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ABSTRACT

In recent years, the number of linguistically diverse students (LDS) in the U.S. public school system has significantly increased (Araujo, 2009). Public school enrollment is projected to grow to 54 million in the year 2018 (Planty et al., 2009). Currently, one in every four students in the public school system is a LDS (NCELA, 2007). Evidence points to a wide gap between native English speakers and LDS on achievement tests (Albus, Thurlow, & Liu, 2002). Research on school counselor involvement in school, family, and community (SFC) partnerships is insufficient; few studies have examined school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with linguistically diverse families (LDF).

Using unexamined variables, this study extends the findings of Bryan and Griffin (2010) and Aydin, Bryan, and Duys (2011) by examining how school and school counselor-related variables impact involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Variables include bilingual status, caseload, percentage of LDS, free and reduced price lunch (FRPL) status, and specific instruction received in SFC partnerships working with LDF. This national study surveyed 916 school counselors using quantitative research designs as measured by The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS) instrument. Using linear regression models, t-tests, ANOVAs, correlations, and a multiple regression model, this study examines the complex interplay of school and school counselor-related factors that influence involvement.

Whenever school counselors used translators, they were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF. While general partnership-related training affected involvement, specialized training in SFC partnerships with LDF predicts stronger involvement, accentuating the importance of integrating specialized curricular training. School and school counselor-related factors were associated with involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF; the relationship varied by the type of involvement (i.e., school-family
partnerships, school-community collaboration, and inter-professional collaboration). Contrary to Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study, inter-professional collaboration was related to a number of school counselor-related factors. School counselors reported inadequate training, when working with LDF, yet they understood the importance of involvement on an inter-professional level to meet the wide-ranging needs of LDF.

Race and ethnicity was related to involvement in SFC partnerships. School counselors who were non-White had statistically significant higher involvement scores. Knowing that race and ethnicity, and bilingual status were negatively correlated, White school counselors may experience limitations to building SFC partnerships. There was a significant correlation between percentage of LDS served and FRPL status, caseload, bilingual status, and race and ethnicity. Whenever school counselors had higher percentages of LDS, they inclined to have a higher number of students as part of their caseload, speak another language, come from diverse backgrounds and have higher number of students on FRPL status. These issues illuminate the complex interplay of challenges facing LDS, such as limited resources, limited number of bilingual school staff and a need for bilingual education. This study highlights the multitude of factors that determine the degree of school counselor involvement by examining caseloads, specific training on LDS and LDF, the use of translators, and bilingual ability.
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CHAPTER I
A NATIONAL STUDY: SCHOOL COUNSELOR INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL, FAMILY AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS WITH LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE FAMILIES

Introduction

The number of linguistically diverse students in the U.S. public school system has increased significantly in recent years (Araujo, 2009). In 2018, primary and secondary public school enrollment is projected to grow to 54 million (Planty et al., 2009). In the 2004–2005 school year, 10.5% (i.e., 5.1 million) of students were linguistically diverse (Payan & Nettles, 2008). In 2007, 20%, (i.e., 10.8 million) of children ages 5–17 spoke a language at home other than English, and 5% (i.e., 2.7 million), spoke English with difficulty; 75% of those who had difficulty in speaking English spoke Spanish (Planty et al., 2009). By the year 2026 the number of linguistically diverse students (LDS) in America is estimated to rise to 25% (Garcia, 2002). These demographic changes will influence school and mental health experiences of linguistically diverse students.

Studies have explored how these demographic changes will affect the educational experiences of students (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001). No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) mandates that educators provide parents with necessary information on their children’s experience in school, which in turn helps parents become comfortable in schools and learn about the schooling process. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) mandates that all students have an equal opportunity and access to achieve a high-quality education. Title I provides funds to improve school achievement of the lowest-achieving students enrolled in high-poverty schools. The purpose of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is to help make sure that English Language Learners (ELL) master English and meet the same state achievement standards as their peers (U.S. Department of Education,
2009). In addition to the federal mandates, effective school programs embrace a philosophy of partnership and view that children’s educational development is a collaborative endeavor among parents, school staff, and community members (Henderson & Mapp). As accountability becomes increasingly important, educational leaders across the nation are actively engaging to promote these qualities in their schools (Ferguson 2005a). The importance of creating a welcoming environment that fosters school, family, and community (SFC) partnerships is emphasized in the literature. The sense of welcome families feel has a direct effect on their involvement in their children’s education (Caspe & Lopez 2007; McGrath, 2007; Resto & Alston, 2006; Stewart, 2008). K-12 educators are now publicly accountable for the achievement of each and every child (Ferguson, 2005b). Studies have shown that when school staff is considerate of their students’ families, they can develop strategies to bridge school and home activities and boost support for students’ success (Wong & Hughes, 2006).

Evidence points to a wide gap between native English speakers and English Language Learners (ELL) on achievement tests (Albus, Thurlow, & Liu, 2002). According to National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA), in the 2007-2008 academic year, total U.S. Pk-12 enrollment was 49,914,453 and total ELL enrollment was 5,318,164; while Pk-12 enrollment growth was 8.45% and ELL growth was 53.25% (2008). For example, in 2005-2006, California has the largest and fastest growing ELL population; 25% (1.6 million) of K-12 students were ELL, while 85% of them came from economically disadvantaged backgrounds (California Legislative Analysts Office, 2007). Ballantyne, Sanderman, and Levy noted, “6 in 10 ELL adolescents qualify for free or reduced-price lunch,” experiencing the hardships of poverty alongside a language barrier (2008, p. 7). ELL students are more likely to attend public schools with low achievement test scores, where the student-to-teacher ratios, student enrollments, number of students living in (or near) the poverty level is high. The gap in their test results is significantly narrow when they are not “isolated in these low-
achieving schools” (Fry, 2008, p. i). Many studies report, “the deleterious effects of low socio-economic status on academic achievement hold true for ELL populations” (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & McLaughlin, 2008, p. 15). The results from the 2008 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Long-Term Trend Assessment (LTTA), administered to over 26,000 students in each content area, were released in April 2009, which compared results among ELL, former ELL, and English-Proficient Students (Wilde, 2010). ELL students, who participated in NAEP testing as a subgroup of students with accommodation, had a composite math scale scores and reading test scores which indicated that former ELL students’ average scores are close to, or above, their non-ELL age peers. Former ELL students’ and non-ELL students’ average scores are above their ELL age peers. Non-ELL students who do not live in poverty outscored all other student groups at each age level, while ELL students who live in poverty scored somewhat poorly in math and reading, compared to non-ELL students (Wilde, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

Due to the increasing numbers of linguistically diverse students, many schools face the challenge of building partnerships with linguistically diverse families (LDF). Studies have documented that students from diverse cultural backgrounds scored lower on achievement tests than their White peers (Bali & Alvarez, 2004) and such academic issues may be due to language difficulties (Schwallie-Giddis, Anstrom, Sánchez, Sardi, & Granato, 2004). Academically, linguistically diverse students are at risk (Park-Taylor, Walsh, & Ventura, 2007). Learning a new language can also create anxiety and social isolation (Spomer & Cowen, 2001). In addition, these students may experience post-traumatic stress disorder, racial labeling, different learning styles, inadequate social support networks, and lack of social acceptance (Williams & Butler, 2003).

There are number of issues highlighted in the literature about LDF and students. Ironically, instead of having more resources available to them, LDF and students are
often deprived of resources, raising warning signs for school professionals. For example, schools with high percentages of racially and ethnically diverse students and with students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds had a smaller number of school counselors and had higher student-to-counselor ratio in comparison to schools with lower percentages of students of color and economically disadvantaged students (Lapan, Gysbers, Cook, Bragg, & Robbins, 2006). Similarly, school counselors revealed feeling more uncomfortable working with LDF as compared to students since they believe working with families requires cross-cultural understanding of the family dynamic. Translators are often not available to help, which intensifies school counselors’ frustrations in communication when working with these students and families (Schwallie-Giddis et al.). It is even more concerning to know that ELL tend to not reach out and seek help when compared to the English-speaking students (Montgomery, Roberts, & Growe, 2003). In truth, linguistically diverse students need more assistance and support than the other students since they often do not have family members helping them navigate the school system (McCall-Perez, 2000) due to language barriers and lack of access to academic preparation in their home language (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004).

Facing increased accountability standards in public education and being confronted with the challenge to build effective partnerships with LDF, school counselors are under pressure to raise the achievement of linguistically diverse students. As the number of linguistically diverse students’ increases, so does the school counselors’ challenge of providing services that utilize effective communication among SFC members (Davis & Lambie, 2005). School counseling services are essential for students, for those who care for and work with children (i.e., families, teachers, school principals and other counseling professionals; Falls, 2009). However, each stakeholder has a personal perception of the school counselor’s role within the school and how the school counselor could be most utilized by the school community (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005). School principals and policy
makers “tend to see any activity not directly related to instruction as taking resources away from schools’ primary mission of teaching” (Adelman & Taylor, 2002, p. 236), thus, creating challenges for SFC partnerships. While, school districts and administrators face meeting students’ immense needs and accountability demands, they do not always recognize how school counselors’ role and training prepare them to address social, emotional, and career needs of students, which in turn promote achievement methods that they are administered and reviewed (Adelman & Taylor, 2002).

Due to the multifaceted issues LDS experience, they need an advocate within the school to help them negotiate the system and engage with families. School professionals are in the position to strengthen rapport with LDF to promote SFC partnerships for social, emotional and academic welfare of every student (Epstein, 1995; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). School counselors are equipped to promote partnerships, due to their expertise in human development, partnerships, and as system change agents (Davis & Lambie, 2005). They have the skills required to collaborate with students, school staff, and families to identify perceptions, procedures and policies that obstruct the academic experiences of culturally diverse students (ASCA, 2004). School counselors are fundamental professionals in the steps toward closing the achievement gap (e.g., Martin, 2002). They face the challenge of how best to fulfill their transformed role with LDS and LDF (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). The ASCA National Model (2005) supports school counselors as leaders, advocates, collaborative team members, and agents of systemic change. TSCI (Education Trust, 2003) called for school counselors to take an active role and to support disadvantaged students for academic achievement.

School counselors must be trained to help students develop and learn optimally, and be willing to collaborate with SFC members to meet the children’s developmental, cultural, linguistic, and educational needs toward closing the achievement gap. Few studies have examined school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships whether or not their training prepares them for such partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). In
their literature review about family involvement, Mattingly, Prislin, McKenzie, Rodriguez, and Kayzar (2002) found that the majority of the programs targeting diverse families emphasize changing parents’ rather than school professionals’ behaviors and actions. Boethel identified only two studies (i.e., Desimone, Finn-Stevenson, & Henrich, 2000; Moon & Callahan, 2001) which focused on training teachers to improve their abilities and skills in working with families. This is troubling for professionals who promote using research driven best practices in meeting all students’ needs. Due to their central role in building partnership (Davis, 2005), it is imperative to examine school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF to ensure educational success for their students. However, existing literature on the role of school counselors’ work with LDF is limited. Thus, the school counselor’ beliefs, knowledge, and skill competencies working with LDF, should be examined.

Significance of the Study

Federal mandates and state legislations enforce school districts and schools to develop SFC partnership policies and programs; however, “the implementation and effectiveness varies tremendously within and across districts” (Morris, 2009, p. 8). Despite growing evidence about the benefits of SFC partnership, the support given by policymakers, state education agencies, school districts and school sites is inadequate (Jordan, Orozco & Averett, 2002). No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) mandates that educators promote SFC partnership activities to help families be comfortable in schools and be educated about the schooling process. Stakeholders want research-based evidence showing that SFC partnerships occur in school districts (Jordan, Orozco & Averett, 2002). Effective school programs embrace a philosophy of partnership and view that children’s educational development is a collaborative endeavor among parents, school staff, and community members (Jordan, Orozco & Averett).
There is evidence that school counselors believe that SFC partnerships are important (e.g., Bryan, 2005; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Dimmitt, 2003; Simcox, Nuijens, & Lee, 2006). Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy (2004, 2007) examined school counselors’ perceptions of partnerships and their studies suggest that in spite of a range of obstacles, such as administrative tasks, too many roles and functions, time limitations for developing and implementing partnership programs, school counselors believed in the efficacy of collaborative partnership programs. Griffin and Steen (2010) argued that SFC partnerships are an ideal approach to maintain the rising needs of K-12 students. Current data indicated that there are still achievement gaps between low-income students and students of color and their White peers; for instance, students from high-socioeconomic groups do better in math; and Asian American and White students continue to achieve better in school (House & Sears, 2002; NCES, 2005). Developing SFC partnerships have proven to be an effective approach to minimize these academic deficits (Sheldon & Epstein, 2005). SFC partnerships provide means “…to increase student achievement and to ensure more equitable practices in schools to increase parent and community involvement” (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007, p.66).

The existing research on school counselors’ perceptions in SFC partnerships is limited (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007). There are concerns whether or not school counseling training prepares school counselors in SFC partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2006, 2007). In spite of a range of obstacles, such as administrative tasks, too many roles and functions, time limitations for developing and implementing partnership programs, school counselors believed in the efficacy of collaborative partnership programs (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007). However, Griffin and Steen (2010) indicate that many counselors believed that they have the ability to promote SFC partnerships, but they were not involved in it. Some studies still demonstrate that school counselors see other counseling duties as more important than collaboration and partnerships. What’s more school counselors revealed feeling more uncomfortable
working with LDF than with linguistically diverse students, since they believe working with LDF requires cross-cultural understanding of the family dynamics (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Such challenges highlight the importance of SFC partnerships for school counselors, meeting the needs of LDF and students.

Performing an active role in facilitating SFC partnership is congruent with the counselors’ multifaceted role with students; teachers and administrators; and parents and community members in removing the barriers for learning, advocating for all students and helping to uncover access and equity issues. Due to changing demographics in American schools, SFC partnership is a crucial topic of interest, debate, and research to meet the needs of all (i.e., minority and majority) students (Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001). Reaching out to diverse families has become even more important since accountability policies are implemented at a greater degree and schools are being held responsible to provide high quality education for all children (Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001). That is consistent with ASCA National Model approach in shifting school counseling program activities from individuals to a more systemic perspective.

Definition of Terms

*Linguistically diverse* refers to those students and families who speak languages other than English. Linguistically Diverse students are also classified as English Language Learners (ELL). For the purposes of this study, the following definition will be used to identify a Linguistically Diverse student. According to the U.S Department of Education (2007), Linguistically Diverse refers to students who are either non-English-proficient or limited-English-proficient. A linguistically diverse student is “(a) 3 to 21 years of age, (b) enrolled or preparing to enroll in elementary or secondary school, (c) either not born in the United States or have a native language other than English, and (d) owing to difficulty in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding English, not able to meet the State’s proficient level of achievement to successfully achieve in English-only
classrooms or not able to participate fully in society” (p. 2). This term ELL is generally favored over limited-English-proficient (LEP) because it focuses on achievements rather than deficits (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

*Limited English proficient* or sometime referred as *non-English-proficient* used interchangeably with ELL and refers to students whose second language is English and perform below their grade level in reading and writing English (NCLB, 2001).

*Language proficiency* refers to students’ knowledge, ability and skill over the use of language, which include the measurement of expressive and receptive language skills.

*School, family, and community partnerships* are defined as collaborative partnerships with school personnel, parents, families, community members and other community organizations to promote equity and access opportunities and rigorous educational experiences to address academic, personal/social and career development needs for all students both at home, in school and in the community (Epstein, 1995).

*Parental or family involvement* refers to as a set of “group-defining actions, beliefs, and attitudes that serve as an operational factor in defining categorical differences among children from different racial-ethnic and socio economic backgrounds” (Desimone, 1999, p. 11). Moreover, parental involvement refers to various forms of participation in education and with the school. Recent definitions replace “parent” with “family,” since the important adults in many children’s lives may be siblings, relatives, or other adult caregivers (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001; Davies, 1991). NCLB Act (2001) defines parental involvement as regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student learning experience through ensuring (a) parents play a vital role in their children’s learning; (b) active parental involvement at school; and (c) parents are full partners in education (e.g., involve in leadership).

*School counselor* is a licensed professional (i.e., known as guidance counselors in the past) whose roles and functions involves assisting each student improve in academic, personal and social development, and career planning areas (ASCA, 2008). For the
purpose of the study, school counselors are considered members of American School Counseling Association (ASCA), which is a division of the American Counseling Association, is a nationwide professional organization for school counselors that promote professionalism and ethical practices (ASCA, 2008).

*Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Program* refers to a school counseling program that is comprehensive in scope, preventive in design, and developmental in nature (ASCA, 2005). These programs strive to (a) serve all students and their parents/guardians, (b) achieve desired student competencies, (c) offer extensive programs (e.g., counseling, consultation, coordination, and classroom and large group guidance), and (d) provide remediation and prevention (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000).

**Summary**

This study will examine factors that predict school counselor involvement in partnerships and school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF using the SCIPS. In Chapter I, the researcher provided a brief introduction to study. Later, statement of the problem, significance of the study, and research questions are presented. In the end of the chapter, terms and concepts relevant to the study are defined.

Because of the increasing numbers of LDS, many schools face the challenge of building SFC partnerships with LDF. Facing increased accountability standards in public education and being confronted with the challenge to build effective partnerships with LDF, school counselors are under pressure to raise the achievement of LDS. Due to their central position to be advocate and help these students and families negotiate the system, a study examining school counselor involvement in SFC partnership with LDF is needed.
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

In Chapter I, the researcher provided a brief introduction to the study. In Chapter II, the existing literature on school counselors’ work with linguistically diverse families (LDF) in relation to school, family, and community (SFC) partnerships will be presented. This study will examine factors that predict school counselor involvement in partnerships and school counselor perceptions about partnerships with LDF using The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS) revised by Bryan and Griffin (2010). The acronym, LDS, refers to linguistically diverse students.

Experience of Linguistically Diverse Students in Education

The number of English Language Learners (ELLs) in the public school system is rising fast; the number of ELL students in the last 15 years almost increased twice as much —to about 5 million. Linguistically diverse students (LDS) refer to those who speak languages other than English. LDS are also classified as English Language Learners (ELL). It is projected that by 2015, ELL enrollment in U.S. public schools will rise up to 10 million by 2025, making one in every four students in the public school system an ELL student (NCELA, 2007). For the academic year of 2008 - 2009, total number of students enrolled in K-12 schools was 57.4 million and among those 5 million were LDS (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

There are many challenges that LDS face in the educational system. Due to their diverse backgrounds, LDS present multifaceted issues in the K-12 classrooms. Meeting the learning needs of LDS is an enormous responsibility that requires coordination and collaboration in the entire educational system. Similarly, there are many issues teachers experience related to LDS. Teachers often lack clinical and evidence-based knowledge and the necessary resources and strategies to support, teach, and evaluate these students, regardless of their citizenship, birthplace, and generation status in K-12 schools. While
meeting the learning needs of LDS requires the coordination and collaboration within the educational system (Van Roekel, 2008), communication is a pressing issue among students, teachers, and parents, according to a survey with California ELL teachers in 2004. These teachers noted a lack of adequate tools, or appropriate assessments to diagnose or measure LDS’ learning. They recognized that good professional development is among their highest needs and expressed frustration due to meager professional development or in-service training on how to teach LDS who come from a wide range of language proficiency and academic levels (Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005). Training programs have a duty to prepare teachers to work effectively with LDS who come from differing language proficiencies and academic levels.

In the court case, Williams versus the State of California argued that California provides poor children with a fundamentally inequitable education as compared to students based on wealth and language status. The California has the largest population of LDS (nearly 1.6 million in 2003), corresponding to 40% of nation’s LDS. In order to prepare background to that case, Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly and Callahan, (2003) reviewed the conditions of schooling for LDS in California. Zehler et al. (2003) studied how socioeconomic status affected LDS; the results of the study indicate that more than 75% of LDS are poor based on the criteria used for FRPL status. Knowing that 75-79% LDS are Spanish-speaking Latinos and 80% of LDS live in households where no one older than 14 speaks English (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008, p. 17), calls attention of the range of barriers that LDS face, which affect their school success.

There are seven aspects that LDS received poorer schooling compared to their English-speaking peers. LDS are “assigned to less qualified teachers, are provided with inferior curriculum and less time to cover it, are housed in inferior facilities where they are often segregated from English speaking peers, and are assessed by invalid instruments that provide little, if any, information about their actual achievement” (Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly and Callahan, 2003; p. 2). Christenson and Sheridan (2001)
asserted that many teachers often tend to label parents for what they fail to do as identified by the school agenda rather than realize what they do to support their children.

How long it takes to develop academic English proficiency is a question that affects the experience of LDS in the education system. Research supports the notion that it takes 5 to 7 years to develop academic proficiency in a second language (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). Some found that it takes 5 or more years to fully develop academic proficiency, while oral proficiency takes 3 to 5 years to develop in districts with successful ELL programs (e.g., Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). Additionally, it takes 4 to 10 years to reach the same grade equivalency level with peers in the areas of reading in English (Thomas & Collier, 1997). By grade 3, listening skills in English could be up to 80%, while reading and writing may lag behind (Gándara, 1999). A high school student needs to know 50,000 words; on the other hand, an average student annually learns approximately 3,000 new vocabulary words (Graves, 2006). An LDS might have acquired 12,000 to 15,000 words in their four year high school career, fewer than what is typically achieved in high school (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007). Lack of new terminology may result in academic consequences.

Research evidence supports the critical role of native language in the progress of academic English (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). Knowing the evidence about the role of LDS’ first language and the development of academic English, it is a concern that these students are not being educated according to accepted theories and current research paradigms, which adds to the challenges that LDS’ experience. Further challenges arise due to the differences among lawmakers and educators. The differences among lawmakers about the educational goals for LDS generate debates on how to assess these students (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). Education for LDS generally focuses on acquiring a proficiency in the English language, but not on the content knowledge (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). If content knowledge were a concern, LDS would be assessed in their first language (Houser, 1995) and education would focus on the content
knowledge. On the other hand, it is important for all LDS to be included in all assessments. Two main issues are important equity concerns related to the assessment of LDS: (1) separating academic and content language proficiency and (2) the validity of the tests given to LDS (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008).

Providing fair assessment to LDS is a matter of equity (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). One of the key issues surrounding fairness that LDS experience in education is centered on remains how these students are assessed (i.e., related to national and state’s mandates). While teachers may use assessment strategies developed to measure curriculum content, large-scale fair assessments needs to be developed for LDS (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi). Literature documents the effect of high-stakes testing in English for LDS. It is known how high-stakes testing in Texas has been harmful for Latinos (Valenzuela, 2005). Due to their test results, LDS experience increased rate of remedial instruction, assignment to lower curriculum tracks, dropout rates, lower graduation rates, and uneven referrals to special education (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002).

Altogether separate issue related to educating these students is their exclusion from gifted and Advanced Placement programs (Hopstock & Stephenson, 2003). The percentage of students from diverse background in gifted and talented programs is below their percentage composition represented by the total enrollment statistics. According to a 2000 survey conducted by the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education, only 1.4% of LDS attend gifted and talented programs nationwide, compared with 6.4% of those proficient in the English language and enrolled in the gifted and talented program. While 3.2% of the high school students registered in Advanced Placement (AP) mathematics and science, only 0.8% of LDS are enrolled in AP science and 1.0% in AP math. LDS are often excluded from “gifted and talented” and/or AP programs (Hopstock & Stephenson, 2003). The disproportionate under representation of LDS in gifted and talented programs is reinforced by cross-cultural misconceptions, testing bias and high number teacher referrals (Ford, More & James, 2004).
Access to educational resources and materials is another source of concern for LDS. There is a correlation between instructional resources and a student’s academic success (Oakes & Saunders, 2002). While it is necessary that LDS have developmentally appropriate resources to learn English, they often do not have access to them. In one study, teachers with high percentages of LDS reported having limited textbooks and instructional materials, as well as limited access to technology (Gándara et al., 2003). Although Title III of NCLB requires that states align their English language proficiency standards with the state curriculum instruction’s standards, this alignment is poor when compared to students proficient in the English language (Hopstock & Stephenson, 2003).

Since access to school facilities that promotes learning for LDS is limited, it creates barriers for learning and school success. Research indicates that classrooms LDS use are often located in the basement or in makeshift buildings adjacent to the school (Olsen, 1997). Moreover, LDS tend to attend schools with poor hygiene standards. In a 2002 survey of 1,017 California teachers, almost half of the teachers in schools with high numbers of LDS, stated that their school bathrooms are unsanitary, compared to 26% of teachers with little or none LDS in their schools (Gándara et al., 2003). LDS seem to attend schools, which are devoid of resources, indicating the isolation and segregation they experience within the public educational system (Orfield, 2001).

Other challenges arise due to the competency issues related to the educational staff. The quality of teacher and principal is a criterion that defines the school’s effectiveness and the student’s success (Clewell & Campbell, 2004). As the numbers of ELL students increase, the shortage of qualified teachers has been amplified (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). Teachers with high numbers of LDS in their schools have generally fewer credentials than those with few or no LDS in their schools (De Cohen et al., 2005). More than 50% of teachers in schools with a high number of LDS have full certification, compared to 80% of teachers in schools with few or no LDS (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). The 2006 GAP report shows that states have much difficulty
in finding qualified personnel to teach LDS. For example, in California, less experienced teachers are often employed in schools that have the greatest number of diverse students (Gándara et al., 2003). In 2002, 25% of LDS teachers in California did not have full certification (Rumberger, 2002). Not only do schools with very high numbers of LDS experience more difficulties filling teaching positions, they also tend to employ unqualified teachers and depend on substitute teachers (De Cohen et al., 2005). In the past five years, more than 40% of ELL teachers stated that they participated in only one in-service workshop that focused on teaching LDS (Maxwell-Jolly, Gándara, & Méndez Benavídez, 2006). While in 1986 there was one bilingual teacher to every 70 LDS, in 1996, there was only one for every 98 LDS in California, showing the lack of school professionals to assist LDS (Gándara et al., 2003). Only less than 8% of the school psychologists were bilingual to conduct assessment in a LDS’s native language in California (Gándara et al., 2003). The shortage of bilingual school staff is perceived as a barrier to communication, making parents to feel left out from their children’s school experience (Chavkin & Gonzalez, 1995).

Likewise, there are very few bilingual school counselors. Paredes (2010) stressed the role that language serves as a barrier for monolingual school counselors working with LDS and called attention to recent efforts targeting bilingual individuals, with school counseling programs offering specializations and certifications in bilingual school counseling (e.g., Brooklyn College, St. John's University, Mercy College, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture). Knowing that the majority of school counselors are monolingual, there is an apparent need for bilingual school counselors. In meeting LDS’s counseling needs due to their language proficiency in LDS’s first language, training for school counselors fall short (Paredes). Concurrently, second language learning should be promoted. Feelings and thoughts are expressed more precisely and meaningfully in the first language, even though LDS may have adequate English language proficiency skills to communicate with their school counselors (Acevedo, Reyes, Annett, & Lopez, 2003;

In schools, where large numbers of LDS attend, although there may be more teaching assistants, LDS have far fewer opportunities to interact with English speaking adults, as their parents and other adults tend to spend less time in their classrooms (Gándara et al., 2003). Though parental involvement has been identified as an important factor advancing education, the strengths LDF possess are rarely integrated in classes, isolating them from the school community (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008). Involving parents and communities in LDS’s education is an essential message of NCLB. When school personnel and family members work together, it can accelerate their learning (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi). Research shows that SFC partnerships lead to increased school attendance, higher achievement, positive attitudes toward learning, and higher graduation rates. Children who come from diverse family backgrounds benefit the most from SFC partnerships (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Hidalgo, Siu, & Epstein, 2004; Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001).

