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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS AND THE USE OF COUNSELING SKILLS

By Valerie Suzanne Hodge Cleckler

August 2010

In most educational leadership programs, the working relationship of the principal with teachers, parents, and the community is discussed, but the relationship of the principal and counselor is typically not given much, if any, attention. Principals are not trained in the use of counseling skills in educational leadership programs at Mississippi universities (Delta State University, 2008; Jackson State University, 2007; Mississippi State University, 2008; Mississippi University for Women, 2008, 2009; The University Southern Mississippi, 2009; University of Mississippi, 2007). The leadership training provided to school administrators is very important because of the role they play in the success of the school. The skills, and behaviors of, and the decisions made by, principals can impact the successfulness of schools.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between counselors’ reports of principals’ effectiveness and their use of counseling skills. Principals’ effectiveness was measured using Mississippi Curriculum Test, 2nd edition (MCT2), Algebra 1, and English 2 Multiple Choice score gains, performance ratings assigned by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) and counselor report of leadership effectiveness based on the 21 responsibilities of the Mid-continental Research for Education Leadership (McREL) Balanced Leadership Framework. Counseling skills were measured using the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) National
Model. Descriptive data were used to create a model that was analyzed to determine if those variables predicted the counselors’ report of principals’ use of counseling skills.

Data were collected from 129 Mississippi public school counselors, from 121 schools. A strong, positive relationship was found to exist between counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills and principal effectiveness based on counselors’ report of principal effectiveness measured by the McREL Balanced Leadership Framework. When principal effectiveness was measured using standardized test score gains, only 3rd grade MCT2 Language Arts scores were moderately, positively correlated with counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills. There was a small, positive correlation between counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills and MDE’s rating of school performance. The overall model, using the principal, school, and student demographic characteristics, was found to be predictive of counselors’ report of principals’ use of counseling skills, but only student socioeconomic status was a statistically significant predictor of the principals’ use of counseling skills.

This study found significant correlations among counselors’ ratings of principal effectiveness and counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills. Significant results can be used to enhance educational leadership programs in order to better train more effective principals. More effective principals can improve schools, thus assisting many students in becoming more successful (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).
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CHAPTER I
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between principals’ effectiveness and their use of counseling skills. Principals’ effectiveness is sometimes measured using standardized test scores and other measures of school effectiveness. This research addressed additional criteria as a basis for drawing conclusions about principal effectiveness. Significant results can be used to enhance educational leadership programs in order to better train more effective principals. More effective principals can improve schools, thus assisting many students in becoming more successful (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Through studies conducted by the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), and other entities, student achievement has been correlated with principal effectiveness, but not with the principal’s use of counseling skills. The proposed research explored whether there are correlations among counselors’ ratings of principal effectiveness, principals’ use of counseling skills, and student achievement.

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. The first chapter introduces the purpose of the study. It also provides the statement of the problem, background, research questions, hypotheses, definition of terms, delimitations, and assumptions. The theoretical framework upon which this research is built and a review of the literature is presented in Chapter II. The third chapter explains the methodology including the design method, participants, instrumentation, and procedures. Chapters IV and V describe the
results of the research, discuss these findings, assess their implications, and provide suggestions for future research.

Statement of Problem

Standardized state testing is required by all states receiving federal funds. This began over forty years ago with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. No Child Left Behind is a more recent and somewhat stricter version of this act (McKim, 2007). Mississippi and most other states use these test results to make determinations about students, teachers, administrators, schools, and districts (Mississippi Department Education, 2009). Podgursky (2006) indicated that many states including Texas, Florida, and Minnesota factor student test results into teacher pay. Students must pass graduation exams in many states in order to graduate (Georgia Department of Education, 2009; Mississippi Department of Education, 2009; Ohio Department of Education, 2009). Schools and districts can be placed under school improvement plans or can be taken over by the state based on student test scores (Mississippi Department of Education, 2009). These high stakes tests are very important to all educational stakeholders.

School administrators play an important role in the success of the school, which many times is determined by student test scores. Administrators work with other stakeholders to determine the vision and focus of the school. These decisions impact how students learn, and therefore how well they achieve. Marzano et al. (2005) conducted a meta-analysis which found a statistically significant correlation ($r = .25$) between school administrators and student achievement. Administrators are not the only influential school employees who make an impact on student achievement. Lapan, Gysbers, and Sun (1997) conducted a study that found a fully implemented guidance program can
improve students’ grades. The present study sought to find if a leader using counseling skills could increase student achievement and leader effectiveness.

Background

Schools are an integral part of most communities. Many perceive that the school is the cohesive bond that holds a community together. In larger areas, schools affect housing costs and whether an area is considered a desirable place to live. School leaders make an impact in communities by having an effect in the schools. A strong, effective leader can take a school from the edge of closing and help to make it, the teachers, staff, and students, successful. A successful leader can also help to make a thriving school even more successful.

In most educational leadership programs in Mississippi, principals are trained in instructional leadership, organizational management, community outreach, supervision, theory, and research. In those programs, the working relationship of the principal with teachers, parents, and the community is discussed, but the relationship of the principal and counselor is typically not mentioned (Delta State University, 2008; Jackson State University, 2007; Mississippi State University, 2008; Mississippi University for Women, 2008, 2009; The University Southern Mississippi, 2009; University of Mississippi, 2007). Principals are not trained in counseling skills in Mississippi according to educational leadership departmental websites at such universities as Delta State University (2008), Jackson State University (2007), Mississippi State University (2008), Mississippi University for Women (2008, 2009), The University of Southern Mississippi (2009), and University of Mississippi (2007).
Research Questions and Hypotheses

The first research question addressed by this study is stated as follows: Is there a relationship between counselor ratings of principals’ effectiveness and principals’ use of counseling skills? The second research question considered by this study is stated as follows: Are there relationships among principals’ use of counseling skills and school and principal demographic characteristics?

Principal effectiveness was measured by examining counselor ratings of principals’ performance as operationalized through the 21 responsibilities found in McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). Student achievement score gains of the principals’ schools, as assigned by the Mississippi Department of Education (MDE, 2009) served as additional measures of effectiveness. Finally, the schools’ accreditation performance ratings (MDE, 2009) provided an additional gauge of effectiveness. Counseling skills were measured using counselor ratings of the degree to which principals employ counseling skills consistent with the American School Counseling Association Model standards (ASCA, 2003). The hypotheses tested in this study are as follows:

1. There is no relationship between counselors’ ratings of principals’ effectiveness as measured by McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework and principals’ use of counseling skills.

2. There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by MDE’s school achievement score gains and counselors’ ratings of principals’ use of counseling skills.
3. There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by MDE’s school performance ratings and counselors’ ratings of principals’ use of counseling skills.

4. Principals’ use of counseling skills, as rated by counselors on The Leadership Questionnaire, are not predicted by principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, years at current school, whether school has a full time or part time counselor, and school and student demographic characteristics.

Definition of Terms

1. Administrator – A school principal or assistant principal
2. School leader – A school principal or assistant principal
3. Principal – A school administrator and leader
4. Stakeholder – Any person who has a stake in the outcome of students and the effectiveness of the school. Typically stakeholders are students, teachers, parents, community members, area businesses and educational institutions

Delimitations

This study was limited to Mississippi public schools grades 3 through 12. The Mississippi Curriculum Test 2 and English II Multiple Choice and Algebra I Subject Area Tests’ curriculum was changed two years prior to the study. This allowed for only one comparison point of growth since only two years of data were available. The only schools sampled were those with school counselors, which may or may not be different from those schools without counselors. The principal behaviors being assessed were limited to those observed by the counselors sampled. The counselors may or may not be aware of all of the counseling skills being used by the principals. Lastly, the sample of
counselors in the study was drawn from membership of the Mississippi Counseling Association (MCA). These school counselors may or may not be different from counselors who do not join the organization. This research was restricted to analogous populations with like characteristics.

Assumptions

There were few assumptions made by the researcher in this study. It was assumed that the respondents would answer honestly. The researcher also presumed that the counselors felt uninhibited by concerns about confidentiality. It was also presupposed that the counselors had the opportunity to observe whether their principal uses counseling skills. The researcher assumed that there is no difference in counselors who join MCA and those who do not.

Summary

No Child Left Behind has made it necessary to find ways to ensure that students perform well on high stakes tests (McKim, 2007). McREL conducted a meta-analysis that found twenty-one responsibilities of effective leaders and that leadership is correlated with student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005). With the evidence of the importance of school leaders’ impact on student success, it is important to find any additional skills or behaviors that might further improve school leaders’ effectiveness. Research has shown school counseling programs’ impact on student success (Lapan et al., 1997). This study examined if a correlation exists between principals’ use of counseling skills and principal effectiveness.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The second chapter provides a detailed review of the literature. It begins with informing the reader of the theoretical framework. Research shows that situational leadership theory, contingency theory, and the managerial grid have been useful in predicting effective leadership in different situations. If different styles are needed by leaders to be effective in different situations, it may also be beneficial to have different behaviors. The following section provides research regarding situational leadership theory, contingency theory, and the managerial grid. The other sections illustrate how leaders can be effective by using certain behaviors and abilities, such as those shown to be effective by the meta-analytic studies conducted by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) and those expected by the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and the American School Counseling Association’s (ASCA) National Model.

Theoretical Framework

The major job of a school, and therefore a principal, is to help students receive an education that will help them succeed and become productive citizens of the world (Dewey, 1938). This is accomplished through a systematic approach involving students, parents, teachers, counselors, and principals. Based on previous literature, the theoretical framework for this study consists of the work of Hersey and Blanchard, Blake and Mouton, and Fiedler. Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Theory, Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid and Fiedler’s Contingency Theory will be the specific
theories utilized for this study. Situational leadership examines the situations that impact effectiveness, whereas, the managerial grid uses leaders’ styles as a determinant of effectiveness. The contingency theory combines both style and situation to predict leader effectiveness.

These three theories have a common thread. All of the theories emphasize the relative balance between concern for relationships and concern for production, which culminates in leadership effectiveness. Leadership effectiveness is then contingent upon leader style matching the situation at hand. Many books and articles point out the commonalities of these three theories, including Blake & Mouton (1978), Hersey and Blanchard (1972), and Vecchio (2007).

Situational Leadership

Early theories of leadership focused on leaders’ traits in order to determine who was likely to be an effective leader. Since little research supported one specific trait that consistently correlated with effective leadership, theories began to address the behaviors’, situations’, and styles’ of leaders that result in effective leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972). One such theory is the Situational Leadership Theory (SLT), devised by Hersey and Blanchard. It emanated from the idea that behavior is motivated by the desire to achieve a goal, and this behavior, depending on the motives, can lead to accomplishing or failing to accomplish a goal. Different environments or situations can be motivating or fail to motivate leaders and workers. Hersey and Blanchard (1972) theorized that there is no best leadership style, rather different situations call for different leadership behaviors in order for the leader to be effective.
Hersey and Blanchard (1972) stated that the model is constructed on the notion “that effectiveness results from a leader using a behavioral style that is appropriate to the demands of the environment” (p. 109). The environment consists of job demands, time, and the personalities and expectations of the leader, followers, superiors, associates, and organization. This culminates in determining organizational effectiveness by examining how concerned each player of the organization is in regards to relationships and/or tasks. The effective leader varies his or her style in order to adapt to the situation.

Specifically, the theory focuses on the need of leaders, or “managers” as Hersey and Blanchard (1972) call them, to understand how people work. The theorists explain that once leaders understand how people work, they can motivate them to work for the leader, which will result in organizational effectiveness. The leader must understand what motivates the group, what the organization’s goals are, and how motivated the group is. Using these understandings, an effective leader can find the best path to obtaining the organization’s goal. The leaders must address the members of the group becoming frustrated, acting immaturely, engaging in ineffective behaviors, and resigning, all of which might impede the group from success and productivity.

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) used Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs to help leaders understand what motivates members of the group. Once leaders know the needs of the group, they can satisfy those needs. Workers, according to the theory, want their jobs to satisfy their needs. Employees will work harder, accomplishing the organization’s goals, when they have their needs met. The researchers argue that the strongest need is what motivates someone to work. If workers are hungry, they will work enough to eliminate their hunger. Relationships become an important aspect of the work environment once
physiological and safety needs are met. Workers try to belong to the group and take pride in their work because it increases their esteem. At the highest level, self-actualization, employees work because it is who they are. A leader cannot motivate a worker whose strongest need is to fit in by offering a raise. These needs must be understood by the leader in order to know how to motivate the worker.

Hersey and Blanchard’s theory provides leaders with studies and earlier theories that support a leader creating a positive working environment. Studies were conducted in the early decades of the twentieth century at the Hawthorne Works, a Western Electric manufacturing plant. The study found that due to the relationships created, as an indirect factor of the study, output increased. The study illuminated the importance of relationships in work place production. Douglas McGregor took this idea further and developed Theory X-Theory Y. The two theories are in direct opposition to one another. Theory X affirms that employees dislike work, must be controlled, and only work in order to meet physiological and safety needs. Theory Y insists that employees enjoy work, can work on their own if properly motivated, and work in order to meet a continuum of needs from the Hierarchy. Leaders’ belief in either Theory X or Y determines how they relate to employees, which is believed to directly determine output in accordance with the Hawthorne study. Although, Theory X-Theory Y is well known, many researchers do not believe people can be seen in such a clear-cut manner. Argyris, the author of the Immaturity-Maturity Theory, hypothesized that people are on a continuum. This theory showed how people move between passive and active or dependence and independence. Passive and dependence are in the immature realm and active and independence are on the mature side. This theory also works on the idea that
leaders view workers as immature and do not act in a mature manner are not going to be as effective as the alternative. Herzberg took the ideas of McGregor and Argyris even further creating the Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Herzberg found that workers were dissatisfied about the environment they worked in, called hygiene factors, and those same workers were motivated by the job itself called motivators. These studies provided the basis and support for Situational Leadership. In their book describing Situational Leadership, Hersey and Blanchard (1972) even cite two studies used as the basis for the Contingency Theory, evidencing the strong link between the theories.

