree in counseling or related field, 11% reported a specialist degree ($n = 27$), and 4% earned a doctoral degree ($n = 148$).
The participants length of employment ranged from one-year to thirty-six years with the mean reported to be 11.33-years of school counseling experience ($SD = 8.55$).

The results of the measures of central tendencies from the demographic data appear to be consistent with research conducted with practicing school counselors. For example, Lambie (2002) found the majority of school counselors ($N = 218$) who participated in a study investigating the contributions of ego development to school counselor burnout were Caucasian (87.6%) females (89.3%) with a master’s degree in school counseling (71.1%) or related field. In another study, Sebera (2005) explored the relationship between leadership attributes and job satisfaction of school counselors ($N = 114$) and reported the majority of participants were Caucasian (88.6%), females (78.1%), with a master’s degree in school counseling (85.1%). Finally, Parikh (2008) in examining the differences in school counselors’ ($N = 298$) beliefs in a just world, politics, religion, socioeconomic status, race, and social justice advocacy attitudes indicated that the majority of participants were Caucasian (83.6%) females (84.2%). Therefore, based on the current findings and that of Lambie (2002), Sebera (2005), and Parikh (2008), the average school counselors were Caucasian females who have earned a master’s degree in school counseling or a related field.

However, inconsistencies were found in school level of the practicing school counselors. For example, Sebera (2005) reported the majority participants were employed as middle school counselors (41.2%), elementary school counselors (36%), and high school counselors (22.8%). Similarly, Parikh (2008) found participants employed as middle school counselors (39.9%), high school counselors (32.2%), and elementary school counselors having the lowest representation (27.9%). Consistent with the current findings though, Lambie (2002) reported level of employment of participant as primarily elementary school counselors (32%), followed by high
school counselors (16%), and then middle school counselors (15.6%). Therefore, although Sebera (2005) and Parikh (2008) found that the majority of participants in their study were middle school counselors, the findings from Lambie’s (2002) findings that elementary school counselors were in the majority was consistent with the current study.

The results on length of employment of participants were also found to be inconsistent with previous research. For instance, while the current study found average length of employment to be 11.33 years, Lambie (2002) found average school counseling participants to have at least 4.92 years of experience and Parikh (2008) reported length of employment of participating school counselors was less than three years. The inconsistencies in the findings on school level and length of employment suggest that other factors may have influenced the school counselors’ choice in completing research surveys. For instance, the aspect of values and leadership in the current study may have had a greater appeal to more experienced school counselors with higher levels of professional maturity and identity. Finally, the inconsistency in length of employment may be due to differences in the population of school counselors from different states. The current study included only school counselors from the state of Florida, where the average counselors may have attained several years of experience. Further exploration may be beneficial in identifying key factors which may influence school counselors’ decisions to participate in research on the profession.

Instrumentation

Demographic Questionnaire: Likert scaled items were used on the demographic questionnaire (Shillingford, 2008) to obtain information on participants’ perceptions of their professional performance. A five point Likert scale items ranged from one (not at all prepared) to
five (very prepared). A median score of three (3) suggested “average” preparation for leadership. A review of the results indicated that the majority of participants (40%) perceived that their graduate program had prepared them for leadership roles ($M = 3.39, SD = 1.09$). Conversely, 8.8% of the participants reported only “limited” preparation for leadership from their graduate program.

Although no studies that investigated school counselors’ graduate preparation for leadership were found, the results of the current study appear consistent with a qualitative study conducted by Dollarhide, Gibson, and Saginak (2008). Dollarhide and colleagues found that novice school counselors ($N = 5$) were able demonstrate successful leadership practices over time in spite of systemic barriers, suggesting that some graduate programs may be preparing students for leadership. Therefore, it may be assumed that some graduate programs include content on leadership to prepare their school counseling students to become education leaders in their future school settings.

To determine participants’ level of influence (decision-making process) on the school counseling activities they implement, Likert-scaled items were included on the demographic questionnaire. A five point Likert scale items ranged from one (limited influence) to five (strong influence). A median score of three (3) suggested “moderate” influence on program implementation. The results of measures of central tendencies of items in the demographic questionnaire revealed that mean scores of participants’ perception of their influence on their school counseling activities indicated average influence ($M = 3.93, SD = .84, Mdn = 4.00$). Additionally, 54% of the participants perceived themselves as having strong influence on school counseling activities. Although no studies that examined school counselors’ level of influence on their school counseling activities were found, a review of literature on school counselor roles
indicated that often, it is the school administrator and even teachers and parents who may dictate the activities of the school counselor (Amatea, Bringham, & Daniels, 2004; Chata & Loesch, 2007; House & Hayes, 2002; Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Therefore, based on the results of the current findings and the literature on school counselor role activities, it appears that although participants perceived that they have some influence in their school counseling activities, there may still be a need for further collaboration between school counselors and administrators on the counselors’ role in the decision-making process and appropriate service delivery.

To determine participants’ level of involvement in administrative duties such as hall duty and student discipline, Likert-scaled items were included on the demographic questionnaire. A five point Likert scale items ranged from one (limited involvement) to five (strong involvement). A median score of three (3) suggested “moderate” involvement in administrative duties. The results of measures of central tendencies of items in the demographic questionnaire revealed that mean scores of participants’ perception of their level of involvement in administrative duties was 3.84 (SD = 1.14, Mdn = 4.00), indicating that on average, participants were involved with administrative duties such as hall duty and student disciplinary procedures. Similar findings were reported by Burnham and Jackson (2002) in a study exploring discrepancies between actual practice and existing models of school counselors (N = 80). Burnham and Jackson indicated that a vast majority of their participants reported involvement with non-guidance related activities with the most significant involvement being handling student records (65%) followed by scheduling (56%). Likewise, research conducted by Hebert (2007) and Clark (2006) reported school counselors’ varying levels of involvement in administrative duties. Therefore, based on the results of the current study and the reports from other researcher (Burnham & Jackson, 2002;
Clark, 2006; Hebert, 2007), it may be assumed that school counselors are engaged in unrelated administrative duties.

To determine participants’ level of comfort in challenging their involvement in assigned duties they felt were not appropriate for their role as school counselors (e.g., hall duty and administrative duties), a five point Likert scaled item was included on the demographic questionnaire. Likert scale items ranged from one (not very comfortable) to five (very comfortable). A median score of three (3) suggested moderate (somewhat) level of comfort. The mean score was 3.12 ($SD = 1.22; Mdn. = 3.0$), suggesting that participants were “somewhat comfortable” in challenging their involvement in unrelated school activities. No studies were found examining school counselors level of comfort in challenging their roles, which is of concern considering the potential long-term effects role stress, (e.g., Culbreth et al., 2005), role confusion, (Lieberman, 2004), marginalization of the school counselor, (House & Hayes, 2002; Johnson, 2000; Kaffènberger, Murphy, & Bemak, 2006), and defiant professional identity (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Therefore, future research is needed to explore factors related to school counselors’ comfort level in challenging for systemic change.