In an earlier study, Jeynes (2003) emphasized a link between student achievement and minority’ families involvement using meta-analysis of 20 studies, particularly “to determine the impact of parental involvement on the academic achievement of minority children” (p. 202). Regardless of children’s ethnic and racial background, parental involvement has a significantly positive impact on academic outcome (Jeynes, 2003). Parental involvement had a significant positive impact on children across race and across academic outcome (Jeynes, 2003). While conclusions indicated that African American, Asian American, and Latino families’ involvement had a significant impact on academic achievement, there were variations between populations based on the measure used for academic achievement and how specific parent involvement activity measured.

Another meta-analysis with 41 studies conducted by Jeynes (2005) related to urban elementary students’ school achievement demonstrates a significant link between
parental involvement and academic achievement. Findings indicated a significant relationship between parental involvement and students’ academic achievement. Analyses revealed “the effect sizes for parental involvement overall and subcategories of involvement”. Parental involvement was related to all of the academic variables “by about 0.7 to 0.75 of a standard deviation unit” both for students’ from diverse backgrounds and White students, regardless of their gender. (Jeynes, 2005, p. 237).

A meta-analysis with 52 studies indicates positive effects for secondary school students in urban school setting (Jeynes, 2007). Using four measures of educational outcomes, statistical analyses examined the general influence of parental involvement also specific characteristics of parental involvement. These measures of academic outcome include overall academic achievement combined (i.e., includes all component of academic achievement), grades, standardized test scores, and teacher rating scales and other documents related to academic attitudes and behaviors. Meta analyses examined the effect parental involvement differed by race and socioeconomic status. The results revealed the parental involvement was significant; it “affects all the academic variables under study by about .5 to .55 of a standard deviation unit” (Jeynes, 2007, p. 82).

The National Research Council identified 13 factors that are common in effective schools supporting LDS school achievement. Schools that promote achievement use a) a supportive but stimulating school climate; b) a solid instructional governance; c) a learning atmosphere that is geared to meet each student’s educational needs; d) clearly communicated, planned, and coordinated programs and practices; e) an approach that uses LDS’ native language and values their cultures; f) a balanced curriculum that integrates both basic and higher-order skills; g) instruction in basic skills and learning strategies; h) opportunities for activities directed by students; i) strategies that improve understanding; j) opportunities for practice of what is learned; k) student assessments for instructional decision making; l) high level staff development; and m) family involvement programs (August & Hakuta, 1997). The following school factors seem
very beneficial to LDS: a) school-wide commitment to LDS’s success; b) regular and adequate language support throughout K-12; c) an increased number of educators; and d) a match between resources and community (Center for Public Education, 2007).

**Experience of Linguistically Diverse Students in Counseling**

Linguistically diverse students (LDS) across the nation “…face dilemmas stemming from racial, ethnic, linguistic, and religious discrimination; language barriers and stereotyping” (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004, p. 15). Discrepancies between LDS’ cultures, values and the school system may cause disengagement in school and dropping out of the school. They may experience academic issues due to language barriers and lack of access to academic preparation in their home language (Schwallie-Giddis et al.). In addition to language acquisition, many LDS face other concerns, such as posttraumatic stress disorder, racial labeling and categorizing, different learning styles, inadequate social support networks, and lack of social acceptance (Williams & Butler, 2003).

There are individual challenges that LDS experience relevant to school counseling. Immigration itself may be a very stressful process. LDS are stripped away from their close friends, extended family and community members, where they find themselves thrown in a new social environment with a different culture, school system, and language (Orazco, Onaga, & de Lardemelle 2010). Initially, immigrants often experience an intense sense of loss, confusion and upheaval (Suárez-Orozco, 2000) and this process has a long lasting impact on LDS’s development (Orazco, Onaga, & de Lardemelle 2010). Learning new social and cultural expectations may provoke anxiety and acculturative stress (Garcia-Coll & Magnuson, 1997). Moreover, LDS encounter new approaches to schooling, frequently different from what they knew in their country.

LDS may experience challenges due to differences in the education systems (i.e., differences in behavioral, teaching and learning-related expectations). LDS may be
unable to recognize differences in teachers’ expectations in class (e.g., active participation), differences in learning styles (e.g., deviation from rote memorization) or differences in the role perception of the instructor, which may create confusion and anxiety (Suárez-Orozco, 2000). While many cultures view student reticence as a sign of respect in America, student quietness may be perceived as a lack of knowledge and motivation (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Regarding their perceptions the purpose of schooling or desired student behaviors, there may be differences among different culture. DS are expected to be accustomed with the educational culture in America related to their educational goals and desired student behaviors (Orazco, Onaga, & de Lardemelle).

Further, different approaches to education affect both LDS and their families, which may require reevaluations of their expectations. For example, in many Latin American and Asian cultures, there is an extensive respect and trust in teachers involving all issues regarding education. In American culture, however, this approach may be viewed as passive and may be perceived as parents’ unwillingness to be involved in their children’s education (Valdés, 1998). How LDF are involved in their children’s education may be different than mainstream American families. Such practices should be respected and capitalized when planning SFC partnerships programs. Researchers (e.g., Espinosa, 1995) found that LDF may be very involved in their children’s education, but may choose not to participate in their schooling in ways expected by school personnel. Many LDF want their children to succeed in school; and for some, the reason for immigration is to provide better education opportunities for their children (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). LDF may have differences in their beliefs about the factors that create a successful student (e.g., traditional values regarding gender-appropriate educational attainment or vocational pursuits), which may be in conflict with mainstream American cultural norms. Counselors must identify new ways of partnerships with LDF who respect their culture.

There are challenges related to learning a second language. Besides academics, many LDS are required to learn English. It takes 4 to 7 years of instructional exposure to
academic second-language for LDS to gain adequate language skills to do well academically (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000). Before they gain enough competence in English, LDS are required to engage in formal schooling like their native English speaking peers (Orazco, Onaga, & de Lardemelle 2010). While mastering the language skills is a must for LDS, they neither have the adequate ability to participate in regular classroom activities nor the necessary exposure to mainstream American culture and communication style. LDS tend to read more slowly and may find their teachers and peers speaking rapidly. Due to the difficulty to follow, they miss out on not only literal, but also implied meanings of lectures’ content and class communication. Such issues present obstacles for their academic engagement. For example, LDS tend to score lower on “objective” assessments (Solano-Flores, 2008).

There are other challenges that LDS experience, which are influenced by number of factors related to immigration. Mainly, immigration tends to have a destabilizing effect on the family (Sluzki, 1979). While LDS are required to embrace traditional roles in their family, at the same time, they are faced with a task to adjust to new setting. A “generation gap” between parent and child may be more obvious and disturbing in immigrant families, since the conflict between the “new” and “old” cultures may be stronger (Orazco, Onaga, & de Lardemelle 2010, p. 17). While LDF desire LDS’ acculturation to mainstream American culture, they may not approve of adjusting to the new culture, which can create conflict with their traditional values. Their work schedule may be inconvenient to cultivate family time with their partner and LDS (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Parents react to these stresses in a few different ways. Parents can be anxious or depressed about their personal and psychological unavailability (Ahearn & Athey, 1991). By the intrusion of new cultural values and behaviors of their LDS, parents may feel threatened; in turn, they may attempt to “tighten the reins” and became strict disciplinarians (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 17).
LDS experience other challenges due to shifts in family dynamics. Compared to their parents, LDS are able to acculturate and develop language skills more rapidly. Due to their limited language skills in English, LDF may give up their power in certain areas and force LDS to be their translators and cultural brokers, which may be a stressful role for them (Orellana-Faulstich, 2009). Such arrangements may alter the family dynamics and affect previously defined traditional family roles. While being the translator and cultural broker for the family may be an empowering experience, it could shake the dynamics and threaten family cohesion. LDS may feel depressed and isolated, exploring alternative family structures (e.g., gangs) (Vigil, 2002), which create barriers to their adjustment to school culture, overall well-being, and academic success (Orazco, Onaga, & de Lardemelle 2010). Being separated from their parents changes and challenges their family dynamics as parents prepare a new life (e.g., housing, employment) in the host country (Suárez-Orozco, Todorova & Louie, 2002). Often, when parents first leave their country of origin, their children are cared for by extended family; thus, they experience at least two forms of separations, one from their parents and then from their caretakers (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002). These separations from parents and extended family members may generate a range of emotional issues and interpersonal challenges that may affect academic performance (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2002; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008).

Due to the increasing diversity in U.S. schools, mainstream classroom teachers have more LDS. New legislative changes (e.g., Proposition 227 in California) encourage restricting LDS’ time spent in an ESL classroom. Such practices increase the need for extensive language accommodations for LDS, as these students are forced to enter into mainstream classrooms earlier than their language acquisition level (Pappamihiel, 2002). When LDS enter classrooms with limited language skills, they tend to be nervous, which increases the likelihood of experiencing anxiety with English language. Dealing with such apprehension may affect the learning process of LDF, similar to those students’ experiences in the foreign language classrooms (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990).
Pappamihiel (2002) examined English language anxiety in two settings: English as a second language (ESL) and mainstream classrooms with 178 middle-school Mexican students. The researcher gave participants the English Language Anxiety Scale. Data using three statistical tests were analyzed: paired t-tests (i.e., to analyze broad levels of anxiety between ESL and mainstream classes); ANCOVAs (i.e., to identify how anxiety level correlated with the factors such as years spent in the U.S., academic achievement level, listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, and gender); and an exploratory factor analysis (i.e., to identify other factors predicting anxiety) (Pappamihiel, 2002).

Pappamihiel’s (2002) study may have implications for school practitioners. Results suggest that English language anxiety is a complex multidimensional phenomenon. Findings indicated that several types of English language anxiety with a significant gender difference shed light on the complexity of anxiety. Most importantly, English language anxiety affects LDS, socially and academically. Depending on the contextual factors, LDS may experience a different level of anxiety, requiring a different range of coping strategies. LDS often experience difficulties transitioning from ESL to regular classrooms. This may be due to being placed in the mainstream classrooms before they have enough academic proficiency skills to accommodate the academic demands of the typical classroom. While LDS may not experience anxiety-provoking feelings and apprehension in the ESL classroom, they may experience high levels of English language anxiety in the mainstream classroom because of the challenges to their language skills. This experience is due to academic incompetence and lack of self-efficacy in listening, speaking, writing and engaging in discussions and conversations (Pappamihiel, 2002) which may also generate self-esteem issues.

In addition to academic challenges, LDS may experience emotional issues. Interventions strategies should be considered to address these issues. Findings indicated significant gender differences. For example, female students who adjusted well socially in their ESL classes, tended to distance themselves from engaging in social interactions in
the mainstream classrooms. This reservation can be harmful for these female students because it creates barrier to develop and utilize coping strategies with their peers. In mainstream classrooms, in addition to the cycle of English language anxiety, female students’ self-efficacy is threatened even more, minimizing their coping opportunities. Thus, it is imperative that mainstream classroom teachers are aware of these students’ emotional anxiety level and English language anxiety; how to both reduce and manage it to overcome the academic challenges that they experience (Pappamihiel, 2002).

**Partnership and the NCLB Act**

Parental involvement is an essential element for the success of students and high achieving schools recognize this fact. The NCLB Act (2001) was developed to make sure that all children, regardless of their race, ethnicity and disability, or spoken language, have equal opportunity to receive a high-quality education. Federal legislation promoted partnerships as a way to increase parental involvement for children’s social, emotional, and academic well-being. Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Improving America’s Schools Act (1994) and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act (1994) promoted parental involvement (Epstein & Hollifield, 1996). These laws outlined guidelines, acknowledging the effect of parental involvement research and practice.

Parental Involvement as defined by NCLB Act of 2001 refers to a two-way and meaningful communication in student learning and school activities, through a) ensuring parents fundamental role in their child’s education; b) encouraging parents to actively involved in their child’s education at school; and c) making sure that parents are full partners in their child’s education. Parents are included in decision-making and on advisory committees to support their child’s education. The NCLB Act (2001) has shown the importance that the federal government placed on parental involvement.

Furthermore, the NCLB Act (2001) requires school districts to communicate in a language that is easy for parents to understand. Schools must move from traditional one-
way (e.g., using mass communication methods) to more interactive ways of communication in order to achieve higher levels of parental involvement (Barnett, 1995; Blackerby, 2004; NCLB 2001). Being skilled at interpersonal communication is essential to increase parental involvement (Rogers & Wright, 2008). Both schools and parents must attempt to utilize all available modes of communication (Morris, 2009). When parents with limited English proficiency are unable to understand the language of the school, it is a major obstacle for communication (Antunez, 2000). Thus, schools should be accountable to all stakeholders, such as families who need assistance accessing school systems and educational materials due to language barrier (Abedi & Dietel, 2004).

Using Epstein’s Framework of Parent Involvement, a study by Morris (2009) examined 540 Oklahoma public schools superintendents or their designees’ perceptions of NCLB (2001) with mixed methodology. The quantitative part of the study involved completing a survey instrument, resulting 167 usable surveys of superintendents or designees (i.e., 31% response rate). While only 26% (44) of the participants revealed providing communication in languages other than English, other 71% (120) of them did not provide offer such services (Morris, 2009). Results revealed that despite the parental involvement legislation and policies, there are differences in terms of parental involvement programs across school districts.

Parental involvement elements of The NCLB Act (2001) were examined in 2006 by a consortium of 16 state and local organizations, in 18 school districts in six states by Appleseed Foundation and the report called “It Takes a Parent.” Research outcome and interviews with educational leaders, and 24 parent focus groups, revealed three conclusions. First, school districts and schools had not completely incorporated parental involvement as a main student achievement strategy despite the support of the federal mandates and parental involvement research. Appleseed Foundation (2006) suggested that this lack of extensive parental involvement in schools were due to several causes: a) Not having clear assessments to measure effective parental involvement policies and
programs; b) Limited awareness and training on involving parents; and c) More emphasis to meet the NCLB’s accountability components (e.g., testing and teacher quality), rather than parental involvement (Appleseed Foundation, 2006). Second, parental involvement mandates was not fully understood, supported, and implemented; the report suggested that state, district, and school leaders work to implement the laws. Third, the report revealed important information related to parental involvement practices: a) many parents did not receive information, which was communicated clearly, and in a timely manner about their children and the schools; b) poverty, language, and cultural differences create obstacles to parental involvement; and c) parental involvement is not a regular practice by school leaders to ensure accountability (Appleseed Foundation, 2006).

**Partnership and the ASCA National Model**

To strengthen a Comprehensive School Counseling Program, school counselors can express their commitment in school, family, and community partnerships with students and families from diverse background in their mission statement and other documents. The ASCA National Model consists of four components: foundation, delivery, management and accountability. The foundation component includes mission and philosophy; thus, the school’s mission statement should be reviewed and revised; thus, it is congruent with the Comprehensive School Counseling Program focus. The philosophy section includes the importance of commitment in SFC partnerships with families from diverse background to support student needs in academic, personal/social, and career competencies. Based on the core beliefs and mission statement identified in the foundation, delivery systems (e.g., guidance curriculum, individual planning, and responsive services) must reflect conceptually how school counselors’ commitment in SFC partnerships with families from diverse background families will look like regarding the activities, interactions and methods necessary to deliver the program.
The ASCA National Model (2003, 2005) integrated Gysbers and Henderson's (1994) advice: "Demonstrating accountability ... helps ensure that students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the general public will continue to benefit from quality comprehensive guidance programs" (p. 362). Therefore, the efficacy of Comprehensive School Counseling Program should be reviewed regularly to ensure improvement of services provided for students and families. To identify needs and concerns for this purpose and guide program modifications, Comprehensive School Counseling Program leaders must conduct needs assessment with stakeholders (i.e., students, families, teaching staff, and administrators) (Sink, 2009). If school counselors want to be effective leaders and advocates in their work with students and families “… school counselors must be ardent consumers of best-practices evidence, consistent about evaluating results of what they do, and sincere participants in the creation and distribution of those outcomes to districts and to policymakers” (Sink, 2009, p. 72).

Wood and Winston (2007) use the concept of “leader accountability” and defines it by three characteristics: a) willingness to take responsibilities pertinent to the leadership position in order to serve the welfare of the program; b) acknowledgement of leaders’ role being publicly linked to their actions, reactions, statements and expressions; and c) anticipation that the leader may be expected to answer questions, explain issues, choices, behaviors, belief and principals (Wood & Winston, 2007, p. 167-168). Leaders who value accountability share stronger personal ownership related to their organizational commitments (Wood & Winston, 2007). Regarding management and accountability components, school counselors are pivotal to fostering collaboration and partnership with school educators, administrators, families, community members and related advisory groups. Stakeholder collaboration is essential for culturally sensitive services to be effective in promoting student developmental outcomes. School counselors’ work with LDF in SFC partnerships must be results-driven such that this work should ensure that all families and students' needs are met. As such, school
counselors are in a strong position to assess their school and school community and they offer data to support the use of SFC partnerships with LDF to promote student success.

**Historical Events Defining School Counselors’ Role**

A new vision of school counseling practice is emerging in America. Recent shifts in the school counselor’s role require counselors to consider the racial and ethnic diversity in the schools and the challenges that these students’ experience (Bemak & Chung, 2002, 2005, 2007). This new outlook encourages school counselors to give up their roles as substitute teachers; registration, scheduling, and administrative assistants; tests coordinators and administrators; and individual educational plans preparers, and to embrace their roles as educational leaders, social advocates, prevention specialists, counselors, collaborators, consultants, interpreters of student records and test results, and evidence-based practitioners (American School Counseling Association, 2004). Therefore, it is critical to examine the role of school counselors in working with parents, families, and community as collaborators and consultants (Davis, 2005).

Historically, there were three major initiatives that affected the school counseling profession and school counselor role significantly: (a) *Transforming School Counseling Initiative* (TSCI; Education Trust, 2003), (b) *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (NCLB; U.S. Department of Education, 2002), and (c) *National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* by American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2005; Bowers & Hatch, 2002). The primary objective of TSCI was to redefine the school counselors’ role in the 21st century. The purpose of TSCI (2003) was to collaborate both with higher education institutions and with school districts at a national level in reforming the school counselors’ roles to support the mission of schools and to improve educational outcomes for all students. TSCI focused on redefining school counselors’ academic training and implementation of comprehensive school counseling programs. Although the goal was to include the traditional roles such as counseling, coordination, classroom guidance, and
consultation, these roles were encompassed within the new roles—systemic change, advocacy, leadership, teaming and collaboration, and assessment and use of data. The need for systemic change was the emphasis of the TSCI focused on providing nationwide training information to counselor training programs and school districts to unite the profession and transform the counselors’ role (Davis, 2005). Knowing that school counseling as a profession did not exist in the beginning of the 20th century; the mission of the profession in 2000s remains similar to the mission in 1900s in supporting the academic achievement of all students in preparing them for the 21st century.

TSCI also offered linkages, from school counselors’ role to the No Child Left Behind legislation, to current educational reforms movement (Davis, 2005). No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001) mandated that educators provide parents with information, which in turn helps parents to be comfortable in schools and seek information about their children’s educational experience. Effective school programs embrace a philosophy of partnership and view children’s educational development as a collaborative endeavor among parents, school staff, and community members (SEDL, 2002). NCLB commands involvement of the parents of every student in the legislation and defines parental involvement in Section 9101 (32) as “the participation of parents in regular, two-way and meaningful communications involving student academic learning and other school activities. One of the purposes of Title III of NCLB is “to promote parental and community participation in language instruction educational programs for the parents and communities of limited English proficient children” (Sec. 3102 (6)). As defined in Section 9101 (31), one way to help parents, legal guardians or other individuals in a status of “loco parentis” [i.e., a legally responsible person for the child’s welfare or a grandparent, stepparent, or a close relative with whom the child resides] understand their role in the education of their children is to provide them with a copy of the Declaration of Rights for Parents of English Language Learners (ELL) Under No Child Left Behind.
School counseling training programs have conflicting and varied theoretical perspectives and opinions about the school counselors’ role, function, purpose and focus (Borders, 2002; Whiston, 2002). When ASCA published *Sharing the Vision: The National Standards for School Counseling Programs in 1997* (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), the intention was to develop a conscious effort to participate in the national reform agenda. ASCA held a national summit to create a *National Model for School Counseling Programs* to create the vision, to address historical concerns and current challenges, and to assist counselor educators and school counselors for the school counseling programs and the professions’ future (Bowers & Hatch, 2002). *The National Model* was written to represent all-encompassing programs (i.e., program foundation, delivery, management and accountability). The model offered a systematic method by which school counseling programs design, coordinate, apply, manage, and assess students’ success. It provided a framework for the program components, the school counselor’s role in application and the foundational philosophies of leadership, advocacy and systematic transformation which allowed switching focus from service-centered for some of the students to program-centered for all of the students. In this sense, school counselors serve as change agents, collaborators and advocates and to implement the model, they must be skilled in examining the school data, advancing student improvement continuously, and ensuring educational equity for all students (Bowers & Hatch).

The National Model paradigm is similar to the Comprehensive Developmental Guidance Program (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000) movement that started in the 1970s and promoted the integrated role of the school counselors in the school system which highlighted that school counseling programs should be comprehensive, collaborative, and developmental (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Myrick, 2003; Paisley, 2001; Paisley & Hubbard, 1994). Such wide ranging programs strive to (a) serve all students and their parents/guardians, (b) achieve desired student competencies, (c) offer wide-ranging programs (e.g., counseling, consultation, coordination, and classroom and large group
guidance), and (d) provide remediation and prevention (Gysbers & Henderson, 2000). Similar to the systemic perspective that draws upon both general systems and ecological theories; comprehensive programs operate from a multi-systemic origin to guidance and counseling. For example, when promoting behavioral change in students, school counselors need to be attentive to the existing interrelated subsystems (e.g., family, peer group, the school, and the community) and their influence on students’ lives (Keys & Bemak, 1997; Keys, Bemak, & Lockhart, 1998; Keys & Lockhart, 1999).

The key objective of the Education Trust is to create a more prominent role for school counselors in the academic development of all students, specifically relating to the long-standing achievement gap between diverse and economically poor students and their White middle-class peers (Education Trust, 1997). In addition, regarding the national standards for school counseling programs, ASCA has recommended that school counselors act as leaders to identify the issues that need to change in the school and help develop strategies for the benefit of every student (ASCA, 2003) (Colbert, Vernon-Jones, & Pransky, 2006). In response to these issues, Colbert and Magouirk (2003) presented a new counselor education research and training model that is consistent with the new vision presented by CACREP (2001). The objective of this model is to guide counselor educators in the development of research, training, and practice for school counselors in facilitating culture-centered education reform. Colbert and Magouirk defined culture-centered education reform as school change efforts, which “…attempt to target all students, inclusively; to ensure the extension of educational advantages which have traditionally been available primarily to middle and upper class White students” (p. 4).

The emphasis of all of these initiatives, TSCI, NCLB, and the National Model, was the need for systemic change in the education system. One area that still needs close attention is the role of school counselors in working with parents, families, and community as collaborators and as consultants. To accomplish their goals, school counselors do not work in isolation; instead, they are professionals, integral to the total
educational program. Parents and community agencies are significant elements of the educational systems, thus, they play a central role in promoting needed changes.

**School Counselors’ Role with Linguistically Diverse Families**

Research consistently indicates how family involvement is an influential factor on students’ success in school (Burkhardt, 2004; Downs, 2001; Epstein, 2004). When families are involved in their children’s education, students’ school attendance is more regular; grades and test scores are higher; and homework is more complete. Additionally, these students have positive attitudes and behaviors, higher graduation rates, bigger dreams, and enroll in college more compared to students with less involved families (Deslandes & Bertrand, 2005). Most influential predictor of school achievement is not socioeconomic status, but family involvement (Hawes & Plourde, 2005).

In order for schools and families to work together as collaborative partners, schools must offer opportunities to increase families’ involvement in their students’ education. If schools were to develop effective partnership programs with families, all school personnel (i.e., teachers, administrators, school counselors) must work together to enhance a school atmosphere that welcomes families (Davis & Lambie, 2005). To development these collaborative partnerships, school personnel need to extend their services by offering families necessary information and support so that they can involve in their children’ education (Davis & Lambie, 2005).

Schools with established successful partnerships with families tend to approach students’ academic, career, and personal/social development as a collective effort among all stakeholders—for instance, families, administrators, teachers, school counselors, and the community (ASCA, 2003, 2005). Congruent with the recent movements in school counseling, school professionals capitalize how to promote family involvement in students’ learning. The ASCA National Model (2003, 2005) advocates that school
counselors not only collaborate with families, but also with other stakeholders to support students’ school achievement (ASCA, 2004, p. 1). When working with families and school personnel, school counselors should assume a leadership role in planning and implementing a comprehensive school counseling program that engages all stakeholders proactively (i.e., to collaborate and coordinate programs) to promote students’ academic, career, and personal/social development (Davis & Lambie, 2005). Counseling, consultation, and coordination used to refer integral functions of the school counselor (ASCA, 2003, 2005). Thus, working closely with families to build SFC partnership is a central component of school counselors’ role to promote all students’ success in school.

Schwallie-Giddis, et al. (2004) conducted a series of seven interventions over a 9-month period. Using a qualitative study on issues related to the professional development needs of 35 school counselors were assessed about meeting the counseling needs of LDS. Each intervention included a didactic professional development component, which involved both a processing and interaction component. While the trainees felt more multiculturally skilled, they did not report feeling completely multiculturally skilled. They reported feeling uncomfortable working with LDF because they were unsure of how to act in a culturally appropriate way. School counselors face the challenge of how best to fulfill their transformed role in relation to LDF.

There are number of issues that LDF face that school counselor should be aware. LDF experience devastating barriers when they attempt to involve in their children’ education. Such barriers comprise, “the inability to understand English, unfamiliarity with the school system, and differences in cultural norms, and cultural capital can limit parents’ communication and school participation” (Arias & Morillo-Campbell, 2008, p. 1). Because of their race, social class, immigration status, language skill and education level, many LDF fit the definition of a marginalized group (Hudak, 1993, as cited in Arias & Morillo-Campbell, 2008). The term refers to describe individuals who are categorized as “outsiders” due to their racial, social class, gender, sexual orientation,
immigration status, and ability status. Research described “marginalized” parents as those whose involvement level is viewed to be less than equal from a White mainstream American family member’s involvement due to having very limited or negative school experience themselves (Chavkin, 1993). In contrast, research has shown that LDF share a serious concern about their children’s education (Yao, 1988; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Yet, LDF frequently view their role in schooling very differently from the way that mainstream English speaking communities view their relationship with schools (Faltis, 2001, as cited in Arias & Morillo-Campbell, 2008). School counselors should be conscious of any beliefs and attitudes, which marginalize LDF in the school community. As an advocate for LDF, they need to be proactive leaders in the school system so that these families have access and can capitalize SFC partnerships for their student success.

Furthermore, school counselors have ethical responsibilities to parents as outlined by the ASCA Ethical Standards. The school counselor “endeavors to establish, as appropriate, a collaborative relationship with parents to facilitate the counselee’s maximum development” (ASCA, B. 1. a.). Collaboration, for the benefit of the student, should create a successful relationship between home and school as much as possible. When they develop relationships with parents, they need to be aware of the diverse cultural and social dynamics, as mentioned in ASCA Ethical Standard B. 1. d. School counselors’ awareness of their personal worldview is critical since lack of or limited awareness of their personal worldview may lead to biased views of cultural differences (Davis, 2005). If school counselor collaborates with families it brings academic success for the student, regardless of the student’s presenting problem (Davis, 2005).