There have been numerous studies that examine Situational Leadership. Vecchio (2007) designed a study to test situational leadership theory. The study consisted of three hundred three high school teachers. The omnibus test supported situational leadership theory. The post hoc tests to determine individual differences indicated six of the nine comparisons were in compliance with the theory, and four of the six were statistically significant. The study provided evidence that overall situational leadership theory was supported, but only moderately supported depending on the level of maturity, which was rated by the principals and could have been a limitation of the study (Vecchio, 2007). Another study which included thirty-six hundred undergraduate and graduate students, was conducted by Fernandez and Vecchio (1997). The authors indicated that the study provided support for the theory but had some concerns about the psychometric properties of the instrumentation associated with the theory.

Studies have been conducted around the world. One such study was performed by Silverthorne and Wang (2001). Managers and employees from twenty Taiwan businesses were given the LEAD, a questionnaire developed by Hersey and Blanchard to
test the aspects of situational leadership. The study found the LEAD measure to be valid with the sample tested. The researchers also concluded that this study did support the theory that the more adaptive and flexible a leader is the more the group produces, but not all of the variables were significant (Silverthorne & Wang, 2001). Another international study was conducted by Hur (2008) examining leadership styles and differences in Korean human services organizations. A factor analysis was conducted and separated the participants into two groups, administrators and human services. Administrators worked with the budgets and personnel, and those in human services cared for the welfare of the people. There was a statistically significant difference in the two groups leadership style, which was due to their different jobs. The author stated that this shows that the task of the group determines the style of the leader (Hur, 2008).

There were numerous criticisms of situational leadership theory posed by Northouse (2004). The first critique concerned the lack of empirical research to support the tenets of the theory. Other matters of interest were the construct of commitment, the model of the development of subordinates, and how leader’s style and subordinate development were matched. Also noted was the lack of mention of the role of demographic characteristics in the model and the lack of discussion of how the model works in a one on one setting. The last weakness of the theory involved the statistical characteristics of the leadership questionnaire used by the theory. Graeff (1983) pointed out many areas of concern within the theory. He stated a contradiction concerning the curvilinear model of task and relationship and how maturity did not fit into that model. This was evidenced through statements Graeff claimed were made by Hersey and Blanchard indicating a positive linear relationship between maturity and success.
Another weakness of the theory existed in the connection between theory and the LEAD instrument used to test a leader’s style, style range, and style adaptability. Graeff noted the LEAD instrument underrepresented the low task, low relationship leader. Lastly, there were numerous comments about the lack of theoretical explanation of variables especially maturity and its connection to tasks (Graeff, 1983).

In spite of the criticisms, there are many supporters of Situational Leadership Theory. Hersey and Blanchard responded to Graeff (1997), who identified many concerns about the lack of theoretical rationale, by stating that Situational Leadership is an approach or model and not a theory. Despite Situational Leadership not being a theory, it has been a major force in the training of business leaders around the world for the past thirty years (Northouse, 2004). Waddell (1994) stated Situational Leadership is used extensively with military officer training programs, such as Officer Training School (OTS), Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC), and the Squadron Officer School (SOS). It is also used in many other occupations, including telecommuters (Farmer, 2005), public relations (Aldoory & Toth, 2004), and air traffic controllers (Arvidsson, Johansson, Ek, & Akselsson, 2007).

The Managerial Grid

Another model that examines leaders’ styles and ability to adapt to situations is the Managerial Grid, also called the Leadership Grid, formulated by Blake and Mouton. In the grid, assumptions guide behaviors. The grid is used to aid a leader in seeing “himself and others more objectively, to communicate with them more clearly, to understand where their differences come from, to see how to change themselves, and to help others towards more productive and rewarding experiences” (Blake & Mouton,
Blake and Mouton assert that assumptions, determined by past experiences, guide behavior. Most people try to deceive themselves about who they are and their assumptions about others, so the authors provide six elements to “strip away” these assumptions. The six elements are decisions, convictions, conflict, temper, humor, and effort. Decisions addresses how leaders accept decisions, and convictions examines how leaders handle their own and others opinions, attitudes, and ideas. Conflict and temper both inspect how leaders resolve conflict and control their temper. The fifth element is how a leader uses humor. Effort is how much energy the leader puts into the situation and how much the leader expects others to contribute. The authors stress the importance of leaders truly knowing themselves. Once they know themselves they can change their assumptions about themselves and others and in the end their behavior. When behavior can be changed, the leader can embrace the most appropriate Grid style for the situation (Blake & Mouton, 1978).

The authors state that the characteristics of any organization are a purpose, the people, and power. The first characteristic is purpose; the typical purpose is the production of something. The second characteristic is people because people are needed to achieve the purpose. Lastly, power is needed to direct the people to accomplish the goal of production. These characteristics or attributes of an organization combine to form the Managerial Grid. The vertical axis is labeled concern for people, and the horizontal axis is called concern for production (Blake & Mouton, 1978).

The intersection of the differing levels of concern for people and concern for production yield five distinct grid styles. Leaders’ grid styles are influenced by the organization, the situation, their values, their personality, and chance. The grid style
called *impoverished management* has a leader who has little concern for relationships or power. It is characterized by a manager who expects and gives little, disrespects employees, blames others, and by an organization with extremely low productivity. *Authority-obedience* is a grid style in which the leader is interested in power and not relationships. Managers with this grid style do not like to lose control, will not accept assistance, and are inflexible, which leads to lowered productivity. In the middle of the grid is the grid style termed *organization man management*. This style is exemplified by balancing the need for accomplishing work with maintaining the morale of the staff, which provides moderate productivity. *Country club management* is directed by a leader who is apathetic in regards to his or her authority and is overly impacted by the importance of relationships with subordinates. This leadership style represents concern for the relationship with employees creating a positive work environment but not necessarily a productive one. The last style is known as *team management*. In this style the leader attempts to manage his/her role as leader and maintain positive relationships with employees. It is based on the need for people to be engaged in rewarding work, so as to be more productive. Through the use of the grid and its prescriptions for effective leadership, a leader can determine which style is needed for specific situations (Blake & Mouton, 1978).

As with most ideas, the concept of the Managerial Grid has evolved. It has been revised twice, and there have offshoots of the original such as *The Academic Administrator Grid* (Blake, Mouton, & Williams, 1981). The Administrator’s Guide is very similar to the Managerial Grid, but most of the names of the styles were changed. The *impoverished manager* is renamed the *caretaker administrator*. The *organization
man manager was amended to become the constituency-centered administrator, and the
country club manager became the comfortable and pleasant administrator. The style
named authority-obedience and team remained the same only changing manager to
administrator. The descriptions of each of the styles remained the same (Blake et al.,

As in the original grid, administrators need to understand themselves and their
motivations. The Administrator’s Grid has specific motivations that can be positive or
negative, that steer an administrator toward styles. These motivators are on a continuum
from negative to positive. The fear of rejection or a need for warmth and approval leads
an administrator into a comfortable and pleasant administration. An authority obedience
administration results from a fear of failure or need for control or domination. A fear of
being embarrassed or the need to be popular points a leader toward a constituency-
centered administration. The caretaker administrator is a consequence of a fear of
abandonment or an effort to hang on. The optimal style, team administrator, is a product
of fear or betraying trust or a fulfilling contribution (Blake et al., 1981).

The Academic Administrator’s Grid recognized that academic administrators
have specific responsibilities. Although the book is targeting college and university
administrators, many of the responsibilities are the same as in the primary and secondary
education arena. Administrators should encourage the learning process by establishing a
strong curriculum and managing personnel. They must obtain and distribute the financial
resources appropriately, and maintain the facilities. Community outreach and managing
the student affairs is also a responsibility of an administrator (Blake et al., 1981).
Much like situational leadership, many of the same theories undergird the managerial grid. Blake and Mouton (1978, 1985) and Blake, Mouton, and Williams (1981) all cite Feidler’s Contingency Theory as a very similar approach. They also mention Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership as another dualistic or arithmetic model. This is due to the fact that all three were derived from the Ohio State leadership studies and The University of Michigan leadership studies.

The Managerial Grid began in the 1950’s and 1960’s with the Ohio State leadership studies and The University of Michigan leadership studies. The Ohio State leadership studies were trying to discover dimensions of leadership behavior. Two dimensions were found, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure referred to the patterns and procedures of the organization, while consideration dealt with the relationship between staff and leader. An instrument, Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), was constructed to gather data concerning leaders’ behavior. The data was found to fit neatly into four quadrants with consideration on the vertical axis and initiating structure on the horizontal axis with the continuum of each variable ranging from low to high (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972; Northouse, 2004). During the same time Ohio State University was researching leadership behaviors, the University of Michigan also observed leaders’ behaviors and group performance. The study produced similar results with the variables labeled, employee oriented and production oriented. Much like Ohio State’s results, employee oriented was concerned with the relationship between leader and worker, and production oriented suggested workers were viewed for the ability to accomplish work (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972; Northouse, 2004).
There have been quite a few studies conducted on the Managerial Grid. Following the initial publication of *The Managerial Grid* in 1964, many organizations were engaging in grid training with their employees. One of the more famous studies conducted by the Sigma Corporation in 1963. Blake, Mouton, Barnes, and Greiner (1964) instituted the Managerial Grid framework with eight hundred managers. The researchers used productivity and profit indices, opinion and attitude surveys, and interviews and conversations to determine if the Grid’s seminars were successful. The corporation lost around twenty employees from 1962 to 1963, yet it more than doubled its profit. More units were produced than the previous year, and operating costs were decreased. The employees reported a decrease in an atmosphere of the focus being only on profit. They also testified to an increase in both the leader’s and group’s work effort. The Sigma Corporation is one of the most cited studies in support of the Managerial Grid in the workplace (Blake et al., 1964).

A follow up study to the Sigma Corporation study was performed by Smith and Honour in 1969. The researchers used many of the methods employed by Blake and others (1964) in the Sigma Corporation study. The study was conducted at two smaller companies, Alpha and Beta. Alpha was the test company and Beta served as the control. Seventy-one managers were chosen to participate in the pretest and posttest, one week managerial grid seminar, and the interviews. In the interviews, forty percent of the managers stated they accepted the Grid model and fifty-five indicated that their attitudes toward employees had in fact improved. After five months, seventy percent of those managers now revealed improved attitudes. There were some differences in pre and post tests from Alpha and Beta. At Alpha, there was not an increase time spent in meetings,
but there was more time spent in meetings at Beta. This difference was statistically significant. All of the elements of the questionnaire were in the expected direction at the Alpha company although most of them were not strong differences from the Beta company. Although the researchers did not find much support for the Grid model’s implementation, the managers of the companies did not regard the implementation as a failure. They found communication flowed more openly and freely at the Alpha company (Smith & Honour, 1969).

Hastings State Hospital (HSH) in Minnesota was another of those organizations. In 1971, Kreinik and Colarelli reported the outcome of grid training on twenty-six of HSH’s employees. They were asked to complete three tests designed by Blake and Mouton, an Evaluation of Organization Culture (EOC), a Self-Examination of Managerial Styles (SEMS), and a Comparison Study of Personal Managerial Styles (CSMS). These tests determined the organization’s grid style, the employees’ grid style and the employees’ preferences for a leader’s grid style. The pretests found that the employees felt the hospital had predominantly an impoverished and country club management, which is different from most industries. The employees also indicated that they preferred these styles over the others in the pretest. The employees rated their grid style as being more relationship oriented as in the country club style. After the employees were trained in the grid style, the employees had the highest preference for team management style and second highest for the organization man style. Three months later, during a follow up, the values learned through grid training improved effectiveness through more open communication and more efficient problem solving procedures. This
is consistent with Blake and Mouton’s theory, according to the authors. The grid training was not only predictive but prescriptive in this study (Kreinik & Colarelli, 1971).

There have been many studies examining the validity of the Managerial Grid. One of the first was the study performed at the Alpha company. Although the managers reported the implementation of grid training was not a failure, the researchers point out that it was not successful. There was not an increase of time spent in meetings including the workers in decision making with the managers. The effect size was not very large indicating concern for generalizability. There was also little significance despite the fact that the significance level was set relatively low at $p = .10$. This allows for statistical significance even when there was not significance ten percent of the time. Despite the outcome, the researchers did indicate that the Sigma study was conducted at a large corporation that had an overabundance of employees and had recently gone through a merger. None of these variables were present at the Alpha company, which could have had an impact on the results (Smith & Honour, 1969).