To determine participants’ perceptions of the level of support received from their school principals, Likert-scaled items were included on the demographic questionnaire. Likert scale items ranged from one (not at all supportive) to five (very supportive). A median score of three (3) suggested “moderate” support from principals. The results indicated mean scores of 4.23 ($SD = .89, Mdn. = 4.0$), suggesting that participants perceived that their principals were supportive of their roles as school counselors. The results were consistent with research conducted by Clark (2006) who found that 59.56% of school counselors ($N = 118$) reported satisfaction with the support they receive from their principals. Similarly, Zalaquett (2005) noted principals ($N = 500$)
strong regard for the role of their school counselor as positive contributors to students and other stakeholders.

However, the results of the current study on principal support were inconsistent with Monteiro-Leitner, Asner-Self, and Milner (2006) who reported that although administrators were supportive of their school counselors, inconsistencies were found in the activities that administrators deemed to be appropriate such as student testing. Therefore, it may be concluded that although school administrators may be supportive of the roles of their school counselors, there is still concern for the inconsistencies that exists between school counselors and administrators on activities they consider to be appropriate and inappropriate.

To determine participants’ perceptions of the consistency of their school counseling program with how they believe a successful school counseling program should be implemented, five point Likert scaled items were included on the demographic questionnaire. Likert scale items ranged from one (not at all consistent) to five (very consistent). A median score of three (3) suggested “moderate” program consistency. A review of the measures of central tendencies indicated that 31% of the participants ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.05$, $Mdn. = 3.0$), perceived their current programs to be somewhat consistent with their beliefs. No current studies were found on school counselors’ perceptions of their school counseling programs. However, in exploring discrepancies and factors predictive of role discrepancies, Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) found that high school counselors were less likely to perform the way they would prefer in their role as school counselors. Future research is needed to explore school counselors’ perceptions of program effectiveness.

Values (SVS): The SVS (Schwartz, 1992) was used to obtain the participants value scores based on four value dimensions (openness, conservatism, self-transcendence, and self-
The Cronbach alpha for the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) was strong at .825 for these data (four value dimensions ranged from .728 to .835). A review of the results of the measures of central tendencies of the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) indicated that on average, the participants reported to be highly motivated by the value dimension of *conservationism*, with a reported mean of 65.90 (SD = 9.33, Range = 44-86). *Self-transcendence (M = 65.07, SD = 7.12, Range = 47-78)* was reported as the second highest value dimension, followed by *openness to change (M = 49.58, SD = 9.44, Range = 27-69)* and, *self-enhancement (M = 44.64, SD = 10.05, Range = 17-69)*.

No studies were found that used the SVS (Schwartz, 1992) to measure the value types of practicing school counselors’. However, the results of the current study appeared consistent with research with other helping professions. Specifically, Bacinelli (2006) conducted a study with adoption service workers and found that participants scored highest on *self-transcendence* (benevolence; M = 5.49) and lowest on *self-enhancement (M = 2.15).* Additionally, Bruursema (2007) examined how the values and trait boredom of individuals in the helping fields (e.g. educators and human resource workers) interfaced with the work behaviors and found that participants scored highest in *self-transcendence* (universalism [M = 37.2]; benevolence [M = 26.4]) and lowest in *self-enhancement* (power [M = 11.3]; Hedonism [M = 13.7]). Although the results of the current study are supported by Bacinelli (2006) and Bruursema’s (2007) study, variation in mean scores may have been due to the alternative methods of scoring provided by Schwartz (1992). Schwartz suggested using the raw scores of each value type or centering scores around the mean. The current study used raw scores of each value dimension. Based on the results of the current study and the findings from Bacinelli (2006) and Bruursema’s (2007) study, it may be assumed that individuals in helping fields and human services may be highly motivated
by the desire to help others and to conform to rules and less motivated by the need for self-enhancement (personal success).

*Leadership (LPI)*: The LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was used to obtain the participants leadership scores. For the current study, the Cronbach alpha for the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) was strong at .927 for these data (five leadership practices ranged from .903 to .917). A review of the results of the measures of central tendencies of the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) indicated that on average, the participants reported highest scores in the leadership practice of *enabling* ($M = 48.75$, $SD = 6.09$, Range = 33-60), followed by *modeling* ($M = 46.91$, $SD = 6.45$, Range = 29.60), and *encouraging* ($M = 46.23$, $SD = 8.31$, Range = 26-60). The lowest mean scores were found for *challenging* ($M = 42.53$, $SD = 8.68$, Range = 20-60) and *inspiring* ($M = 41.02$, $SD = 10.07$, Range = 14-60). The results suggested that the majority of school counselors favored collaborating with others and modeling exemplary behaviors and resisted upsetting the status quo.

Previous studies have been conducted using the LPI to measure leadership practices of school counselors and the results appeared to be consistent with the current study. For example, Sebera (2005) used the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) to measure school counselors leadership practices and reported that highest leadership scores were *enabling* ($M = 49.59$, $SD = 5.12$), followed by *encouraging* ($M = 47.82$, $SD = 6.86$), *modeling* ($M = 46.83$, $SD = 6.06$), and *challenging* ($M = 44.26$, $SD = 7.91$). Sebera found that the lowest leadership score was found for *inspiring a vision* ($M = 72.76$, $SD = 8.69$). Mason (2008) examined school counselors leadership practices and implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program and found highest leadership scores for *enabling others* ($M = 49.75$, $SD = 5.64$), *encouraging* ($M = 47.48$,
SD = 7.06), and modeling (M = 46.07, SD = 6.68). Mason found lowest leadership scores for inspiring (M = 41.98, SD = 9.14) and challenging (M = 43.25, SD = 7.78).

Similarly, Grant (2002) explored the leadership practices of counseling center directors and reported highest leadership mean scores in enabling (M = 52.6), encouraging (M = 50.0), modeling (M = 48.6), and challenging (M = 45.8). Grant found the lowest leadership score was for inspiring (M = 43.6). Therefore, based on the findings from the current study and the findings from Grant (2008), Mason (2008), and Sebera’s, (2005) study, it may be suggested that leadership practices, enabling (development of collaborative goals) and encouraging (motivating others) may be strengths for counselors, whereas, challenging (being a risk-taker) and inspiring (communicate a vision to motivate others to work towards goals) may be areas in need of strengthening.

Service Delivery (SCARS): The SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) was used to obtain participants’ school counseling activities scores. The Cronbach alpha for the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) was acceptable at .729 (Cohen, 1988) for these data with the five service delivery subscales ranging from .610 to .782. A review of the results of the measures of central tendencies of the SCARS indicated that on average, the participants reported the majority of time spent in coordination of services (M = 39.31, SD = 8.61, Range = 18-59), followed by counseling (M = 33.23, SD = 6.98, Range = 16-50), “other services” (M = 32.04, SD = 6.70, Range = 14.48). Lowest mean scores were found for consultation (M = 26.47, SD = 4.91, Range = 14-35) and curriculum development (M = 21.97, SD = 8.11, Range = 8-40).