**School Counselor Role with School and Community Members**

The SFC partnerships are “collaborative relationships and initiatives in which school counselors, school personnel, students, families, community members, and other
stakeholders work jointly to implement school and community-based prevention and intervention programs and activities to improve children’s chances of success” (Bryan & Griffin, 2010, p. 1). Collaborative partnerships with community agencies when planning prevention and intervention programs are fundamental to assist students and families (Keys & Lockhart, 1999). It is important to identify and make use of the resources, which exist in the community (e.g., health, social services, substance abuse services, juvenile justice, recreation, service clubs, and other organizations) to strengthen school counseling programs (Thompson, 2002). School counselors serve as liaisons between the school and the community; thus, partnership practices are central functions of the school counseling programs (Davis, 2005). Bemak (2000) advised three ways to work with community organizations: (a) connecting students and their families to the community resources to meet their unique needs (i.e., summer and/or enrichment programs, alternative education, employment, mental health, health care), (b) making collaborative arrangements with the community to bring services (e.g., substance abuse counselors working with students in the school), and (c) partnering to develop and implement prevention and intervention services to be offered in or outside of the school. Such collaborations are vital to promote good public relations and support school projects and activities that demand community participation.

Reviewing 51 studies with sound methodological standards, Henderson and Mapp (2002) provide ideas how to turn these research findings into SFC partnership programs. Relevant to school counselor role with school and community members, nine suggestions emerged, some of which include: (a) increasing the competence of school staff as they work with families and community members; (b) enhancing a philosophy of partnership which underlines sharing power; (c) connecting family and community partnerships to student learning; (d) working with families to build social and political relationships; and (e) building strong connections between schools and community associations.
Partnerships among school stakeholders are especially relevant for school counselors who find themselves in the position to implement wide-ranging solutions to various issues (e.g., homelessness, poverty, academic failure, school alienation) that many students encounter (Bryan, 2005). School counselors reported that partnerships with multiple stakeholders often result in innovative solutions to complex student problems (Bryan & Henry, 2008). For example, when school counselors involve in SFC partnership activities, they work with teachers, administrators, school psychologists and student support personnel, families and community members to create a school environment that is accessible and welcoming to all families. Through using collaborative partnerships both inside and outside the school, a school counselor reaches out and offers the information (e.g., referral) and support necessary for all families to be involved in education at home and in school. School counselors work as leaders, advocates, collaborative team members, and supporters of systemic change in order to empower students and families from all backgrounds. In collaboration with local community, health care, and university members, a school counselor promotes tutoring programs, health and safety training, and college visits for students; classes on parenting and communication/networking opportunities for families. To understand the role of attitudes of the school professionals who facilitate connections with school, family, and community member, further research is necessary to explore these perceptions (Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001). However, examining the existing literature on SFC partnerships reveals new knowledge how school and school counselor-related factors influence school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

**Variables**

In the literature, the following variables are documented to affect SFC partnerships: *collaborating, coordinating, teaming* with and *training* others (Baker et al., 2009; Bryan, 2005; Epstein, 1995, 2001; Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010; Taylor &
Adelman, 2000); training in partnerships (Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2006, 2007; Clark & Amatea, 2004; Hiatt-Michael, 2006); school counselor caseload (McCarthy, Van Horn Kerne, Calfa, Lambert, & Guzman, 2010; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006); collaborative school climate (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001; Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008; Hernández & Seem, 2004; Littrell, Peterson, & Sunde, 2001); principal support (Leuwerke, Walker, & Shi, 2009; Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004; Sanders & Harvey, 2002); self-efficacy about partnerships (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008; Hoover-Dempsey, Walker, Jones, & Reed, 2002), commitment to advocacy (Baker et al., 2009; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; McCall-Perez, 2000; Ratts, DeKruyf, Chen-Hayes, 2007); attitudes about partnerships (Bryan, 2007; Christenson & Sheridan, 2001; Mitchell & Bryan, 2007); attitudes about families (Chavkin & Williams, 1987; Christenson & Sheridan, 2001; Comer, 1988; Cotton & Wiklund, 1989; Epstein, 1991; Lott & Rogers, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy, 2000, 2001, 2007; Schwallie-Giddis et al. 2004); and role perceptions about partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007); attitudes about school (Loukas, Suzuki, & Horton, 2006; Hernández & Seem, 2004); and barriers to partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Finkelstein, 2009; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

The present study diverges from studies (e.g., Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010), which previously examined school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships. This difference transpires due to its unique center of attention on school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Its focus is to understand factors that may help or hinder school counselor involvement in partnerships, which may narrow or widen achievement gaps for LDS. However, these abovementioned studies are cited frequently in this study; the purpose is to set up the rationale, to address the lack of literature on school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF for the purpose of using a modified version of the SCIPS revised
by Bryan and Griffin in 2010. These earlier studies serve as stepping-stones in the general area of SFC partnerships literature, to bridge a transition, to create a pathway from general SFC partnership literature to specific SFC partnership literature with LDF.

A 2010 study by Bryan and Griffin extended the findings of Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy’s 2007 study by examining factors related to school counselor involvement in partnerships. Overall, school counselor involvement seemed to be related to a collaborative school climate, school principal expectations, school counselor role perceptions, self-efficacy about partnerships, time constraints, and partnership-related training (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Additionally, principal expectations, time constraints, and partnership-related training were the variables examined.

Similarly, findings in the Aydin, Bryan, and Duys (2011) study with 95 Iowa school counselors revealed that school counselors are more likely to build partnerships with LDF when their principal expects them to, when they perceive it as part of their role, and when they have the training related to developing and implementing partnerships. These findings are consistent with those from previous studies (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). This dissertation extends the findings of Bryan and Griffin (2010) and Aydin, Bryan, and Duys (2011) by further examining what the school and school counselor factors are related to their involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, using variables not studied previously. The variables in this dissertation study focus on SFC partnerships with diverse populations related to principal expectations, time constraints, partnership-related training and other descriptive variables never studied previously. For example, some of these variables include counselors’ bilingual status, school counselor caseload, percentage of linguistically diverse students served, the percentage of students on FRPL, instruction received in partnership specific to working with LDS and LDF with a larger nationally representative sample.

The significance of school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF has been discussed in Chapter I. Research on school counselor involvement in SFC
partnerships is insufficient (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Griffin & Steen, 2010; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Aydin, Bryan, & Duys, 2011). Previous research highlighted the importance of school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with diverse families (Bryan, 2003). Particularly, there is a lack of a nationally representative study using a large sample, addressing school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. This gap should be addressed in research, especially to understand school counselors’ perceptions and training related to SFC partnerships with LDF. This understanding and knowledge will allow an improved response to LDS’ academic and personal needs in K-12 schools; therefore, school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF is necessary (Bryan, 2003; Aydin, Bryan, & Duys, 2011). It would be interesting to observe how school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF relates to the abovementioned variables (i.e., similar to or different from previous findings), using a larger nationally representative sample. It would be clinically beneficial to know how findings from this study would inform implications for school counselor curriculum and practical training, in order to better prepare school counselors to engage in SFC partnership programs with LDF.

Training in Partnership

School counselor training in partnership is an important variable emerging in the literature (Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2006, 2007; Clark & Amatea, 2004; Hiatt-Michael, 2006). School counselors’ faulty assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes; lack of or limited training in multicultural counseling; and other communication barriers between home and school (e.g., language and culture) are issues for building SFC partnerships with LDF. School counselors are often called upon to assist the diverse needs of LDS and their families; in such cases, they often do not have the support or the necessary training (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Counselor education programs may need to incorporate curricular and practical training, which focuses on utilizing the
collaboration process with LDF; thus, school counselors are better prepared to implement SFC partnerships with LDF (Bryan, 2003).

Challenges are present when school counselors have biased perceptions, insufficient knowledge, training, and incompetency in their multicultural counseling skills related to working with LDS. Schwallie-Giddis et al. (2004) conducted a qualitative study over a nine-month period, involving seven interventions on professional development needs of 35 school counselors regarding meeting LDS’ counseling needs. Results underscored the importance of an ongoing need for professional development programs for school counselors who work with LDS. While ongoing professional development programs are essential to gain awareness, knowledge, and skills to respond effectively to the challenges of working with LDS and LDF, what it specifically entails is not yet known. Identifying and evaluating professional development activities designed to address challenges that school counselors find in their work with LDS and LDF is critical. Further, school counselor training should incorporate self-reflection activities of one’s assumptions, perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes because one’s self-perception can influence and create challenges when working with diverse populations.

Effective multicultural professional development programs should consider the challenges that LDS experience (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Schwallie-Giddis et al. suggested that future studies should focus on developing in-service multicultural professional development programs for school counselors. Similarly, it would be interesting to know if school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF would remain related to partnership-related training, stressing the importance of general partnership training and specific partnership training (i.e., partnership with LDF).

Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy’s (2006) study with 72 school counselors from South Carolina examined school counselors’ perceptions about “1) the importance of their involvement in school-family-community partnerships, 2) their level of involvement in each of the eight school-family-community partnership roles, and 3) the importance of
their pre-service training in preparing them for the eight partnership roles” (p. 5). Their findings indicated that school counselors across all school levels see their involvement in SFC partnerships to be very important, which is consistent with the emphasis on collaboration and partnerships by professional organizations (e.g., ASCA) and current literature. Compared to roles as a leader, school-home liaison, coordinator, trainer, and facilitator, school counselors reported being more involved in partnership roles as an advocate, consultant, and team member. Elementary school counselors had a higher level of involvement in partnership roles than high-school counselors did. Future studies could investigate why school counselors tend to be more involved in SFC partnership practices.

In 2010, Bryan and Griffin’s nationwide study of 217 school counselors indicated that 39.6% of the participants received partnership-related training, while 35.9% received eight or fewer hours of partnership-related training. Findings indicated that school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships seemed to be related to “a collaborative school climate, school principal expectations, school counselor role perceptions, self-efficacy about partnerships, time constraints, and partnership-related training” (p 82).

In 2011, Aydin, Bryan, and Duys surveyed 95 school counselors in Iowa. Results indicated that 74% of the participants received 0 to 10 hours of partnership-related training. Interestingly, about half of all school counselors (N = 42) did not have any training at all. Partnership-related training significantly predicted school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Rapidly changing demographics in the American school system require that school counselors and counselor educators examine school counselor role perceptions, self-efficacy about partnerships, and partnership-related training when working with LDF in building effective SFC partnership programs.

School Counselor Caseload

School counselor caseload is an important variable as it affects school counselor service delivery and involvement in SFC partnerships. When school counselors are
assigned to serve more than 250 students (i.e., ASCA’s recommended ratio), it creates difficulties in achieving the essential roles and responsibilities of a school counselor. Thus, it is important to examine how school counselors work with LDF in SFC partnerships related to their caseload. Misunderstandings of the school counselor’s role are a common issue, creating barriers for SFC partnerships with LDF.

For the 2007-2008 academic year, according to ASCA (2010) the average K-12 student-to-counselor ratios for some states are: Illinois, 1,076; California, 809; Minnesota, 777; Arizona, 750; Utah, 772; Michigan, 643; Washington, 500; New York, 463; Ohio, 493; Florida, 433, while the national average is 460. Number and percentage distribution of staff employed in public elementary and secondary schools (i.e., by school level, staff type, and selected school characteristics) are provided by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Indicator 2, in comparison to the school years 1999-2000 and 2007-2008. Clearly, the increase in the number of students enrolled over the years is not reflected by the increase in the number of school counselors hired and school counselor caseload. In 1999-2000, the total number of school counselors nationwide was 106,900, while the total percentage of school counselors employed in public elementary and secondary schools was 2.2. For the school year of 2007-2008, the total number of school counselors increased to 114,900, while the total percentage of school counselors employed in public elementary and secondary schools decreased to 2.0. However, public school PK-12 total enrollment for 1999–2000 was 46,857; for 2007–2008 it was 49,293; and for 2019–2020 projected enrollment is 52,342 (Aud et al., 2010).

Despite professional standards and recent initiatives, school counselors reported spending too much time in administrative duties (Baker, 2000) and participating in duties that are not closely related to their training and professionally defined roles (Zalaquett, 2005). An issue that surfaces in the literature often is lack of clarity and inconsistencies among school professionals’ perceptions regarding the school counselor’s role, especially by school principals (Baker, 2000; Lieberman, 2004; Schmidt, 2003). This lack of clarity
and misconception regarding school counselors’ role are a concern, because carrying out inappropriate tasks may create obstacles to deliver other essential services and may be misleading for the school counselors’ role (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2009).

In 1983, Sears and Navin’s study examined the level of stressors that 240 Ohio school counselors’ experience. Their findings indicated that 14.8% of school counselors viewed their profession as “very stressful” and 50.4% viewed their profession as “moderately stressful.” The most frequent sources of stress in sequence included: a) very limited time assisting students; b) too much office work; c) a very heavy caseload; and d) many added non-counseling duties. Combined, these stressors may lead to work overload, not to mention uncertainty about duties expected of school counselors.

A school counselor’s caseload is believed to predict burnout. School counselors are in danger for facing mental health challenges due to a wide range of professional roles they are expected to perform and manage the workload they face (Bryant & Constantine, 2006). Looking at the relationships among multiple role balance, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction with a sample of 133 female school counselors, Bryant and Constantine’s (2006) study revealed that multiple role balance and job satisfaction positively predicted overall life satisfaction, even after counting the effects of age, years of experience as a school counselor, and location of school environment.

Scarborough and Culbreth’s (2008) study with K-12 school counselors (N = 361) investigated what factors predict discrepancies between the actual practice and preferred practice in relation to comprehensive school counseling programs. Findings revealed that school counselors preferred to use their time consistent with best practice. Also, professional, employment, self-efficacy, and school climate variables predicted differences between actual and preferred practice. McCarthy, Van Horn Kerne, Calfa, Lambert, and Guzman’s (2010) study investigated how demands and resources in their work setting were related to perceived stress, biographic factors, and caseload characteristics with 227 school counselors in Texas. As one can imagine, school
counselors viewed paperwork requirements and caseload as the most demanding aspects at work. Other counselors were viewed as the most helpful resource.

In Aydin, Bryan, and Duys’s (2011) study with 95 school counselors in Iowa, the average caseload was 374. Engaging in collaborative behaviors and school counselor caseload were significantly correlated: $r = .21; p < .05$. Being involved in collaborative behaviors was associated with school counselors’ caseload, accentuating the importance of engaging appropriate activities for school counselors (ASCA, 2004). Exceeding the recommended student-to-counselor ratio (i.e., 1:250) creates challenges for school counselors engaging in collaborative behaviors. School counselors need to be more proactive in clarifying their professional identity in schools, so that they do not have to give up the role that promotes partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004).

Frequently, the school principal determines a school counselor’s caseload. Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan and Jones’s (2004) national study with 636 (63.6%) American School Counselor Association (ASCA) members, 255 (51.0%) National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and 220 (44.0%) National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) asked about appropriate and inappropriate tasks for school counselors. The results of this survey study revealed that school principals endorsed inappropriate school counselor roles and functions, implying that these school principals had inaccurate perceptions of school counselors’ roles. For example, the majority of high school principals view test administration and maintenance of student records as appropriate work for school counselors (Pérusse et al.). While such duties may be assumed as appropriate and important for a school’s overall functioning, they are not identified as appropriate for school counselor duties by the ASCA National Model (Bardhoshi & Duncan, 2009). Future school principals believed that assisting in special education services are an essential function of a school counselor (Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshal, 2001). However, ASCA promotes meeting all students’ needs.
The Use of Translators

There are nearly 500 languages represented in K-12 schools in America; Spanish remains the most commonly spoken language among those. Census data indicates that roughly 75 - 79% of LDS speak Spanish (Zehler et al., 2003), followed by the six most represented language groups, including Vietnamese (2.4%), Hmong (1.8%), Korean (1.2%), Arabic (1.2%), Haitian Creole (1.1%), and Cantonese (1.0%) (Zehler et al., 2003). According to the U.S. Census (American Community Survey, 2004), the percentage of languages spoken by LDS in K-12 schools fall into the following ethnic groups: Spanish 75% (2,080,000); Indo-European 12% (344,000); Asian Pacific 11% (311,000); other 1% (40,000); total 2,775,000. How the use of translators by school counselors affects their involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF is a significant topic of interest for the present study, which has previously been unexamined. Spanish-speaking students make up 80% of the LDS in special education programs, pointing to their overrepresentation, compared to overall LDS population (Zehler et al., 2003). This may be related to cultural biases against Spanish-speaking students. The shortage of bilingual school professionals (e.g., school counselors) magnifies such overrepresentations (Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly & Callahan, 2003).

Larocque’s (2007) study provided evidence regarding the significance of the use of translators in student achievement in economically disadvantaged, urban, ethnically, racially and linguistically diverse Florida Middle school. Through effective use of leadership, which embraces the use of translators that encourage SFC partnerships, data based decision-making and the celebration of cultural diversity significantly influenced students’ academic achievement. Participants completed surveys, interviews, and documents to provide evidence about factors and practices that contribute to student achievement at the district, school, and classroom levels over a three-year period. Data was collected from principals, classroom teachers, parents, and community members. To provide SFC partnership opportunities, a task force directly contacted parents and
community members, which involved identifying and then inviting LDF to serve on district-required boards (e.g., the School Advisory Council and the School Improvement Team). Similarly, teachers supported parental involvement by encouraging parents to attend school events, such as PTA conferences, math nights, and international fairs. Information related to these programs was translated into pertinent languages. Using translators helped bridge the language gap, facilitating access to a greater number of LDF on behalf of LDS. Appreciating diversity allowed school members to treat LDF as equal stakeholders, valuable mentors and partners.

Free and Reduced Price Lunch Status

LDS often go to schools serving students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (i.e., defined by FRPL eligibility). Wilde (2010) examined the effect of poverty on education, specifically on LDS. A comparison of 2004 and 2008 average NAEP scores for LDS and non-LDS indicated an increase in all students’ average scores, regardless of their backgrounds. Compared to their mainstream counterparts, LDS living in poverty have the lowest average scores in both math and reading, according to 2004 and 2008 test results. Furthermore, as LDS advance in grade level, the achievement gap widens, regardless whether they live at or near the poverty level.

Generally, LDS attend public schools with overall lower achievement. These schools often have higher student-teacher ratios, enrollment rates, and students living at or near the poverty level (Fry, 2008). Fry stated, “When LDS are not isolated in these low-achieving schools, their gap in their test score results is considerably narrower” (2008, p. i). This explains the gap in LDS’ achievement scores (i.e., due to struggles both with language and poverty), compared to those students who are non-LDS and not living in poverty (Wilde, 2010). All of these abovementioned conditions accentuate the complex interplay of the multiple factors that influence LDS’ achievement.
Although mainstream students’ achievement may be due to attendance in higher achieving schools with lower student-teacher ratios, enrollment rates, and percentages of students living at or near the poverty level, it should be noted that NAEP students were randomly chosen (also, the sample of LDS was small). In addition, studies that clarify the double effect on being both LDS and living in poverty have yet to be conducted (Wilde, 2010). As Ballantyne, Sanderman, and McLaughlin (2008) stated, a number of studies that report the harmful effects of poverty on achievement is accurate. However, such conclusions are made based on a small number of studies, compared to research about the effect of SES on mainstream English-speaking students. Much of the research on ELL examines “… students from low-income families, it is difficult to assess the cumulative effects of low SES and linguistic barriers access faced by low-income non-English speaking communities” (Ballantyne, Sanderman & McLaughlin, 2008, p. 15).

Collaborative School Climate

It is known that children are best supported when families and schools have shared goals and work collaboratively, and when the partnership with the community is integrated into the student’s learning experience (Epstein, 1995). There are many reasons to invest in developing SFC partnerships, such as improving “school programs and school climate, provide family services and support, increase parents’ skills and leadership, connect families with others in the school and in the community, and help teachers with their work” (Epstein, 1995, p.701).

School climate is composed of factors that are shaped by the involved individuals’ attitudes, feelings, and behaviors within the school system (Hernández & Seem, 2004), which is highly relevant to the school counselors’ role. School counselors have a key role in creating a school environment that is welcoming and that educates mainstream students about the LDS’ needs (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004); at the same time, they focus on meeting the needs of all students (ASCA, 2005). A systemic perspective
committed to ensuring academic achievement for all students regardless of their racial, ethnic, socioeconomic backgrounds (Lee, 2005) is necessary. This systemic approach is consistent with the school counselors’ role in addressing discrepancies between diverse cultural communities and the K-12 educational system (Lee, 2001). The current school reform movement suggests that school counselors increase their visibility within school communities through developing supportive partnership systems (Herr, 2002).

However, school counselors are absent in this movement (Taylor & Adelman, 1996). Instead, the profession continues to focus on traditional topics (e.g., career counseling, individual and group counseling, and testing and assessment). Current school counselor training is limited to promoting a systemic perspective, which is problematic (Bemak, 2000). Further, incongruities exist between counselor education programs and actual school counselor practices (Paisley & Hayes, 2003). It is unclear how counselor education preparation programs enable trainees to play an active role in the educational reform movement (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Pérusse & Goodnough, 2001).

Fitch and Marshall (2004) researched what school counselors do in high-achieving schools. Collecting data from 63 schools in Kentucky, school counselors’ tasks and student achievement scores were examined. Six factors were common in the high-achieving schools; they are pertinent to the outcome expected within a collaborative school climate. These factors are: a) autonomous school leadership; b) understanding how academic achievement predicts student achievement; c) strong staff relationships and professional development opportunities, as well as proof of team work and staff training; d) students’ sense of belongingness within school; e) high level of parent and community support; and f) high quality of the social systems around the students.

School counselor training in human relations equips them with the skills necessary to influence linking systemic areas to student success (Fitch & Marshall, 2004). Advocates of the school counseling profession encourage school counselors to accept leadership roles and to collaborate on increasing support for their programs (Herr, 2002;
School counseling advocates have suggested that training in system and organizational skills will enhance school counselors’ advocacy and leadership skills (Bemak & Chung, 2005).

**Principal Support**

Principal support emerged as an important variable that affects school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships (Chata & Loesch 2007; Leuwerke, Walker, & Shi, 2009; Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004; Sanders & Harvey, 2002). Just as each stakeholder has a personal perception of the school counselor’s role within the school, the principal may have a personal vision on how school counselors could be most effective within the school community (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005). While school districts and administrators face meeting students’ immense needs and accountability demands, they do not always recognize how the school counselors’ role and training prepares them to address social, emotional, and career needs of students (Adelman & Taylor).

School principals and policy makers “tend to see any activity not directly related to instruction as taking resources away from schools’ primary mission of teaching” (Adelman & Taylor, p. 236), thus, creating challenges for SFC partnerships. If school counselors and principals join together for leadership and advocacy, it can have a positive influence on school’s mission, climate, and students’ capacity to achieve academic success (Stone & Clark, 2001). Although school principals and school counselors have unique roles and responsibilities, they have common goals (i.e., to ensure students’ best interest); thus, their roles and responsibilities overlap.

In a qualitative study, Amatea and Clark (2005) interviewed 26 school administrators regarding their view of the school counselor’s role. In this study, 25% of the administrators reported that the school counselor, as an administrative team member, is responsible to perform administrative tasks as a subordinate rather than a professional.
Amatea and Clark stated that counselor education programs can provide better opportunities for school counseling students by training them “(a) to view themselves as having a unique skill set needed by the school as a whole, (b) to deliver those skills, and (c) to function as a member of a team of school leaders” (Amatea & Clark, 2005, p. 25). Furthermore, Janson, Militello, and Kosine (2008) examined perceived professional relationships of school counselors and principals. Using Q methodology to develop 45 opinion statements with 39 professional school counselors and principals about their relationship, four factors emerged. Three of these factors involved constructive attributes of the school counselor-principal relationship; one factor emphasized interpersonal collaboration. Learning to influence other school members’ expectations is essential. To do this, training programs can foster systemic thinking in relation to school counselors’ roles as part of a larger system, which is reciprocally structured and restructured.

Kirchner and Setchfield (2005) assessed the perceptions of school counselors and administrators who had academic training that focused on understanding about each other’s roles. School principals were inclined to accept statements inconsistent with the school counselors’ roles. Likewise, some literature indicates how school principals advanced their knowledge of school counseling programs through training and research; many principals’ perceptions about the school counselors’ roles are formed by their own experiences (Coy, 1999). School administration graduate training does not always require courses in school counseling or embrace teaching about school counselors’ roles and the comprehensive school counseling program (Fitch, Newby, Ballester, & Marshall, 2001; Beale & McCay, 2001). Consequently, school principals often formulate a counseling department on minimal expertise, based on previous or clinical experience (Seashore, Jones, & Barajas, 2001). They are not always aware of the appropriate role of a school counselor, which is a concern for SFC partnerships.

In Aydin, Bryan, and Duys’s (2011) study, 95 school counselors were asked about their involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. School counselor perceptions about
LDF and perceptions of the school principal were significantly correlated. Perceptions of partnerships with LDF and perceptions of the school principal were also significantly correlated. Moreover, perceptions about school climate and perceptions of the school principal were significantly correlated. Briefly, having more favorable perceptions of the principal was associated with having a more collaborative school climate, a positive perception about the school and positive attitudes toward partnerships with LDF.

**Principal Expectations**

Over the years, written comments that school counselors offered at the end of the SCIPS (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007, Bryan & Griffin, 2010) persistently called attention to the importance of principal expectations as an important predictor for their involvement in SFC partnerships (Phone Communication with Dr. Julia Bryan on December 5, 2010). As a school counselor variable, a principal’s expectations is a single item indicator rather than a factor and measured by the statement in the SCIPS “I believe that the principal expects me to be involved in school-family-community partnerships.”

The importance of principal expectations on school counselors’ role and SFC partnership activities is well documented in the literature (Amatea & Clark, 2005; Finkelstein, 2009; Fitch, Newby, Ballestero, & Marshall, 2001; Janson, Militello, & Kosine 2008; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005). In the previous research, a principal’s expectations were related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). In addition, principal expectations appeared to predict school counselor involvement in several dimensions: school-home partnerships, school-community collaboration, and overall partnership involvement, except involvement on collaborative teams. School counselors reported being involved in moderate level on all three types of involvement: a) involvement in school-home partnerships ($M = 2.62$); b) school-community collaboration ($M = 2.91$); and c) involvement on collaborative teams ($M = 3.$)
Principal expectations were the strongest predictor of these types of partnership involvement (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

Due to abovementioned reasons, a principal’s expectations are chosen to examine if it predicts school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. In Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study, school principals’ expectations were not only related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships, but also were a significant predictor of school counselor involvement. Of interest is whether school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF relates to principal expectations using a nationally representative sample of participants, since it is known that school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships is related to principal expectations. Principal support plays an important role, if school counselors become involved in SFC partnerships.

Self-Efficacy about Partnerships

Previous research indicated that school counselors’ self-efficacy is related to their involvement in SFC partnerships (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). When school counselors were confident in their ability to build partnerships, they tended to be more involved (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy’s 2007). Self-efficacy about partnerships was not significantly related to school counselor involvement in partnerships with LDF, contrary to previous studies (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). These relationships require further investigation with a larger national sample to study if self-efficacy would remain an insignificant variable to involvement in partnerships with LDF.