The Sigma and Alpha studies were using phase one implementation of grid training. Williams (1971) conducted a qualitative study of the execution of phase two, which implements the lessons learned in phase one and puts them into practice. In phase two, the managers were trained in the grid model and then used it in their normal workday. In this study, six managers were interviewed a few days prior, three weeks following, and one year after implementation. The results showed that the grid training did have some influence on some of the managers in that it improved problem solving and execution of the solution. The follow up interviews revealed that the changes did not
continue. Many of the managers attribute the discontinuation to lack of support from higher management (Williams, 1971).

A study of the Grid was conducted in a large Midwestern manufacturing plant by Bernardin and Alvares (1976). One hundred and twenty-nine managers were included in the study which consisted of a series of conflicts, resolutions to the conflicts, and a questionnaire, constructed by Blake and Mouton. The study found that supervisors did not differ significantly in their choice of conflict resolution based on their grid style, which does not support grid theory. Blake and Mouton (1976) responded to this article. They stated that Bernardin and Alvares did not address the issue of self deception, which strongly impacts their choice of grid style. Blake and Mouton also pointed out the lack of representative sample obtained by Bernardin and Alvares.

Since that time, other researchers have examined the reliability and validity of the theory. Northouse (2004) proposed three criticisms of the managerial grid. He recognized that there was a lack of empirical data to support the theory. He also commented on the lack of a universal style that was appropriate regardless of the situation. Lastly, the author stated an issue with the managerial grid’s implication of high task, high relationship style being the most effective style.

Blake and Mouton (1985) acknowledge that The Managerial Grid has a couple major limitations. A leader must buy into any program in order for it to be successful. Some managers criticize the grid stating not everyone has the ability to be a great leader. Another complaint from managers is that an old dog cannot be taught new tricks. Blake and Mouton (1985) insist that no one and nothing can become more successful without effort and the belief that one can learn to be more.
Regardless of the criticisms, there have been many studies that support The Managerial Grid. Brolly (1967) reported a study in which sixty-four managers attended a grid seminar. The managers were asked to answer four questions ascertaining if they felt the seminar was interesting, stimulating, beneficial, and enjoyable. The questionnaire was a seven point likert scale ranging from extremely to other negative. All but one of the sixty-four managers reported the seminar as being at least positive. The studies conducted at both Sigma and Alpha companies showed improved communication (Blake et al., 1964; Smith & Honour, 1969). Also, the Grid has been used in many organizations from a large petroleum factory, Sigma (Blake et al. 1964), medium size factory, Alpha (Smith & Honour, 1969), and hospitals (Kreinik & Coarelli, 1971).

Despite concerns over supporting research, Northouse (2004) found four positive aspects concerning the Grid. The Grid moved research from leadership traits or behaviors alone to combining behaviors and situations. Secondly, despite the lack of research supporting the Managerial Grid, there were a large number of studies supporting the style approach. The heart of the leadership process was explained using the factors of relationship and task. Lastly, Northouse (2004) called the theory heuristic, in that leaders can gain insight into their leadership style and improve.

Blake and Mouton address the benefits of the Managerial Grid. They state that despite the detractors, many organizations utilizing the grid have expressed increased communications between leaders and employees that has improved organizational success (Blake & Mouton, 1978). The grid was scientifically derived from many approaches to leadership, and it is empirically supported. Through comparisons of the different styles and evaluations of the different types, a personal appraisal of one’s own
leadership style can be obtained. It allows for a common language to be used by all to
discuss leadership and improve the overall organization. The grid can also be used to
select the appropriate person for the specific job and help those to improve in their
current job. Lastly, the authors tout the multitude of uses for the grid. Obviously, it is
useful in the professional world, but it can be used in the home. It is functional in
multicultural settings and can be utilized by persons of varying educational levels and
varying sized groups (Blake & Mouton, 1985).

Contingency Theory

Contingency Theory is a combination of the style approach, The Managerial Grid,
and the situational approach, according to Northouse (2004). In 1967, Fielder published
A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, in which the Contingency Theory of leadership
was clarified. First, with all of the explanations of leadership, he wanted to define
leadership as a process where a group of people accomplish a common task due to the
persuasion of another person, the leader. Second, the purpose of understanding
leadership effectiveness is to predict group performance, which is highly dependent upon
the amount of influence the leader has on accomplishing the task at hand. Third, he
explained that the situation, which is determined by the member-leader relationship, can
predict principal effectiveness. Situations can be favorable or unfavorable. Lastly, the
purpose of the contingency theory is to provide aid in matching leaders to the appropriate
situation to maximize effectiveness.

Fiedler explained that the contingency theory was derived from research studies
and the classification system that stems from three factors. The classification system is
“guided by the notion that the leader’s style of interacting with his members will be
affected by the degree to which the leader can wield power and influence” (Fielder, 1967, p. 22). The classification system yielded three factors: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. The first factor, the relationship between the leader and members, can be good or moderate poor. It can be measured through an instrument called “Group Atmosphere (GA),” according to Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (2007). The second factor, task structure, explained the type of task to be completed by the employees. The task can be structured or unstructured. Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (2007) cite two instruments that determine the type of task, “Task Structure Scale” or “Type of Job.” The last factor is the type of power given to leaders by their subordinates, their superiors, the organization, and others, called position power, which can range from strong to weak. The “Position Power Scale” is used to determine the type of power the leader has (Ayman et al., 2007). The task structure influences the position power of the leader, which determines the leader-member relationship. The relationship is the situation and the leader’s style in regards to that situation determines a leader’s effectiveness (Fiedler, 1967).

Fiedler (1967) elucidated how to calculate each variable of the theory. He first clarified the difference between leadership behavior and style. Behaviors are the acts a leader engages in as a leader, whereas, a leader’s style is the essential need that motivates behavior. A measure of leader style began by looking at psychotherapy patients and how their therapists rated the patients’ self-concept. The actual score the therapist gave was usually wrong. Later studies revealed that when individuals rate others who are like themselves, it was more correct. Cronbach (1955) found that in general, individuals’ beliefs were more stable and reliable rather than perceptions of the truth. Fiedler (1967)
stated that studies were also conducted having members of a group to rate themselves, the person they like the best, and the person they like the least. As expected, the group members rated themselves more like the other members they liked and vice versa, which is where assumed similarities (AS) was derived. The difference between the person liked best and the person liked least produces a score called assumed similarity of opposites (ASo). The score for the member rated least liked results in score labeled the least preferred coworker (LPC). The strongest measure of predicting group performance is the LPC because it shows the perceived similarity of leader and least preferred coworker. A low LPC shows the leader perceives him or herself as dissimilar, whereas the leader who sees him or herself as similar has a high LPC. A correlational study was performed to attempt to correlate LPC with psychological traits or behaviors, but the researchers found that ASo and LPC measured unrelated traits.

Contingency theory was not only derived from the previously mentioned classification system, but also from theories derived from research. French (1951) conducted a study of naval recruits. Those recruits who were somewhat randomly chosen for leadership roles were more likely to be accepted as leaders by the other recruits. Fiedler (1967) also cited a study performed by Bavelas, Hastorf, Gross, and Kite at Stanford University in 1965. The study found that when a participant is praised from an outsider for positive behavior, he or she begins to accept him or herself as a leader. The other group members also begin to recognize that participant as the leader. This information led to the groundbreaking idea, at that time, that a certain personality type is not a prerequisite to becoming a leader.
With studies supporting the idea that personality traits are not the only factor in determining leadership ability, other researchers began studying what is involved in determining who is and will be a leader. Fiedler (1967) stated that McGrath summarized the research and found two clusters of behavior in leadership. The first cluster was those leaders who were autocratic, task-oriented or initiating. Those leaders who were democratic, group-oriented, or considerate comprised the other cluster. Fiedler took the two clusters, called them leadership styles, and labeled them, task-oriented and relationship-oriented. He then created the Contingency Theory to explain which leadership style best suites specific situations. His theory states that when leaders are in very favorable or very unfavorable situations, a task-oriented leadership style promotes group performance, otherwise, a relationship-oriented style is more appropriate (Fiedler, 1967).

In the over fifty years since the Contingency Theory was first printed, there have been many studies conducted to evaluate its accuracy. In 1960, the Dutch Creativity Study was reported. The study’s participants were sixteen Catholic and sixteen Calvinist students. The students were placed in one group of four with other students of the same religious background and then another group of four where two students were Catholic and the other two were Calvinist. The study analyzed three variables, the leader’s position, group members’ relationships, and the leader’s style. The study found that task oriented leaders worked more effectively in unfavorable situations and relationship-oriented leaders work was more successful in favorable situations. The results supported the Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1967). Another early study was The Belgian Navy Study conducted from 1963 to 1964. It involved two hundred eighty-eight petty officers
and recruits formed into ninety-six three man groups. It was expected that relationship oriented leaders would perform worse than task oriented leaders regardless of situation type. The results supported the overall hypothesis of the Contingency Model, but there were some deviations in the expected curve. One of the limitations of the study was that the deviations could be due to the sample (Fiedler, 1967). The ROTC Study was also reported in 1964 and examined creativity. In this study, one hundred sixty-two Army and Navy ROTC students were grouped into three person groups and assigned to three levels of stress. The study found a significant difference where leaders with low power performed significantly better than leaders with high power. It also discovered a negative correlation between effectiveness of relationship-oriented leaders and stress level in that as stress increased, the effectiveness of relationship-oriented leaders decreased. This was in line with the results found in the Dutch Creativity Study and with the Contingency Theory (Fiedler, 1967). Lastly, as a part of dissertation research, Hunt, tested the Contingency Theory on three groups of workers, research chemists, meat market workers, and heavy machinery manufacturing plant workers. The results were closely aligned with the curve found by Fiedler, which supported the main hypothesis of the Contingency Theory and provided support for the utility of the model in real world settings (Fiedler, 1967).

Many studies have been conducted testing Contingency Theory. Hardy (1975) took numerous situations and tested to determine if the Contingency Theory predicted correctly the outcome. A statistically significant difference existed between high and low LPC leaders on a structured task no matter the position power, which is in alignment with Fiedler’s theory. In 1982, the Contingency Theory was tested in Islamic Elementary
schools using principals, teachers, and students. The theory was not found to be supported by the data, but the author strongly qualified the results. The statement was made that the results were strongly impacted by the culture, which did not allow for many, if any, task oriented leaders because the teachers were working for their faith and not to accomplish a task for a leader (Theodory & Hadbai, 1982).

Two major meta-analyses were conducted to test the Contingency Theory’s criteria related validity. Peters, Hartke, and Pohlmann (1985) found only moderately supportive results. The lab tests provided support for all of the theorized situation and leadership style combinations except one. When leader-member relations were good, the task was structured, and the leader’s position power was weak, the lab tests did not align with the theory. The field tests found support for only half of the combinations. Strube and Garcia (1981) reported somewhat different results based on one hundred forty-five validation hypothesis tests. The authors stated that the “model was found to be extremely robust in predicting group performance” (Strube & Garcia, 1981, p. 307).

Studies often yield research that sustains or contradicts related theories. Northouse (2004) also provided some criticisms of the Contingency Theory. The first comment concerned the lack of explanation as to the “whys” of the theory. The author stated that the theory does not adequately clarify why task-oriented leaders are more effective in stressful situations and relationship-oriented leaders are better in favorable situations. Another complaint with the theory dealt with the validity and clarity of the LPC Scale, which rated the leader’s motivation orientation. The last criticism was related to the application and solution providing ability of the theory. Northouse indicated the theory was difficult to apply in real world situations and did not provide adequate
solutions when a leader and situation are inappropriately matched. Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (2007) identify some weaknesses. The authors mentioned the lack of face or concurrent validity and the theory itself had only moderate construct validity. Lastly, the authors acknowledged the difficulty in applying the theory in real world situations.

Northouse (2004) cited a few strengths of the Contingency Theory. He stated the theory was defended by a great number of empirical research studies and provided new understanding of the concept of leadership. Other strengths were its predictive nature and helpfulness to organizations looking for the best leader for that organization. Lastly, the theory helped leaders understand that they may not be effective in every situation. The leader explained that if leaders find themselves in a situation that does not allow them to lead, one of the variables should be changed, whether it is the organization or the leader. Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (2007) highlighted some strengths of the contingency theory. The central constructs and outcomes were statistically independent and were less vulnerable to invalidation. Another strength is the emphasis on measurable outcomes. Lastly, the authors mention the theory’s lack of invalidation of its three constructs, that have been used in other models, such as The Grid and Situational Leadership. A major strength spotlighted by both Ayman, Chemers, and Fiedler (2007) and Northouse (2004) was the predictive nature of the theory.

Summary of Theoretical Framework

All of the theories combine to create a working theory based on the idea that a leader must flexible and adaptable to the situation. Situational leadership identifies the importance of leader flexibility in order to meet the needs of the group and motivate them to success. The Managerial Grid defines the leader’s behaviors and style and associates it
with a favorable or unfavorable environment to determine if the leader will be effective or ineffective. Contingency Theory is the basis for both. Its research showed that not every leader with traits that were previously shown to correlate with effective organizations will be effective. It revolutionized the idea that a leader must be flexible and adaptable, and it suggests which behaviors and style would be most effective in certain environments.