The results of the current study were inconsistent with other research conducted with school counselors. In exploring the time, task, and knowledge of school counselors, Hebert (2007) examined the activities school counselors (N = 305) were engaged in and found highest
mean scores for consultation ($M = 3.6$, $SD = .7$), curriculum ($M = 3.4$, $SD = 1.3$), counseling ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .67$) and coordination ($M = 3.0$, $SD = .83$). Lowest activity rating scores were found for “other services” ($M = 3.10$, $SD = .74$). Additionally, Clark (2006) investigated self-efficacy of school counselors ($N = 118$) in engagement in the ASCA (2005) National Model® and reported activity mean scores ranging from curriculum ($M = 3.72$), coordination ($M = 3.68$), counseling ($M = 3.65$), consultation ($M = 3.57$), and the lowest, “other” services ($M = 3.33$). The findings of the current study and Hebert’s (2007) and Clark’s (2006) study, suggested that there were inconsistencies in the findings on the service delivery of school counselors. Inconsistencies included differences in activities with the highest engagement. The inconsistencies may be due to several reasons. First, the current study utilized raw scores of each subscale due to the variance in the data whereas, Clark and Hebert used mean scores of the data. Nevertheless, there appeared to still be significant differences in mean scores between Hebert’s and Clark’s study. Second, the results may be a reflection of individual state mandates on the appropriate role of the school counselors within each state where the studies were conducted (e.g., current study [Florida], Hebert [Tennessee], and Clark [Alabama]) as well as, differences in state requirements for school counseling certification. A third reason for the discrepancy in curriculum scores may be due to differences in sample size for each study. Although Hebert reported a larger representation of the school counseling population, the researcher also indicated that missing scores may have altered the results of the study. Finally, the discrepancies in delivery of curriculum services may be in fact be due to the role ambiguity that still exists in the school counseling profession. Thus, it appears that school counselors’ service delivery may be influenced by systemic factors such as school administrators, supervisors, school counseling organizations, and the individual value standards of school counselors themselves.
Descriptive Data Analysis

Research Hypothesis One

Professional school counselors’ values as measured by the four value dimensions of the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS; Schwartz, 1992) and leadership practices as measured by the five leadership subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI; Posner & Kouzes, 1988) contribute to their service delivery, as measured by the five subscales of the School Counselors Activity Rating Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005).

Structural equation modeling (SEM) applied to the latent variable Service Delivery and the four dimensions of Values and the five subscales of Leadership Practices accomplished a theoretically appropriate model fit for the data after modification re-specifications. Initial CFA indicated low factor loadings for the Value dimension, self-transcendence, as well as low factor loadings for Service Delivery subscale, “other services.” The two variables were therefore extracted from the model, resulting in a theoretically appropriate model fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 65.337$, $df = 50$, $p = .071$). All factors for the LPI (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) loaded appropriately. Correlations were found between some of the subscales of leadership, indicating that some factors loadings may be shared among particular variables. SEM path diagrams were then constructed based on the confirmed CFA model.

The results of the CFA revealed that (a) self-enhancement made the most significant contributions to the variance in values, (b) encouraging made the most significant contributions to leadership, and (c) coordination of services made the most significant contributions to service delivery. The results of the CFA suggested that the most salient contributors to the model may be participants who value self-enhancement (self-directed and risk-taker), practice encouraging
others (collaborating and celebrating), and engage in coordination of school counseling services (development of comprehensive program). However, the results suggested that values made small, non-statistically significant contributions to the model fit (less than 1%); nevertheless, leadership practices made the most significant contributions (39%) to service delivery. The results support the findings of hypotheses one, two, and three indicating that school counselors who were able to engage in effective leadership practices, particularly those who were successful in encouraging others to promote systemic change, were most influential in successful service delivery (see Figure 17).

**Figure 17: Path Diagram: Structural Equation Model**

No other studies were found that specifically investigated the contributions of values and leadership practices to school counselors’ service delivery. Moreover, no studies were found that simultaneously examined the three constructs of Values, Leadership, and Service Delivery in other human service professions. Nevertheless, the results of the current study appeared
consistent with research conducted by West and colleagues (2006) on leadership in the counseling profession ($N = 82$). West and colleagues found that counselors were most successful in meeting the needs of those they serve by implementing leadership practices that would (a) encourage and celebrate the success of others, (b) communicate a clear vision of organizational goals, and (c) have the courage to evaluate and defend their vision. The results of West and colleagues’ qualitative study suggested that effective leadership involves developing a clear vision for success, collaborating with others, and implement services for accomplishing organizational goals based on the identified vision.

The results of the current study on the contributions of Values and Leadership Practices to Service Delivery were further supported by leadership scholars (e.g., Bass, 1985, Fiedler, 1966, Kouzes & Posner, 1995) who emphasized that effective leadership is paramount to promoting organizational goals, expectations, and roles. Furthermore, leadership scholars (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974; Kouzes & Posner, 1995, Zaccaro, 2007) contended that values (e.g., personal and shared among leaders and followers) are important in promoting individual and organizational success.

Therefore, based on the results of the five hypotheses, it may be concluded that successful implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program may be dependent upon school counselors demonstrating more self-directed, risk-taking behaviors and less behaviors centered on restraint of actions or fear of upsetting the status quo. Equally essential is the need for school counselors to establish enhanced leadership practices, particularly in collaborating, appreciating, valuing, and acknowledging others.
Research Hypothesis Two

School counselors’ values (as measured by the Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) contribute to their leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]).

Structural equation modeling was conducted to determine the model fit between exogenous variable, Values (openness, conservatism, transcendence, and enhancement) and Leadership Practices and the respective subscales (challenging, modeling, enabling, inspiring, and encouraging). The results indicated a non-significant Chi-square goodness of fit ($\chi^2 = 29.155, df = 21, p = .110$), suggesting that the model fit the data. Additional fit indices such as, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI = .992), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = .049), and the Tucker and Lewis index (TLI = .986) were consulted and supported the model fit for these data. The model also indicated that self-enhancement ($r = .91$) and openness ($r = .90$) made the most significant contributions to Values and encouraging ($r = .87$) and inspiring ($r = .87$) made the most significant contributions to Leadership Practices. Based on the results of the path model, it appears that Values made small, non-significant contributions to Leadership Practices.

No studies were found that have examined the contributions of school counselors values and leadership practices. However, Ledbetter (2005) used the Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992), and interviewing procedures to examine the ways values were used in the organizational leadership of executive women ($N = 10$). Ledbetter found significant relationships between values types (e.g., achievement, benevolence, and universalism) and the organizational leadership of the participants.
Additionally, Rendall (2005) found statistically significant differences in value types among for-profit and non-profit business leaders ($N = 36$). Using $t$ tests, Rendall found significant differences in value types, openness to change and conservatism ($t = 2.01, p < .05$) and self-enhancement and self-transcendence ($t = 2.81, p < .05$) among the two leadership groups which contributed to their effectiveness as leaders. Although caution should be taken in the interpretation of the results due to the non-statistically significant contributions, the results hold practical significance and indicated that values were foundational to the participants and may have played distinct roles in the attainment of successful leadership.

Research Hypothesis Three

School counselors’ values (as measured by the Schwartz Value Survey [Schwartz, 1992]) contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale [Scarborough, 2005]).