Self-efficacy is a concept that originates in Bandura’s social cognitive theory. Self-efficacy (Bandura, 1995, Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) refers to one’s belief regarding his or her ability to accomplish something. Self-efficacy includes skills in areas of social, cognitive, and behavior and affects people’s motivation, feelings, actions and thinking because if people do not believe in their ability to do something they have little motivation to execute it (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996). Self-
efficacy is the belief about one’s personal ability in a chosen endeavor, activity, or field, such as counseling (Bandura, 1986, 1997). A developing practitioner’s belief of self-efficacy has a direct effect on cognitions, behaviors, affect and motivation (Bandura, 1994, Bodenhorn and Skaggs, 2005). The strength of self-efficacy affects people in (a) developing goals, (b) staying determined, and (c) staying motivated to attain these goals (Bandura, 1995, Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). When people fail to establish a solid foundation of self-efficacy, it can diminish their self-efficacy; on the other hand, perseverance, observation of models, and social persuasion increase self-efficacy (Bandura, 1991).

Counselor training incorporates opportunities to develop and improve trainees’ skills through feedback and observation of others, which aids development of their self-efficacy in counseling (Bandura, 1991, Tang, et al., 2004). The literature points out that when practitioners have a high level of perceived self-efficacy, they tend to have higher goals along with having stronger motivation and commitment to achieve their aspirations. These people will perceive difficult tasks as challenges rather than seeing them as obstacles (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy determines the ability of counselors to have success in assuming their professional roles in the field (Tang, et al. 2004). Self-efficacy affects people’s motivation to act. If people believe that they cannot act to achieve a goal, they do not try as hard due to having little incentive (Bandura, 1994).

Counselor self-efficacy is developed during their clinical training. Effectively participating in activities or learning from their colleagues increases school counselors’ self-efficacy (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010). In order to determine if their services were effective, school counselors need to refer to their school data to examine if any changes have occurred. When they notice any positive effect, then they have achieved self-efficacy, which may increase their likelihood of continuing to achieve their goal(s). Awareness of data, self-efficacy, and establishing a programmatic approach to school counseling is associated with narrowing the achievement gaps among various groups.
Developing a coherent program, understanding the data related to their school, and increasing their self-efficacy should be an ongoing effort for school counselors (Bodenhorn et al). Thus, it is important that counselor training addresses these concerns.

Bodenhorn, Wolfe, and Airen, (2010), conducted a national study with 860 ASCA members related to their level of self-efficacy, type of program, status of achievement gap, and equity in their schools. Results indicated that school counselors with higher self-efficacy showed more awareness of achievement gap data. School counselors with a program approach and high level of self-efficacy were more inclined to report narrowing achievement gaps. One fifth of the respondents reported no awareness of achievement gap data. The study showed that the use of a program-oriented approach and “a professional belief in one’s capacity to perform the activities that are involved in school counseling (self-efficacy) are related to differences in student achievement level” (p. 173). The authors affirmed that school counselors need to be a part of the data-driven decision-making process. High levels of self-efficacy have an effect on equity; one’s self-efficacy can be increased through personal and vicarious accomplishments (Bandura, 1986). Understanding the student’s achievement data, self-efficacy, and a program-oriented approach to school counseling programs may be a predictor of increasing the equity and closing achievement gaps in school (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010).

School counselor perceptions play an important role as perceptions influence people (i.e., how school counselors evaluate their skills and competence to perform a particular task) (Bandura, 1995). Self-efficacy is an important aspect of successful teaching and counseling (Bandura, 1995). Yet, there are no definitive studies on how counseling self-efficacy affects counselor performance (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). While school counselors are qualified to deliver psychological services to children, how they perceive their ability or time may create barriers for school counseling services (Holcomb, 2004). When people believe in their ability to master specific tasks, they tend
to perceive difficulties as challenges, which prevents obsessions and concerns and help
them focus on how to best use their ability and access the resources (Bandura, 2001).

Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines and Johnston’s (2008) study with 181 ASCA
members explored the factor structure of the School Counselor Multicultural Self-
Efficacy Scale (SCMES). Exploratory factor analysis of the 90-item scale suggested a
six-factor structure: “(a) Knowledge of Multicultural Counseling Concepts, (b) Using
Data and Understanding Systemic Change, (c) Developing Cross-Cultural Relationships,
(d) Multicultural Awareness, (e) Multicultural Assessment, and (f) Applying Racial
Concepts to Practice.” Ethnicity and the number of multicultural counseling courses
taken were significantly correlated with some of the SCMES’s factors. Holcomb-McCoy
et al. (2008) stated, as people believe in their self-efficacy in a particular context, the
greater their satisfaction will be. The authors posited that professional school counselors
with high levels of multicultural self-efficacy were more likely to believe in their ability
to understand multicultural and diversity concepts, utilize resources, and recognize and
challenge barriers for achievement, and be satisfied in their work with culturally diverse
students and families.

Furthermore, it is hypothesized that a school counselor’s multicultural self-
efficacy could be separate from general school counselor self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy
et al., 2008). Siwatu, Polydore and Starker’s (2009) study examined future elementary
school teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs related to their culturally responsive teaching, using
The Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale with 104 pre-service teachers
from a Midwestern university. Participants were more competent using a range of
teaching and instructional methods, communicating with parents, and developing trust in
their relationships with students. However, they were not as confident in their skills to
communicate with LDS and educate student about non-Western cultures’ input to science
and math. Research about counselor self-efficacy is still developing. While the
constructs make sense theoretically, how self-efficacy effect counselor performance has not yet been studied (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), which future studies should explore.

Commitment to Advocacy

Commitment to advocacy has been identified as a variable, which predicts a school counselor’s level of involvement and role in partnerships (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Due to the multifaceted issues LDS experience, they need an advocate within the school to help them negotiate the system and engage with families. School professionals are in the position to strengthen rapport with LDF to promote SFC partnerships for the social, emotional and academic welfare of every student (Epstein, 1995; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). It is inadequate to simply train school counselors in building partnerships to increase their participation. Counselor education programs should also train school counselors to be advocates for partnership programs, to formulate strategies to overcome obstacles, and to be agents of change in the school system, knowing the barriers that school counselors experience in implementing partnership programs (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004).

LDS represent a population at risk whose needs must be addressed (Paredes, 2010). The issue has echoed across several disciplines (e.g., communication sciences and disorders, educational testing, school psychology, school counseling, counselor education, teacher education, and special education) (Paredes, 2010). Existing literature emphasizes the need for more experimental studies, systemic intervention, and an increased level of collaboration and advocacy by school community for LDS (e.g., Baker et al., 2009; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005; Goh, Wahl, McDonald, Brissett, & Yoon, 2007; McCall-Perez, 2000; Ochoa, Riccio, Jimenez, Garcia de Alba, & Sines, 2004; Ratts, DeKruyf, Chen-Hayes, 2007; Roseberry-McKibbin & O’Hanlon, 2005; Schwallie-Giddis et al, 2004; Smith-Adcock, Daniels, Lee, Villalba, & Indelicato, 2006; Williams & Butler, 2003). When school counselors have specialized
training to serve LDS, they have the ability to collaborate with other school staff and be more active with LDS. In turn, LDS do better academically, shown by their increased level of English language proficiency skills, credits toward graduation, and enrollment patterns (McCall-Perez, 2000).

A school counselor’s role with LDS is critically important (McCall-Perez). This emphasis is consistent with the ASCA National Model (2005) in meeting the academic, personal-social, and career needs of all students. The school counselor role as advocate is one of the essential qualities described in the ASCA National Model (2005). This role allows for 1) eliminating barriers obstructing students’ development, 2) creating opportunities for learning, 3) making sure all students have access to a challenging school curriculum, 4) collaborating with school and community members to meet students’ needs, and 5) supporting positive, systemic change in schools (ASCA, 2005). Applying systemic intervention is also essential for the academic success of every student (McCall-Perez, 2000). Additionally, the ASCA (2003, 2005) National Model asserted that advocacy is a critical leadership component of comprehensive school counseling programs. Similarly, the TSCI (Education Trust, 2003) called school counselors to be actively involved in supporting students from diverse backgrounds in order to succeed academically. Actively advocating for all students to succeed in their personal, educational, and career goals is congruent with recent developments in multicultural and social justice approaches to counseling (Astramovich & Harris, 2007).

In recent years, school counselors are being called to address the achievement gap between students from diverse backgrounds and White students (ASCA, 1999; House & Sears, 2002). It is a documented fact that students from diverse backgrounds in all grade levels scored worse than their White counterparts on standardized achievement tests (Bali & Alvarez, 2004). Studies identified multiple causes of this achievement gap. Because of racism and oppression within the educational setting, along with sociopolitical and socioeconomic factors, school achievement of students with diverse backgrounds has
been adversely affected (Roach, 2004). Within the educational system, policies and practices related to tracking, retention, standardized achievement testing, core curriculum, pedagogic principals, inadequate physical structures, disciplinary rules and regulations, limited roles of students and teachers, and limited family and community involvement could be potentially oppressive (Nieto, 2004). Despite harmful results, oppression increases when society does not challenge the abovementioned routine practices and rules (Bell, 1997). Numerous educational policies and practices are structured for students to succeed; these may result in perpetuating stereotypes and oppression of students from diverse backgrounds (Astramovich & Harris, 2007).

For instance, the current focus of closing the achievement gap between students from diverse backgrounds and White students initiated school reform measures with a special emphasis on raising standardized achievement test scores (Haycock, 2001). However, it is empirically documented that standardized testing has been used to segregate students from diverse backgrounds and to reinforce barriers, such as tracking practices. As a result, students from diverse backgrounds may experience barriers to academic, career, and personal/social achievement that perpetuates oppression entrenched in the educational system (Nieto, 2004).

The academic challenges that diverse students experience within the educational system have been widely debated. Often, starting from kindergarten, students experience academic disadvantages, particularly when they were unable to go to preschool due to their families’ financial strains (Hale, 2004). These students lag behind in elementary school, especially in reading proficiency. They also suffer other significant academic obstacles later in their school career as the achievement gaps considerably expand and intensify when they progress toward higher-grade levels (Bali & Alvarez, 2004).

Furthermore, students with diverse backgrounds are disproportionately assigned to remedial tracks, which are often labeled “slow learners” or “learning disabled,” and classified under and grouped with the special education category (Potts, 2003). Although
the NCLB Act of 2001 draws attention to the academic success of students from linguistically diverse backgrounds, strategies to help them shine in school have not been fully and vigorously employed in the public education system (Roach, 2004). Federal mandates and state legislations enforce school districts and schools to develop SFC partnership policies and programs; however, “the implementation and effectiveness varies tremendously within and across districts” (Morris, 2009, p. 8). The NCLB Act of 2001 requires school districts to communicate with parents in a language that parents are able to understand. Morris (2009) examined NCLB parental involvement guidelines, which are part of Title I regulations, but are not fully supported by policymakers, state education agencies, local education agencies, and school districts (Jordan, Orozco & Averett, 2002) with school superintendents or their designees in Oklahoma public schools resulting in a sample of 167, yielding a 31% response rate. Survey responses indicated that the main mode of communication with parents in public schools was primarily English, with 74% of the rural and 63% of the suburban survey responses indicating that English was the only available mode of communication with parents.

Astramovich and Harris (2007) asserted that the personal and social growth of children with diverse backgrounds may perhaps be “significantly compromised by oppression in the educational environment” (p. 270). Hale (2004) disparaged schools for concentrating only on school success with the exclusion of social factors that influence the success of the students with diverse backgrounds (e.g. family and community involvement). Ironically, in an attempt to acquiesce to oppression, some students with diverse backgrounds may try espousing dominant culture’ values and norms, which lead to internalization of harmful beliefs, attitudes, myths, stereotypes, and misunderstandings about their diverse backgrounds (Lewis & Arnold, 1998). Because of oppression, these students may suffer from low self-esteem, relationship issues, increased levels of stress, and powerlessness (D’Andrea & Daniels, 2000).
Conventionally, the U.S. schooling experience has provided little opportunity for cultural diversity in educational practice. Since school success has often been defined narrowly based on White middle-class norms, students with diverse backgrounds are frequently asked to make important adjustments to achieve academic or social success. These adjustments turn out to be vital, taking into account the lack of cross-cultural sensitivity and awareness among many educators. Many obstacles to culturally diverse students’ school success are frequently viewed as student failure rather than as originating with institutional insensitivity (Lee, 1995). Many times, the school system needs adjustment in its operation toward the student rather than the student needing to adjust to the school, leaving the professional school counselors with a unique dilemma.

Comprehensive guidance and counseling initiatives redefine the counselors’ role, which enables counselors to be aware of the systemic barriers that prevent culturally sensitive and quality education (Lee, 1995). Through their redefined advocacy role, a culturally responsive counselor can intervene for students in the educational system to eliminate institutional barriers and cultural insensitivities. Additionally, they help to bridge crucial cultural gaps among students, teachers and administrators to integrate culturally diverse children and the school (Lee, 2001). School counselors are also called to be bridge-building agents for LDS (Goh et al., 2007). Advocates in the field suggest that school counselors take leadership roles in their schools and seek partnerships in order to draw support for their programs (Schwallie-Giddis, ter Maat, & Pak, 2003).

Commitment to advocacy, school climate and perception of principal support seem to be correlated. If school counselors and principals join services for leadership and advocacy, this can have a positive influence for a school’s mission, climate, and students’ capacity to achieve academic success (Stone & Clark, 2001). School counselors can facilitate leadership through advocacy when they collaborate with principals in changing attitudes and beliefs, developing high aspirations in students, and creating opportunities
for all, especially those who have been marginalized in society. Together, they can devise ways to communicate to students and parents how certain academic choices widen or narrow students’ future opportunities (e.g., financial), which in turn can promote equity and access to opportunities (Stone & Clark). Gaining organizational skills in training is believed to improve advocacy and leadership skills (Bemak & Chung, 2005).

School counselors should be trained to question the beliefs, assumptions, and values behind biased school policies, structures, or actions; they become an integral part of schools and educational reform to be prepared to work in the 21st-century as proactive leaders and advocates for students’ success (House & Sears, 2002). Thus, this approach requires moving beyond the role as ‘helper-responders.’ Knowing how to examine and question unfair practices that some K-12 students experience in school settings should be infused into counselor training. Such counselor training should integrate experience, active learning, reflection, and dialogue, which guides program development, classroom discussions, field practice, involvement with colleagues, and collaboration with members of the community. In turn, school counselors become equipped to take a stance against unjust policy and practices, joining counselor trainers and community stakeholders in creating a blueprint for school success.

Attitudes about Partnerships

It is predicted that school counselors’ attitudes about partnerships are related to their involvement in SFC partnerships. According to Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy, (2007) school counselor partnership roles include acting as leaders, advocates, team members, collaborators or consultants, school-home liaisons or home visitors, coordinators, trainers, and facilitators. Research indicates that the complex social environments of effective schools share some common characteristics. These features include, (a) clear school mission, (b) high expectations for success, (c) instructional leadership, (d) frequent monitoring of student progress, (e) opportunity to learn and
student time on task, (f) safe and orderly environment, and (g) home-school relations (Carey, Dimmitt, & McGannon, 2004). In effective schools, there is a structured environment. The school is free from any threat; and the school climate is not oppressive, but conducive to teaching and learning. Parents understand and support the school’s mission and are provided with opportunities to take part in accomplishing that mission as well as any desired educational, personal, and social ideals for students (Carey et al., 2004). Thus, it is essential that school members are aware of their own “cultural blindspots” and how it affects students developmentally and academically who come from diverse backgrounds, which may be different from their own (Lee, 2001).

Communication is the foundation of effective partnerships (Decker & Decker, 2003). If school and family members cannot communicate effectively, it is impossible for even the best-planned SFC partnership practices to be successful. Schools that are successful in involving large numbers of parents and other family members, including those who may have language barriers, use a team approach where each partner assumes responsibility for successful SFC partnerships. Additionally, strategies should be in place to accommodate the various needs of SFC members (e.g., the use of translators, transportation, and schedule arrangement) to promote SFC partnerships, since LDF may know little about the school system and how best to communicate and negotiate.

Attitudes about Families

*Attitudes about families* influence school professionals’ behaviors toward them (Chavkin & Williams, 1987; Christenson & Sheridan, 2001; Comer, 1988; Cotton & Wikelund, 1989; Epstein, 1991; Lott & Rogers, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy, 2000, 2001, 2007; Schwallie-Giddis et al. 2004). School counselors face the challenge of how best to fulfill their role in SFC partnerships with LDF. Students’ background characteristics such as parents’ education level, family social class, and parental involvement have been examined frequently in previous research to understand students’ academic experience
(Epstein, 1991). Often, school personnel engage in communication with home when there is a serious problem that requires family involvement (Davis & Lambie, 2005).

The research indicates that LDF are often underrepresented among the parents who are involved with the schools. Some of the reasons for this underrepresentation include lack of time or energy (i.e., due to long, awkward, and heavy work schedule), shyness about their education or language skills, lack of understanding of the school system and communication channels, beliefs about the lack of welcome by school staff, teachers and administrators’ assumptions about parents’ lack of concern or ability to help with their children’s education (Chavkin & Williams, 1987, Comer, 1988). School personnel may tend to have biased views toward LDF, which may be due to the socio-cultural gap among SFC institutions. These experiences allow parental involvement to be viewed as less influential and less persuasive. This perspective is named, “deficit model” and it is detrimental to the LDF as it affects their attitudes toward education and relationships among SFC members (Cotton & Wikelund, 1989).

Although parents are expected to take part in decision making processes in school, their input is often undervalued and likely to be readily dismissed in comparison to school personnel’s. Conversely, the contributions that parents provide can be critically important in making meaningful and informed educational decisions (Lott & Rogers, 2005). When there is a well-established alliance between home and school, it increases students’ school achievement. Dialogues with parents, teachers, and school psychologists in a joint problem solving process were found to be effective in solving social, behavioral, and academic issues (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001).

Cotton and Wikelund (1989) research indicated that when LDF received adequate training in parental involvement, they could make a contribution to their children’s achievement in school, which reiterates the importance of school counselors’ multicultural competence for SFC partnerships to train, consult, collaborate, team and partner with parents. The research dispels a popular myth by revealing that parents can
make a difference regardless of their own levels of education and cultural background. In fact, LDS benefit most from parental involvement programs and activities. However, school personnel often tend to view diverse families and their community as not having much to offer and needing to change because of the social and cultural gap between teachers/administrators and the communities. In addition to LDS, students with special needs or identified as gifted experience benefits when their parents are involved in their education. Parents with diverse cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds are often underrepresented among parents who are involved with the schools, due to reasons such as lack of time or energy (i.e., as a result of long and/or heavy work schedule), reticence about their education or language skills, lack of understanding of the school system and communication channels, beliefs about the lack of welcome by school personnel’ assumptions about parents’ lack of concern or ability to help (Cotton & Wikeland, 1989).

School counselors’ competence working with LDF is an essential requirement in fulfilling their role in SFC partnerships with LDF. School counselors are in an influential position in developing and implementing ongoing school-wide programs to promote multicultural tolerance and knowledge among faculty, students, and parents (Johnson, 1995). While having an instrumental position in shaping the school climate, school counselors reported perceiving themselves as incompetent in multicultural knowledge, which can be problematic in interpreting diverse students’ “behaviors and interactions” (Halcomb-McCoy, 2001, p. 199). Holcomb-McCoy (2000) identified five significant factors that shed light to school counselors’ perceived multicultural competence: (a) an understanding of racial identity development, (b) facility with multicultural terminology, (c) multicultural awareness, (d) multicultural knowledge, and (e) multicultural skills.

Schwallie-Giddis et al. (2004) conducted a qualitative study, which examined the challenges and professional development needs of school counselors who work with LDS and LDF. The study included seven interventions (i.e., professional development sessions) over a 9-month period with 35 school counselors, which focused on enhancing
school counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills to meet the needs of LDS. At the end of the program, 13 school counselors were interviewed. Methods, group dialogue, and instructional materials in each session were designed to address specific multicultural counseling competencies. Most of the 31 multicultural counseling competencies (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992) were incorporated into each session. Other activities included integration of videos, case studies, panel presentations, lively dialogue and debate, and storytelling into the program.

The first session focused on addressing self-awareness of assumptions, values, and biases. The second session focused on understanding the culturally different clients’ worldview. The third and fourth sessions incorporated workshops lead by counselor educators with concentration in multicultural counseling (e.g., Dr. Patricia Arrendondo). Both the third and fourth sessions emphasized awareness and application of the multicultural counseling competencies; thus, as effective multiculturally competent counselors, participants could utilize culturally competent intervention strategies and techniques with LDS. The fifth session focused on understanding the worldview of culturally different clients. In the sixth session, participants involved developing appropriate intervention strategies to work with LDS. They also had opportunities to discuss their frustrations about multicultural issues. In the seventh session, they shared their personal experiences in their schools, participating in professional development sessions working with LDS. This professional development program allotted time to reflect upon the insights acquired from the professional development sessions.

Participants indicated two areas to be the most challenging in their work with LDS and LDF: (a) counseling LDF and (b) understanding cultural differences in students across a range of cultures. Participants voiced a need for professional development programs that incorporate learning the dynamics of LDF, understanding and relating to specific cultures, learning how to communicate appropriately with the LDF, and learning culture-based counseling strategies. In order to ensure increased family involvement,
participants discussed how these differences influence interactions with these families within the school system. Results draw attention to school counselors’ demand to attain cultural capital for working with LDS (Paredes, 2010). Particularly, participants requested guidance in ‘translating’ the U.S. school culture to LDF in a culturally appropriate way and “requested guidance in understanding and relating to specific cultures, and they had specific suggestions for the kinds of cultural information and skill they believed would be helpful” (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004, p. 21).

In summary, it is important to examine school counselors’ perceptions working with LDF in SFC partnerships. The sense of welcome that families experience has a direct effect on their involvement in their children’s education (Caspe & Lopez 2007; McGrath, 2007; Resto & Alston, 2006; Stewart, 2008). School counselors expressed discomfort working with LDF as compared to LDS, due to feeling multiculturally incompetent to understand LDF dynamics. In addition to the federal mandates (e.g., NCLB Act of 2010) effective school programs embrace a philosophy that children’s educational development is a collaborative endeavor among parents, school staff, and community members (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Contrary to federal mandates, translators are often not available to help, which intensifies school counselors’ frustrations in communicating with LDF (Morris, 2009; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). When school staff is considerate of LDF, they can develop strategies to bridge school and home activities and boost support for students’ success (Wong & Hughes, 2006).

Role Perceptions about Partnerships

Role perceptions refer to one’s own perceptions about others’ expectations concerning one’s role along with one’s own personal views about one’s role (Katz and Kahn, 1966, as cited in Bryan, 2003). Research acknowledged that a multidimensional interaction of external and internal factors shapes school counselors’ professional identity (Brott & Myers, 1999). Perceptions of school counselors’ own professional identity were
believed to influence their involvement in building SFC partnerships with LDF. Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy (2007) used the SCIPS to examine what school and school counselor factors predicted school counselor involvement in partnership, using factor analysis to determine how school and school counselor-related survey items were grouped together. They found that school counselor involvement in partnerships related to one school factor (i.e., collaborative school climate), and a number of school counselor factors (i.e., role perceptions, attitudes about partnerships, and confidence in their ability to build partnerships) (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007).

Recently, Bryan and Griffin (2010) explored the SCIPS further from the prior Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy’s (2007) study on SFC partnerships. Bryan and Griffin (2010) examined other variables, which were not explored before (e.g., principal expectations, time constraints, and partnership-related training), in addition to school and school counselor factors related to SFC partnerships. This study examined how school counselor involvement in partnerships were correlated with factors related to (a) school (collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations); (b) school counselor (role perceptions, attitudes toward partnerships, attitudes toward families, commitment to advocacy, self-efficacy related to building partnerships, lack of resources, and time constraints); and (c) partnership training. Findings supported the ways in which multiple interactions of external and internal factors shape school counselors’ role performance (Brott & Myers, 1999). Overall, school counselor involvement in partnerships were found to be related to a collaborative school climate, school principal expectations, school counselor role perceptions, self-efficacy about partnerships, time constraints, and partnership-related training. However, these relationships may differ by the types of SFC partnerships that school counselors engage in (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

Further, school counselors are expected to play a dynamic role in addressing the discrepancy between diverse cultural communities and the educational system (Lee, 2001). School professionals’ beliefs and attitudes play an important role in the level of
engagement they invest in partnerships with families and communities. Future research should focus on exploring these beliefs and attitudes (Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001).

While previous research found that role perceptions about partnerships is related to school counselor involvement in partnerships, it did not focus on how that variable is related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. To fill this gap, this study will examine school counselors’ role perceptions about partnerships as a variable of interest and if this variable is related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). It is known that school counselors’ misconceptions, beliefs, and attitudes, limited training in multicultural counseling, and communication barriers between home and school may create obstacle for partnerships.

School counselor involvement in SFC partnerships found to be related to the school counselor’s role perceptions about partnerships (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Aydin, Bryan, and Duys’s (2011) study with 95 school counselors from Iowa show similar results. They revealed that school counselors are more likely to build partnerships with LDF when they perceive it as part of their role. This finding is consistent with previous studies that examined whether school counselors’ overall involvement in partnerships were related to their role perceptions (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). It would be interesting to examine if school counselor involvement with LDF in SFC partnerships would relate to the role perceptions about their partnership with a larger nationally representative sample of school counselors. The school counselor’s role perceptions about partnerships is an important variable as it may have significant implications for school counselor curricular and practical training in partnerships (Bryan & Griffin, 2010), knowing that school counselor’s role perceptions are influenced by their training (Amatea & Clark, 2005).
Time Constraints

Bryan and Griffin (2010) examined if school counselor involvement in partnerships is related to time constraints. Previous studies indicated that besides other variables school counselor involvement in partnerships is related to time constraints (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007) but may be different by the types of involvement. Over the years, feedback that school counselors offer on the SCIPS (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007, Bryan & Griffin, 2010) repeatedly emphasized the importance of time constraints to be an important predictor for their involvement in partnerships (Phone Communication with Dr. Julia Bryan on December 5, 2010). In this study, this item is chosen as an independent variable because it is significantly and negatively related to school counselor involvement in school-community collaboration (i.e., $B = -0.194$, $t = -2.4808$, $p = .005$); and overall involvement in partnerships (i.e., $B = -0.156$, $t = -2.481$, $p = .016$) (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

As a school counselor variable, time constraints is a single item rather than a factor measured by the statement in the SCIPS “I do not have the time to get involved in partnerships.” Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study further examined Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy’s (2007) study by exploring school and school counselor variables related to involvement in partnership variables not heretofore examined (e.g., principal expectations, time constraints, and partnership-related training). In summary, school counselors’ time constraints is related to their involvement in school-community collaboration and their overall involvement in partnerships; however, it is not related to their involvement in school-home partnerships, consistent with previous findings about barriers to collaboration with other school professionals (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004). Literature highlights the importance of a recommended student-to-counselor ratio and appropriate roles for school counselors. Time constraints may hinder school counselor involvement since building SFC partnerships investing “out-of-school time” with the community members (Bryan & Griffin, 2010, p. 83).
Unexpectedly, Aydin, Bryan, and Duys’s (2011) study indicated that time constraints did not limit school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Regardless of time constraints that school counselors experience, findings indicated that school counselors saw the importance of reaching out to LDF. While this may indicate that time constraints school counselors face may not limit their efforts to build partnerships with LDF, the result should be interpreted with caution as using a statewide sample has limitations for generalizing the results. A national study with school counselors is necessary to further examine the findings if time constraints would negatively influence school counselor involvement SFC partnerships with LDF.