The research shows that situational leadership theory, contingency theory, and managerial grid have been beneficial in predicting effective leadership in different situations. If different styles are needed by leaders to be effective in different situations, it may also be beneficial to have different behaviors. The next sections will also show how leaders can be effective by using certain behaviors, such as those shown to be effective by the meta-analytic studies conducted by McREL and those expected by the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and the (ASCA) American School Counseling Association’s National Model.

Effective School Leaders

School leaders of the past “managed” the school; however, the role of school leaders has changed. They are expected to be instructional leader, accountant, personnel director, paralegal, public speaker, technology wiz, and so much more (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). Many studies have been conducted concerning the numerous responsibilities of principals. With all of these responsibilities, standards were created and used in the licensing of school leaders. These standards were established to ensure the training programs were producing administrators that are prepared for the difficult job
of leading a school. The next sections will describe the ISLLC standards, McREL’s twenty-one responsibilities of school leaders, and leadership studies.

*Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards*

There is a plethora of literature on the abilities and behaviors that make a school leader effective. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) created the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), which provides six standards for school leaders. The Council’s standards encourage the success of every student by providing a safe and orderly school, creating instructional programs, establishing a vision and positive culture, and working with all stakeholders. The stem of the standards focuses upon student performance; each standard begins with “An education leader promotes the success of every student…” (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14). An effective leader establishes his or her vision and works with stakeholders in order to create instructional programs, a safe environment, and a culture that makes it possible for students to succeed.

There has been much debate in the literature over whether the ISLLC standards help or hurt the profession. English (2008) stated that the creation of standards hurt the profession by transforming the art of leadership into a business where efficiency and standardization are crucial. He also indicated that the standards do not take into account lessons administrators learn at their schools that might be specific to that context. In an earlier commentary, he indicated that the ISLLC standards are vague and have no foundation, but due to Educational Testing Service’s use of the standards as the basis of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), a test most states use to determine licensure, those pursuing an administration license must use them in order to be certified.
His opinions concerning the ISLLC standards seem clear in the title of the commentary, “Psssst! What does one call a set of non-empirical beliefs required to be accepted on faith and enforced by authority? [Answer: a religion, aka the ISLLC standards]” (English, 2000).

The proponents of the ISLLC standards elaborate on the antagonists’ remarks concerning the vagueness, the lack of foundation, the need for a universal method to ensure administrator effectiveness, and provide the other benefits to the profession. First, Murphy, Yff, and Shipman (2000) point out the concept that a leader must constantly evolve to adapt to the changes in the school, surrounding community, state, county, and field of education. Second, many authors have complained that the foundation of the standards is not clear; however, Murphy (2005) states that the history of the ISLLC standards presents the foundation. The foundation was determined by a panel of experts, a group of state leaders, who came together and determined that the two main domains of importance to a school leader are theories and concepts from management and behavioral sciences (Murphy, 2005). Lastly, state leaders were looking for a universal way to license and/or certify school leaders nationwide. The standards provide national principles for effective leadership based on the central tenets that reduce school leaders’ duties to the core responsibilities that apply to all educational leaders to enable them to be productive and rise to a higher level of leadership (Murphy, Yff, & Shipman, 2000).

The ISLLC standards are the foundation of accreditation standards for educational leadership programs in most universities. Most school leadership programs are aligned, at least nominally, with the standards and the standards are also frequently utilized by administrators. Barnett (2004) conducted a study of graduates of educational leadership
programs at Morehouse State University and other universities to determine what activities they were performing and if and how they related to the ISLLC standards. Overall, both Morehouse State University (MSU) students and non MSU students engaged in and felt they were somewhat prepared for the many sub-elements of standard one, which is centered on school vision. The author stated a need for training programs to increase their concentration on creating and maintaining a vision. Standard two focuses on the school leader’s role in student achievement and MSU students indicated they were more satisfied with their training than the non MSU students, but both affirmed that more training is needed in instructional technology. The third standard, dealing with resources, produced opposite results for MSU and non MSU students. MSU students rated their training and usage of the training as the second highest area of satisfaction with their program of the six standards, whereas, non MSU students rated theirs training and usage and their second lowest area of satisfaction with their training program. Although graduates of both colleges said they were prepared to communicate with stakeholders, as a part of the fourth standard, they both had this area rated lowest in regards to their engagement of it. What does that mean? The fifth standard was rated the highest as it dealt with ethical behavior of school leaders. Lastly, the sixth standard calls for engagement with all stakeholders. The participants indicated involvement with different stakeholders for different areas, such as discussing student achievement with local, state, and federal agencies, but not talking with local agencies concerning implementing local initiatives. The author showed how the ISLLC standards are taught in school leader training programs and utilized by school leaders (Barnett, 2004). Johnson and Uline (2005) show how the standards are utilized by administrators to create
high performing schools that have closed achievement gaps. Those administrators have created schools with a mission and culture of success, a staff of teachers that feel supported, a fair and equitable environment, and they use every available resource to achieve the goals they have set.

*Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning’s Leader Responsibilities*

The Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) is a research consortium that conducted a factor analysis of the twenty-one leadership responsibilities. Like previous research, this study provides certain behaviors of leaders that make them effective. McREL found that establishing culture, focus, ideals and beliefs, order, discipline, communication, relationships, affirmation, and flexibility are central to effective school leadership. The effective leader also provides resources, rewards, knowledge of and involvement in curriculum, opportunity for input, intellectual stimulation, and evaluation. Lastly, the study showed that leaders are visible, change agents, optimistic, and are aware of surroundings. The study also found a statistically significant relationship between leadership behavior and student achievement (Marzano, Walters, & McNulty, 2005).

The many roles and responsibilities established by the ISLLC standards and McREL give evidence of the potentially daunting nature of school leadership. Elementary and middle school principals must test virtually all of their students once a year at the end of the year and must provide remediation for those students not meeting standards. Administrators of high schools often test much more and, in the case of exit/graduation exams, must offer repeated testing opportunities to students. Some states require five tests, as is the case in Mississippi (MDE, 2009), while others require even
more; North Carolina requires eleven end-of-course tests in order for students to graduate (Lyons & Algozzine, 2006). These numerous testing hurdles for students to overcome in order to graduate can also be exacerbated by the school’s population of students; some small schools must have more students meet standards than larger schools due to the requirements of ninety-five percent testing in every subgroup in order to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) (MDE, 2009). With significant responsibility for such high stakes tests resting upon the shoulders of administrators, the requirements of No Child Left Behind can become quite a challenge.

Rammer (2007) wrote an article in response to the findings of McREL. The article pointed out that No Child Left Behind (NCLB) had made an indelible impression on the education community. Many changes have been made in response to this legislation. Many studies have been conducted to determine what factors impact student achievement since it is one of the most important parts of NCLB. The studies revealed the important role of principals in school and student effectiveness. The author conducted a study of Wisconsin superintendents, who hire principals, and their opinions of the McREL twenty-one responsibilities and the use of them in hiring principals. Ninety-two percent of the superintendents surveyed felt the responsibilities were important, but they were not utilizing them in the hiring process. Rammer (2007) suggested the superintendents use these responsibilities in their hiring process due to their correlation with student achievement.

Research on Leadership Effectiveness

There have been numerous studies of leadership effectiveness. Many of them have dealt with the gender, age, and ethnicity of the leader. Gaziel (2003) found that
male and female school leaders differ in their handling of school problems and in their
decision making. Gender is not only important in the leader, but also in the group
member, according to Jackson, Engstrom, & Emmers-Sommer (2007), who found that
males usually chose a male leader and females usually chose a female leader. Another
study examined male and female leaders’ self ratings of themselves. Vecchio and
Anderson (2009) found that males did not rate themselves higher than females as was
expected. Female leaders were rated significantly higher than male leaders by both their
supervisors and their peers. The study also looked at race and age. Although race was
not significant, older people overrated themselves in comparison with their peers and
supervisors. Leaders’ age, ethnicity, and gender can have an impact on their rating of
effectiveness.

School factors, such as location, size, and socioeconomic status of students can
greatly impact the effectiveness of the leader. Leaders of rural schools have very
different responsibilities than their counterparts in suburban and urban schools. This is
due to a different population of students who have different needs than students from
more urban schools (Bauch, 2001). This was supported by McCray, Wright, and
Beachum (2004) who found that principals of smaller schools usually had students with
low SES and lived in rural areas. No matter the school, leaders can change the culture of
a school which can override statistics that show certain ethnicities and low SES students
have low test scores (Reavis, Vinson, & Fox, 1999). Leaders have a major influence on
student achievement despite the impact of school factors such as location, size, and SES
of students.
There has been much research on school leaders and what makes them effective. The ISLLC standards were created to provide general guidelines for leaders. They are used in licensing and are meant to raise the bar of educational leaders (Gorton, Alston, & Snowden, 2007). The role and responsibilities of principals continue to evolve as legislation is created and as students’, businesses’, and communities’ needs change. McREL found that there are twenty-one responsibilities of effective educational leaders. Studies show the behaviors of successful school leaders.

Effective School Counselors

When one considers what makes counselors effective, it is observed that many of the factors that might help principals accomplish their core responsibility—that is to ensure that students leave with the skills and knowledge to succeed in the world—are the same. The American School Counseling Association created a model in 1984 that has since been revised four times. The American School Counseling Association (2003) created “A Framework for School Counseling Programs.” It states the importance of the “development of the total student” in the educational process (ASCA, 2003, p. 2). The ASCA model, as it is commonly called, has four interrelated components: foundation, delivery system, management system, and accountability. The first of the four components is the foundation, which states that good counseling programs have beliefs, philosophy, and a mission statement in order to provide a firm base for positive change. The second component, a delivery system, indicates the importance of determining the guidance curriculum and providing individual student planning, responsive services, and support systems. The third component, management, addresses the importance of having administrative agreement and action plans, creating an advisory council, and using data,
calendars, and effective time management to ensure the delivery of services. Lastly, a
program audit, a results report, and an evaluation of counselor performance provide
accountability, which is the last component (ASCA, 2003).

The American School Counseling Association promotes the development of the
“total student” through cultivating student academic, career, and personal social
development. Within these three areas are nine embedded competencies. The academic
development area includes students obtaining what is needed to effectively learn, having
options following graduation, and understanding how the outside world is related to
school. Students will understand how personality plays a role in career choice and
training in the work world as well as employ strategies to have success in their career as a
part of the career development competency. The last competency, personal social
development, includes helping students value themselves and others, make choices to
obtain objectives, and survive (ASCA, 2003).

Principals have indicated that exemplary counselors work in, “the themes of
leadership, collaboration, advocacy, and systemic change,” all of which are promoted by
the ASCA National Model (Dollarhide, Smith, & Lemberger, 2007, p. 366). Dahir and
Stone (2009) conducted an action research study examining the top priorities of
counselors and the related results. Most of the guidance curricula, a part of the delivery
system, dealt with improving achievement and decreasing failure. Of the twenty-nine
schools included in the study, twenty-seven showed positive change. This study shows
the important role of counselors in student achievement and success. This idea was
tested over a two year period in Florida, using a research sample of one hundred and
eighty students from elementary, middle, and high schools. Counselors implemented a
guidance program to increase student performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) by increasing social, cognitive, and self-management skills. The study found that more than 80% of students increased math achievement and over 60% increased reading achievement (Brigman & Campbell, 2003). A five-year study of seventh graders in Missouri showed that fully implemented counseling programs predicted better student and teacher relationships, greater self-reported student satisfaction with their education, and higher grades (Lapan, Gysbers, & Petroski, 2003).

The American School Counseling Association (ASCA) National Model wants the school employees to work together to produce students who have obtained the skills to be successful in the future. This correlates with most school’s vision and objective. Situational Leadership, Managerial Grid, and the Contingency Theory are being used to undergird this study to test if principal’s use of counseling skills could be a behavior that improves the leader’s knowledge of group behavior, maintenance of relationships with the group, and ability to ensure the task of producing competent graduates is obtained.

School Leadership and Counseling

Principals and counselors work together to make the school effective. There have been many articles addressing the relationship between principals and counselors, principals’ view of counselor, and vice versa. Counselors are even encouraged to take a leadership role in the school (Dollarhide, 2003), but rarely is a principal encouraged to act like a counselor. The following section will examine articles that address the relationship between principals and counselors and some dissertations that studied which counseling skills are being employed by principals.
The way principals view the role of the school counselor greatly impacts the functions carried out by the school counselor. Amatea and Clark (2005) conducted a qualitative study of twenty-six principals from elementary, middle, and high schools. The researchers found that the principals’ view the function of counselors in four broad areas, innovative school leaders, collaborative case consultants, responsive direct service providers, and administrative team players. The role of innovative school leader, which is supported by ASCA model, was only preferred by three of the 26 principals. Another study was conducted analyzing principals’ view of the role of counselors but this one was using only elementary school principals in Florida (Zalaquett, 2005). The study found principals have positive views of elementary school counselors. Ninety-two percent of the elementary principals said that they and parents were satisfied with the performance of their counselors’ and that the counselors contribute significantly to a positive school environment. More than three quarters of the principals indicated that they and the teachers feel the counselors are effective and that counselors make a significant difference in the academic performance of students (Zalaquett, 2005). These studies show that most principals view the role of the counselor in a positive light, but it is unclear if they know what the counselor does.