Structural equation modeling was conducted to determine the model fit between the exogenous variable, Values (openness, conservatism, transcendence, and enhancement) and Service Delivery (i.e., counseling, coordination, consultation, curriculum, and other services). The original model included all subscales of values and service delivery. However, a poor goodness of fit indicated the need for re-specification of the model. Modification indices were consulted, including the extraction of Value dimension, self-enhancement, and Service Delivery subscale, “other services.” The two excluded subscales were found to contribute poorly to the theoretical model due to low factor loadings for these data. The results of the modification re-specification procedures indicated a non-significant Chi-square goodness of fit ($\chi^2 = 10.894, df = 12, p = 538$), suggesting that the model fit for the data.
Additional fit indices such as the Comparative Fit Index (CFI = 1.00), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = .000), and the Tucker and Lewis index (TLI = 1.00) were consulted and supported the model fit. Based on the finding, value dimension, self-enhancement appeared to have made the most significant contribution to the Values construct and self-transcendence contributed the least. Likewise, coordination of services was the most significant contributor to the Service Delivery construct, while “other” unrelated services contributed the least. The results of the path diagram however indicated that, although the model fit for these data, Values made only small, non-statistically significant contributions to Service Delivery, potentially due to the small sample size.

Although no studies were found that examined the contributions of school counselors’ values to their service delivery, Feathers (1995) conducted research on the influences of individuals’ values on their behavior choices. Feathers found that the values of graduate students in a psychology graduate program (N = 239) contributed to their behavior choices. Specifically, Feathers found that participants’ choice to accept employment where the opportunity existed for independence, freedom, and creativity, but less security was positively related to value dimension, openness to change (r = .15, p < .001) but negatively related to value dimension, self-enhancement (r = -.17, p < .001).

Based on the model fit results of the current study and Feather’s (1995) findings, Values appeared to be related to activities participants deem to be important. Therefore, it may be assumed that the manner in which individuals respond to career choices and career behaviors may be related to their value-driven motivational goals. However, the lack of research on the contributions of Values and career behaviors and services indicated a need for future studies.
Modification specification including the exclusion of the two subscales (self-transcendence and “other services”) from the model may be due to several reasons. First, SEM is not considered to be a test of significant (Garson, 2009), but rather a test of the goodness of fit of a given model based on the data and emphasizes the development of the simplest model fit for theoretical constructs. Therefore, the exclusion of variables indicated the simplest model to represent the contributions of Values to Service Delivery. A second potential reason for the exclusion of value dimension (self-transcendence) from the theoretical model may be due to the opposing nature of the dimensions on the SVS (Schwartz, 1992). Schwartz clarified that self-transcendence opposes self-enhancement in that an individuals who scored higher on self-enhancement may ultimately score lower on self-transcendence. Based on the results of the current study, self-enhancement made a more significant contribution to participants’ values; therefore, based on Schwartz’s theory (1992), self-transcendence scores would be less significant. So, it may be inferred that participants’ value scores opposed each other according to the theoretical tenets of values.

Additionally, exclusion of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005), service delivery subscale, “other services,” from the model was supported by Scarborough (2005) who found that “other” services was not directly related to fostering the academic, social/personal, or career development of students. Moreover, Clark (2006) utilized the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) to examine the relationship between school counselors counseling activities and their self-efficacy and reported that “other” services did not make statistically significant effects on participants’ self-efficacy.

Consequently, it may be suggested that participants who may be motivated by self-enhancement may be more successful in delivery comprehensive school counseling services to
include coordination, consultation, counseling, and curriculum development. Therefore, to promote more successful service delivery, school counselors may need to be more focused on being self-directed and action-oriented, while engaging in more appropriate school counseling activities.

**Research Hypothesis Four**

School counselors’ leadership practices (as measured by the *Leadership Practices Inventory* [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]), contribute to their service delivery (as measured by the *School Counselors Activity Rating Scale* [Scarborough, 2005]).

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was conducted to determine the model fit between the exogenous variable, *Leadership* (challenging, inspiring, enabling, modeling, and encouraging) and latent variable *Service Delivery* and the respective subscales (coordination, counseling, consultation, curriculum, and other services). The results indicated a non-significant Chi-square goodness of fit ($\chi^2 = 20.103, df = 19, p = .388$), suggesting that the model fit for the data. Additional fit indices such as the Comparative Fit Index (CFI = .999), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA = .019), and the Tucker and Lewis index (TLI = .998) were consulted and supported the model fit for the data. In order to identify a theoretically appropriate model fit, modification re-specification procedures were conducted whereby service delivery subscale, “*other services,*” was extracted from the model. See Figure 18 below.
Figure 18: Path Diagram: Leadership and Service Delivery

To substantiate the findings of the SEM, Pearson’s product-moment correlations were conducted and were found to support the path findings. The results of the correlational analysis indicated statistically significant relationships between leadership practices and service delivery. The strongest effects were found between leadership practices (modeling [$r = .50, p < .05$]); encouraging [$r = .51, p < .05$]; inspiring [$r = .47, p < .05$], challenging [$r = .47, p < .05$]; and enabling [$r = .42, p < .05$]) and coordination of services. The smallest effects were found between leadership practices and “other services” (encouraging [$r = .20, p < .05$], inspiring [$r = .15, p < .05$], and challenging [$r = .19, p < .05$]).
Limited research was found that investigated the contributions of school counselors’ leadership practices to their service delivery. However, the results of the current study appeared consistent with research in counseling and other related professions. Berry (2006) found statistically significant differences ($\chi^2 = 21.33, p < .001$) in coordination of services of school counselors ($N = 231$) who considered themselves as leaders and those who did not, with 98% of the leaders conducting coordination of services. The results of Berry’s study suggested that school counseling leaders were significantly engaged in related school counseling activities such as, coordination of services.

Additionally, Dollarhide, Gibson, and Saginak (2008) examined the perceptions and service delivery of school counselors ($N = 5$) in a qualitative study and found significant differences in the performance of participants who exhibited leadership practices and those who did not. For instance, Dollarhide and colleagues found that participants who were successful in their leadership roles were able to delivery effective comprehensive school counseling programs in spite of systemic paradigms. Similarly, West and colleagues (2006) in a qualitative study found that effective leadership was instrumental among counselors ($N = 82$) in evaluating the strength and weaknesses of their institution and implementing necessary action for organizational growth. Therefore it may be concluded that successful leadership promotes the efficiency of the counselor in meeting the needs of the individuals they service.

Based on the current study findings and Berry (2006), Dollarhide et al. (2008), and West et al. (2006) findings, successful leadership appeared to be a constant theme in delivering appropriate services. Specifically, effective leadership practices were found to make the most significant contributions to coordination of services which supported the development and implementation of the comprehensive school counseling program. However, “Other services”
was not found to make significant contributions to service delivery, neither were they found to be influenced by leadership practices. Therefore, the findings suggest that leadership practices are instrumental in increasing the probability of success in implementing an effective comprehensive school counseling program.