**Lack of Resources**

School counselors, families and community members are significant constituents in the educational systems; thus, they play a crucial role in promoting SFC partnership programs. However, barriers to partnerships emerged as an important variable in the literature (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Finkelstein, 2009; Sanders & Harvey, 2002; Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). Bryan and Griffin (2010) stated that “school counselors’ partnership roles and practices and the factors that promote or hinder their partnership involvement could facilitate school counselors’ ability to effectively implement the partnership strategies” (p. 75). While SFC partnerships are related to school counselors’ efforts to improve student outcomes, their implications may be hindered by the collaborative nature of the school climate, principal expectations, school counselors’ role perceptions and self-efficacy about partnerships, time constraints, and lack of training in partnership (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

While all stakeholders are engaged in a meaningful partnership building process where there are reciprocal understandings, decision making, and trust (Ferguson, 2005a), faulty beliefs among stakeholders may present barriers for SFC partnerships. Thus, an awareness of these misconceptions is an effective strategy to overcome barriers for SFC
partnerships with diverse family engagement (Anderson & Minke, 2007; Boethel, 2003; Caspe & Lopez, 2006; Ferguson, 2008; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). When SFC resources are directed to support identified needs, it challenges barriers for family involvement (Caspe & Lopez, 2006; Ferguson, 2008). Some of these barriers for SFC partnership can be addressed through providing school translators, using a family-school liaison to engage parents, and providing professional development programs to families (Ferguson, 2005b). Ferguson (2005b) suggests developing a team approach for SFC partnerships to create a “family-friendly” school (p., 2). Developing a “family-friendly” school can be accomplished through overcoming barriers between home and school: language, scheduling, and transportation barriers; and creating a school atmosphere where parents feel welcome at the school. In this team approach, there is networking through community organizations where they support school that affect learning and help remove barriers to involvement for family and community members.

Abedi and Dietel stated, “non-school factors are strong, and they are persistent” (2004, p 784). These factors include parents’ education level or socioeconomic status, and often have a greater influence on school success compared to school factors, which exist within the ELL population. Their study with more than 30,000 students compared the gap between SAT-9 reading scores of ELL students with parents who had postgraduate education and the scores of other ELL students with parents who had not graduated from high school; and the difference was approximately 15%.

School counselors are in a central position to consider all critical players in the education of students and should acknowledge that students, as part of their family systems are appreciated for their individuality (Davis, 2005). School counselors should make an effort to connect with and act in unity with the community and provide consistent assistance for students and families (Davis). If their students and families are integrated into the school community, “schools can better address barriers to learning and teaching and promote positive development…” (Taylor & Adelman, 2000, p. 299). Yet,
school counselors’ biased perceptions, beliefs, attitudes and insufficient knowledge, skill, and training related to LDS and LDF may create barriers for SFC partnerships.

Schwallie-Giddis et al.’s (2004) qualitative study with 35 school counselors over a 9-month period, which used seven professional development sessions as interventions and focused on enhancing school counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skill stressed the following barriers for SFC partnership with LDF and LDS. Issues expressed by school counselors include difficulties in helping families “interpret” the U.S. school system, lack of confidence about culturally appropriateness of their interactions with LDF, limited knowledge about LDF’s culture, difficulty to help parents understand the school’s role and expectations of their children, frustration due to language barriers, discord that families experience as children acculturate, overreliance to LDS to translate for families, economic challenges, difficulty differentiating between cultural and individual differences, lack of time to educate themselves more about LDS and LDF, and challenges “stepping out” of their own cultures.

Training and professional development identified certain means to overcome barriers to SFC partnership (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). As school counselors’ felt strongly about their involvement in SFC partnerships, they tend to have much more willingness to be involved (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2006). It is expected that there is a negative correlation between school counselors’ awareness, knowledge and skills and the level of barriers. A school counselor’s role is defined by their school principal (Fitch et al., 2001), which creates a possible barrier for involvement. While the effectiveness of SFC partnerships for students’ academic achievement is echoed by many researchers, promoted politically, and valued by educators and others in the general public, it is hindered by such barriers as families’ lack of confidence to become involved, educators’ reluctance to encourage family involvement, educators’ lack or misconceptions related to a family’s responsibility rather than blame, home-school scheduling conflicts, and lack of training and administrative support (Gonzalez-DeHass & Willems).
Epstein’s Overlapping Spheres of Influence Model

Epstein’s model will be used for theoretical conceptualization of SFC partnerships with LDF. The theory is used commonly as the foundation for national conversations related to SFC partnership activities (Cooper, Chavira, & Mena, 2005). The standards for parent involvement in the National Parent Teacher Association are grounded on the principals of Epstein’s theory (National PTA, 1997). The model founded upon the premise that how three contexts (i.e., school, family, and community) “overlap” to some degree, identifying areas of overlapping and isolated effect on children (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010, p.2). Externally, the model frames how the context of SFC environment may be “pulled together or pushed apart by the philosophies, policies, and selected activities that are operating in each context” (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010, p. 2). Internally, the model determines how interpersonally meaningful relationships with and among parents, children, educators, and community members may affect student success.

Epstein’s (1990, 2001) Model of Overlapping Spheres of Influence examines the spheres of SFC members’ interactions for children’s learning, which conceptually explains interests, responsibilities, and investments in partnerships. Six types of involvement refer to broad categories of practices that include parents, teachers, students, and community partners and their contributions to students’ academic experience and success in school (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010). These include: (a) parenting: assisting families with parenting skills and home situations for student learning; (b) communicating with families about school programs and student progress at school; (c) volunteering at school; (d) learning at home that promote learning through homework and other activities; (e) decision making in school administration, leadership and advocacy; and (f) collaborating with community businesses and agencies to strengthen school programs, family practices that promote student learning (Epstein, 1995; Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010). These six types of involvement overlap, intersect, and influence one another (Espstein, 1995, 2001; Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010).
Epstein’s model suggests factors that predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Her model illustrates how SFC partnerships are based on a social organization perspective of overlapping influence, where children are at the center. School, family, and community relationships are dynamic and the overlapping spheres can be “pulled together or pushed apart” by forces, such as family background, parenting practices, schools and community characteristics, students’ developmental traits, and important historical events (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010; Sanders & Epstein 2000). System theories recognize families’ role in their children’s education and how SFC relations affect schooling experience (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001).

The concept of Overlapping Spheres of Influence is important because it examines the sphere of SFC interactions for children’s learning. The model explains why when children move from elementary school into middle or junior high and high school, the spheres of SFC influences may pull apart, prompting declining reciprocal SFC involvement (Cooper, Chavira, & Mena, 2005). McDonough (2004) indicate that regardless of their ethnic background, teachers and counselors can act as cultural and institutional brokers to overcome institutional barriers when they assist students to reach up to their potential (as cited in Cooper, Chavira, & Mena, 2005). Conversely, teachers and counselors can also function as institutional gatekeepers when they use standardized tests to determine students’ career paths (i.e., to decide who is qualified for vocational or college-preparation programs). As gatekeepers, they enroll students in vocational tracks based on students’ ethnicity, race, or social class (Erickson & Shultz, 1982, as cited in Cooper, Chavira, & Mena, 2005). There is evidence that parents’ aspirations and expectations are linked to students’ performance (Fan & Chen, 2001), how schools are influential in school achievement (Cooper, Chavira, & Mena), and how teachers’ beliefs can positively or adversely affect LDS’ college aspirations (George & Aronson, 2003).

Epstein’s model provides a conceptual tool to understand school counselors’ work with LDF and how such a partnership could affect LDS’ experience in school. While
these six types do not guarantee effective partnership programs, “Challenges arise that must be solved to involve all families, and activities must be selected that lead, purposely, to a welcoming climate at school and that help all students achieve at high levels” (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010, p. 2). If the goal is to develop meaningful interactions among SFC members for the LDS’ best interests, the quality and outcome of these activities must be monitored and measured to ensure engaging families for students’ benefit (Epstein & Van Voorhis, 2010), since students from diverse background benefit the most from SFC partnerships (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Hidalgo, Siu, & Epstein, 2004; Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001).

Social and Cultural Capital Approach

The concept of social and cultural capital will be used for theoretical conceptualization of partnerships with linguistically diverse families (LDF). Application of social and cultural capital concepts may increase how we understand the achievement gap (Lee & Bowen, 2006). Social capital refers to social relationships from which an individual is potentially able to create a variety of institutional resources and support (A. Portes, 1998). Schmid (2001) stated, “Academic achievement and its relationship to the sector of American society that a particular immigrant group will assimilate to is a question of extreme importance today” (p. 72). Pong, Hao, and Gardner (2005) assert that social capital can be produced through various kinds of social relations, information exchange, norms and expectations (e.g., high academic standards set by parents or other adults). Parents’ involvement in school (e.g. membership in to the parent teacher organization - PTO), helps build relationships with teachers and other staff members, which generate social capital. Parents establish these organizations to involve other parents for the governance and advocacy work in school and the larger home-school community. Parent-child interaction and communication at home refers to home-based
social capital. Such social relationships in the family and school enhance the accessibility of the present social capital for the child (Pong et al., 2005).

According to Coleman (1988), a social capital approach highlights how parents’ social relationships support the progress of children’s school effort. Parent-child interaction and communication, and parents’ social participation correspond to two different dimensions of social capital. Coleman introduced three concepts of social capital: a) obligation and expectations in social relationships; b) norms and social control; and c) information channels. Social capital is visible when obligations, expectations, trustworthiness, and norms are present in social relationships. Regular parent-child interaction itself does not constitute social capital but a kind of conversation, which transmits parents’ expectations and norms. Coleman recognized that social capital depends on trustworthiness. Thus, a high level of trust between parents and their children cultivates a sense of obligation or commitment so that children meet parents’ expectations. In such cases, social and cultural capital used to promote school success. When school partners with families, it utilizes social capital as a means to increase information, skills (i.e. ways to help with homework), access to resources, and sources of social control (i.e. consensus between home and school on students’ behavioral expectations). Further, social capital both in school and community can be facilitated through intergenerational closure, a type of social structure within a community, which binds parents and their children together (Coleman, 1988). As parents become acquainted with other parents of their child’s friends, they may receive feedback about the child’s behavior, which occurs outside the child’s immediate environment. Thus, the child is subject to the norms set by the community. In theory, parenting style and social capital have separate characteristics. Social capital can be anchored in the social relationships between parents, children, and other adults, whereas parenting styles refer to orientations of child-raising practices and parent-child relations (Pong et al., 2005).
Supportive relationships between adults and children promote desired behavior and attitudes for their successful academic outcome. There are several types of social capital. The first approach, *culture-poverty thesis*, emphasizes that varying levels of parental involvement result from social class differences since lower-class culture has different values about social organizations (Lareau, 1987). It is assumed that lower class and working class families do not value education as highly as middle-class families (Deutsch, 1967). Another view, *institutional discrimination approach*, holds responsible the schools for being more welcoming toward middle-class families than working-class and lower class families (Ogbu, 1974). How families perceive the teachers’ leadership role is a critical aspect in their involvement (Epstein & Becker, 1982).

As a term “cultural capital” was first used by Bourdieu to explain educational inequality. Bourdieu postulated that cultural capital conferred power and status for those who owned it. According to Bourdieu (1986), cultural capital produces the difference in educational achievement beyond natural aptitudes. Thus, schools represent an academic market where the distribution of cultural capital benefits the members of dominant culture. Bourdieu (1986) believed students who possess the dominant culture’s cultural capital are rewarded by the education system since the system favors their cultural capital as assets that are more valuable. However, students from non-dominant cultures have cultural capital as well, which are recognized and valued in certain familial and cultural settings but overlooked or not valued within the educational setting (Paredes, 2010).

Bourdieu (1986) identify three forms of cultural capital: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized. Embodied cultural capital refers to the “…long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body” (Bourdieu, 1986, 47). Embodied cultural capital encompasses sense of time, tradition, other cultural preferences, and ways of knowing. It is usually conveyed through socialization in the family and influences the actions one takes (Bourdieu, & Passeron, 1977). Objectified cultural capital appears to be the most noticeable “cultural goods” represented as physical objects (i.e., pictures, books, arts,
writings, and instrument), which are the hints or actualization of theories (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47). For example, for K-12 student objectified cultural capital refers to the “right” type of apparels, music and food (Paredes, 2010). While anyone can own objectified cultural capital, one must have the correct embodied cultural capital to consume it properly (Bourdieu, 1986). The institutionalized form of cultural capital refers to academic credentials and educational qualifications, which are authorized by academic institutions, which “confers entirely original properties on the cultural capital” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47). When one’s competencies and skills are recognized by institutions, it objectifies those competencies and skills. The distinction between cultural capital and economic capital can be unclear since this distinction underlines the role of cultural capital for success of those who own it (Paredes, 2010). Its exchange does not usually occur overtly and it is the “best hidden and socially most determinant educational investment” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 48). The school as social institution “helps to make and to impose the legitimate exclusions and inclusions that form the basis of the social order” and function “in the manner of a huge classificatory machine that inscribes changes within the purview of the structure, (Bourdieu, 1988).

“…capital can present itself in three fundamental guises: as economic capital, which is …directly convertible into money and may be institutionalized in the form of property rights; as cultural capital, which is convertible, on certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of educational qualifications; and as social capital, made up of social obligations ('connections'), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalized in the form of a title of nobility.” (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 47)

Often, cultural capital is mistakenly ascribed to innate talents. Likewise, successes in standardized tests are attributed to those innate talents or one’s individual effort other than cultural capital (i.e., transmitted by parents) (Paredes, 2010). Due to the hidden nature of cultural capital, the dominant culture legitimizes the educational and social inequalities that prevent non-dominant cultures to succeed. While cultural capital may be hidden (Bourdieu, 1986), English language ability, a form of cultural capital, is
overtly accepted as the valuable language in U.S. schools. One’s ability to understand and converse in English allows access to resources and opportunities within the educational system, presenting challenges for LDS. While LDS may have cultural capital in their native language, in U.S. schools, they are required to adapt their first language skills (capital) into English so that they can be successful in school (Paredes, 2010).

Lareau (1987) defined cultural capital as “The social and cultural elements of family life that facilitate compliance with teachers’ requests can be viewed as a form of cultural capital” (p. 73). Social class provides parents with unequal resources to comply with teachers. Additionally, requests for parental participation, characteristics of family life (e.g. social networks) intervene and mediate family-school relationships. In the Home Advantage (1989 & 2001), Lareau analyzed how parents shape their children’s educational experiences and challenged the view on the role of family socio-economic factors in the academic success or failure of students. The analysis of qualitative interviews unfolded differences in parental involvement patterns and placed these differences within the larger socioeconomic framework of family life experiences. Using Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital, she explained how social class shape parental involvement patterns in school and how parents’ access to cultural capital patterns affected in children’s schooling experiences. Lareau traced institutional linkages and class connections between family life, school life work, and social networks that clarified the gap in understanding institutional dynamic. By exposure to the social class system and the types of the cultural capital that their social class offers, parents shape the type of experiences they have as they move in and out of institutional settings.

However, research indicates schools have standardized views of the proper role of parents in schools (Lareau, 1989 & 2001), which may be culturally value laden (Pong et al., 2005). Furthermore, communication difficulties may become complex when parents hold biased expectations about school personnel’s role and school personnel hold biased expectations about parents’ roles. Kalyanpur, Harry, and Skrtic (2000) described two
problems related to these faulty expectations during special education considerations that hinder communication and collaboration. Professionals believe that objective knowledge is more valuable than subjective knowledge. Since some parents do not have the same knowledge as professionals, parents are viewed as less knowledgeable. For example, low income parents are viewed this way because of their lack of “cultural capital” or “access to elaborate networks of support and [educationally relevant] information” (Kalyanpur et al., 2000, p.126), which puts them at a disadvantage in successfully negotiating the channels within the educational system. As stated previously, cultural capital is a significant concept in explaining various levels of parental involvement in school experiences (Lareau, 1987). Cultural experiences in the home smooth the progress of children’s adjustment to school and academic achievement, thus converting cultural resources into cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Social and cultural aspects of family life, which facilitate acquiescence with teachers’ requirements, may be seen as a form of cultural capital (Lareau, 1987), highlighting the structure of schooling, family life and personality characteristics of individuals in understanding different levels of parental participation. Presuming that the school expectations are not neutral, the requests for parental involvement may be socially and culturally value-laden.

**Summary**

This study will examine factors that predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF using The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS). Existing literature on linguistically diverse students’ experience in educational and counseling setting was reviewed. School counselor role with LDF and students are examined. Partnership is discussed in a broader context. Chapter II reviewed the existing literature on school counselors’ work with LDF in relation to SFC partnerships. Detailed overview of the variables of interest and rationale for choosing them to answer research
questions is discussed. Chapter II concluded with rationale for choosing Epstein’s model and social and cultural capital as theoretical frameworks to make sense of the issues.

Epstein’s *Overlapping Spheres of Influence Model* presented for theoretical conceptualization for *school, family, and community partnerships* with LDF, since her conceptual framework assisted researchers and educators to consider systematic ways to collaborate with parents. Epstein’s model is investigated extensively and used to develop SFC partnership programs. Later, social and cultural capital framework presented to provide theoretical conceptualization of *school counselors’ work with LDF*.

The effectiveness of SFC partnerships for students’ academic achievement echoed extensively by many researchers, promoted politically, and valued by many educators and others in the general public. However, effective SFC partnerships are hindered by numerous barriers for families such as lack of confidence for involvement, socioeconomic, cultural and language barriers. Those barriers school counselors and educators face include a reluctance to encourage family involvement, a lack of knowledge or misconceptions related to families’ culpability, home-school scheduling conflicts, lack of counselor training, inappropriate administrative duties. Social and cultural capital framework can afford explanations for understanding and overcoming barriers for school counselor involvement with LDF.

This study diverges from studies (e.g., Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010), which previously examined school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships. This difference transpires due to its unique center of attention on school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Its focus is to understand factors that may help or hinder school counselor involvement in partnerships, which may narrow or widen achievement gaps for LDS. However, these abovementioned studies are cited frequently to set up the rationale, to address the lack of literature on school counselor involvement in SFC partnership with LDF for this study using modified version of the SCIPS revised by Bryan and Griffin in 2010.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The goal of this study is to examine school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF to understand factors that may help or hinder involvement in school, family and community (SFC) partnerships using The School Counselor Perceived Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS) revised by Bryan and Griffin in 2010.

Two school-related (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support), six school counselor-related scales (i.e., role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources), two single item indicators (i.e., principal expectations and time constraints) and partnership-related training predict school counselor involvement with LDF in SFC partnerships (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Other important descriptive variables are school counselor caseload, percentage of students on FRPL, percentage of LDS, the use of translators, bilingual status, and region of work. Variables in Part 2 (school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, and interprofessional collaboration) will be used as dependent variables.

The nature of the research questions calls for the use of quantitative research design as measured by the SCIPS. This study examines the complex interplay of school and school counselor-related factors’ influence on school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Research questions will be answered using subsequent statistical analyses (i.e., linear regression models, t-tests, ANOVAs, correlations and a multiple regression model) consistent with the research design.

Participants

There are approximately 108,000 school counselors across the United States. There are more than 28,000 ASCA members, consisting of school counselors,
administrators, and other school professionals. Among those members, 24,256 are school counselors, and only 11,779 of them owned valid e-mail addresses and had permission to share their contact information (i.e., names and e-mails) with other ACSA members.

In this study, school counselors nationwide make up the population of interest. The researcher contacted the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) to find out ways to recruit ASCA members for this study. Phone communications with Jeff Broderson (2010, July) at ASCA membership revealed that ASCA members could access the electronic membership directory and retrieve the e-mail list of the school counselors who have permission to release their names to other ACSA members. Utilizing this method, the researcher retrieved 13,120 school counselors’ e-mail information. In July of 2010, 3280 classified themselves as elementary; 936 classified themselves as elementary-middle; 2082 classified themselves as middle-junior; 877 classified themselves as middle-secondary, 1282 classified themselves as K-12; and 4663 classified themselves as secondary-high school counselors. This sampling frame was screened for invalid and duplicate e-mails. After the removal of invalid and duplicate e-mails, 11,779 valid e-mail addresses were saved in an Excel document; these usable e-mail contacts (N=11,779) created the study sampling frame. The entire sample was contacted via e-mail; 916 school counselors responded to the survey. Participants were not compensated for their time in any way (e.g., money).

Most of the school counselors were female (83.3%; 763) and White/European (81%; 742). Additionally, 10% (92) were African American/Black, 4.8% (44) Hispanic/Latino, 1.4% (13) Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.4% (4) Native American, 1.3% (12) Multiracial, and 0.8% (7) chose the category of “Other.” Approximately, 32% (293) of the school counselors who responded indicated that they had 1-5 years of experience working as a school counselor, 27.3% (250) 6-10 years, 17.2% (158) 11-15 years, 9.8% (90) 16-20 years, and 13.6% (125) had over 20 years of experience as a school counselor.
Table 1. Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Graduate School Program Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-accredited</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants (81.6%; 747) reported having a M.A., M.S., and M.Ed., 7% (64) Ph.D., Ed.D., 7.8% (71) Advanced Specialist or Certification while .2% (2) chose B.S., B.A. and 2.8% (26) chose “Other.” Almost sixty percent (58.1%; 532) of school counselors participating in the survey reported graduating from a CACREP accredited training programs, while 17.1% (157) from NCATE, 11.5% (105) other, 5.6% (51) non-accredited, and 2.9% (27) from CORE accredited training programs. A.S.C.A.
members made up 91.7% (840) of the participants, 71.6% (656) were State School Counseling Association members, 20.6% (189) had other memberships, 15.4% (141) A.C.A., 2.3% (21) A.P.A. members and 1.4% (13) did not select any choice.

About a third of all participants, 33.2% (304) worked in middle or junior high, while 38.1% (349) worked in elementary, and 43.7% (400) in high school. While the majority of school counselors, 84.2% (771) worked at public and/or non-charter schools, 8.2% (75) worked at private, 4.9% (45) worked at public-charter schools, and 1.5% (14) in “Other” settings. A majority of participants, 40.2% (368), worked in suburban schools, while 31.6% (289) were employed in rural and 27.1% (248) in urban community settings. A considerable proportion, 39% (338) of the participants worked at the southern region, 19.4% (168) at the north central, 16.7% (145) at the north Atlantic region, 13.3% (115) at the western region, 7.6% (66) at the rocky mountain region, 0.2% (2) at other regions, and 0.2% (2) at District of Columbia, while 3.4% (31) at other countries. Means and standard deviations of number of school counselors employed and caseload:

Table 3. Number of School Counselor Employed and School Counselor Caseload

<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>number of school</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselors employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school counselor</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>393.70</td>
<td>213.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caseload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Measure**

The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS), designed by Bryan (2003) and revised by Bryan and Griffin (2010), was used for this study (see Appendix F). The original SCIPS was developed by Bryan (2003) “to assess school
counselor involvement in school-family-community partnership practices and factors that influence their partnership involvement” (Bryan & Griffin, 2010, p. 76). The instrument served as a data collection tool in a number of published studies (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010) and has been revised over the years. Recently, the factor structure of the instrument has been studied (Bryan & Griffin, 2010) and minor revisions have been made to the SCIPS to better capture the school-related factors, new items were added to measure role perceptions, and some items were reworded for clarity. A panel of three counselor educators and two school psychologists with an expertise on SFC partnerships and two experienced education researchers in survey development were utilized for revising the survey. The panel reviewed the instrument using item analyses and provided suggestions for modifications. The revised survey was later piloted on 10 elementary, middle, and high school counselors in Virginia settings to receive feedback on the clarity and relevance of the items, length and format of the survey, and content validity (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

The investigator chose to use the SCIPS, because an extensive search yielded no other measures of involvement in SFC partnerships. Since the SCIPS was not specifically developed to assess school counselor involvement with LDF, the researcher modified the survey to incorporate the *linguistically diverse* phrase throughout as a way to remind the participants to answer questions with respect to LDF (e.g., Part 2.4. Training *linguistically diverse* families and students to access services in the school and community –words in italics added). The acronym LDS refers to linguistically diverse students; the acronym LDF refers to linguistically diverse families. The definition of SFC partnership is integrated into the instrument. Others who want to the measure for research purpose should contact, Dr. Julia Bryan, the author of the SCIPS.

The instrument consists of three sections. Part 1 presents Descriptive Information (e.g., years of experience, gender, racial and ethnic background) and includes 26 questions. Part 2 includes 17 items on various partnership practices (e.g., collaborating,
coordinating, teaming with and training others) that measure involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF on a five point Likert Scale: 1 (not at all) to 5 (very frequently). The items in Part 2 are treated as dependent variables using Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) three dimensions of involvement factor structure: (a) school-family partnerships (9 items), (b) school-community collaboration (5 items) and (c) inter-professional collaboration (3 items). Part 3 includes 57 items, which examine the role of school and school counselor-related affect school counselor involvement in SFC partnership with LDF on a six point Likert Scale: 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study revealed school counselor involvement in partnerships was related to two school and six school counselor-related factors, which are used as independent variables in this study. They are: (a) collaborative school climate (7 items); (b) principal support (9 items); (c) role perceptions about partnership (6 items); (d) self-efficacy about partnership (6 items); (e) commitment to advocacy (5 items); (f) attitudes about partnerships (6 items); (7) attitudes about families (11 items); and (8) lack or resources (2 items). Two single item indicators (i.e., principal expectations and time constraints) and other variables such as the use of translators and bilingual status were used as independent variables in the regression analyses to examine school counselor involvement with LDF in SFC partnerships. The items that make up each three dimensions of involvement, two school and six school counselor-related scales were constructed based on previously determined factor analyses of Bryan and Griffin (2010).

At the end of the survey, there are three open-ended questions. These questions are used to report any patterns or themes related to school and school counselor factors that help or hinder school counselor involvement in partnerships with LDF and LDS, which contribute to the LDS’ school success by narrowing the achievement gap. These questions are included to gain an in-depth understanding about participants’ motivation to respond in the way they did to the survey, which in turn may explain school and school counselor-related factors that contribute building SFC partnerships with LDF.
Internal-consistency reliability coefficients were estimated using Cronbach’s alpha for 17 items in Part 2 that made up dependent variables/scales and for 57 items in Part 3 of survey that made up independent variables/scales (i.e., by taking the average covariance among items). For example, Cronbach’s α score was .935 for 57 items, which measured school and school-counselor variables for 606 (66.2%) participants. This process indicated that items in Part 3, which measured school and school-counselors related factors were significantly positively correlated with each other, indicating consistency among test items (i.e., using Cronbach’s α to measure inter-item reliability). During this process, the reverse scored items were used for those negatively worded seven items so that all the items are positively correlated. Similarly, Cronbach’s α score was .956 for 17 items, which measured involvement SFC partnerships for 785 (85.7%) participants. High Cronbach’s α values indicate that individual scales and all items in Part 2 which measure constructs related to involvement and Part 3 which measure school and school counselors-related constructs were all related and significantly positively correlated with each other, indicating the consistency of items in Part 2 and Part 3.