A frequently-cited early study examined future principals’ perceptions of counselors’ roles (Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001). The study was conducted in two Kentucky leadership preparation programs, and the instrument utilized Kentucky counseling standards that were correlated with ASCA standards. The study found that leaders have little knowledge of the role of counselors because leadership preparation programs lack school counseling courses. The administration students rated
direct crisis response, providing a safe place to talk, communicating empathy, helping teachers respond to crisis, and helping students with transitions as the most important duties of counselor. The future administrators rated non-counseling tasks such as registration of students, testing, assisting special education students, record keeping, and discipline, as not being important functions of a counselor. The study also found that although the future administrators did not view the non-counseling tasks as important, fifty to fifty-seven percent of the participants stated that all of the non-counseling duties but discipline were significant. Therefore, sometimes these non-counseling tasks become counseling tasks (Fitch et al., 2001). This article shows how the administrators’ perceptions of counselors highly impacts the role of the counselor, and due to a lack of school counseling classes in administrator training program, their perceptions of the role of counselors are not being addressed.

A more recent study illustrates the impact principals have on subordinates’ ability to do their jobs, especially counselors whose role is defined by ASCA standards. The principal can require counselors to perform non-counseling duties. In one study, 240 master level graduate students in educational leadership programs read 4 vignettes and were asked to determine if the counselor was performing counseling or non-counseling duties. The researchers found that overall most principals in training could tell appropriate counseling functions from inappropriate and did so regardless of their own gender and gender of the counselor in vignette. Item analysis showed inconsistencies that although the majority was able to differentiate, many were not. Also, older graduate students and male principals in training rated the vignettes lower (Chata & Loesch, 2007). This study illustrates how gender and age play a role in administrators’
perceptions of counselors. It also demonstrates there is still some confusion as to what school counselors really do.

The relationship that occurs between a principal and counselor greatly impacts the principal’s view of the counselor and enhances their knowledge of the counseling profession. Dollarhide, Smith, and Lemberger (2007) conducted a qualitative study of nineteen principals who won awards for their support of the school counseling profession. An unusual finding was that most of the principals had little to no interaction with the counselor when they were in school. A few of the principals saw their counselors as administrators and career planners, while only two classified their relationship with their high school counselor as positive. Despite this relative negative prior interaction with counselors, the principals had positive incidents with counselors during their career that positively impacted their opinion of counselors (Dollarhide et al., 2007). The principals’ comments showed that counselors could make a significant impact on students, parents, and teachers, the principals respected, saw the need for, and supported the counselors. Another qualitative study also examined principals with fully implemented guidance programs. Ponec and Brock (2000) found that the counselor and principal trusted each other and communicated. The principal and counselor indicated understanding of the role of the counselor in promoting education through crisis intervention, consultation, home visits, committee membership, coordination of programs, and individual, group, and classroom guidance (Ponec & Brock, 2000). Both of these studies were conducted using principals and counselors from well implemented guidance programs. They show how principals and counselor working together can improve the successfulness of a school.
A large, national study was performed to examine the principal counselor relationship. Principals were recruited from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and counselors were invited from ASCA. Many aspects of the relationship were addressed including the time the participants held their positions, size and location of school, ethnicity of students, and whether participants worked at a high school, middle school, or combination. Most of the participants had been in their position three to nine years, worked in a high school that had less than five hundred students, and was located either in the suburbs or was rural. The principals and counselors agreed that respect and communication were the most important part of their relationship, and time to meet is the biggest hindrance to improving the relationship. Both also agreed that the counselors’ most important function is “helping to promote student personal growth & social development” and “helping students with career planning” (Finkelstein, 2009, p. 9). This article also reiterates the importance of communication, respect, and trust in the relationship between principals and counselors. The roles of the counselor are also consistent with the ASCA National Model.

Despite the research that shows that most principals understand of the role and skills of the counselor, there has been little research concerning principals’ use of counseling skills. Nicoud (1999), as a part of dissertation research, conducted a qualitative study of Wisconsin principals who were certified as both principal and counselor and both principal and teacher. The researcher gathered informational data from one hundred and nineteen administrators, with eighty-six percent of the respondents being teacher-trained administrators, thirteen percent were counselor-trained administrators, and one percent not specified. The researcher drew a number of
conclusions from her interviews in the three case studies. She observed that principals with counselor training achieved or surpassed the standards for effective administrators. She also indicated, “that a school counseling preparation and experience may provide a viable training ground for the principalship,” based on the comments of one of the respondents (Nicoud, 1999, p. 168). This study did not use principals trained in counseling skills defined by the ASCA National Model, but instead used principals trained in the Wisconsin Internship in School Counseling program. Irrespective of the counseling standards used, Nicoud recommended that licensure agencies and programs of study look at adding a counseling component to the training programs for principals.

Another dissertation was conducted to find which counseling skills were used by highly effective school leaders. Principal and school demographic information were analyzed to determine their role in predicting student achievement (Balch, 2008). McREL’s research on 21 responsibilities of effective school leaders and the ASCA framework were both used. This study was conducted using only elementary principals in Indiana, mostly in rural schools. The descriptive data included the principal’s ethnicity, gender, type of license, years of administrative experience, whether he or she held a school counseling license, and whether the school had a full time, part time, or no school counselor. The twenty-one practices that influence student achievement derived from Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) were used to conduct a factor analysis to detect the key counseling skills for administrators.

Balch found that counseling skills were integral to five factors: expert authority orientation, academic support, change capacity, celebrate successes, and ethical transparency. These factors seem to match well with several of the ISLLC standards
(CCSSO, 2008). ISLLC standard 1, creation of a vision shared with the stakeholders, correlates with expert authority orientation, which shows the principal is the authority in the school. ISLLC standard 2, creating a school culture and instructional program, aligns well with academic support, which is associated with curriculum and assessment. The factor called change capacity, which includes communicating with stakeholders is associated with ISLLC standard 4, collaborating with the community. Lastly, ISLLC standard 5, which states that administrators must act fairly, is related to the factor named ethical transparency. They also align with many of the responsibilities found by McREL, such as culture, knowledge of and involvement in curriculum, instruction and assessment, communication, outreach, affirmation, and change agent (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The principal and school demographic information that were significantly correlated to student achievement were principal ethnicity, administrative years in current building, whether a school counselor was in the building, and an interaction between administrative years in current building and gender (Balch, 2008). The researcher recommended a closer examination of counseling skills and principal factors that impact student achievement at the middle and high school level.

Although most articles have only examined the principal’s view of the counselor or the relationship between principal and counselor, some dissertations have researched the use of counseling skills by principals. The studies did not address whether the principal was more effective if he or she used counseling skills. Also, the ASCA National Model was not used. This study seeks to find if a principal, who uses counseling skills as determined by the ASCA National Model, is more effective.
Summary

Situational Leadership, the Managerial Grid, and Contingency Theory form a cohesive theory of leadership effectiveness. This theory can aid leaders in discerning their leadership styles, describing the tasks expected of the group, and defining context. Using this information, leaders can decide which style to employ to illicit the most effective results. School leaders also have standards, created by ISLLC under the direction of the Council of Chief State School Officers, that direct their behavior. These standards provide numerous actions that direct the everyday behaviors of a school leader. Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), along with other agencies, conducted a meta-analysis of leadership articles to determine which behaviors and responsibilities correlate most with student achievement and leader effectiveness. McREL found twenty-one responsibilities or behaviors that are highly correlated with school leader effectiveness, student achievement. The American School Counseling Association has its own standards, the ASCA National Model that guide the behaviors of school counselors.

Many of the responsibilities found in the McREL meta-analysis are in alignment with the ASCA standards. The foundation of ASCA includes counselors creating their mission statement. Through this act, counselors are setting their culture, focus, and ideals/beliefs, which are three of the twenty-one responsibilities. The ASCA delivery system is purported to be a professional framework that allows the counselor to be visible, a change agent, and an optimizer. In this system, a counselor provides affirmation, contingent rewards, intellectual stimulation, outreach, and resources. The delivery system is also the context in which the counselor can show situational
awareness, and knowledge and involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The management system allows the counselor to engage in and display even more of the responsibilities, including flexibility, gain input, and engage in communication and relationships. Lastly, the accountability component of the ASCA model is similar to the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating found in the McREL responsibilities. The behaviors expected of a counselor in the ASCA model are very similar to McREL responsibilities of a school leader. This study seeks to determine if principals are more effective if they use the expected behaviors and standards of school counselors.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter III is to outline the research design. Research questions and the related hypotheses are proposed along with the methodology through which they were tested. The participants, instrument, and procedures are explained. Lastly, the method of analysis is also included in this chapter.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

McREL has illustrated, through numerous studies, the impact that school administrators can have on student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005). It then follows that school leaders should have appropriate training in order to be effective in impacting student performance. According to most Mississippi universities’ educational leadership websites, school administrators are trained in facilities, finance, law, curriculum, teaching evaluation, and leadership theory (DSU, 2008; JSU, 2007; MSU, 2008; MUW, 2008, 2009; UM, 2007; USM, 2009). Principals do not appear to be trained in counseling skills that are determined by the American School Counseling Association to have a positive impact on student achievement (Lapan et al., 1997). This study investigated two questions:

1. Is there a relationship between counselors’ ratings of principal’s effectiveness and principals’ use of counseling skills?

2. Are there relationships among counselors’ report of principals’ use of counseling skills and school and principal demographic characteristics?
There are three hypotheses for the first research question. Principal effectiveness was measured by (1) a counselor questionnaire that employs McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework, (2) the Mississippi Department of Education’s report of schools’ achievement score gains, and (3) the MDE’s schools’ state accreditation performance rating. The principals’ use of counseling skills was assessed using a counselor questionnaire that employs the American School Counseling Association’s National Model. The second research question examined whether the counselors’ perceptions of the principals’ use of counseling skills, are predicted by selected school and principal demographic characteristics. The second research question utilized the principal and school demographic characteristics, which included: principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, and years at current school. The question also used students’ socioeconomic status, schools’ size, schools’ location, grade levels, and whether the school had a full time or part time counselor. The four hypotheses are as follows:

1. There is no relationship between counselors’ ratings of principals’ effectiveness as measured by McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework and principals’ use of counseling skills.

2. There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by MDE’s school achievement score gains and counselors’ ratings of principals’ use of counseling skills.

3. There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by school performance rating and counselors’ ratings of principals’ use of counseling skills.
4. Principals’ use of counseling skills, as rated by counselors on the Leadership Questionnaire, are not predicted by principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, years at current school, whether school has a full or part time counselor, and school and student demographic characteristics.

Research Design

This study was correlational in design. There were four major variables used in the study: principal effectiveness as rated by school counselors, principal’s use of counseling skills, school demographic characteristics, and principal demographic characteristics. Principal effectiveness will be measured using three methods. The first method of measuring principal effectiveness was through a counselor questionnaire that utilized the twenty-one responsibilities of an effective leader from McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework. The second metric for effectiveness was schools’ achievement growth gains as reported by MDE, and the third was MDE’s school performance ratings. Principals’ use of counseling skills was measured using counselor questionnaires that employed the standards of the ASCA National Model. The school demographic characteristics examined were student socioeconomic status, grade levels of the schools, school size, location, and whether the school has a part time or full time counselor. The principal demographic characteristics were the principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, and years at current school.

Participants

A sample of certified public school counselors of grades K -12 from across the state of Mississippi participated in the study. The school counselors included the counselors who are members of the Mississippi Counseling Association (MCA). The results were
analyzed for representativeness of the schools throughout the variables of geographic region and student demographics, including student socioeconomic status, school size, and school level (elementary, middle, and high school). A questionnaire was sent to every school counselor who is member of MCA and was employed by a public school that contained grades three through twelve. The counselors’ names and addresses were obtained from the online membership directory of the Mississippi Counseling Association (MCA). Even though the directory is accessible, with the use of a given username and password, to all MCA members, permission to use the members’ information was granted by the MCA President. The permission letter can be found in Appendix A. Demographic information concerning the counselor’s MCA convention attendance, membership in ASCA, and knowledge of the ASCA National Model provided further demographic characteristics of the participants.

Instrumentation

The instrument administered to participants was created by the researcher and named, “The Leadership Questionnaire.” It contained 45 questions, which included 13 demographic questions. The remaining 32 questions included 11 questions about counseling skills as defined by the ASCA model. The other 21 questions were about leadership responsibilities as described in the McREL Balanced Leadership Profile, which was developed from research conducted by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) and Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005). A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix B. This instrument was reviewed by a panel of experts to assist the researcher in gauging reliability. It was pilot tested with twelve counselors in order to obtain a Cronbach alpha for the complete instrument. The leadership skills factor consisted of
Questions 12 through 32 and obtained a Cronbach alpha of .966. The counseling skills factor was composed of questions one through eleven and had a Cronbach alpha of .909. Both Cronbach alphas were evidence of sufficient internal reliability of the instrument. Cronbach alphas were computed for the two scales to test the reliability once data were returned from the participants. The counseling skills factor, still composed of the first eleven questions obtained a Cronbach alpha of .930, and the leadership skills factor received a Cronbach alpha of .970. These alphas indicated the factors are measuring the construct consistently. No items were deleted as a result of the analysis.