Research Hypothesis Five

School counselors’ leadership practices (as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory [Posner & Kouzes, 1988]) and demographic variables (ethnicity/race, length of employment, graduate preparation, and school level), contribute to their service delivery.

Simultaneous multiple regression applied to dependent variable, Service Delivery (coordination, consultation, curriculum, counseling, and other services) and independent variables, Leadership Practices (challenging, enabling, inspiring, modeling, and encouraging), and demographic information (school level, length of employment, and graduate preparation for leadership) identified statistically significant relationships between the dependent and independent variables. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship \( F [8, 150] = 5.07, p < .05 \) between Leadership Practice (encouraging), school level, and Service Delivery (consultation). It was found the leadership practice encouraging \( (t = 2.573) \) contributed significantly more to the model than did school level \( (t = -2.370) \). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to further examine the contributions of school level to service delivery. The results indicated that there were statistically significant differences between elementary school counselors \( (M = 27.80, SD = 4.5) \), middle school counselors \( (M = 26.46, SD = 4.9) \), and high school counselors \( (M = 24.23, SD = 4.6) \). Therefore, it may be concluded that school counselors with enhanced leadership skills in encouraging others (getting to know others,
share their values, setting examples, and celebrating successes with others) may be more successful in delivery appropriate services. Likewise, school counselors employed at the elementary level may be more instrumental in delivering effective consultative services to students and other stakeholders.

Statistically significant relationships ($F[3, 150] = 5.79, p < .05$) were also found between Leadership Practices (encouraging and modeling) and Service Delivery (coordination of services). Leadership practice of modeling was found to contribute more to Service Delivery (coordination of services) and reported a higher beta value ($\beta = .248$). Finally, simultaneous multiple regression indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship ($F[8, 150] = 6.194, p < .05$) between school level ($\beta = -.300$) and Service Delivery (curriculum). Therefore, it appeared that leadership practices of modeling and encouraging others were related to coordination of services. Likewise, the school level of school counselors contributed to their engagement in curriculum development such as, delivery of classroom guidance lessons.

The results of the current study appeared consistent with research conducted on the service delivery of school counselors. Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) found statistically significant effects of school level on curriculum services ($F[2, 358] = 13.55, p < .05$) of school counselors ($N = 361$), with elementary school counselors having more significant mean score than did middle and high school counselors. Similarly, Dahir, Burnham, and Stone (2009) found significant difference in service delivery of school counselors ($N = 1,244$) based on school level. For example, Dahir and colleagues reported that elementary school counselors placed higher priority on delivering classroom guidance and small group counseling than high school counselors. However, contrary to the findings of the current study, Berry (2006) found that there were non-statistical significant relationships between school level and curriculum development
The inconsistency between the findings of the current study and the results of Berry’s study may be due to differences in school counselor expectations as mandated by individual states or school administrators. The inconsistencies may also be as a result of role confusion and lack of time management that continues to subsist in the school counseling profession.

Based on the findings from the current study and the findings of Scarborough and Culbreth’s (2008) study, school level appear to have a direct relationship with curriculum delivery of school counselors. Therefore, it may be assumed that elementary school counselors implement curriculum services by conducting classroom guidance lessons significantly more than middle and high school counselors.

Limitations of the Study

This study encountered limitations in research design, sampling, and instrumentation. Each is discussed categorically in the following section.

Research Design

A correlation design was chosen for this study. One primary limitation with correlation research is that although it gives an indication of relationships between variables, it does not indicate causality (Pallant, 2007). Therefore, correlations may be due to one or other variable or a third, unknown variable. Furthermore, correlation research, including structural equation modeling may be influenced by other extraneous factors such as non-linear relationships, outliers, as well as statistical versus practical significance.

Another significant limitation was the potential lack of sufficient power. At least 359 participants were needed for a $p < .05$ for the school counseling population of 5000. A 50% response rate would have been required in order to achieve this alpha level with a sample of 718.
Achieving a response rate under 50% affected the generalizability of the findings as well as potentially affecting the significance of hypothesized relationships. The small sample size may have potentially limited the findings of the study.

**Sampling**

Several sampling limitations have been noted. First, sampling limitations in the findings may have been the inclusion of only school counselors from the State of Florida. The sample may not be representative of the general population of school counselors in the United States. A second potential limitation is that of participants having volunteered for the study. It may be possible that school counselors who were already motivated to engage in leadership practices were more willing to participate in the study. Third, participants who responded to the electronic version of the study may be different from those who chose to complete the printed version of the survey packet. A fourth limitation may have been due to time constraints; that is, those who chose to answer the electronic version may have spent less time and devoted less concentration to reviewing responses for completeness and accuracy.

**Instrumentation**

A potential limitation involving instruments utilized in this study was the number of instruments and the length of each individual instrument. Fewer instruments or instruments with fewer items may have affected the response rate and findings differently. Additionally, although each instrument had strong reliability and validity, confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling confirmed that subscales from the SVS and SCARS did not load appropriately for these data and were excluded from the model. Finally, instrumental limitation
included deleted items from the demographic questionnaire due to technological malfunctions during the data collection period. Ten days into the data collection period (peak collection period), it was reported by a potential participant that he or she was not able to proceed past the second screen. It was at that time the researcher discovered that a technological glitch caused one page of the survey to be skipped; therefore, three items (e.g., teaching experience, length of time as a teacher, and CACREP status) on the demographic questionnaire were not completed by several participants and thus were excluded from the data analysis procedures.

A final limitation may have been the influence of social desirability in completing the survey instruments. It is possible that participants’ responses may differ from their actual practice. In spite of these limitations, the study produced several significant findings, which were consistent with previous research, as well as findings worthy of future exploration. Particularly significant in the findings from the current study was the contributions of effective leadership practices to the successful delivery of appropriate school counseling services.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings of the study, future studies may be necessary to provide additional information on the contributions of values and leadership practices to the school counseling profession. Any future research related to this topic would need to include a larger sample size, better representing the school counseling population. A larger sample size would provide strength and variance in data analysis and decrease the potential for statistical errors. Furthermore, future studies on this topic should include a more diversified sample of school counselors, particularly in regards to the influences of values. Also important would be to
include a sample of school counselors from different regions of the United States to increase the
generalizability of the findings.

In terms of exploring leadership practices of school counselors, it may be necessary to
investigate different populations of PSCs such as, those who are members of ASCA as opposed
to those who are not. This option would give insight into the nature of the contributions of the
ASCA (2005) National Model to the leadership practices of school counselors as well as the
influence of professional membership and the engagement in developmental activities.

Additionally, future studies may need to include qualitative data analysis in order to
identify systemic issues that may contribute to the lack of leadership practices of school
counselors, particularly in terms of external, systemic barriers to challenging the process of
change from unrelated activities to more appropriate school counseling activities. Although
statistically, values appeared to make minimal contributions to service delivery, a qualitative
study may provide further information in terms of internal barriers to appropriate leadership and
program implementation. Finally, a replication of the current study with different instruments for
measuring the three constructs (i.e., Values, Leadership, and Service Delivery) may produce
more statistically significant results. Recommendations for future research in order to increase
the strength of the findings of this study have been presented. These suggestions include
revisions to the research design, sampling, and instrumentation. Future research utilizing these
suggestions would either challenge or support the findings and contribute further to the
profession.
Implications for Professional School Counseling and Counselor Education

The overall findings from this study have implications for practicing school counselors, school administrators, and counselor educators who are commissioned to train future school counselors for the profession. The following section provides implications for PSCs and counselor educators.