Table 4. Reliability Statistics for Dependent Scales of the SCIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-Family Collaboration</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Collaboration</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-professional Collaboration</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 17 items in Part 2</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.
Table 5. Reliability Statistics for Independent Scales of the SCIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative School Climate</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Support</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Perceptions about Partnership</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy about Partnership</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Advocacy</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about Partnerships</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about Families</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Resources</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 57 items in Part 3</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Procedures

Due to their training, experience, and expertise, the survey was piloted to 18 individuals to obtain feedback on grammar, clarity, readability, comprehension, appropriateness, as well as formatting, set-up, layout, and length. These extensive reviews provided evidence to support content validity. Based on feedback, some items were added, rephrased and/or revised in Part 1 of survey (i.e., Descriptive Information). Other issues related to set-up (e.g., question type and properties), layout (i.e., color, presentation and order) and formatting were reexamined (i.e., section banners). Comments from the Aydin, Bryan, and Duys (2011) study were considered in the item inclusion (e.g., Question 18. “Please indicate the approximate total number of linguistically diverse students enrolled in your school”). The survey was piloted through a process of internal review. One person with expertise in school, family and community partnerships, Dr. Julia Bryan, provided continuous feedback throughout the study by answering questions and offering clarification, especially related to Part 2 and 3. One
individual with expertise in WebSurveyor, with years of experience as a school professional, administrator and teacher educator, provided an immeasurable amount of feedback on survey set-up, layout, formatting, as well as grammar, clarity, and appropriateness of survey questions. In addition, he completed the survey several times for testing purposes. Another individual with expertise in WebSurveyor also provided additional feedback on the survey layout, formatting, clarity and grammar. Two individuals with training in English and professional writing experience assessed survey questions based on grammar, clarity, and readability. Five individuals with doctorates in counseling-related fields provided feedback to support content validity, as well as clarity and pertinence of items. Four individuals with a background in educational measurement, one individual with a background in school psychology, and one individual with a background in sociology of education also provided feedback, which especially helped improve the Descriptive Information section. Five The University of Iowa Counselor Education doctoral students were also asked to complete the survey to obtain feedback on word clarity, comprehension, format, and length. At the end of the piloting procedure, all piloted surveys were deleted to exclude from the data analyses.

The University of Iowa Institutional Review Board approved this study with an exempt status on January 5, 2011 (see Appendix G). After piloting, minor modifications were made to the wording, formatting, and layout of survey; these revisions were approved on February 22, 2011. Participants completed the study survey (i.e., SCIPS) via WebSurveyor. The researcher collected data through WebSurveyor, an online data collection method through The University of Iowa. The researcher administered the survey, using the study’s listserv created by The University of Iowa Information Technology Services (i.e., COE-AYDIN-SC-LDF@list.uiowa.edu). Numerous options to gather data were explored; using listserv was found to be most efficient. The researcher created a listserv to manage sending 11,779 e-mails to participants at one time, thereby simplifying the process. The researcher did not collect any personally
identifiable information about the subjects, including who participated or who did not in the study. The survey is estimated to take approximately 20 – 30 minutes to complete.

Achieving a minimum 25% response rate (i.e., 2,945) as a target percentage of return was expected for a minimum of 11,779 participants because web surveys often have a lower response rate in comparison to mail (Couper, 2000, Solomon, 2001). Kittleson stated, “One can expect between a 25 – 30% response rate from an e-mail survey when no follow-up takes place. Follow-up reminders will approximately double the response rate for e-mail surveys” (1997, p. 196). However, after counting 154 bounced back and unsubscribed e-mail notices (i.e., who left the listserv), the researcher reduced the number of school counselors in the population. Thus, the population of school counselors was reduced from 11,779 [- 154] to 11,625, reducing a minimum 25% response rate from 2,945 to 2,906; 916 participants completed the survey, corresponding to 7.9% response rate. The completion criterion of 70% was implemented at the scale level for Part 2 and 3. In terms of descriptive statistics for Part 1, the N count for each question was considered separately. This exclusion criterion is reflected on the composite mean scores of two school-related, six school counselor-related and three dimension of involvement scale scores (i.e., keeping survey 70% or more complete).

Data Collection

All participants received recruitment, first reminder, clarification and second reminder e-mails. Initially, school counselors received a recruitment e-mail (see Appendix B) that included an explanation about the purpose of the survey, its voluntary nature, confidentiality, and a hyperlink to WebSurveyor. When participants followed the hyperlink, they read the exempt information sheet (see Appendix A) before taking the survey and continued to take the survey, if they chose to participate. An exempt information sheet followed the introduction page that described the purpose of the survey and a definition of SFC partnerships, LDS and LDF. One week after the recruitment e-
mail, the researcher sent the first reminder e-mail (see Appendix C); two weeks after the recruitment e-mail, participants received the second reminder (see Appendix E). These two reminder e-mails were very similar to the initial recruitment e-mail regarding content. They included an explanation of the survey’s purpose, its voluntary status, confidentiality, and a hyperlink to WebSurveyor. The researcher acknowledged those who already completed the survey and reminded others to participate. The researcher respected the right of any individual withdrawing his or her participation. The second reminder e-mail indicated that a) this would be the last e-mail; b) participants will not receive any more e-mails; and c) the survey would conclude within a week, and if participants had not yet taken part but planned to do so, they should do so soon.

E-mails were sent on the following order and dates: recruitment e-mail, February 22nd, 2011; first reminder e-mail, February 28th, 2011; clarification e-mail, March 2nd, 2011; second & final reminder e-mail, March 7th, 2011. Data collection was closed on March 14, 2011 and 916 participants completed the SCIPS. The clarification notice was sent in response to the inquiries regarding participants’ inclusion. Namely, an overwhelming number of school counselors who initially declined taking part in the survey (i.e., due to not having any or limited number of LDS) necessitated this action. The clarification e-mail indicated that the number of LDS served in school is not an issue and thereby does not determine participants’ inclusion. This e-mail indicated that all school counselors are eligible and encouraged to participate in this study, regardless of the number of LDS in a school; in addition, skipping several questions would not invalidate their response. Data collection was completed over a three-week period.

Reviewing the survey response-rate-pattern, the number of school counselors participating in the survey increased considerably after each e-mail notice (e.g., 115 school counselors completed the survey on February 22; 273 on February 28; 154 on March 2; and 115 on March 7). Collected data exported from WebSurveyor to SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 19) for data analyses. There may
have been a fortuitous time-sensitive occurrence during data collection, which should be mentioned as an important anecdote related to the study. There happened to be a legislative alert on Monday, February 28, 2011. The House Majority recently passed H.R. 1. This legislative action would cut $10.6 billion or 15.3 percent of the education budget for fiscal year 2011, thereby eliminating the elementary and secondary school counseling program. Since this legislative alert happened during the data collection process of the study, unexpectedly, rather than hurting response rate, it may have helped boost the number of school counselors completing the survey (i.e., 273) particularly on February 28. Almost one third of the total respondents completed the survey on this date alone. This time-sensitive occurrence, regarding the highest response rate on February 28, 2011, could be related to the timing of the first reminder e-mail as well.

While 7.9% response rate may seem much smaller than 25% target return rate, the researcher realized that the actual (accessible) population is also much smaller when some participants indicated a number of conditions, which disqualified them from taking part in the study. These conditions include a) retirement, b) transfer to an administrative or another job related or unrelated to school counseling, c) loss of jobs due to budget cuts, d) inability to participate without school district’s permission, e) being new in the profession or f) being a graduate student with no experience. If these individuals could be calculated and removed from the population, it might result in reducing the number of school counselors in population and increasing the response rate (i.e., higher than 7.9%). The researcher is unable to estimate how much smaller the accessible population is.

**Research Questions**

Research Question 1. Does general partnership-related training predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

Research Question 2. Does school counselor caseload predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?
Research Question 3. Are school counselors’ gender, race and ethnicity, bilingual status, specific training received in partnership on LDS and LDF and the use of translators related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

Research Question 4. Do school (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations) and school counselor variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnerships, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints, the use of translators and bilingual status) predict involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, after controlling for the percentage of students on FRPL and LDS?

Research Question 5. To what extent did the use of translators, bilingual status, caseload, race and ethnicity, FRPL status relate to the percentage of LDS served?

Data Analyses

Survey data downloaded from WebSurveyor into an Excel file to calculate and report the mean and standard deviations of descriptive information. Later, the researcher transferred the data from the Excel file to SPSS 17.0. If more than 30% of the data was missing in any survey, it was considered incomplete; thus, those particular surveys were not included in the calculation of composite scores of overall involvement, three dimensions of involvement, two school-related and six school counselor-related scales (Part 2 and 3). In terms of descriptive statistics for Part 1, the N count for each question was considered separately. This exclusion criterion is reflected on the composite mean scores of two school-related, six school counselor-related and three dimension of involvement scale scores (i.e., keeping survey 70% or more complete).

The descriptive information includes years of school counseling experience; gender; ethnicity; the highest degree earned; the accreditation of the graduate school program; professional association membership; the school setting; the type of school; community setting; the size of school district; the region of the country; general
partnership-related training hours; specific partnership-related training hours; the number of students enrolled; the number of school counselors employed; the school counselor caseload; the number of students on FRPL; the number of LDS; the most commonly spoken language of LDS and LDF; if the school utilize translators; if the school counselor is bilingual; any formal instruction in partnerships specific to working with LDS and LDF; hours of formal instruction received in partnerships specific to working with LDS and LDF; informal knowledge about LDS and LDF.

This study examined factors that help or hinder school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF using the instrument The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS), originally designed by Bryan (2003) and revised by Bryan and Griffin in 2010. Using 217 responses from a national sample of participants, the factor structure of the 16 dependent variables in the SCIPS in Part 2 were examined. Results revealed three dimensions of involvement: a) home-school partnerships (eight items), b) school-community collaboration (five items) and c) involvement on collaborative teams (three items). Modeling Bryan and Griffin (2010) three dimensions of involvement factor scales, dependent variables are created. Overall involvement and three dimensions of involvement composite mean scores were calculated.

Bryan and Griffin (2010) results revealed two school a) collaborative school climate (seven items) and b) principal support (nine items), and six school counselor-related factor scales a) role perceptions about partnership (six items); b) self-efficacy about partnerships (six items); c) commitment to advocacy (five items); d) attitudes about partnerships (six items); e) attitudes about families (11 items); f) lack of resources (two items). Two additional school counselor-related single item indicators were also entered as factor, since they were found to be significant predictor of school counselor involvement a) principal expectations “I believe the principal expects me to be involved in partnerships with LDF” b) time constraints “I do not have the time to get involved in partnerships with LDF.” These single items are used as independent variables in the
Regression analyses. Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) factor analyses results provide preliminary support for the validity and reliability of the revised SCIPS.

**Research Question 1.** Does general partnership-related training predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

- Dependent Variable: school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF
- Independent Variables: general and specific partnership-related training

A linear regression analysis was used to predict school counselor involvement from general partnership training. The model examined if partnership-related training significantly predicted school counselor involvement with LDF and what percentage of the variance in school counselor involvement with LDF was accounted for by the partnership-related training. Partnership related training is used as predictor independent variable while school counselor involvement with LDF is used as a dependent variable.

**Research Question 2.** Does school counselor caseload predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

- Dependent Variable: school counselor involvement in SFC partnership with LDF
- Independent Variables: school counselor caseload

A linear regression analysis was used to predict school counselor involvement with LDF from school counselor caseload. The model examined if school counselor caseload significantly predicted involvement with LDF and what percentage of the variance in school counselor involvement with LDF was accounted for by school counselor caseload. The school counselor caseload is used as predictor independent variable while school counselor involvement with LDF is used as a dependent variable.

**Research Question 3.** Are school counselors’ gender, race and ethnicity, bilingual status, specific training received in partnership on LDS and LDF and the use of translators related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

- Dependent Variable: school counselor involvement with LDF
Independent Variables: gender, race and ethnicity, bilingual status, specific training received in partnership on LDS and LDF and the use of translators.

T-tests were used to answer if school counselors’ gender (i.e., Male or Female), race and ethnicity (i.e., White or non-White), bilingual status (i.e., Yes or No), and instruction received in partnership on LDS and LDF (i.e., Yes versus No) are related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

An ANOVA was used to answer to what extent school counselors’ the use of translators is related to their involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

**Research Question 4.** Do school (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations) and school counselor variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnerships, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints, the use of translators and bilingual status) predict involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, after controlling for the percentage of students on FRPL and LDS?

A multiple regression analysis was used to answer the question.

Dependent Variables: school counselor involvement with LDF

Independent Variables entered in the following four steps:

First: the percentage of students on FRPL and the percentage of LDS
Second: collaborative school climate, principal support, principal expectations
Third: role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, lack of resources, and time constraints
Fourth: the use of translators and bilingual status

**Research Question 5.** To what extent did the use of translators, bilingual status, caseload, race and ethnicity, FRPL status relate to the percentage of LDS served?

Dependent Variable: the percentage of LDS
Independent Variables: bilingual status, ethnicity, caseload, FRPL, and the use of translators

Independent samples t-tests were used to examine whether race and ethnicity and bilingual status were related to the percentage of LDS. Correlation analyses were used to determine whether the percentage of LDS served in school was related to FRPL status and caseload. An ANOVA was used to answer whether the use of translators was related to the percentage of LDS served. The dependent variable was the percentage of LDS; the independent variable was the use of translators.

Summary

Chapter III presented research questions and described participant selection and recruitment process. Detailed information on study instrument (i.e., reliability and validity information) is provided. Procedures, data collection, and data analyses processes chosen to answer research questions are outlined.
CHAPTER IV RESULTS

Introduction

Over the course of three weeks, 916 school counselors participated in the study survey that examined factors that predicted school counselor involvement in partnerships and school counselor perception about SFC partnerships with LDF. This sample represents a national study of school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, using The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS) revised by Bryan and Griffin in 2010 that surveyed American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and non-ASCA members across the United States.

Descriptive Information

Descriptive information presented below provides basic statistics of the general characteristics of the participants (e.g., general and specific training, school size, student enrollment, FRPL status). Question 12 asked, “Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received specific to developing and implementing school, family, and community partnerships?” Maximum clock hours of training were 999 and a minimum clock hour was zero. Out of 916, only 780 (85.2%) school counselors responded to this question. Question 13 asked, “Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received specific to school, family, and community partnerships from each of the following sources?” School counselors had multiple options to select from.

Question 14 asked, “Did you receive any training in school, family, and community partnerships specific to working with linguistically diverse students and families?” Nearly half of all participants (478; 52.2%) indicated that they received training specific to working with LDS and LDF, while the other half did not (429; 46.8%). For school counselors who answered “Yes” in Question 14, Question 15 followed up by asking, “Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received in school, family, and community partnerships specific to working with
linguistically diverse students and families?” Participants had multiple options from which to select. Maximum clock hours of training were 999 and a minimum clock hour was zero. Descriptive information about this specific training received working with LDS and LDF is listed in the following table:

### Table 6. General Hours of Training Received in SFC Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course(s)</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>132.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>87.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service workshop(s)</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>91.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum/Internship</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>89.48</td>
<td>210.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>96.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class presentation(s)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>100.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. Specific Hours of Training Received in SFC Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course(s)</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>128.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>26.84</td>
<td>106.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service workshop(s)</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>96.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum/Internship</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>62.39</td>
<td>164.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56.02</td>
<td>180.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class presentation(s)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>100.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On average, 906 (SD=729) totaled the number of students enrolled in school; among those students, 212 (SD=472) of them were LDS, indicating that nearly one in every four students enrolled was a linguistically diverse student. The mean for the number of school counselors employed at participants’ schools was 2.70 (SD=2.8). Participants had an approximate average of 393 (SD=213) students in their caseload (i.e., student-to-counselor ratio ~number of students assigned per counselor). On average, school counselors indicated having 43.7% (SD = 30) students on FRPL in their school.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Students Served

<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>number of students enrolled</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>906.34</td>
<td>729.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of counselors</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counselor caseload</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>393.70</td>
<td>213.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Percentage</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRPL Percentage</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>30.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. The Use of Translators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Use of Translators</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most commonly spoken language of LDS was Spanish 72.9% (668), Korean 4.1% (38), Chinese, Cantonese 4.0% (37), Arabic 1.9% (17), Hmong 1.4% (13), Vietnamese 0.7 % (6), and other 10.5% (96). In question 23 participants were asked, “How frequently do you utilize translators to communicate with linguistically diverse students and/or families? About 20% (17.2%; 158) of the school counselors responded not at all, 37.8% (346) rarely, 23.6% (216) moderately, 14.3% (131) frequently, and 5.9% (54) very frequently, while 1.2% (11) participants left that question blank.

To question 24, “Are you proficient in more than one language? (e.g., are you bilingual/ multilingual?),” only 17.5% (160) stated they were bilingual/multilingual, while the majority of participants (753; 82.2%) indicated “No” and three (.3%) participants did not respond to the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Bilingual/Multilingual Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of any informal knowledge that school counselors have about linguistically diverse populations included interaction with students and families (82.8%; 717), professional conversations (79.2%; 686), books (67.7%; 586), consultation (55.0%; 476), internet (47.5%; 411), TV programs/movies (31.2%; 270), other (12.7%; 110), and trainees (12.4%; 107).

Question 26 asked, “What are the most common issues you encounter while working with linguistically diverse students?” School counselors reported those issues to be academic challenges (638; 69.7%), family issues (420; 45.9%), learning difficulties
friendship issues (313: 34.2%), behavioral issues (250: 27.3%), language anxiety (240: 26.2%), acculturation anxiety (228: 24.9%), bullying/violence (204: 22.3%), depression (133: 14.5%), and other issues (83: 9.1%).

Results

The goal of this study was to examine school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF to understand factors that may help or hinder involvement in SFC partnerships using the SCIPS revised by Bryan and Griffin in 2010.

Dependent variables were created by averaging the items that make up each of the three scales in Part 2 of the survey. This procedure generated scale composite scores for three dimensions of involvement (i.e., school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, and inter-professional collaboration). Taking the weighted average of the three scales from Part 2 created an overall involvement score. Independent variables were created by calculating the composite scores of the scales that made up each scale in Part 3 of the survey. Scale composite scores were calculated by taking the average scores of all items that made up each scale for two school-related (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support) and six school counselor-related factors (i.e., role perceptions about partnerships, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources). When calculating composite scale scores, reverse coded items were re-coded (i.e., two items in self-efficacy about partnerships scale and 11 items in the attitudes about families scale). The items making up each scale was decided by previously determined factor analyses (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Seven negatively keyed items, such as “In this school it is difficult to get LDF involved in partnerships,” were re-coded.

Scale composite mean and standard deviation scores for three dimensions of involvement were calculated. In the present study, school counselors reported a moderate level of involvement in three dimensions of SFC partnerships with LDF: a) school-family
partnerships (9 items; $M = 2.17; SD = .87$); b) school-community collaboration (5 items; $M = 2.18; SD = .91$); c) inter-professional collaboration (3 items; $M = 2.60; SD = 1.04$) and overall involvement ($M = 2.26; SD = .85$). Results were compared to Bryan and Griffin’s 2010 study scores in three dimensions of involvement; these three dimensions of involvement scale scores were slightly lower: a) school-family partnerships (9 items; $M = 2.62$); b) school-community collaboration (5 items; $M = 2.91$); c) inter-professional collaboration (3 items; $M = 3.29$) and overall involvement ($M = 2.86$).

Table 11. Overall and Three Dimension of Involvement Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-Family Partnerships</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Community Collaboration</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-professional Collaboration</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Involvement</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Two School and Six School Counselor-Related Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative School Climate</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Support</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Perception about Partnerships</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy about Partnerships</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Advocacy</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about Partnerships</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about Families</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Resources</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1

Does general partnership-related training predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

A linear regression model was used to predict school counselor involvement from general and specific partnership-related training. The model predicted the percentage of variance in school counselor involvement determined by general partnership-related training hours received. General partnership training was used as the independent variable; overall involvement was used as the dependent variable.

Table 13. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Training</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Overall Involvement

The model was statistically significant ($R^2 = .01$) with a $p = .001$ (i.e., $p < .05$). A statistically significant proportion of variance in overall involvement was explained by general training received. However, only 1.4% of the variance in involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF was accounted for by general training hours received. Results indicated that general hours of training received in developing and implementing partnerships was related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

Does specific partnership-related training predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF? Specific hours of training received was used as the independent variable, while overall involvement was used as the dependent variable.
Linear regression model was significant \((R^2 = .09; p < .001)\). The p-value reported was .000 (i.e., \(p < .05\)). Specialized training received in developing and implementing partnerships predicted school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. About 9% (i.e., 8.7%) of the variance in school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF was accounted for by the specialized training received. Nearly half of the school counselors who indicated receiving specialized training working with LDS and LDF ranked higher involvement scores in SFC partnerships with LDF.

Table 14. Coefficients\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Training</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Dependent Variable: Overall Involvement

**Research Question 2**

Does school counselor caseload predict school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

A linear regression analysis was used to predict school counselor involvement from school counselor caseload. *School counselor caseload* was used as the independent variable; overall involvement was used as the dependent variable.

Linear regression model was significant \((R^2 = .26)\). The p-value reported was .000 (i.e., \(p < .05\)). School counselor caseload predicted involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF as 2.6% of the variance in involvement in SFC with LDF was accounted for by school counselor caseload. The positive direction of the relationship \((r = 162)\) is such
that a heavier caseload resulted in more involvement as measured by the overall involvement scale; however, the magnitude is very small. School counselors with a heavier caseload were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF.

Table 15. Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Overall Involvement

Research Question 3

Are gender, race and ethnicity, bilingual status, the use of translators, and specific training received related to overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF?

An independent samples t-test was used to answer whether school counselors’ gender was related to overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, using the independent variable being gender, the dependent, overall involvement.

Table 16. Group Statistics: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An independent samples t-test indicated nonsignificant differences between gender $t (.051) = .96$ with 887 df, representing that on average, men (N = 146; M = 2.26; SD = 8.58) and women (N = 743; M = 2.26; SD = 8.49) did not differ in their overall involvement as measured by the SCIPS.

An independent samples t-test was used to investigate whether race and ethnicity (i.e., White or non-White) was related to overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. The dependent variable was overall involvement; the independent variable was school counselors’ race and ethnicity (i.e., White or non-White).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent samples t-test indicated significant differences between race and ethnicity and overall involvement $t (5.07)$ with 227 df. On average, Whites (N = 724) and non-Whites (N = 169) differed in their overall involvement scores as measured by the SCIPS. Significance (2-tailed) $p > .05$ (.000) with unequal variance was assumed. The t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the average mean scores of White (M = 2.18, SD = .80) and non-White (M = 2.58, SD = .954) school counselor involvement scores $t = 5.07$, $p < .05$. Results indicated that school counselors who identified themselves as non-White were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF.

A t-test was used to examine whether school counselors’ bilingual status was related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. School
counselors’ bilingual status was used as the independent variable, while their overall involvement was used as the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilingual Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typically, school counselors who indicated being bilingual or multilingual (N = 156) had slightly higher overall involvement scores, compared to monolingual participants (N = 734). On average, school counselors with bilingual status rated higher involvement scores as measured by the SCIPS with a p < .05.

A t-test was used to examine whether specific training received in partnerships (i.e., Yes versus No) was related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. The dependent variable was school counselor involvement; the independent variable was specific training received in SFC partnerships working with LDS and LDF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Training Received</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents who indicated having received training in serving linguistically diverse populations (N = 468) did not have significant differences in their involvement scores, compared to participants who did not receive such training (N = 417). School counselors did not differ in their involvement scores as measured by the SCIPS with a p < .05, compared with those indicated not receiving training on LDS and LDF.

An ANOVA was used to answer to what extent the use of translators related to overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. The dependent variable was overall involvement; the independent variable was the use of translators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 20. Descriptive: Overall Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21. ANOVA Overall Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School counselors responded to the question, “How frequently do you utilize translators to communicate with linguistically diverse students and/or families?” on a five point Likert scale, ranging from “Not at all” to “Very Frequently.” Answers ranged from 17.2% (158) school counselors who responded not at all, 37.8% (346) rarely, 23.6% (216) moderately, 14.3% (131) frequently, and 5.9% (54) very frequently. An ANOVA revealed significant results (i.e., the mean difference is at the 0.05 level), indicating that overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF was influenced by the use of translators. A post hoc Tukey HSD was conducted to examine origins of these differences. The largest mean differences fell between those who answered “not at all” and “very frequently.” The mean difference (i.e., -1.50) was significant at the 0.05 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) The Use of Translators</th>
<th>(J) The Use of Translators</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.77*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-1.05*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-1.50*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.70*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-1.15*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-0.72*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-0.45*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level on a five point Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 5 –“Not at all,” “Rarely,” “Moderately,” “Frequently,” to “Very Frequently.”
Figure 1 Means Plot for Overall Involvement and the Use of Translators
Research Question 4

Do school (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations) and school counselor variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnerships, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints, the use of translators and bilingual status) predict involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, after controlling for the percentage of students on FRPL and LDS?

A multiple regression analysis was used to answer the question. What items make up each scale was decided by previously determined factor analyses of Bryan and Griffin (2010). Based on this method, scale composite scores were created by taking the average scores of all items that make up school and school counselor-related scales. It is important to note that the independent variables of principal expectations, time constraints, the use of translators and bilingual status are single items. Other independent and dependent variables entered in the regression model were the scale scores reported for each respondent; the average of the items belonged to that given scale. Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between one dependent variable and a set of independent or predictor variables, using the order of entry method to enter predictor variables in several steps (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

First, control variables (FRPL status and the percentage of LDS) were entered. Second, school related variables (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support and principal expectation) were entered as predictor variables to examine whether they contributed a significant proportion of variance in school counselor involvement. Third, school counselor-related variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnership, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints) were entered to examine whether they contributed a significant proportion of variance in school counselor involvement beyond school variables. After controlling for variables entered earlier, bilingual status and the
use of translators were then entered into the model to examine whether they contributed to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

The percentage of LDS and FRPL status contributed to a significant increase of school counselor overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, $R^2 = .136$, $F (2, 700) = 54.980$, $p = .000$, adjusted $R^2 = .133$ (Step 1). After controlling for the percentage of LDS and FRPL status, school variables (i.e., principal support, principal expectations, collaborative school climate) contributed to a significant proportion of variance in overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, $R^2 = .342$, $F (3, 697) = 72.971$, $p = .000$, adjusted $R^2 = .338$ (Step 2). After controlling for the percentage of LDS and FRPL status, school and school counselor-related variables contributed significantly to overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, above and beyond the school variables, $R^2 = .430$, $F (7, 690) = 15.109$, $p = .000$, adjusted $R^2 = .420$ (Step 3). After controlling for the variables previously entered, bilingual status and the use of translators accounted for a significant proportion of variance in overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. For example, the R square change column and the significance F change column indicated that after controlling for the variables in Step 1, variables in Step 2 accounted for a significant proportion of variance in overall involvement (20.7%). All variables entered in steps 1 and 2 accounted for 34.2% of the variance in overall involvement. The R square change (20.7%), along with this F value as the F value reported, accounted for the addition of variables in step 2. Thus, the p values indicated whether the addition of variables in each step under consideration contributed to a significant proportion of variance above and beyond what the other variables entered.
Table 23. Multiple Regression Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Change df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.368a</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.79149</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>54.980</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.585b</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.69193</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>72.971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.656c</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.64757</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>15.109</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.717d</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.59859</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>59.776</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Predictors: (Constant), percentage of LDS and FRPL

2. Predictors: (Constant), percentage of LDS and FRPL, principal support, principal expectations and collaborative school climate

3. Predictors: (Constant), percentage of LDS and FRPL, principal support, principal expectations, collaborative school climate, role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, lack of resources, and time constraints

4. Predictors: (Constant), percentage of LDS and FRPL, principal support, principal expectations, collaborative school climate, role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, lack of resources, and time constraints, bilingual status, and use of translators
Research Question 5

To what extent did the use of translators, bilingual status, caseload, race and ethnicity, FRPL status relate to the percentage of LDS served?