The demographic characteristics of principals’ gender, ethnicity, years at current school, and years of experience were obtained through the responses of participants to the counselor questionnaire. Items to use in reporting the grade levels of schools and whether schools have a part or full time counselor were also on the questionnaire. Counselors’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, years at current school, MCA conference attendance, membership in ASCA, and knowledge of the ASCA National Model were obtained using the questionnaire as well. Student socioeconomic status, school size, and location were obtained using the Mississippi High School Activities Association (MHSAA, 2009), MDE website (MDE, 2009), the Chief Council of State School Officers (CCSSO) School Data Direct website (CCSSO, 2009). The demographic data were used in the multiple regression analysis and to provide descriptive data for the study.

Procedures

Names of licensed Mississippi public school counselors were obtained from the Mississippi Counseling Association’s (MCA) online members’ directory. The
Leadership Questionnaire was mailed to all school counselors who are members of MCA. Informed consent information was attached explaining all aspects of the study to the participant. It indicated that the study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The University of Southern Mississippi, and the researcher’s name was provided. The IRB approval letter can be found in Appendix C. The packet explained that the survey would take less than twenty minutes to complete; it further noted that there would be minimal to no harm to participants. It also explained that due to the nature of the study, the researcher coded the instrument in order to identify the school from which each response came, but not the individual counselor from which each response came. Since some schools may have only one counselor, the researcher provided further assurances by placing a school code at the top of the questionnaire, which was accompanied by an explanation that after data had been entered, the code would be removed to ensure confidentiality. The fact that the questionnaires were not be seen by the principals of the participating schools - further assured confidentiality. Lastly, participants were informed that data was used anonymously and identified by demographic characteristics and not by individual school or district name. Participants mailed the questionnaires back to the researcher in self-addressed envelopes. The cover letter explaining the procedures to the participants is included in Appendix D.

Data Analysis

A Pearson’s $r$ was used to determine if a relationship exists between counselors’ ratings of principal effectiveness as measured by McREL’s responsibilities and counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills. A Pearson’s $r$ was also employed to ascertain if a statistically significant relationship is present between
principal effectiveness as measured by Mississippi school performance ratings and counselors’ report of principals’ use of counseling skills. A Pearson’s $r$ was used to gauge whether a correlation is present between principal effectiveness as measured by achievement score gains on the Mississippi Curriculum Test, 2nd edition (MCT2) and the Subject Area Testing Program (SATP) and counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills.

A multiple regression analysis was employed to determine if principal effectiveness, as measured by MDE’s achievement and growth rating of the schools, is predicted by principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, and years at current school, as well as, students’ socioeconomic status, grade levels of the school, school location, nor whether the school has a full time or part time counselor. Another multiple regression was used to determine if principals’ use of counseling skills, as measured by the questionnaire, is predicted by principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, and years at current school, as well as, students’ socioeconomic status, grade levels of the school, school size and location, or whether the school has a full-time or part-time counselor.

Summary

This was a correlational study to determine if there is a relationship between principals’ use of counseling skills and leadership effectiveness. Public school counselors from across Mississippi completed the Leadership Questionnaire. The questionnaire displayed counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills as well as their perceptions of the effectiveness of their principals using the 21 responsibilities from McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework. The questionnaire also supplied the
principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, years at current school, schools’ grade levels, and whether schools have a part time or full time counselor. Growth gains, performance rating, and location of each school were obtained from MDE’s website. Student socioeconomic status was obtained from CCSSO’s School Data Direct website.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine if a relationship exists between school counselors’ perceptions of principal effectiveness and principals’ use of counseling skills. This reports the processes through which the study was conducted and the analyses through which the research questions and related hypotheses were examined. Descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, and a summary of results are provided.

Descriptive Statistics

Questionnaires were sent to four hundred and fifty-one Mississippi public school counselors who are members of the Mississippi Counseling Association. They represented three hundred and twenty-two public schools throughout the state of Mississippi. Only schools containing grades three through twelve were included in the study. One hundred and twenty-nine questionnaires (29%), representing one hundred and seventeen schools (36%) were returned in a timely manner and included in the analysis. Twelve schools had two counselors return questionnaires. Five additional questionnaires were returned after data analysis and were not included in the study.

Of the one hundred and twenty-nine counselors returning questionnaires, two did not provide their principal’s gender or ethnicity. Seventy principals (54.3%) were reported as being males, and fifty-seven (44.2%) were female. Forty-four of the principals (34.1%) were reported as being African American, and eighty-three (64.3%) were White. One hundred and ten (85.3%) of the responding counselors were female, and six (1.6%) were males. Thirteen counselors (10%) did not report their gender. One
(.8%) counselor reported being an Asian/Pacific Islander, thirty-five (27.1%) identified themselves as African American, and ninety (69.8%) identified themselves as white. Table 1 shows years of experience and years at current school for both principals and counselors.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principals’ years of Experience</th>
<th>Principals’ years at Current School</th>
<th>Counselors’ years of Experience</th>
<th>Counselors’ years at Current School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>14 (10.9%)</td>
<td>56 (43.4%)</td>
<td>15 (11.6%)</td>
<td>46 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>12 (9.3%)</td>
<td>32 (24.8%)</td>
<td>16 (12.4%)</td>
<td>24 (18.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>19 (14.7%)</td>
<td>27 (20.9%)</td>
<td>22 (17.1%)</td>
<td>21 (16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>19 (14.7%)</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
<td>15 (11.6%)</td>
<td>17 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>13 (10.1%)</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>20 (15.5%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and more</td>
<td>35 (27.1%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>38 (29.5%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>14 (10.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that largest proportion of the principals and counselors had twenty-one or more years of experience. Despite the many years of experience, nearly half of the principals had less than four years of experience at their current schools. Similarly, more than a third of the counselors in this study had been at their current school one to three years.

Additional descriptive information was obtained from the counselors concerning their professional knowledge. Forty-five (34.9%) counselors stated they were members
of ASCA, and eighty-one (62.8%) indicated they are not members of ASCA. Three did not respond. Of the 129 respondents, four did not indicate if they were part-time or full-time counselors. Two stated they were part-time, 1.6%, and 123 indicated they were full-time, 95.3%. The counselors were asked to indicate how knowledgeable they were of the ASCA National Model. Seven (5.4%) claimed they were not knowledgeable at all and thirty-five (27.1%) stated they were slightly knowledgeable. Forty-seven (36.4%) indicated that they were moderately knowledgeable, while thirty-seven (28.7%) indicated they were very knowledgeable of the ASCA National Model. Three counselors did not respond to this question. The counselors were also asked to report the number of times they have attended a MCA Conference. Nine (7%) said they have never attended, while forty (31%) had attended one to three conferences. Twenty-eight (21.7%) had attended 4-6 conferences, and 26 (20.2%) had attended 7-10 conferences. Fifteen (11.6%) and eight (6.2%) had attended 11-15 and sixteen or more conferences, respectively. Three counselors did not indicate the number of times they had attended an MCA Conference.

There were sixty-eight schools, 52.7% from the northern part of the state and forty-six, 35.7% from the southern portion of the state. Fifteen schools were unable to be classified as being from either the north or south. Table 2 shows the grade levels of the schools represented in the study.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Levels</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table illustrates the many configurations of schools. The largest percentage, 21%, of schools represented in this study appeared to be schools consisting of grades 9 – 12. Sixteen percent of the schools include grades kindergarten through fifth grade, and twelve percent were constituted of middle school grades (grades five through eight).

Demographic data, including means, standard deviations, range, and sample size, for school performance rating, student socioeconomic status, school size, principal effectiveness (McREL), and counseling skills is provided in Table 3.

Table 3

*Demographic Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School performance rating</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86 – 250</td>
<td></td>
<td>159.32</td>
<td>33.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student socioeconomic status</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15.2 - 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>23.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>206 - 1876</td>
<td></td>
<td>698.87</td>
<td>366.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Skills</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Effectiveness (McREL)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.45 – 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School performance ratings ranged from 86 to 250, with a mean of 159.32, and a standard deviation of 33.7. Twelve schools had two counselors from the same school responding. One hundred and seventeen schools were represented in the study. One hundred and nine of the 117 schools had a performance rating available on Mississippi Department of Education’s website. Data found on the CCSSO’s School Data Direct website, indicated the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in each school. Therefore, the higher the percentage, the higher the poverty level of the students of that school. SES data for three schools were unavailable, reducing the number of schools to 126. The average of economically disadvantaged students in the schools involved in this study was 64.5%, with a standard deviation of 23.89. The schools’ socioeconomic status ranged from 15.2% to 100%. The schools in this study varied in the number of students from 206 to 1876, with an average of 699 students in each school; three schools’ sizes were not reported.

The factor, Counseling Skills, represents the counselors’ report of their principal’s use of counseling skills as found in questions one through eleven on the Leadership Questionnaire. The ratings were averaged, and the mean was found to be 4.4, with a standard deviation of .66. This mean is on the higher end, closer to five, indicating, on average, counselors rated their principals as often using counseling skills.

The factor, principal effectiveness as measured by McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework, corresponds to the counselors’ account of their principal’s leadership skills as found in questions twelve through thirty-two. The answers were averaged, and the mean was 4.3, with a standard deviation of 7.1. This mean indicates that on average the
counselors rated the principals as very often being effective since the mean was closer to the high end of five.

The MCT2 and SATP scores were obtained from MDE’s website and used to compute the school achievement score gains. English II and Algebra I scores range in the six hundreds, while the MCT2 scores range in the one hundreds. It is important to note that the scores from one grade level cannot be compared to those of another grade level. These scores can be found in Table 4.

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for MCT2 and SATP Test Scores.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I 08-09</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>642.3 - 673.5</td>
<td>656.75</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I 07-08</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>642.6 - 669.9</td>
<td>655.33</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II 08-09</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>641.2 - 656.1</td>
<td>650.56</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II 07-08</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>642.8 - 655.9</td>
<td>650.72</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTLA 3rd grade 08-09</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>141.9 - 156.8</td>
<td>148.56</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTM 3rd grade 08-09</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>143.6 - 159.9</td>
<td>151.05</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTLA 3rd grade 07-08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>142 - 157.5</td>
<td>148.81</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTM 3rd grade 07-08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>143.4 - 159.7</td>
<td>150.57</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTLA 4th grade 08-09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>139.2 - 157.2</td>
<td>148.60</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTM 4th grade 08-09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>142 - 158.3</td>
<td>150.75</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTLA 4th grade 07-08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>140.5 - 159.3</td>
<td>148.77</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTM 4th grade 07-08</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>139.8 - 159.9</td>
<td>150.73</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The counselors rated the principals on their use of counseling skills. The skills that counselors stated were most used dealt with the personal and social development of the student. They included advocating for students to gain self respect, be safe outside of school, and gain decision-making and goal-setting skills. The counselors also indicated that their principals do not encourage the students to investigate their career options nor gather data to evaluate performance. The questions and their descriptive
statistics can be found in Table 5. The component or components of the ASCA National Model to which each question corresponds is listed in parentheses.

Table 5

*Descriptive Data for Counselors’ Report of Principals’ Use of Counseling Skills*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My principal advocates for students gaining self respect &amp; respect for others</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My principal encourages students to graduate &amp; have many post-secondary options</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principal persuades students to be safe &amp; survive after high school</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My principal promotes students to engage in decision making &amp; goal setting to achieve certain aspirations</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My principal ensures students have the knowledge &amp; skills to continue learning throughout their lives</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My principal employs a specified system determined by the mission statement to ensure that students receive all available &amp; needed services</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My principal develops a philosophy or mission statement agreed upon by a majority of the faculty &amp; staff to guide the school's operation</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My principal utilized an advisory council, data, action plans, &amp; calendars to ensure that services are organized, relevant, &amp; necessary</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My principal supports students investigating the relationship between their personalities, skills, education, &amp; profession</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My principal assures effectiveness by collecting data to evaluate performance &amp; compares self to leadership standards</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My principal endorses students to employ approaches to guarantee achievement in their chosen occupational field</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale 1 (never) - 5 (always)

The counselors’ rankings of the principals’ use of leadership skills, as defined by McREL Balanced Leadership Framework, were analyzed to determine the counselors’ perceptions of the principals’ usage of the skills. The counselors reported that the behavior demonstrated most by their principals was maintenance of a safe and orderly school. The second most frequently demonstrated skill was “my principal conveys his or her educational beliefs.” The third most frequently demonstrated skill was “the principal celebrates achievements and concedes disappointments in the school.” The lowest rated
behaviors dealt with the staff, including the principal adjusts his or her style for the staff, requests input from the staff, and gets to know the staff. The lowest rated skill of the effective leader was for the item that addressed the principal encouraging the teachers to be knowledgeable of current research. The questions and their descriptive statistics can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6

*Descriptive Data for Counselors’ Report of Principals’ Effectiveness Based on the Skills from the McREL Balanced Leadership Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My principal maintains a safe &amp; orderly school</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My principal celebrates achievements &amp; concedes disappointments in the school</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principal conveys his or her beliefs about education</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My principal promotes the school to all stakeholders</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My principal communicates with faculty, staff, &amp; students</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My principal guards instructional time from avoidable distractions</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My principal makes resources, such as professional development, available to teachers</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My principal constructs clear goals for the school</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My principal creates a positive school culture</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My principal is well-informed of curriculum, instruction, &amp; testing</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My Principal has meaningful exchanges with students &amp; teachers</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My principal works as a change agent within the school</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My principal is integral to the development of curriculum, instruction, &amp; assessment</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My principal motivates others to use innovative techniques</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My principal is aware of the underlying nuances of the school &amp; uses them to avoid problems</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. My principal creates relationships with the teachers &amp; is aware of their personal aspects</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My principal requests input from teachers concerning important decisions</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My principal encourages the staff to be knowledgeable of current research in education</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My principal modifies leadership style to the current situation</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale 1 (never) - 5 (always)

Analysis of Hypotheses

The first research question was stated as follows: Is there a relationship between counselor ratings of principal’s effectiveness and principals’ use of counseling skills. It was addressed by three related hypotheses. The first hypothesis proposed that there is no relationship between counselor ratings of principals’ effectiveness as measured by McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework and principals’ use of counseling skills. This question was tested by conducting a Pearson’s $r$ correlation. This hypothesis was rejected, $r = .838$, $p < .001$. The relationship is strong and positive. The higher the principals’ use of counseling skills, the more effective they were perceived to be by the counselors.