School Counselors

The findings of the current study provided support for PSCs to engage in effective leadership practices in order to deliver appropriate services to students and other stakeholders. Effective leaders are guided by clear organizational roles and identified goals (Kouzes & Posner, 1995) therefore PSCs it would be advantageous to have a clear understanding of their roles. Engagement in professional activities geared towards decreasing role confusion and increasing professional identity may be beneficial in clarifying PSCs appropriate roles in schools (Butler & Constantine, 2005).

The finding that leadership practices contribute and relate significantly to service delivery supported the need for practicing PSCs to enhance their leadership skills, particularly in challenging their involvement in unrelated school counseling activities. It would therefore be beneficial for PSCs to solicit leadership training from supervisors, administrators, and district personnel to facilitate appropriate service delivery. Additionally, the findings from the current study suggested that promoting effective leadership practices involved the process of encouraging others and inspiring a clear vision. A three step model is suggested in promoting these leadership practices among PSCs. The first step includes PSCs identifying and developing
a vision portraying how they believe a successful comprehensive school counseling program should be implemented. Step two includes, encouraging others in promoting the identified vision by developing strong collaborative relationships with administrators and other stakeholders. Collaboration may be the first and most important method in attaining recognition as school counseling leaders. PSCs could begin the collaborative process by (a) attending grade level meetings, (b) organizing and participating in staff professional development workshops, (c) attending school advisory meetings, (d) attending parent/teacher conferences, and (e) coordinating parent/student workshop. The final step in the process of leadership would be to recognize the contributions of all collaborators in meeting the needs of all students and to celebrate the successes in delivering a successful school counseling program. By engaging in this three step process, it is suggested that PSCs may increase visibility at their schools and exemplify their vision of what an effective school counseling program represents, and collaboratively improve students’ academic, personal/social, and career development.

_Counselor Educators_

Counselor educators may be instrumental in assisting counselors-in-training in recognizing the importance of values and understanding how values influences the delivery of effective school counseling services to students. The findings of the current study suggested that self-enhancement and openness to change were influential in promoting effective leadership and successful service delivery. Therefore, it may be meaningful for counselor educators to support counselors-in-training in recognizing the need to be more self-directed, more open to verbalizing the need for engagement in appropriate roles, and more visible to their school community.
Counselor educators can assist students by facilitating open discussions, engaging the class in experiential activities, and encouraging student reflections of aspect of self-advocacy.

Furthermore, in refining graduate program curricula, counselor educators may find it beneficial to include significant leadership preparation (CACREP, 2009) by engaging students in practical and experiential leadership activities. The findings from the current study implied that by encouraging others, inspiring a vision, and challenging the process of change, PSCs were successful in promoting effective service delivery. Therefore, it is recommended that counselor educators train students to understand their professional roles (ASCA, 2005), develop a vision of program effectiveness (Kouzes & Posner, 1995), anticipate systemic obstacles, and develop confidence in overcoming these systemic barriers (Dollarhide et al. 2008). Such graduate courses as, Introduction to School Counseling and Career Development, Techniques in Counseling, and Theories of Group Counseling, could incorporate leadership enhancement activities and discussions in order to provide students with greater exposure and awareness of leadership effectiveness and experience.

West and colleagues (2006) recommended a three phase method of preparing students for leadership. Phase one included having students develop a vision or mission statement for their ideal counseling programs. Phase two was to encourage students to develop and implement a plan for carrying out their vision. Plan implementation included professional presentations and/or professional writings. The final phase of preparing students for leadership was to have students reflect on their vision and plan implementation. West and colleagues suggested that the three phase method may be beneficial in promoting student success as effective leaders in their eventual counseling professions. Therefore, development of effective leadership practices is
advantageous in preparing counselors-in-training for successful service delivery and program implementation.

To address the preparation of counselors-in-training for effective service delivery, the findings from the current study suggested significant engagement in coordination of services. Coordination of services included maintenance of the comprehensive school counseling program, coordination of teacher and parent consultation and workshops, and formal evaluation of student progress. It is suggested that counselor educators prepare counselors-in-training for operational coordination of services by promoting the aspects of the ASCA (2005) *National Model* and by recognizing the importance of the models guidelines in understanding appropriate roles. Furthermore, counselor educators can prepare their students for effective program coordination by strengthening students’ program evaluation skills. Astramovich, Coker, and Hoskins (2005) reported that PSCs were not adequately prepared for program evaluation in their graduate programs. Therefore, it may be meaningful to engage students in practical evaluation training experiences.

Additionally, coordination of services includes efficient consultative services with parents and teachers; consequently, counselor educators may assist in increasing counselors-in-training consultative skills particularly in prescriptive and collaborative consultation by utilizing vignettes, role-playing, and group discussions. Counselor educators could also facilitate the preparation of counselors-in-training for effective service delivery by promoting student awareness of the influence of their values and leadership practices through comprehensive program training.

Finally, the findings of the current study and prior research on PSCs indicated that the majority of participants were Caucasian females. It is suggested that counselor education
programs increase diversity in the school counseling profession by improving recruitment strategies to attract counselors-in-training from varied minority groups. Diversity in the school counseling profession is vital due to the increase in diversity of the K-12 student population (Davis, 2006). Therefore, it would be favorable for counselor educators to prepare counselors-in-training for successful leadership practices in delivery comprehensive school counseling services to meet the academic, personal/social, and career needs of a diverse population of students.

Summary

This study investigated the contributions of school counselors’ values and leadership practices to their service delivery in a sample of school counseling professionals. The results of the statistical analyses supported the hypotheses. Furthermore, the findings provide strong empirical support that although values made only minimal contributions to service delivery, leadership practices, particularly encouraging others, contributed significantly to service delivery. Additionally, the findings supported the need for PSCs to be more assertive in engaging in school counseling related roles according to the identified needs of their diverse population of students.

The findings of the study are encouraging in that the majority of PSCs were engaged in collaborative efforts with stakeholders, which may be indeed the first step in unraveling the effects of decades of role disparity which has impinged the school counseling profession. In spite of the limitations mentioned, the study offers practical implications for the enhancement of school counseling professional and counselor education preparation programs.
Title of the Study:  
*The Contributions of School Counselors’ Values and Leadership Practices on their Professional School Counseling Activities*

Principal Investigator: M. Ann Shillingford

Dear Professional School Counselor,

My name is Margaret Ann Shillingford and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education Program at the University of Central Florida. Because I am a graduate student, I am being guided by Dr. Glenn Lambie, a UCF faculty supervisor in the Counselor Education Program in the College of Education. I am working on a research study investigating the contributions of school counselors’ personal values and leadership practices on their school counseling activities. You are being invited to take part in this study because you are a practicing school counselor in the State of Florida; however, you must be 18 years of age or older to be included in this research study.