Correlation analyses were used to determine whether the percentage of LDS served in school was related to FRPL status and caseload.

Independent samples t-tests were used to examine whether race and ethnicity and bilingual status were related to the percentage of LDS.

An ANOVA was used to answer whether the use of translators was related to the percentage of LDS served. The dependent variable was the percentage of LDS; the independent variable was the use of translators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>22.77</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>28.46</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>31.61</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>26.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>34.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>21.02</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Descriptive Statistics for the Percentage of LDS Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>89352.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22338.24</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>554596.55</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>630.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>643949.53</td>
<td>884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. ANOVA Test for the Percentage of LDS Served
Table 26. Multiple Comparisons: Percentage of LDS Served Tukey HSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) The Use of Translators</th>
<th>(J) The Use of Translators</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-4.49</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound  Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.14  2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-18.88*</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-26.12  -11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-22.03*</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-30.21  -13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-33.66*</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-44.50  -22.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-14.38*</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-20.41  -8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-17.53*</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-24.66  -10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-29.17*</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-39.23  -19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-3.15</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>-10.83  4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-14.78*</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-25.25  -4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-11.63*</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-22.76  -0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level on a five point Likert scale, ranging from 1 to 5 – “Not at all,” “Rarely,” “Moderately,” “Frequently,” to “Very Frequently.”

An ANOVA test was employed to determine whether the use of translators influenced the percentage of LDS served. As one would anticipate, findings revealed significant results (i.e., mean difference is at the 0.05 level), indicating that the use of translators was influenced by the percentage of LDS served. School counselors utilized translators more frequently as the number of LDS increased. A post hoc Tukey HSD was conducted to examine the origin of these differences. Results indicated significant differences in school counselors’ use of translators (i.e., not at all, rarely, moderately, frequently, and very frequently). The largest mean differences fell between those who answered “not at all” and “very frequently.” The mean difference (i.e., -33.6) was significant at the 0.05 level (see the means plot figure).
Correlation analyses were used to examine whether the percentage of LDS served was related to students’ FRPL status and caseload. Percentages of LDS served correlated significantly with FRPL status ($r = .337$) and caseload ($r = .161$) (i.e., significance at the 0.05 level - 2-tailed). Whenever school counselors had higher percentages of LDS, they had a higher number of students with FRPL status, including having more students as part of their caseload.
Table 27. Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of LDS</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of FRPL</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>30.47</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>393.70</td>
<td>213.23</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of LDS</th>
<th>Percentage of FRPL</th>
<th>Caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of LDS</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of FRPL</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>.084*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

An independent sample t-test was used to answer if school counselors’ race and ethnicity was related to the percentage of LDS served in school. The dependent variable was the percentage of LDS served in school; the independent variable was school counselors’ race and ethnicity.

An independent samples t-test indicated significant differences between the percentage of LDS served in school and school counselors’ race and ethnicity. The result indicated significant differences between race and ethnicity and the percentage of LDS served in school $t(5.29)$ with 216 df.
Table 29. Group Statistics: The Percentage of LDS Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White or Other</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, White school counselors (N = 722) and non-White school counselors (N = 168) differed by the percentages of LDS served in school as measured by the SCIPS. The finding indicated that school counselors who identified themselves as non-White were employed in schools with higher percentages of LDS served in school, while school counselors with White racial and ethnic backgrounds tended to work in schools with a lower percentage of LDS.

An independent sample t-test was used to answer if bilingual status was related to the percentage of LDS served in school. The dependent variable was the percentage of LDS served in school; the independent variable was school counselors’ bilingual status.

Table 30. Group Statistics: Bilingual Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bilingual Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent samples t-test indicated significant differences between the percentage of LDS served in school and school counselors’ bilingual status. Results indicated significant differences between school counselors’ bilingual status and the percentage of LDS served in school \( t (3.98) \) with 197 df. On average, school counselors with bilingual (N = 156) and non-bilingual status (N = 734) differed by the percentages
of LDS they served in school as measured by the SCIPS. School counselors who identified themselves as bilingual had higher percentages of LDS in their schools.

**Rationale for Using Previously Determined Factors**

Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) factor analyses provided preliminary support for the validity and reliability of the revised SCIPS. For this reason, their factor structure was used to create factor scores to be used as independent variables for the analyses.

The researcher reached a decision to use Bryan and Griffin (2010) factor composition to create three dependent and eight independent factor scores to be used for the regression analyses. This decision was made because the instrument is well published (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010) and has undergone several revisions, which provide evidence for the internal consistency of the measure with its original rationale in mind. Furthermore, the reliability and validity of the construct has been studied with regional and national samples of school counselors. For example, recently, the factor structure of the instrument has been studied (Bryan & Griffin, 2010) and minor revisions have been made to the SCIPS to better capture the school-related factors, new items were added to measure role perceptions, and some items were reworded for clarity. A panel of three counselor educators and two school psychologists with an expertise on school-family-community partnerships and two experienced education researchers in survey development were utilized for revising the survey. The panel reviewed the instrument using item analyses and provided suggestions for modifications. The revised survey was later piloted on 30 school counselors to receive feedback on the clarity and relevance of the items, length and format of the survey, and content validity (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

Dr. J. Bryan has a number of studies conducted earlier, which are important to mention to provide evidence for the validity and reliability of the revised SCIPS. Originally, Bryan designed the SCIPS in 2003 to investigate school counselors’
perceptions about their involvement in nine SFC partnership programs and barriers to their involvement in these nine partnership categories. Among a random sample of 300 school counselors from South Carolina public schools, 72 school counselors rated the importance and degree of their involvement in nine SFC partnership programs. The SCIPS was designed, since there are no instrument found to measure school counselors’ perceptions about their partnership roles and practices. The literature was reviewed and a focus group school counselors’ role in SFC partnerships was discussed with three school counselors and two counselor educators. With ten master’s and doctoral students who were school counselors participated in the piloting of the survey and provided feedback concerning “clarity, comprehensiveness, and acceptability” (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, p. 163). Piloting process tested face and content validity, creation of the final draft of the survey, consisting of four sections (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, p. 163).

In 2007, Bryan and Holcomb-McCoy examined school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships and what factors affect such involvement with 235 ASCA members. Through using participants’ responses to the survey items, the researchers specifically designed a factor analysis of the SCIPS. Factor analysis defined a set of factors that examined variations in school counselor involvement in partnerships. This factor analysis process itself provided evidence regarding the internal consistency thus validity of each scale in the SCIPS through computing Cronbach’s alpha coefficients which helped revising the SCIPS. The following factors emerged from the factor analysis process: involvement in SFC partnership roles, role perceptions, other school counselor factor, and school-related factors. By grouping survey items in the SCIPS if they are measuring the same concept, factor analysis provided evidence for internal consistency (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004). Further, the following information provides evidence regarding the validity of the instrument. Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy’s study in focused to measure school counselor involvement in 18 partnership role behaviors, school-related and school counselor factors, which believed to affect school counselor role behaviors in
SFC partnerships. The SCIPS was piloted with 10 master's level interns and 10 school counselors who then provided feedback on “word clarity, comprehension, format, and length of the survey” which allowed the author reword and change a few items (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007, p 444). Twelve doctoral students from counselor education and education related fields further examined how clear, readable and long it takes to complete the survey. In addition, seven experts reviewed the survey based on their research experience and provided feedback regarding the content validity, clarity and suitability of items in the SCIPS. No other changes or revisions were needed after these reviews (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007).

Summary

Chapter IV reports the results of the data analyses used to answer research questions. Before presenting study results, first rationale for using previously determined factor scores is discussed and participants’ descriptive information are outlined. Chapter IV followed by Chapter V, which comprises discussion of these results.
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION

This chapter includes a discussion of results, integration of those results with previous research, implications for school counselor training and practice, limitations of the study, directions for future research and conclusions for this study.

In Chapters I and II, the argument was made that school and school counselor-related factors affect involvement in SFC partnerships. Results from this study support this. Similar to Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study about school counselor general involvement in SFC partnerships, two school-related (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support), six school counselor-related factors (i.e., role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources) and two single item indicators (i.e., principal expectations and time constraints) predicted school counselor involvement specific to working with LDF in SFC partnerships. Findings indicated that additional factors (e.g., the use of translators and bilingual status) influence school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

The purpose of this study was to examine school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF to understand factors that may help or hinder school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships using the SCIPS. Findings from this study intersect with Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study. In addition to entering school and school counselor-related variables, the present study examined unique variables that have not been previously examined (i.e., the use of translators, bilingual status, the percentage of LDS served in school). Both the use of translators and bilingual status emerged as significant factors that predicted involvement. The percentage of LDS served in school was related to the use of translators, FRPL status and caseload.
Discussion of Results

In this study, school counselors reported a moderate level of involvement in three dimensions in SFC partnerships with LDF: a) school-family partnerships; b) school-community collaboration; c) inter-professional collaboration and overall involvement. Compared to Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study, these three dimensions of involvement scale scores were slightly lower. This difference may be because this study focused on involvement in SFC partnerships specific to working with LDF. Unique sociocultural characteristics of LDF in building partnerships may be hindering school counselor involvement; they may experience communication challenges due to language barriers to reach LDF. In this study “school, family, and community partnerships” are defined as collaborative partnerships with school personnel, parents, families, community members and other community organizations to promote equity and access opportunities and rigorous educational experiences to address academic, personal/social and career development needs for all students both at home, in school and in the community. This definition highlights the multidimensional aspect of SFC partnerships, considering LDF.

The results support that school and school counselor factors affect involvement in SFC partnerships. However, there are other non-school factors, which occur ‘after the bells rings,’ influencing the shape, direction and magnitude of involvement in SFC partnerships. When addressing achievement gaps, it is important to acknowledge how these factors contribute to or hinder student learning. A University of Pittsburgh study stated that 57% of achievement comes from non-school factors (Yaffe, 2010). There are complex mixtures of factors that contribute to school failure, which may be both school and non-school related (Downey, von Hippel, & Hughes, 2008). Thus, when examining which factors contribute to overall achievement, the influence of school (e.g., effective school counselor) and non-school factors (e.g., home and neighborhood characteristics) should be separated in order to understand why some schools are more effective. Schools with disadvantaged students tend have lower achievement levels because of the
contribution of non-school factors (Downey, von Hippel, & Hughes, 2008). The results from the present study support this argument. Correlation analysis revealed that the percentage of LDS served in school was related to their FRPL status. Perhaps, LDS live in neighborhoods with impoverished schools that have limited funding, a lack of investment and external support for involvement.

Evidently, non-school factors contribute to the complex interplay of family, community and school counselor involvement in SFC partnership dynamics, influencing student achievement. School personnel, parents, families, community members and community organizations together create distinctive dynamics, which in turn shapes school professionals’ level of involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. In this study, why the overall involvement score was lower than Bryan and Griffins’ (2010) study is explained by non-school factors’ role in influencing involvement, calling attention to the complexity of involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. General factors account for 70% of variance, while unexplained effects account for 22% in psychotherapy outcome, signifying that counselor training should focus on utilizing common factors (e.g., building a stronger alliance) to facilitate results [involvement] (Wampold, 2001).

When a language barrier is present, building effective relationships with LDF may be more challenging. Considering cultural differences in communication styles (i.e., unique dynamics that each culture offers in interpersonal interactions and relationships), it is necessary to examine school and non-school related factors to fully capture what affects involvement with LDF in building SFC partnerships. A comprehensive understanding of untapped non-school factors’ effect on involvement related to cultural, family and community characteristics (e.g., family immigration status, work schedule and safety) is crucial. Common issues that school counselors encountered with LDS include in order: academic challenges, family issues, friendship issues, behavioral issues, language anxiety, acculturation anxiety, bullying/violence, and depression.
The use of translators, bilingual status, and caseload were related to the percentage of LDS served. The use of translators and bilingual status predicted school counselor involvement with LDF in SFC partnerships, while general training in SFC partnerships did not emerge as a clinically strong variable predicting involvement, differing from previous research (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). However, as one would anticipate, if school counselor received any training specific to working with LDF and LDS, they attained higher involvement scores as measured by the SCIPS. These results underline the debate regarding the role of school and non-school related factors, affecting school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Results also showed that specific training received with LDS and LDF, caseload, use of translators and bilingual status influence school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. These findings highlight the multidimensional elements determining the degree of involvement.

There are also other complex interactions of factors that influence counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF (e.g., self-efficacy). Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) posit that school counselors with high levels of multicultural self-efficacy are more likely to believe in their ability to understand multicultural and diversity concepts, to utilize the resources, and recognize and challenge barriers for achievement; and to be satisfied how they work with culturally diverse students and families.

**Research Question 1**

General training received in developing and implementing SFC partnerships predicted involvement working with LDF. However, the school counselor involvement score was dramatically lower (i.e., 1.4% of the variance) compared to Bryan and Griffin, 2010 (i.e., 21% of the variance). On the other hand, receiving specialized training in developing and implementing SFC partnerships working with LDF contributed to a variance in involvement. School counselors who received specialized training in developing and implementing SFC partnerships working with LDS and LDF reported
being more involved with LDF, stressing the role of specialized training. Similarly, McCall-Perez’s (2000) study found that when school counselors are trained to serve LDS, they have the ability to collaborate with other school staff and be more active with LDS. In turn, LDS do better academically, shown by their increased level of English language skills, credits toward graduation, and enrollment patterns. Besides school counselor training, various other non-school related factors influence involvement in SFC partnerships with non-English speaking families (e.g., social, economic, cultural, educational, linguistic differences and/or barriers).

Research Question 2

School counselor caseload was a statistically significant predictor of involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. However, the magnitude is very small. Regardless of challenges they experience (e.g., time constraints, role clarification) meeting the needs of LDS, school counselors value the building of partnerships, reaching out to families whose first language is not English. Linear regression model was significant, (i.e., school counselor caseload predicted involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF). While the variance in involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF can be accounted for by school counselor caseload. Interestingly, school counselors with a heavier caseload were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF. Rising to the challenge, school counselors realize the importance of reaching out to LDF when their caseload increases.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 examined whether gender, race and ethnicity, bilingual status, the use of translators, and specific training received in partnerships was related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. An independent samples t-test indicated nonsignificant differences between genders. On average, men and women did not differ in their overall involvement as measured by the SCIPS.
On the other hand, race and ethnicity was related to involvement in SFC partnerships. An independent samples t-test indicated significant differences between race and ethnicity, showing that on average, Whites and non-Whites differed in their overall involvement scores. School counselors who identified themselves as non-White were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF, as indicated by significant higher involvement scores. Knowing that the use of translators and bilingual status was related to involvement and that the majority of participants identified themselves as White, school counselors may have been limited to build SFC partnerships, due to language barriers and lack of training. Nearly half of all participants did not receive any training, specific to working with LDS and LDF. Race and ethnicity and also the number of multicultural counseling courses taken significantly correlated to some of the SCMES’s factors; when people experience self-efficacy in a particular context, the greater their satisfaction will be (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Respondents who indicated having received special training in partnerships did not have significant differences in their involvement scores, compared to participants who received such training. On average, school counselors with training received specific to linguistically diverse populations did not differ in their involvement scores, compared to those with no training on LDS and LDF.

School counselors with bilingual status who used translators rated higher on involvement scores. An ANOVA revealed significant results that indicated overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF was influenced by the use of translators. A post hoc analysis indicated that the largest mean differences fell between those who answered “not at all” and “very frequently.” As the use of translators increased, higher involvement scores ensued. By using translators, school counselors may have facilitated their efforts to overcome communication barriers, which in turn attributed to higher involvement scores. The process of active engagement in reaching out may have
contributed to their awareness and commitment to the wellbeing of their LDS. When school counselors used translators, they become aware of the existing issues of LDS.

**Research Questions 4 and 5**

The percentage of LDS and FRPL status pointed to school counselor overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, calling attention to the interaction of a diverse range of factors. Similar to earlier studies (Aydin, Bryan, & Duys, 2011; Bryan & Griffin, 2010), school and school counselor variables influenced school counselor overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Unlike earlier studies, multiple regression analysis revealed that, after controlling for the percentages of LDS, FRPL status, school and school counselor variables, bilingual status and the use of translators affected overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. This finding is relevant to the focus of the study, which diverges from earlier studies on SFC partnerships (e.g., Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Indeed, this present study centers on the role of school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with families whose first language is not English. School counselors who used translators and were either bilingual or multilingual were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF. Such qualities may have facilitated dismantling communication barriers to implement partnership programs, crucial to closing the achievement gap.

Considering the rapid increase in LDS in K-12 school settings, only a few studies exist that focus on school counselors’ training and professional development needs (e.g., McCall-Perez, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis, Anstrom, Sanchez, Sardi, & Granato, 2004; Paredes, 2010). Those studies used qualitative methodology with few participants, utilizing multiple learning methods, which took place over an extended period. They examined the influence of professional development upon school counselors’ awareness, knowledge and skills with LDS and LDF. A recent study by Paredes (2010) surveyed 601 school counselors, using the School Counselor Self-Efficacy with ELLs (SC-SELL)
scale; when working with LDS, a large majority of those participants, reported that their professional development needs were not adequately met. Similar to Paredes’s (2010) study, results indicated that among about 40% of the participants received less than 10 hours of general training in SFC partnerships. In addition, when asked whether they received training in SFC partnerships specific to working with LDS and LDF, nearly half of all participants reported “No.” This finding underscores the need for SFC partnership training specific to working with LDF.

Research question five examined to what extent the use of translators, bilingual status, caseload, race and ethnicity, FRPL status is related to the percentage of LDS served. ANOVA test revealed significant results, indicating that the use of translators is influenced by the percentage of LDS served as one would anticipate. School counselors utilized translators more frequently as the number of LDS increased. Correlation analyses are used if the percentage of LDS served is related to students’ bilingual status, FRPL status, caseload, race, and ethnicity. There was a significant correlation between percentage of LDS served and FRPL status, caseload, bilingual status, and race and ethnicity. Whenever school counselors had higher percentage of LDS, they inclined to have higher a number of students on their caseload, speak another language, come from a diverse background and have higher number of students on FRPL status.

Zehler et al. (2003) studied how socioeconomic status affected LDS; the results of the study indicate that more than 75% of LDS are poor based on the criteria used for FRPL status. Knowing that 75-79% LDS are Spanish-speaking Latinos and 80% of LDS live in households where no one older than 14 speaks English (García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008, p. 17), calls attention of the range of barriers that LDS face which affect their school success. Correlation between FRPL and LDS involvement calls attention of the range of issues that LDS face which affect their school success. There was a significant correlation between percentage of LDS served and FRPL status. Therefore, LDS represent a population at risk whose needs must be addressed (Paredes, 2010).
Wilde (2010) examined the effect of poverty on LDS’ education, knowing that generally, LDS attend public schools with overall lower achievement and LDS often attend public schools serving students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Compared to their mainstream counterparts, LDS living in poverty have the lowest average scores in both math and reading, according to 2004 and 2008 test results. Furthermore, as LDS advance in grade level, the achievement gap widens, regardless if they live in or near poverty putting them increasingly at a greater risk.

Significant correlation between percentage of LDS served and FRPL status emphasize that the specific needs of this population, which demands special attention of school professionals. It is especially worth mentioning that LDS often attend public schools with low achievement test scores, high student-teacher ratios, enrollment rates, and high number of students living in or near poverty (Fry, 2008). While this explain the gap in LDS’ achievement scores (i.e., due to struggles both with language and poverty), compared to those students who are not LDS and not living in poverty, (Wilde, 2010), it emphasize the significance of school and school counselor-related variables to enhance LDS’ school achievement. When school related factors are controlled (e.g., when LDS attend high achieving schools), achievement gap becomes noticeably narrower (Fry, 2008). For example, a school related factor could be controlled through utilizing translators, which in turn facilitates to overcome communication barriers. Unsurprisingly, the results showed that when school counselors used translators, they had higher involvement scores in SFC partnerships with LDF. Similarly, a study Larocque (2007) points out the significance of the use of translators in student achievement in economically disadvantaged, urban, ethnically, racially and linguistically diverse Florida Middle school. School counselors’ use of translators is a significant topic interest for the present study, which has previously found to be unexamined.
Unexpected Findings

Interestingly, school counselors with a heavier caseload were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF. Rising to the challenge, school counselors realize the importance of reaching out to LDF when their caseload increases. Therefore, it can be assumed school counselors with heavier caseload had higher percentages of LDS, knowing that percentages of LDS served and caseload was related. Having heavier caseloads may compel school counselors to recognize the challenges of non-English speaking families. However, size of caseload may not limit efforts to build partnerships with LDF. This result should be interpreted with caution because the magnitude of the relationship is very small. Further examination of this finding may be helpful.

To further understand the relationship how the size of caseload impact involvement, it may be necessary to examine the role of time constraints. Isolated from the multiple regression model, time constraints can be examined separately to analyze whether involvement in SFC with LDF can be predicted. Similarly, an earlier study showed that time constraints was positively related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF; thus, time constraints may not limit school counselors’ ability to build partnerships, indicating the importance of reaching out to LDF (Aydin, Duys & Bryan, 2011). This study’s finding contradicts earlier research, which indicates that time constraints hinder school counselor involvement (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Nonetheless, school counselors understand the importance of reaching out to families whose first language is not English, regardless of their time constraints. Indeed, regression analysis confirmed that school counselor caseload was not a significant predictor of involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Regardless of the challenges school counselors face meeting the needs of LDS (i.e., heavy caseload, numerous daily tasks, and time constraints), they value building partnerships.
Race and ethnicity was related to involvement in SFC partnerships. School counselors who were non-White had statistically significant higher involvement scores, compared to school counselors from White backgrounds. Knowing that the use of translators and bilingual status was related to involvement, White school counselors may have felt limited to build SFC partnerships, due to language barriers and lack of training. Nearly half of all participants did not receive any training, specific to working with LDS and LDF. Likewise, ethnicity and the number of multicultural counseling courses significantly correlated with some of the SCMES’s factors. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) stated, as people believe in their self-efficacy in a particular context, the greater their satisfaction will be in that context.

Furthermore, school counselors reported common issues encountered while working with LDS. Responses reflected the complex interplay of issues involved in their work with LDF. In addition to the issues that all students experience (i.e., academic challenges, family issues, learning difficulties, friendship issues, behavioral issues, bullying/violence, depression), students with linguistic diversity may experience language and acculturation anxiety. These issues underline the multifaceted interaction of challenges that LDS experience. While some issues may be categorized as non-school related, they ultimately influence school counselor, family and community partnership dynamics. Examining non-school factors and the relationships between language competency and academic achievement may reveal how to close the achievement gap existing between mainstream and LDS. Reiterating the relationship between language competency and academic achievement, Hakuta, Bialystok and Wiley (2003) stated that LDS experience a wide range of sociocultural issues. They include poverty, attendance in underfunded schools, coming from a low social status due to ethnic/immigration background, family issues, lower teacher expectations, and challenges to adjust to novel school practices of language use, behavioral expectations, and learning styles. Specifically, FRPL status was related to school counselor involvement in school-family
partnerships, school-community collaboration, and overall involvement in partnerships, but not in inter-professional collaboration. While inter-professional collaboration may be formed outside of school, school-family partnerships and school-community collaborations are grounded in the school setting. FRPL status influences involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, underlining the multidimensional aspect of involvement.

Discussion of School Counselor-Related Factors

Overall, all school counselor-related scale factors and single item indicators were significantly related to involvement. While school and school counselor-related factors are associated with school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, the relationship varies by the type of involvement (i.e., school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, and inter-professional collaboration). To understand the extent of their contribution in the regression model, the correlation matrix was examined.

There was a significant positive relationship between school principals’ expectations and school counselor involvement in school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, inter-professional collaboration and overall involvement. These findings are consistent with earlier research with one exception. In Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study, school principals’ expectations were not related to inter-professional collaboration. Given the focus on LDF, the current study examines school counselor involvement in the inter-professional collaboration category. This finding accentuates the complexity of SFC partnerships with LDF; also, school counselors acknowledge this connection. Moreover, school principals’ expectations predicted involvement in the regression model.

In previous studies, self-efficacy about partnerships was a significant predictor in SFC partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). In Aydin, Bryan, and Duys’s (2011) study, the relationship between self-efficacy about partnerships and involvement with LDF was nonsignificant. However, results from the current study
indicated that self-efficacy about partnerships is related to involvement in school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, inter-professional collaboration and overall involvement. This finding slightly differs from Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study where inter-professional collaboration (e.g., mental health teams, action teams) did not predict self-efficacy in SFC partnerships. This difference may be related to school counselors’ awareness and frequent performance of this type of involvement required in conjunction with the community, responding to the wide-ranging needs of LDF. Similar to studies that examined general involvement in SFC partnerships, school counselors’ self-confidence in their capacity to build partnerships was related to overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). Bryan and Griffin acknowledged that “an examination of the regression coefficients suggests that school counselors’ self-efficacy about partnerships has effects on their partnership involvement that are similar in size to the school factors (i.e., collaborative climate and principal expectations)” (2010, p. 82). While school factors are related to involvement, school counselors may tend to build partnerships with school stakeholders, if they are confident about building, even when a school climate and principals’ expectations act as deterrents (Bryan & Griffin, 2010).

Similarly, school counselor role perceptions regarding partnerships are related to involvement in school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, inter-professional collaboration and overall partnership involvement. These results corroborate with earlier studies, underscoring the positive relationship between role perceptions and overall partnership involvement (Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). While school counselors in Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study viewed inter-professional collaboration as unrelated to role perceptions about partnerships, this study viewed the possible impact role perceptions about partnerships had on inter-professional collaboration. Clearly, school counselors reported inadequate training, specifically when working with LDF. Still, the findings indicated school
counselors are aware of the importance of their involvement on an inter-professional level, responding to the wide-ranging needs of LDF.

Consistent with previous research, partnership-related training remains statistically related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF (e.g., Aydin, Bryan, & Duys, 2011; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2006, 2007; Clark & Amatea, 2004; Hiatt-Michael, 2006). Nonetheless, partnership-related training was not a strong predictor of involvement in the regression model. Partnership-related training and overall involvement were positively correlated; however, the magnitude was small. Specifically, partnership-related training emerged related to school counselor involvement in school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, and general involvement in partnerships, but it was not related to inter-professional collaboration. Nevertheless, role perceptions, self-efficacy and attitudes about partnerships and commitment to advocacy were related to inter-professional collaboration. Indeed, school counselor involvement in inter-professional collaboration involves reaching out beyond the school and LDF. The importance of partnership-related training in school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration and overall partnership involvement outside all school and school counselor-related factors stresses the significance of curricular training and practice specific to SFC partnerships with LDF.

This finding further underscores the significance of specialized counselor training in SFC partnerships working with LDF. Counselor training enhances factors related to school counselor professional role perception (e.g., self-efficacy), which in turn influences school counselor attitudes toward school-related factors (e.g., collaborative school climate). Partnership-related training appears related to involvement in school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, and overall partnership involvement through self-efficacy and role perceptions, as indicated by previous research, influencing school counselor self-efficacy and role perceptions (Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Brott & Myers, 1999). Nearly half of all school counselors in the current study did not
receive any specialized training in partnerships, influencing the degree of their involvement, accentuating the importance of integrating curricular training.