The first research question was also addressed by a second hypothesis, which was stated as follows: There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured
by MDE’s school achievement score gains and principals’ use of counseling skills. This question was also tested by conducting a Pearson’s $r$ correlation. The correlations can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7

*Correlations for Research Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Counseling Skills</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebra I</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English II</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 3 LA</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 3 M</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 4 LA</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 4 M</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 5 LA</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 5 M</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 6 LA</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 6 M</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 7 LA</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 7 M</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 8 LA</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCT 8 M</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .01 level

The table above shows the Pearson’s $r$ correlation conducted to test for a correlation between the gains in student test scores and principals’ use of counseling.
skills. The tests used were the Mississippi Curriculum Test, 2nd edition, for grades 3 through 8, Algebra I, and English II Multiple Choice, from the 07-08 and 08-09 school years. The test scores from 07-08 were subtracted from 08-09 school year to obtain the school achievement score gains, which were each correlated with the principals’ use of counseling skills. Only one correlation was found to be significant. The hypothesis was rejected for the correlation between MCT2 3rd grade Language Arts test and principals’ use of counseling skills, $r = .564$, $p < .001$. This is a moderately strong and positive correlation. The higher the principals’ use of counseling skills, the higher, to a moderate degree, the MCT2 3rd grade Language Arts scores. All other correlations were not found to be significant.

The first research question was also tested by a third hypothesis stated as follows: There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by school performance ratings and principals’ use of counseling skills. A Pearson’s $r$ correlation was used to answer this question. This hypothesis was rejected, $r = .190$, $p = .038$. The relationship is weak and positive. The schools’ performance rating increases, to a slight degree, as the principals’ use of counseling skills increases.

The second research question asked if there are relationships among counselors’ ratings of principals’ use of counseling skills and school and principal demographic characteristics. One hypothesis was used to test this research question, and it was stated as follows: Principals’ use of counseling skills, as rated by counselors on the Leadership Questionnaire, are not predicted by principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, years at current school, whether the school had a full or part time counselor, and school and student demographic characteristics. A multiple regression was conducted to test this
hypothesis. The dependent variable was principals’ use of counseling skills as rated by school counselors. The model of regression being tested included: principal gender, principal ethnicity, principal’s years of experience and years at current school, student socioeconomic status, school’s locations, and number of students. Whether the school had a part time or full time counselor could not be used in the analysis due to the fact that only 2 counselors were part time. The hypothesis was rejected, $F(7, 100) = 2.26, p = .036, R^2 = .136$. The overall model was a statistically significant predictor of counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills. The independent variables in the model accounted for 13.6% of the variance in the dependent variable. The coefficients for the multiple regression can be found in Table 8.

Table 8

*Coefficients Table*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Location</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student SES</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Ethnicity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Years of Experience</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Years at Current School</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that only student socioeconomic status is statistically significant, $p = .010$. None of the other variables were significant. The variable with the greatest
impact was student SES, which had a negative impact on the model. As students become more economically disadvantaged, the more the student performance rating decreases.

Summary

Two research questions were tested. The first research question asked if there was a relationship between principals’ use of counseling skills and principal effectiveness. This research question was tested through three hypotheses. The first stated there was no relationship between counselors’ report of principals’ use of counseling skills and principal effectiveness as defined by McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework. This hypothesis was rejected and found to have a strong and positive correlation. The second hypothesis stated there was no relationship between counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills and student achievement score gains. Only the 3rd grade MCT2 Language Arts test gains were found to have a statistically significant relationship with principals’ use of counseling skills, and it was a moderately strong and positive relationship. The third hypothesis stated there was no relationship between counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills and school performance rating. This hypothesis was also rejected; there was a small and positive correlation. The second research question asked if the counselors’ report of principals’ use of counseling skills was predicted by certain principal, school, and student demographic characteristics. The hypothesis stated that the principals’ use of counseling skills would not be predicted by these variables. The hypothesis was rejected and the overall model was found to be significant, with student SES being the strongest predictor of how often principals use counseling skills according to counselor report.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Chapter V discusses the results of the study. It also provides the limitations discovered during the study. Implications for policy and practice are addressed. Lastly, this chapter offers recommendations for future research.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to discover if a relationship exists between counselors’ ratings of principal effectiveness and principals’ use of counseling skills. The first research question was stated as follows: Is there a relationship between counselor ratings of principal’s effectiveness and principals’ use of counseling skills? Three hypotheses were analyzed in order to examine the first research question. The three hypotheses considered in this study were:

1. There is no relationship between counselors’ ratings of principals’ effectiveness as measured by McREL’s Balanced Leadership Framework and principals’ use of counseling skills.

2. There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by MDE’s school achievement score gains and counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills.

3. There is no relationship between principals’ effectiveness as measured by MDE’s school performance ratings and counselors’ ratings of principals’ use of counseling skills.
The first hypothesis tested whether there was a relationship between counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills, as measured by the ASCA National Model, and counselor report of principal effectiveness, as measured by the McREL Balanced Leadership Framework’s 21 leader responsibilities. This hypothesis was rejected. A relationship was found between principals using counseling skills and effective leadership as perceived by counselors. The relationship was strong and positive, which means that as counselors’ perceptions of their principals’ use of counseling skills increased so did their perception of their principals’ effectiveness. In fact, the correlation indicated that there is a 64% overlap in the two variables.

No related research previously conducted could be found to indicate whether a relationship might be expected. The theoretical framework, including the Managerial Grid, Situational Leadership, and Contingency Theory, supports the finding that a principal perceived as using counseling skills would be perceived as being more effective by counselors (Blake & Mouton, 1978; Fielder, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1972). If principals use different skills and behaviors for different situations, they are perceived as more effective by those with whom they interact in the professional environment. The same can be inferred from this study’s findings. If principals use counseling skills, they are seen as more effective by counselors.

There was a strong relationship found between principals using counseling skills and their perceived effectiveness. Further analysis of this correlation was made by separating the grade levels to look for differences in this correlation by grade levels. Due to the many different types of schools with varying grade levels, it was difficult to label schools as elementary, middle, and high school. Schools with third grade scores were
labeled as elementary and those with English II scores were labeled as high school. All others were left unlabeled. The results showed no significant difference between elementary schools and high schools in the level of correlation between principals’ use of counseling skills and counselors’ reports of principal effectiveness. These data suggested that there were no differences between the use of counseling skills by principals in high schools than the use of these skills in elementary level, according to counselor report.

This presence of a relationship may be due to the fact that counselors are likely to see another educator as effective if they are engaging in similar actions. It would be interesting to see if the same results would be found when teachers, parents or students are surveyed. This finding merits significant attention. At the time of this research, it appeared from an examination of the extant literature that the question had never been researched, nor published. These results could provide a starting point for future research to further examine this relationship.

The second hypothesis examined whether there was a relationship between changes in test scores and principals’ use of counseling skills. The tests used were MCT2, Algebra 1, and English 2 Multiple Choice. All Mississippi public schools test third through eighth graders every year using MCT2. The students receive a language arts MCT2 score and a math MCT2 score. Students from grades eight through twelve are tested on the curriculum and objectives of Algebra 1. Most tenth graders take the English 2 Multiple Choice test, but some eleventh and twelfth graders scores are included as well. Two years ago, MCT2 began using the 2nd edition statewide, as did Algebra 1 and English 2 Multiple Choice. It was for this reason that only the test scores from the last two years were included in this study.
For this hypothesis, it was the change, from 07-08 school year test results to 08-09 school year’s test scores, that was being analyzed. A MCT2 change score for each grade level and each test, language arts and math, was calculated and then correlated with counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills. There was only one significant correlation. A moderately strong and positive correlation between MCT2 language arts scores for third graders and principals’ use of counseling skills. No other correlations were found to be significant.

McREL’s research found statistically significant correlations between use of the twenty-one effective leadership responsibilities and student achievement (Marzano, et al., 2005). Research has shown a positive relationship between full implementation of the ASCA National Model in schools and student achievement (Lapan, et al., 1997). This would suggest the likelihood of a relationship between principals’ use of counseling skills and student achievement. However, there was only one statistically significant relationship found between principals’ use of counseling skills and 3rd grade MCT2 Language Arts.

There is no obvious explanation for this result, although there are a few possibilities. Third grade is the first grade in which students are given the MCT2. There is a possibility that principals at schools housing third graders realize the negative impact associated with three days of testing third graders and use more counseling skills to address this issue. Also, math MCT2 is given on the third day of back to back testing. Third graders may try harder during the first two days of testing, which addresses language arts, and may be exhausted by the third day, which addresses math. This may have impacted the correlation between third grade MCT2 math score changes and
principals’ use of counseling skills. Lastly, most elementary schools have one teacher who teaches every subject. Research indicated that most elementary certified teachers have high math anxiety, which negatively impacts students’ math achievement scores (Beilock, Gunderson, Ramirez, & Levine, 2010). This impact on the math scores and not language arts scores may have played a role in the lack of correlation found between MCT2 math scores for 3rd graders and principals’ use of counseling skills, as reported by counselors.

The third hypothesis examined the relationship between counselor report of principals’ use of counseling skills and principal effectiveness as measured by MDE’s school performance rating. This hypothesis was rejected as well. The correlation was small but positive. As the principal’s use of counseling skills increases, according to counselor report, the school’s performance rating increases slightly.

School performance ratings are based on three components. The first element is Achievement, which involves an algebraic equation assigning more value to higher scores and resulting in a number called the QDI or Quality of Distribution Index. The second factor is Growth. It is calculated using a regression equation where a negative residual indicates inadequate growth, a positive residual indicates outstanding growth, and a 0 indicates adequate growth. Graduation is the third element. Points are assigned to each students’ achievement five years after entering the 9th grade. Schools receive 300 points for every student earning high school diploma and lose 300 points for every student who dropped out. There are other point values assigned for students getting their Mississippi Occupational Diploma, Certificate of Attendance, and GED. All of these components combine to form the School Performance Rating, which is a continuous
variable ranging from 0 to 300, last year. Each year the score needed to obtain certain levels increases. A range of scores is labeled to provide ease of understanding for the general population, which include, Star, High Performing, Successful, Academic Watch, Low Performing, At Risk of Failing, and Failing. A “Star” School’s school performance rating ranges from 200 - 300, while a “Failing” School’s performance rating ranges from 0 - 99 (MDE, 2009).

Based on previous research, some might assert that there would be a correlation between principals’ use of counseling skills and the Mississippi Department of Education’s School Performance Rating. There was a small, positive correlation, but previous research suggests the potential for a stronger relationship between student achievement and principal effectiveness based on the use of the 21 responsibilities found in McREL’s research (Marzano, et al., 2005), and the relationship between increased student achievement and a more fully implemented ASCA National Model (Lapan et al., 1997). The reason for the lack of moderate to strong correlation may be the additional components of growth and graduation rate found in the school performance rating. These two factors were not included in the research mentioned above and may have played a significant role in this finding.

A second goal of this study was to examine if a model predicted counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills. The second research question was stated as follows: Are there relationships among principals’ use of counseling skills and school and principal demographic characteristics? This research question was examined through the analysis of the fourth hypothesis, which read as follows:
4. Principals’ use of counseling skills, as rated by counselors on the Leadership Questionnaire, are not predicted by principals’ gender, ethnicity, years of experience, years at current school, whether school has a full or part time counselor, and school and student demographic characteristics.

This hypothesis was rejected. The overall model consisted of numerous variables: school location, school size, student socioeconomic status, principals’ gender, principals’ ethnicity, principals’ years of experience, principals’ years at current school, and whether a counselor was part-time or full-time. This model did predict principals’ use of counseling skills as reported by counselors. The only significant variable was student SES, which was the biggest predictor of principals’ use of counseling skills according to counselor report. It was a negative predictor in that as the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in a school increases, principals use of counseling skills decreases. Student SES was so strongly negatively predictive of principals’ use of counseling skills that most likely it was strong enough to make the model significant with or without the other variables.

This finding was not unexpected. In most studies, student SES plays a significant role in student achievement (Sirin, 2005). Sirin’s meta-analysis of over 100,000 students’ testing data was collected from 1982 to 2000; he found that SES has a strong negative correlation with student achievement. This means that as student poverty increases, student achievement decreases. The study also found that the impact of SES changes based on school location and size.