**Purpose of the research study:**
The purpose of this study is to investigate the contributions of school counselors’ values and leadership practices on their programmatic school counseling activities. The results of this study may provide clearer understanding of the role of the school counselor in leading educational change by successfully implementing their comprehensive, developmental school counseling program at their schools.

**Procedure:**
E-mail addresses for all school counselors in the State of Florida were made available to the researcher by the Florida Department of Education, Information Database Office. School counselors from the State of Florida will be contacted via e-mail inviting them to participate in this study. Participants will be forwarded to a web-link on Survey Monkey where they will be welcomed with information on the informed consent form, which describes the purpose of the study. The Non-Medical-Adult Waiver of Documentation of Consent form will be used; therefore, participants’ signatures will not be required. Completion of the survey instruments will be the participant’s indication of consent to participate in the study. Participants who are willing to participate will be forwarded to another page where they will find a demographic form, and three data collection instruments: (a) *The Leadership Practices Inventory* (Posner & Kouzes,
1988), (b) Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1992), and (c) the School Counselors Activities Rating Scale (Scarborough, 2005). Upon completion of the surveys, participants will be asked to hit a “complete” icon which will terminate the survey and forward participant responses to a secured database (VeriSign). All responses will be encrypted, thereby only the researcher will be able to retrieve the data. Participants will also be given the option to print and mail surveys to the researcher based on their technological preference and comfort level. All data responses saved in the secured database will be retrieved by the researcher and downloaded to a statistical database. Data retrieved from Survey Monkey will be anonymous, that is, no identifying information will be available about the participants. Surveys which are mailed to the researcher will be stored in a secured location. Upon completion of the data collection period, (three weeks) all data on the Survey Monkey website will be permanently destroyed.

Voluntary participation:
Your participation is voluntary and completion of the data collection instruments is completely up to you. Participants should take part in this study only because they want to and can withdraw at any time. There is no penalty for not taking part, and no one will be penalized. This study requires that participants complete as many of the survey items as possible; however, you may complete only the sections that you like. Your identity and responses will be anonymous. It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

Risks:
There are no known or anticipated risks from participating in this study.

Benefits:
There may be no direct benefits to you for participating in this study. It is hoped that your participation may contribute to the enhancement of the school counseling profession.

Compensation or payment:
Invited participants will be offered a $5.00 gift certificate for use at one professional development workshop offered by the Florida School Counselor Association. All school counselors and related professionals in the State of Florida are invited to these workshops.

Confidentiality:
Whether you complete the electronic version or choose to print and mail your surveys, your identifying information will not be required or collected. All participant information will be encrypted and stored in a secured database. This information will be used for statistical analysis. The information obtained from this research study may be used in future research and publications. However, your right to privacy will be retained. Surveys retrieved from each participant will be numerically coded for data analysis. Your name will not be written on any of the questionnaires. Additionally, as completed survey will be forwarded to a server, your surveys will not be able to be traced back to you. That means the researcher will not know who you are.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem:
Margaret Ann Shillingford, Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education Program, College of Education, (407) 538-0771 or shillingford1@msn.com; or you may contact my dissertation
advisor, Dr. Glenn Lambie, Associate Professor, Counselor Education Program at: (407) 823-4967 or by email glambie@mail.ucf.edu.

**IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint:**

Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

**How to return this consent form to the researcher:**

Please follow directions on the web-page after completing the surveys. If you choose to print and mail your survey packet you may do so at the address provided on the web link. Please do not include your name or other identifiable information on the surveys or mailing envelop.

_I understand my rights as a research participant, and I understand what the study is about and how and why it is being done. By completing the data collection instruments, I consent to participate in this research study._
APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT EMAIL
Dear School Counselor:

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Central Florida and a former school counselor. I am seeking your participation in my dissertation study. I am interested in learning about the contributions of school counselors’ values and leadership practices on their school counseling activities. My goal is to determine how values and leadership influence engagement in related and unrelated school counseling activities as mentioned by the American School Counselor Association. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take a few moments to complete my online surveys. It should take you about 30 minutes to complete.

To know more about this survey and to participate, please click on the web-link below:

(Web-Link to be inserted here).

Attached with the link is a $5.00 gift certificate to one of the Florida School Counselor Association’s professional development workshops. Please free to print and use this gift certificate regardless of your participation in the survey.

Please note that this study has been approved by UCF’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The informed consent form is attached on the web-link for more information on the IRB. If you need further information about this study, you may contact me or my advisor, Dr. Glenn Lambie at (407) 823-6947 or glambie@mail.ucf.edu.

Thank you for your consideration.

M. Ann Shillingford, M.Ed
Doctoral Candidate
University of Central Florida
(407) 538-0771
APPENDIX C: THANK YOU/ REMINDER EMAIL
Dear School Counselor:

A week ago you were sent an email inviting you to participate in an on-line dissertation study regarding the contributions of school counselors’ values and leadership practices on their engagement in related and unrelated school related activities. As the responses are anonymous, I am unable to determine who have participated. Therefore, if you have already chosen to complete the surveys, I thank you and appreciate your time. If you have not yet completed the surveys, please take a moment to do so by clicking on the web-link attached below.

(web-link inserted here)

Please note that the attached $5.00 gift certificate to one of the Florida School Counselor Association’s professional development workshops is for your use regardless of your participation in the survey.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

M. Ann Shillingford, M.Ed
Doctoral Candidate

University of Central Florida

(407) 538-0771
APPENDIX D: GIFT CERTIFICATE
This certificate entitles:

$5.00 OFF: FSCA Professional Development Workshop

(Gift Certificate good for *one* school counselors for *one* workshop)

Florida School Counselor Association
P.O. Box 752
Safety Harbor, Florida 34695
fsca@fla-schoolcounselor.org

Expires: June 5, 2009
Not redeemable for cash. Redemption value not to exceed $5.00
The Contributions of School Counselors’ Values and Leadership Practices on their Professional School Counseling Activities

**Directions:** Please complete the following demographic questionnaire. All responses are anonymous.

**Gender:** Male or Female or Other

**Ethnicity:** ___ Caucasian/White (Non-Hispanic); ___ African American/Black; ___ Hispanic; ___ Asian American; ___ Pacific Islander; ___ Native American; ___ Other

**Age:**

**Highest Degree Completed:** ___ Bachelors; ___ Masters; ___ Specialist; ___ Doctoral; ___ Other (please specify)

**Was your Graduate Program CACREP Accredited?** ___ Yes; ___ No; ___ I Do Not Know

**Current School Level:** ___ Elementary; ___ Middle; ___ High; ___ Multi-level; ___ Other

**Length of Employment as a Licensed/Certified School Counselor:** ________________

**Did you have any teaching experience prior to becoming a School Counselor?** _Yes; _No

**Number of Years of Teaching Experience:** ___

**How would you rate the preparation you received in your graduate program to take on leadership in your role as a school counselor?**