There are some obvious possibilities for these findings. In schools with lower SES, there may be more discipline situations for the principal to handle. Also, in those
schools, there may be lower test scores forcing a stronger emphasis on keeping students in the classroom to protect instructional time. The most obvious reason for principals’ use of counseling skills to decrease as the percentage of economically disadvantaged students increases is that a lack of parent and community support does not encourage those skills to be used. No matter the cause, student SES played a major role in determining principals use of counseling skills.

Balch (2008) found in dissertation research that there was a statistically significant relationship between Indiana’s school performance rating and principals’ ethnicity, principals’ years of experience at current school, and if a school counselor was full-time, part-time, or not present. These findings were not supported in this study, which was unexpected. In Balch’s study, teachers were the participants, which may have been a factor in the differing results. Balch also included school location in that study, which was not found to be significant, but it was categorized as rural, suburban, urban, or other. Despite the different classifications, no statistically significant results were found in either study. Based on the research, it was surprising that the other factors were not found to be significant. Jackson, Engstrom, and Emmers-Sommer (2007) found that gender and leadership were significantly interrelated. Men and women significantly differ in their choice of leader, in that men choose men and women choose women. The study found that each gender saw leadership as an aspect of their own gender identity. This study would indicate that the large proportion of female counselors in this study, 85%, would see their principals, who were mostly men (54%) as less effective. This did not prove to be the case.
Limitations

The generalizability of the findings from this study was limited by the following:

1. Eight schools did not have school performance ratings posted on MDE’s website.

2. When comparing the grade levels listed by the counselor on the questionnaire, it was discovered that some of the schools are listed as k-12 by MDE, but the school has separate principals and counselors for groups of grades.

3. Only 2 schools had part time counselors limiting the usefulness of the question concerning whether the school had a part-time or full-time counselor.

4. Due to the categorizing of principal’s years at current school on the questionnaire, some counselors may have answered the questionnaire based on their current principal, who may or may not have been the principal during the 07-08 or 08-09 school years, years from which the test scores were obtained.

5. The study was conducted within a single state and generalization of findings to other jurisdictions should be approached with some caution.

Implications for Policy and Practice

McREL’s research found a statistically significant relationship between effective leadership practices, the twenty-one responsibilities addressed in this study, and student achievement (Marzano et al., 2005). Researchers have found a relationship between ASCA National Model implemented counseling programs and increased student achievement (Lapan et al., 1997). This study found a significant relationship between
counselors’ perception of principal effectiveness and principals’ perceived use of counseling skills. All of this together indicates the importance of effective leadership, effective use of counseling skills, and the impact of principals and counselors on student achievement. ASCA has been encouraging counselors for years to be leaders in their in their schools (Dollarhide & Gibson, 2008). This research seems to encourage the leader of the school, the principal, to use counseling skills. The overall message seems to say that educators should be less specialized and have some overlap with other disciplines in their abilities, behaviors, and skills.

This research examines a relationship that was typically not addressed by any Mississippi principal preparation program. Current principals might also benefit from gaining some counseling skills based on the strong, positive correlation found in this study. Recently, The University of Southern Mississippi consolidated the Educational Leadership and Research department with the School Counseling department to create the Educational Leadership and School Counseling department. This consolidation may allow for the application and further research of this study’s findings.

There would be many changes if principals were required to learn some counseling skills while obtaining their educational leadership license. First, leadership preparation programs would have to alter their curriculum. These programs would also need to develop school counseling classes geared toward the needs of administrators. These programs might benefit from consolidating educational leadership and school counseling departments. Second, if a leadership training program curriculum is changed, then the licensure test and requirements for continuing education units would likely also need to be changed. This would be a large undertaking because the School Leadership
Licensure Assessment, SLLA, has been used as the test for administer licensure in Mississippi for many years (MDE, 2009). This test is directly related to leadership curriculum and the standards created by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC). Third, principals trained in the use of counseling skills would have additional skills at their disposal, making them better equipped to handle different situations at school. Fourth, the acquisition of counseling skills might improve the working relationship between counselors and principals. This relationship is an important one for the success of the school (Finkelstein, 2009).

Recommendations for Future Research

There are a few recommendations for future research. The first recommendations concern the questionnaire. Instead of asking if a counselor was part-time or full-time, it might have provided more valuable information if the counselors indicated the number of counselors at the school. There were a few participants who indicated the difference in years of experience as a counselor and a teacher and the same for the principals. It might be clearer if the questionnaire distinguished between years of experience as an administrator and years of experience as a non-administrator. More useful data could be gathered if the same was done for the counselors’ years of experience. Lastly, more valuable data could be gleaned from the study if the counselors were asked their opinion of how effective they think their principal is and how effectively their principal uses counseling skills. These data could be correlated with counseling skills and leader effectiveness factors to provide even more useful information.

Different data could be used to get a different view of the study. Schools that contain certain grade levels may be used to allow the comparison of principals’ use of
counseling skills with certain grade levels. For example, the study may only use those schools with grades k – 5, 6 – 8, and 9 – 12. This would allow the researcher to compare principals’ use of counseling skills to be discerned more specifically across certain grade levels. Also, Biology 1 and US History test scores could be entered and correlated with principals’ use of counseling skills. If the study was conducted outside of Mississippi, state test scores for that location could be used or ACT and or SAT scores would be additional options.

Future research could involve other participants and different research designs. Other stakeholders, such as students, parents, and teachers, could be involved in the study and asked to complete the questionnaire. They may have different experiences with principals than those of the counselors. This would also address the statement made earlier about counselors rating principals as more effective if they use the skills counselors use.

A quasiexperimental research design could be employed. In a quasiexperimental design, the dependent variable would continue to be student achievement and the independent variable would be principals’ use of counseling skills. Principals would be given a questionnaire to indicate their current use of counseling skills. A control group of those indicating no use of counseling skills would be employed. An experimental group of principals could be taught counseling skills and asked to use them in their schools. The fact that principals are already at certain school, with certain student and school demographic characteristics, prevents this from being a true experimental design. Counselors could then be given The Leadership Questionnaire and asked to complete it. The data could then be analyzed in a manner similar to that in this study, but in this case,
cause and effect could be established. If the results indicated a statistically significant
difference in perspective between those principals’ using counseling skills and those not
using those skills, principals could participate in professional development to provide
them with a working knowledge of those effective skills.

Lastly, validation studies and generalizability studies could be conducted. Future
research is needed to validate these results. If validation is found, further research can be
conducted to examine the benefit to future principals in adding school counseling
components to the requirements for administrator training programs. Research also can
be conducted in other states or nationally. As mentioned previously, ACT, SAT, or state
assessments can be used in these studies. This research can be used to discover if a
relationship between counselors’ perception of principal use of counseling skills and
counselors’ report of principal effectiveness exits outside of Mississippi.

Summary

This study produced several statistically significant findings. There was a strong,
positive relationship discovered between counselors’ reports of principal effectiveness, as
measured by McREL’s 21 leadership responsibilities and principals’ use of counseling
skills, as measured by the ASCA National Model. A moderate and positive relationship
was discovered between counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills and 3rd
grade MCT2 Language Arts score gains from 07-08 school year to 08-09 school year.
There was also a small correlation found between counselors’ reports of principals’ use
of counseling skills and MDE’s school performance rating. These findings are consistent
with some previous research correlating principal effectiveness to student achievement
and fully implemented ASCA National Model guidance programs. Lastly, it was
proposed that counselors’ reports of principals’ use of counseling skills could be predicted by a group of variables including: school location, school size, student socioeconomic status, principals’ gender, principals’ ethnicity, principals’ years of experience, principals’ years at current school, and whether a counselor was part-time or full-time. This model was found to be statistically significant although only one variable was statistically significant and most likely strong enough to make the model significant with or without the other variables. This finding was not unexpected as research shows the important role of student SES in student achievement, which can play a large role in the behaviors and skills used by the school leader, the principal.

It is hoped that these findings will have an impact. This research could influence policymakers to examine additional preparation elements that would be useful in order for a school leader to be effective and help students succeed. This research could also have an impact on practitioners. Educators know that learning can take place anywhere. If this research can be validated, principals can learn about the ASCA National Model and counseling skills and use them in their schools. If this research is found to be generalizable and valid, it could have a positive impact in the practice of school leadership.
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My name is Gwen Hitt, and I am the President of Mississippi Counseling Association (MCA). Valerie Hodge Cleckler has informed me of her dissertation research project concerning the relationship between principal effectiveness and the use of counseling skills. I am intrigued by the topic and recognize the importance of the study’s results for members of MCA and the profession in general. She has supplied me with details concerning how participants will provide informed consent and that participants will incur little to no risk by participating in the study. Valerie is a member of MCA, and as a member, she has access to our member directory, which includes names, addresses, and emails of all members. As President of MCA, I approve Valerie Cleckler’s use of our member directory in order to obtain participants and give her permission to use the names, addresses, and other member information during the course of completing research for her dissertation.

Sincerely,

Gwen Hitt
Gwen Hitt
MCA President
APPENDIX B  
LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

Leadership Questionnaire

Instructions: Please answer each question by circling only one answer per question. Do not put your name on this paper. When finished, place the questionnaire in the self addressed stamped envelope and place in the mail. Thank you for participating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My principal:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) ensures students have the knowledge and skills to continue learning throughout their lives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) encourages students to graduate and have many post-secondary options.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) supports students investigating the relationship between their personalities, skills, education, &amp; profession.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) endorses students to employ approaches to guarantee achievement in their chosen occupational field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) advocates for students gaining self respect and respect for others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) promotes students to engage in decision making and goal setting to achieve certain aspirations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) persuades students to be safe &amp; survive after high school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) develops a philosophy or mission statement agreed upon by a majority of the faculty &amp; staff to guide the school’s operations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) employs a specified system determined by the mission statement to ensure that students receive all available &amp; needed services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) utilizes an advisory council, data, action plans, &amp; calendars to ensure that services are organized, relevant, &amp; necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) assures effectiveness by collecting data to evaluate performance &amp; compares self to leadership standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Leadership Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My principal:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) celebrates achievements &amp; concedes disappointments in the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) works as a change agent within the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) recognizes accomplishments of individuals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) communicates with faculty, staff, &amp; students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) creates a positive school culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) guards instructional time from avoidable distractions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) modifies leadership style to the current situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) constructs clear goals for the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) conveys his or her beliefs about education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) requests input from teachers concerning important decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) encourages the staff to be knowledgeable of current research in education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) is integral to the development of curriculum, instruction, &amp; assessment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) is well-informed of curriculum, instruction, &amp; testing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) monitors programs and evaluates their effectiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) motivates others to use innovative techniques.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) maintains a safe and orderly school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) promotes the school to all stakeholders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) creates relationships with the teachers and is aware of their personal aspects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) makes resources, such as professional development, available to teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) is aware of the underlying nuances of the school &amp; uses them to avoid problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) has meaningful exchanges with students and teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Leadership Questionnaire

Please circle only one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Ethnicity</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Years at Current School</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Years of Experience</td>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Levels at School</td>
<td>K – 4</td>
<td>5 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor at your School is:</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>Full Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table above captures various aspects of leadership, including gender, ethnicity, years of experience, and school levels.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Leadership Questionnaire</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please circle only one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Your Gender</strong></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Your Ethnicity** | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| **Your years at current school** | 1 – 3 | 4 – 6 | 7 – 10 | 11 – 15 | 16 – 20 | 21 or more |
| **Your years of Experience** | 1 – 3 | 4 – 6 | 7 – 10 | 11 – 15 | 16 – 20 | 21 or more |
| **How many times have you attended an MCA Conference** | Never attended | 1-3 times | 4 – 6 times | 7 – 10 times | 11 -15 times | 16 or more times |
| **Are you a member of ASCA?** | Yes | No | | | | |
| **How knowledgeable are you with the ASCA National Model?** | Not at all | Slightly | Moderately | Very | | |

Thank you for participating.
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APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER

Dear MCA member,

My name is Valerie Cleckler, and I am member of MCA and a school counselor. I am also a graduate student at The University of Southern Mississippi conducting research concerning specific skills and behaviors used by principals and your opinions of those skills and behaviors. I would appreciate you taking the time to complete the 42 item questionnaire, which should take approximately twenty minutes. When finished, please place the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope and mail it back to me by

Due to the nature of the study, I have coded the questionnaires to identify the school from which each response came, but not the individual counselor from which each response came. Confidentiality will be further ensured by the fact that the questionnaires will be mailed directly back to me and therefore will not be seen by the principals of the participating schools. All personal information will be kept strictly confidential, and your name, personal information, and name of school or district will not be disclosed or stated in the dissertation. To further protect your anonymity, please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire, and you will not be asked to sign a consent form. When the study is complete, the questionnaires will be shredded by the researcher to protect your anonymity.

There are little to no risks and no immediate benefits to you. Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time without penalty or prejudice. Any new information that develops during the course of the project will be provided if that information may impact the willingness to continue participation in the study. By completing and returning the questionnaire, you are stating that you have been informed of your rights and consent to participate in the study. If you have any questions, you may contact me at 601-408-8253. This research will be submitted as a part of a dissertation study and will be published as a dissertation at The University of Southern Mississippi if you would like to see the results. The project has been reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at The University of Southern Mississippi at 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001 or 601-266-6829.

Again, I appreciate your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Valerie Cleckler, NCC

School Counselor and Doctoral Student at USM
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