1  2  3  4  5
Weak / Limited Fair / Average Strong / Advanced

**How would you rate your level of influence on the school counseling activities in your school?**

1  2  3  4  5
Weak / Limited Fair / Average Strong / Advanced
How involved are you in administrative duties at your school (e.g., lunch duty, discipline, test coordinating)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very involved</td>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How comfortable are you in challenging your involvement in assigned duties that you feel are not appropriate for your role as a school counselor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very comfortable</td>
<td>Somewhat comfortable</td>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How supportive is your principal in allowing you to engage in school counseling activities such as classroom guidance and small group counseling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very Supportive</td>
<td>Somewhat Supportive</td>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How consistent is your present school counseling program with how you believe your program should be implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very consistent</td>
<td>Somewhat involved</td>
<td>Very involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: SCHWARTZ VALUE SURVEY
The Contributions of School Counselors’ Values and Leadership Practices on their Professional School Counseling Activities

In this questionnaire you are to ask yourself: "What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?" There are two lists of values on the following pages. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for you as a guiding principle in your life. Use the rating scale below:

0--means the value is not at all important, it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you.
3--means the value is important.
6--means the value is very important.
The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life.
-1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.
7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life; ordinarily there are no more than two such values.

In the space before each value, write the number (-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) that indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed</th>
<th>of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to my</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

VALUES LIST I

1. ____ EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
2. ____ INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3. ____ SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
4. ____ PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5. ____ FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
6. ____ A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
7. ____ SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
8. ____ SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
9. ____ AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)
10. ____ MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed</th>
<th>of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to my</td>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. ____ POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
12. ____ WEALTH (material possessions, money)
13. ____ NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
14. ____ SELF RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)
VALUES LIST II

Now rate how important each of the following values is for you as a guiding principle in YOUR life. These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for you. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to you, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance.

Then rate the rest of the values.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling & action)
33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)
34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
35. BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)
36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)
37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)
38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)
39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)
40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)
41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)
42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)
43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)
44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)
45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)
46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")
47. OBEDEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)
48. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)
49. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
50. ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)
51. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith & belief)
52 RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
53 CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)
54 FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
55 SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)
56 CLEAN (neat, tidy)
57 SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)

© Schwartz, 1992, Used with Permission
APPENDIX G: LEADERSHIP PRACTICE INVENTORY
Here are 30 statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each carefully then look at the rating scale and decide how frequently you engage in the behavior described.

1 = Almost Never       6 = Sometimes
2 = Rarely             7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom             8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While    9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally       10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you typically behave—on most days, on most projects, and with most people. As a school counselor, think about how you behave with your colleagues and students. All responses will be anonymous.

For each statement, decide on a rating and record it in the blank to the left of the statement.

____ 1. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.
____ 2. I talk about the future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
____ 3. I develop cooperative relationships among people I work with.
____ 4. I set a personal example of what I expect from others.
____ 5. I praise people for a job well done.
____ 6. I challenge people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.
____ 7. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.
____ 8. I actively listen to diverse points of view.
____ 9. I spend time and energy on making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principle and standards that we have agreed on.
____ 10. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.
____ 11. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
____ 12. I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.
____ 13. I treat others with dignity and respect.
____ 14. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.
____ 15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.
____ 16. I ask what can we learn when things do not go as expected.
17. I show others how their long term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.


18. I support the decisions that people make on their own.

19. I am clear about my philosophy and leadership.

20. I publicly recognize people who exemplify a commitment to share values.

21. I experiment and take risks even when there is a chance of failure.

22. I am contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.

23. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

24. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.

25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.

26. I take the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.

27. I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.

28. I ensure that people grow in their roles by learning new skills and developing themselves.

29. I make progress toward goals one step at a time.

30. I give my coworkers lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

APPENDIX H: SCHOOL COUNSELORS ACTIVITY RATING SCALE
School Counselors Activity Rating Scale

Developed by Janna L. Scarborough, PhD., NCC, NCSC, ACS

Below is a list of functions that may be performed by school counselors. Please write the number that indicates the frequency with which you ACTUALLY perform each function. Please place the corresponding number in each box.

Ratings:

1 = I never do this
2 = I rarely do this
3 = I occasionally do this
4 = I frequently do this
5 = I routinely do this

Counseling Activities

___: Counsel with students regarding personal/family concerns
___: Counsel with students regarding school behavior
___: Counsel students regarding crisis/emergency issues
___: Counsel with students regarding relationships (e.g., family, friends, romantic)
___: Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills
___: Provide small group counseling for academic issues
___: Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g., divorce, death)
___: Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues (own use or family/friends, etc.)
___: Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants
___: Counsel students’ regarding academic issues
Consultation Activities

___: Consult with school staff concerning student behavior
___: Consult with community and school agencies concerning individual students
___: Consult with parents regarding child/adolescent development issues
___: Coordinate referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals
   (e.g., mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)
___: Assist in identifying exceptional children (special education)
___: Provide consultation for administrators (regarding school policy, programs, staff and/or students)
___: Participate in team / grade level / subject team meetings

Curriculum Activities

___: Conduct classroom activities to introduce yourself and explain the counseling program to all students
___: Conduct classroom lessons addressing career development and the world of work
___: Conduct classroom lessons on various personal and/or social traits (e.g., responsibility, respect, etc.)
___: Conduct classroom lessons on relating to others (family, friends)
___: Conduct classroom lessons on personal growth and development issues
___: Conduct classroom lessons on conflict resolution
___: Conduct classroom lessons regarding substance abuse
___: Conduct classroom lessons on personal safety issues
Coordination Activities

___: Coordinate special events and programs for school around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g., career day, drug awareness week, test prep)

___: Coordinate and maintain a comprehensive school counseling program

___: Inform parents about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school

___: Conduct or coordinate parent education classes or workshops

___: Coordinate school-wide response for crisis management and intervention

___: Inform teachers / administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a school counselor within the context of your school

___: Conduct or coordinate teacher in-service programs

___: Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform

___: Attend professional development activities (e.g., state conferences, local in-service)

___: Coordinate with an advisory team to analyze and respond to school counseling program needs

___: Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling from student, teacher, and/or parent perspectives

___: Conduct needs assessment and counseling program evaluations from parents, faculty and/or students

___: Coordinate orientation process / activities for students

“Other” Activities

___: Participate on committees within the school

___: Coordinate the standardized testing program
___: Organize outreach to low income families (e.g., Thanksgiving dinners, Holiday families)
___: Respond to health issues (e.g., check for lice, eye screening, 504 coordination)
___: Perform hall, bus, cafeteria duty
___: Schedule students for classes
___: Enroll students in and/or withdraw students from school
___: Maintain/Complete educational records/reports (cumulative files, test scores, attendance reports, drop-out reports)
___: Handle discipline of students
___: Substitute teach and/or cover classes for teachers at your school
Notice of Exempt Review Status

From: UCF Institutional Review Board
FWA0000351, Exp: 6/24/11, IRB00001138

To: Margaret Shillingford

Date: October 29, 2008

IRB Number: SHE-08-05855

Study Title: The Contribution of School Counselors’ Values and Leadership Practices on their Professional Activities

Dear Researcher,
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