Implications for School Counselor Training and Practice

This present study has several implications for school counselors’ curricular training and clinical practice working with LDF in SFC partnerships. With results drawn from a nationally representative sample of 916 school counselors and using the quantitative data analyses method, this study offers far-reaching implications for school counselor training (e.g., the importance of recruiting bilingual school professionals), considering the issues of students and families whose first language is not English. A few studies addressed school counselor general training in SFC partnerships (e.g., Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010). However, there are only several studies that focus on school counselor training in SFC partnerships, specific to LDF (McCall-Perez, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004; Paredes, 2010).

In working with LDF, this study offers critical information on how achievement gaps can be narrowed. It contributes to the literature by offering a further understanding for school counselors and counselor educators on whether school and school counselor-related factors may help or hinder involvement in SFC partnerships. The number of school and school counselor-related factors (e.g., principal support principal expectations, collaborative school climate, time constraints, lack of resources, attitudes about families) influence involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. As previously mentioned, this study supports the conceptual model based on empirical evidence to facilitate the implementation of distinctive techniques for developing SFC partnerships with LDF (e.g., Bryan, 2005; Bryan & Henry, 2008; Griffin & Steen, 2010; Holcomb- McCoy, 2007; Mitchell & Bryan, 2007).

School counselors reported a moderate level of involvement in three dimensions of SFC partnerships with LDF. However, the involvement scores were slightly lower
than involvement scores of Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study. There may be multiple reasons why school counselors reported being slightly less involved in SFC partnerships with LDF than the results of Bryan and Griffin (2010) suggested. This difference in school counselors’ level of involvement may be due to a lack of awareness, knowledge, and/or skills needed in working with LDF. It is possible that school counselors are not adequately trained to be involved in SFC partnerships with LDF.

Results revealed that those school counselors who were bilingual and used translators were more involved in SFC partnerships with LDF. Findings shed light on the extent to which language barriers may present challenges to school counselor involvement, accentuating the role of language in removing communication barriers and recruiting bilingual school professionals. The use of translators was related to school-family partnerships; school-community collaboration; and inter-professional collaboration. Knowing that the use of translators were related to involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, school counselors who reported a lower level of involvement may have considered LDF difficult to reach (i.e., due to language and cultural barriers and insufficient resources). Previously, school counselors revealed feeling uncomfortable working with LDF, due to the perception of incompetence in their cross-cultural understanding of LDF dynamics (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Such perceptions may create barriers for SFC partnerships to meet the academic needs of LDF and LDS.

There is a need for an increased number of bilingual school counselors. Since language may be a barrier for monolingual school counselors working with LDS, it is crucial to target bilingual individuals in the field and design programs that offer specializations and certifications in bilingual school counseling (e.g., Brooklyn College, St. John’s University, Mercy College, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture) (Paredes, 2010). There is an apparent need for bilingual school counselors, knowing that the majority of them are monolingual. Although some school counselors responded that they used translation services, albeit rarely, those who were monolingual experienced an
intensification of language barriers when translators were not used. Even though LDS may have adequate English proficiency skills to communicate with their school counselors, their feelings and thoughts might be more precisely and meaningfully expressed in their native languages (Acevedo, Reyes, Annett, & Lopez, 2003; Altarriba, 2003). Thus, learning a second language should be promoted as part of school counselor training. Interestingly enough, the U.S. Surgeon General highlighted the significance of having bilingual mental health providers (Office of Minority Health, 2001).

There are a number of barriers to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. School counselor overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF and principal support were correlated, calling attention to the ways in which school principals shaped school counselors’ roles. The significance of school principals’ support in school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF is consistent with previous literature that documents what hinders school counselors’ leadership roles in school (Bryan and Griffin, 2010). Similar to school principals’ support, school principals’ expectations may help or hinder involvement. School principals’ expectations were related to numerous school and school counselor-related factors (e.g., collaborative school climate, principal support, role perception, self-efficacy, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnership, attitudes about families, lack of resources, and the use of translators) in the regression model.

To overcome barriers to involvement, school principals’ support is vital in the implementation and maintenance of a school counseling program (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Therefore, school counselors may influence school principals’ expectations related to their involvement with LDF (i.e., when executing roles in collaborating, coordinating, teaming with and training SFC members). An open leadership style may be necessary to shape school principals’ perceptions of school counselors’ roles, engaging in advocacy roles, using collaboration and communications strategies.
Because school counselors are aware of the importance of reaching out to LDF, they need to systematically challenge dismantling time constraints (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Bryan and Henry (2008) asserted that school counselors would negotiate their time to implement SFC partnerships, only if they realize their influence in implementing inventive programs can enhance students’ academic success. When responding to time constraints, school counselors need to be intentional and committed to implement SFC partnerships programs relevant to their role perceptions about partnerships. Thus, school counselors need to educate their school principals on how scheduling, testing, and other non-counseling duties undermine implementing SFC partnership programs and activities that support academic achievement. Accountability plans are a necessity. Coordinating and implementing effective partnership programs and initiatives involves creating a network of volunteers composed of school staff, parent and community members. Involving other parties’ input will ensure the feasibility of partnership programs, allowing others to engage in the process and take responsibility. Knowing influential leaders in the community would help identify possible volunteers who can direct SFC partnership initiatives (Bryan, 2009; Mitchell & Bryan, 2007).

Without a doubt, school principals’ expectations were one of the most significant predictors in all three dimensions of involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Regression analysis showed school principals’ expectations influence school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Earlier research highlighted the influence of school principals’ perceptions of school counselors’ role in their relationships (Finkelstein, 2009). Similarly, previous research indicated that school counselors’ daily job performance was strongly influenced by school principals’ expectations of specific tasks to complete (Amatea & Clark, 2005). The power differential between school principals and school counselors is an obstacle for building strong collaborative relationships (i.e., the teacher and counselor evaluation process). This power differential may undermine school counselors’ ability to be viewed as leaders, empowering school
principals and minimizing school counselors’ power, hindering collaboration. The school principals’ evaluative position creates pressure on school counselors even when principals’ ideas may conflict with students, teachers, or families’ welfare, influencing school counselors to use their expertise and knowledge. To avoid such obstacles related to this differential, alternative ways to school counselor evaluations may empower school counselors in their relationships with their principals (e.g., the director of psychological services may evaluate school counselors). Primarily, school counselors should make their choices based on students and families’ welfare and the mission of school counseling. Wingfield, Reese, and West-Olatunji affirm “placing school counselors in this catch-22 is simply unfair,” making it difficult to develop appropriate partnership activities for school counselors and principals when one professional has more power over another (i.e., to determine the employment status) (2010, p. 124). Assuming a proactive role to influence school principals’ perspectives about school counselors’ roles is important. School counselors must be diplomatic and educate principals, as well as members of their school community about their role. Participants reported that a lack of available resources negatively correlated with attitudes about families. The deprivation from necessary resources hindered building SFC partnerships with families from diverse linguistic backgrounds. Experiencing a lack of available resources also meant dealing with time constraints for the school counselors.

**School Counselors Emerging as Proactive Leaders**

Numerous barriers to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships exist. Due to time constraints, developing rapport with stakeholders may be challenging; even without time limitations, developing rapport may be difficult because of a reluctance to acknowledge school counselors as valuable assets in schools (Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010). Other barriers to a school counselor’s leadership role include ignorance or misconceptions. It is imperative to educate others about their leadership capacity (e.g.,
the ASCA National Model, 2005). Typically, many school principals have difficulty envisioning school counselors to perform leadership roles (McMahon, Mason, & Paisely, 2009), which hinder school counselor involvement, knowing their power and influence on shaping the school counselor’s role (Clemens et al, 2009; Amatea & Clark, 2005). At times, school principals ask school counselors to perform administrative duties, removing them from performing in roles for which they have been trained (Niebuhr, Nieubuhr, & Cleveland, 1999). This study indicated that school principals’ expectations were positively, time constraints were negatively correlated with involvement.

Moving beyond arguments related to inadequate leadership observed in schools, “school counselors must take an active approach in attaining the leadership status that is well needed and deserved” (Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010, p. 123). Similarly, using leadership, advocacy, collaboration and communications strategies with school stakeholders promote SFC partnerships programs with LDF (e.g., teaming with school stakeholders to conduct home visits) and generate social capital to enhance student learning. Utilizing interpersonal skills and developing relationships with stakeholders to ‘form bonds’ within their school and community may create future leadership opportunities (Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010, p. 119).

A school counselor’s professional role must be clearly defined; otherwise, it may hinder involvement. Similarly, school counselors’ role perceptions and self-efficacy about partnerships could help make use of involvement. School counselors reported that their role perceptions and self-efficacy influenced their involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. In addition, role perception and self-efficacy was related to a number of school and school counselor factors (e.g., collaborative school climate, principal support, role perception, self-efficacy, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnership, attitudes about families, lack of resources, bilingual status and the use of translators).

School counselors need to set clear professional boundaries that can be infused into their training. School counselors’ professional identity needs to be clear; their
essential roles with students are respected, without being asked to abandon or replace them with unrelated ones (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004). Setting appropriate and professional boundaries with school principals to efficiently meet the needs of students has been a long-lasting problem. Being proactive and setting clear boundaries within the school system would not only allow school counselors to better define their role, but would also acknowledge the collaborative nature of their work with other stakeholders, including school principals. However, many school administrators lack an accurate view of the role and skills of school counselors, while making many decisions on their behalf (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Hence, in educating school administrators, being proactive and setting clearly defined professional boundaries to assert professional status is a necessity (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). As proactive leaders and advocates in their schools, school counselors need to know how to work with board of education, how to influence power, how to use the impact of accountability, how to use data for marketing, and how to market their school counseling program. ASCA (2010) recommends similar strategies working with the administration and local board of education to show evidence related to the effectiveness of their programs on student achievement (i.e., via graphical and statistical data). Knowing the relationship of partnership-related training to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, counselor educators need to consider strategies to be used in training counselor trainees. CACREP 2009 standards emphasize knowledge and understanding related to how “student development, well-being, and learning are enhanced” by SFC partnerships, “to promote, develop, and enhance effective teamwork” in the school and larger school community, and “to build effective working teams of school staff, parents, and community members,” which facilitate students’ academic, career, and personal and social development (p. 44). Furthermore, CACREP 2009 standards articulate the significance of understanding systems theories, models, and consultation strategies in their school settings and knowing strategies to work with families and communities; thus, families feel empowered and act
as advocates for their children. Training in systems theories will equip school counselors to recognize dynamics in SFC partnerships. A systems perspective draws upon both general systems and ecological theories, consistent with a comprehensive school counseling program’s multi-systemic focus. Knowledge of the existing interrelated subsystems in the school community is crucial when promoting behavior change in students due to its influence on students’ lives (Keys & Lockhart, 1999). At the same time, it is crucial that school counselors stay proactive in defining their roles as collaborators and advocates. In addition to teaching how to build partnerships, counselor-training programs should focus on enhancing advocacy roles related to partnership programs, to plan strategies to overcome barriers for partnerships, and to become systemic change agents, so that school counselors understand barriers in their involvement in SFC partnership programs (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004).

A small percentage of participants indicated that they were bilingual or multilingual. School counselors’ bilingual status and the use of translators were related to their overall involvement in SFC partnerships with LDS. The mean of approximate total number of LDS revealed that nearly one in every four students enrolled was linguistically diverse. Considering the descriptive statistics for the approximate total number of students enrolled, nearly half of the students were typically on FRPL.

A rising number of LDS and the lack of bilingual school professionals are currently being acknowledged in the literature. Because LDS’ needs go unmet in counseling, due to issues related to language, school counselor training should address them (Paredes). Lack of bilingual school staff hinders LDF’s ability to be involved in school (Chavkin & Gonzalez, 1995). Counselor education programs and professional organizations need to emphasize training bilingual school counselors, since language may be a barrier for a majority of monolingual school counselors, when working with LDS, highlighting an apparent need for bilingual school counselors. Recently, school counseling programs are offering specializations and certificates in bilingual school
counseling (e.g., Brooklyn College, St. John's University, Mercy College, NYU Steinhardt School of Culture) (Paredes, 2010). Such efforts targeting bilingual individuals in mental health professions and school settings need to be systemic.

Challenges faced during training affect skill loss, particularly for new graduates (Ozyurek, 2010). Certain practices, such as coordination and consultation skills, are related to years of experience (Scarborough, 2005). When school counseling trainees are asked to utilize skills inconsistent with their training or do not have the time to practice their skills, it is difficult to predict outcome of training efficacy (McMahon & Patton, 2001).

While school counselors may experience barriers assuming a leadership role, they should remain proactive in attaining this role (Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010). School counselors with more experience tend to self-report greater leadership activities than less experienced colleagues (Mason & McMahon, 2009), which may be related to the development of leadership skills over time (Janson, et al., 2009; Stone & Dahir, 2006). Evidence also indicates that principals may be more accepting of collaborative and leadership behaviors demonstrated by more experienced school counselors.

The research is mixed on how years of school counseling experience is related to school counselor performance as some studies report the positive impact on practice (Brott & Myers, 1999), while others do not suggest a significant relationship (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Besides age, true evidence of experience in leadership role and potential may be an influential factor on the level of school principals’ willingness to collaborate as equal partners with school counselors in leadership roles (Wingfield, Reese, & West-Olatunji, 2010). Disadvantages related to age, however, should not discourage younger school counselors when collaborating on leadership roles with principals. Instead they should be aware of the possible advantages that familiarity with the newer theoretical models and ability to integrate technology into teaching.
Reviewing the role description and practice of school counselors, the researcher was not able to locate a position statement on working with LDF. However, the ASCA position statement found in *The Professional School Counselor and Cultural Diversity* (Adopted 1988; revised 1993, 1999, 2004) stated that school counselors are responsible for meeting the needs of all students. Using the skills necessary to collaborate with students, parents and school personnel to determine if certain attitudes and policies impede students’ learning, school counselors enhance awareness and understanding of cultural diversity in the school community. School counselors strive to maximize that all students have the opportunity to reach their potential in a positive and supportive school climate that nurtures academic, personal/social and career development. In addition, in *The Professional School Counselor and Equity for All Students* (Adopted 2006) ASCA stated that school counselors distinguish and differentiate between individual and group differences, endeavoring to value every student and group through promoting the fair treatment of all students in the school community. ASCA’s position statement in *The Professional School Counselor and School Counseling Preparation Programs* (Adopted 2008) emphasized that school counselor preparation accentuates the development of the attitudes, knowledge and skills critical for the application of effective comprehensive school counseling programs. Counselor educators are committed to train school counselors, so that they can respond to the changing expectations of students, their families, and schools communities. Training programs operate closely with the vision of the ASCA National Model, the ASCA School Counseling Standards: School Counseling Competencies and ASCA Ethical Standards for School Counselors, which focus on creating a program to empower every student in K-12 setting to succeed academically.

**Limitations**

The current study provides useful information regarding school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF to understand whether school and school
counselor-related factors may help or hinder involvement in SFC partnerships, influencing student achievement in school. However, several limitations affected the validity and subsequent generalizability of the results. Some of these limitations include descriptive characteristics of the sampling frame, use of survey method, choice of instrument, quantitative nature of data analyses, and the online nature of data collection.

First, the population from which the sample was drawn was limited to school counselors who were ASCA members. Initially, the researcher intended to recruit only ASCA members to take part in this study. However, ASCA members with administrative positions (e.g., district guidance coordinators) with access to a listserv chose to forward the survey link to other school counselors in their district. Although their decision to forward the survey broadened the generalizability of the results to school counselors nationwide, the researcher was unable to report the number of non-ASCA members who received the study link.

The population of school counselors was much smaller than initially assumed. Due to conditions such as a) retirement, b) transfer to an administrative or another job related or unrelated to school counseling, c) loss of jobs due to budget cuts, d) inability to participate without school district’s permission, e) being new in the profession or f) being a graduate student with no experience, many school counselors could not participate. The number of these individuals could not be calculated or removed from the population. The researcher was unable to estimate how much smaller the accessible population was.

On the other hand, the majority of the participants still consisted of ASCA members. Considering the fact that the study invitation was utilized contacting ASCA members via e-mails, the researcher was then able to access those members who had permission to share their e-mail addresses with other ASCA members. ASCA members may be more aware of the current issues, professional responsibilities and practices than non-members because of being informed through the association about the most up-to-date research. Therefore, there may be differences between ASCA members’ and non-
members’ responses. Also, there could be differences in opinion among those who did not release contact information in the ASCA membership directory. The results are generalizable only to the population accessed in the study.

Second, descriptive characteristics of the sampling frame should be considered for assessing generalizability of the results (i.e., if it may pose any limitations). While the population included all school counselors nationwide, the majority of the participants were ASCA members, female, and those who came from White backgrounds with ten or fewer years of school counseling experience. A significant percentage of the participants were employed in suburban schools. The majority of the participants were from the southern region. Such descriptive characteristics should be considered since the results are generalizable only to the population used in the study.

Third, another limitation may be related to generalizability of the results, because the demographic characteristics and the perceptions of ASCA and non-ASCA members were not known, including those who were invited but chose to not participate. In addition, school counselors who are members of ASCA tend to be White and female (Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, & Rahill, 2002), which should be considered. Due to the sample frame and non-response bias, it is possible that only school counselors with strong perceptions responded to the survey. Moreover, school counselor participation may have been influenced by their schedule, and/or other time sensitive factors such as the dates during which the survey was sent (e.g., winter break or spring break schedule).

The fourth limitation to this study comes from using survey design as a data collection method. This method primarily relies on self-report, introducing response bias. Therefore, participants’ responses would be dependent on an accurate understanding of themselves as well as their willingness to reliably report such information (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1999). Responses entirely depend upon self-report. Self-report surveys are subject to social desirability, which might have influenced some of the
responses (i.e., social desirability in the survey studies refers to respondents answering a question in a way that may make them look good).

In addition, this study only used quantitative methods for data analyses. For example, three open-ended questions at the end of the survey could have been analyzed using qualitative data analyses method; however, this was beyond the scope of this research. These three questions were given to understand participants’ perceptions on an in-depth basis, to explore factors that may contribute to SFC partnerships with LDF.

The fifth limitation comes from using a survey design rather than a qualitative or mixed method approach. Incorporating focus groups, qualitative interviews, or a case study could have been considered, which was outside the scope of this study. Regression and correlation models were used for data analyses; causation was not ascribed to specific variables. In order to avoid collinearity, preliminary correlation analyses were conducted before the regression model. However, due to the large participant enrollment, independent variables may be correlated with one another, causing collinearity (i.e., some of the independent variables were predicted by the others), making estimations of regression coefficients difficult.

The sixth limitation of this study comes from limiting the survey to school counselors, which does not include teachers, parents, principals, school board and community members to examine their perceptions of SFC partnership practices with LDF. Inclusion of teachers, parents, principals, school board and community members’ perceptions and opinions may enhance the findings, revealing more insights. Such methods would be logical since SFC partnerships promote the development of a collaborative partnership between home and school, which engages the stakeholders in activities to improve student success (Epstein & Jansorn, 2004). In fact, several participants suggested doing the study with school principals to have a comprehensive understanding of the SFC partnerships.
The seventh limitation in this study comes from using The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS), designed by Bryan (2003) and revised by Bryan and Griffin (2010), as a measure of school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. The instrument was not specifically developed to assess school counselor involvement with LDF; the researcher modified the survey, which incorporated the *Linguistically Diverse* phrase throughout as a way to remind the participants to answer questions with respect to LDF. Modifying the survey to focus exclusively on school counselor perception of involvement with LDF in SFC partnerships may present limitations. This limitation in particular results from modifying and using a broad based instrument with a specific population of interest. In addition, timing of the data collection (e.g., local, regional or nationwide challenges facing the profession or education system) might have influenced school counselors’ abilities to provide in-depth opinions, which may cause the study to override the perceptions of other elements that exist in the population. Even if the response rate is large enough, the possibility of a bias still exists, due to non-response, in turn limiting the generalizability of the study.

The eighth limitation comes from an overreliance on the technology as the data collection method. School counselors who work in school settings with reliable internet access completed the survey. However, web-based surveys are not free of limitations. Several participants contacted the principal investigator, indicating a glitch in their school district’s internet connection. Dillman (2000) listed these limitations as: a) the method will not be accessible to all populations since there are people with no internet connection, b) even if potential respondents have access to the internet, all of them may not be equally computer literate, c) depending on settings of an individual computer, screen configurations may appear different from person to person, d) there are no directories for e-mail addresses; people sometimes own more than one e-mail address and those addresses are not standardized, so sampling of e-mail addresses may be an issue and e) the decision whether or not to respond may be made rather quickly.
While all available subjects in the population were contacted, this decision may violate random sampling assumption (Zanutta, 2001). Data security on the server is a concern for the surveyor, thus, respondents may be concerned about the privacy of data they are entering. Survey overuse may result in survey fatigue, causing a low response rate (Zanutta). There is a great deal of variance in survey response rates; however, using this mode of data collection is critical in any research study for a number of reasons. The principle of generalizability is dependent on external validity of the research design; further, the results obtained can be used to describe the population (Krathwohl, 1993).

While all e-mail addresses in the study were screened to check their usability, some participants may have given incorrect e-mail addresses or one(s) less commonly used (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). In addition, some participants could have experienced limited access—due to time or technology skills, internet issues, school holiday schedule—to the study. Ultimately, it is unknown whether school counselors in the sample frame had reliable Internet access.

Additionally, responding to the participants’ questions and comments regarding the study was not an anticipated predicted incident costing time, which happened during the data collection process. The overwhelming rate of comments and questions may have hampered the researchers’ ability to thoroughly respond to them. This procedure may have caused a barrier in the response rate because of the overwhelming rate of questions received and time constraints experienced while replying to them.

It should be noted that 11,625, 916 school counselors completed the survey, corresponding to a 7.9% response rate. This is much smaller than 25% expected initial goal. Exclusion criteria was applied for surveys with 30% or more missing data (i.e., to exclude from the scale score). This procedure allowed keeping surveys if they were 70% or more complete, but N count differed for each of those scales scores.

Some questions required entering a numeric value. For example, Q 12 asked, “Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received specific to
developing and implementing school, family, and community partnerships?” with a blank field for a numeric value to be entered. In this question, the maximum number to be entered was determined 999 to prevent participants’ accidentally entering a high number. This cap may have limited others to enter their true and high number of training hours.

**Directions for Future Research**

Examining the factor structure of the SCIPS may be a great topic for a future study to address, especially with a large number of nationally representative school counselors. Future research may conduct confirmatory factor analyses to examine the factor structure of the survey for two reasons: (a) if a relatively large sample size may change the factor structure of the SCIPS and (b) if the factor structure of the instrument still holds for school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Factor analyses will prove evidence for further validation of the instrument to determine if the existing factor structure of the measure will hold across similar independent samples (Smith & McCarthy, 1995). This process may allow for refining the SCIPS and clarifying the relationships between two school and six school counselor-related factor scales and school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF (i.e., about factors that may help or hinder school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships).

However, such factor analyses were beyond the scope of this study, as it may prescribe not only justification of a rationale following such a procedure, but also illuminate any possible inconsistencies with the earlier factor structure of the SCIPS. Specifically, if results manifest differences in the factor structure of the instrument, it would be inconsistent to vary the course of this study. Moreover, the SCIPS was developed with a rationale; besides, previous factor analyses substantiate evidence for its original purpose.

Three open-ended questions at the end of the survey were used to report patterns or themes related to school and school counselor-related factors that help or hinder school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. A future study may examine these
questions to offer a broader understanding of themes related to school and school
counselor factors that help school counselor involvement in partnerships with LDF,
narrowing students’ achievement gap. While such questions helped to more thoroughly
understand participants’ perceptions regarding factors that contribute or hinder SFC
partnerships with LDF, they could have been analyzed using qualitative data analyses
method, for example using content analyses. Content analyses refer to “any qualitative
data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and
attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings” (Patton, 2002, p.453). This process
summarizes data into themes based on valid interpretation, as well as examines the use of
inductive reasoning from which themes emerge.

Earlier research underscored the need for qualitative research (e.g., case studies,
grounded theory), concentrating on school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships.
Future studies may employ “structural equation modeling and a mixed-methods approach
to explore direct and indirect influences on school counselor involvement” in SFC
partnerships with LDF (Bryan & Griffin, 2010; p. 85). Future research should examine
how new knowledge and training influence school counselors’ programs with diverse
students and families (Schwallie-Giddis, Anstrom, Sánchez, Sardi, & Granato, 2004).

Future research needs to advance the knowledge base on the benefits of SFC
partnerships at home, school and community. More descriptive information on SFC
partnerships that produce positive student outcomes needs to be identified (i.e., what is
the critical amount). Future research may focus on examining the quality of SFC
partnership practices among SFC members (Paredes, 2010). Sound research showing
thorough methodology and high quality of design and implementation on SFC
partnerships is needed because research exploring the links between family involvement
and student achievement lack rigorous empirical research support (Boethel, 2003).
Boethel found almost no studies that fit those characteristics, when attempting to identify
quantitative studies with experimental procedures.
Upcoming studies should focus on school counselor competence working with LDS and LDF. In previous research, school counselors perceived themselves to be incompetent in multicultural knowledge (e.g., in interpreting diverse students’ “behaviors and interactions” (Halcomb-McCoy, 2001, p. 199). Future research needs to focus on understanding school counselors’ perceptions and the perception of effectiveness of in-service multicultural professional development efforts that involve LDF (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). School counselors reported feeling more uncomfortable working with LDF than with LDS, since they believe working with families requires cross-cultural understanding of the family dynamic (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004).

Jordan, Orozco and Averett (2001) stated that new methods to capture both the processes and outcomes of multidimensional aspects of SFC interactions. How the outcomes of the connections for various stakeholders (i.e., students, parents, schools, and communities) differ needs to be studied. Studies do not reveal a consistent assessment of SFC partnerships, and they are limited in grasping these connections and their results. Still, the evidence suggests that SFC partnerships can produce positive outcomes for all stakeholders. Future research should focus on examining how school professionals’ attitudes and beliefs influence SFC partnerships; thus, further understanding of these relationships is desirable (e.g., relations between the type of connections and the outcomes they produce). Future research can shed light on why earlier research on SFC partnerships found was contradictory. The topic is crucial, since increased accountability standards mandate reaching out to LDF. Therefore, schools are responsible to provide high quality education for all children (Jordan, Orozco, & Averett, 2001).

Conclusion

This study examined school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, using the SCIPS instrument and quantitative research design with results drawn from a nationally represented sample of 916 school counselors. Understanding the
school and school counselor-related factors’ influence on school counselor involvement provides clinically significant implications for training and practice, narrowing the achievement gap for LDS. This study diverges from past studies (e.g., Bryan, 2003; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2006, 2007; Bryan & Griffin, 2010) that previously examined involvement in SFC partnerships with a general focus. While a multitude of variables, methodologies, theories, and models concerning school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships has been examined, the role of SFC partnerships working with LDF is the unique focus of this study, extending the findings of Bryan and Griffin (2010) and Aydin, Bryan, and Duys (2011). School and school counselor-related factors, as well as previously unexamined variables (e.g., bilingual status, caseload, percentage of LDS, FRPL status, specialized training received with LDS and LDF) were further investigated. Results indicated that school and school counselor-related factors still influence involvement, supporting the previous conceptual model.

Moreover, these findings broaden the discussion; contributing new knowledge related to school counselor training elucidates a wide range of issues regarding LDS. Findings show that building effective relationships with LDF was challenged when language barriers were present. Cultural differences in communication styles (i.e., unique dynamics each culture conveys in interpersonal interactions and relationships) add to the language barrier. Findings highlighted, however, that school counselors who were bilingual and used translators were more involved in SFC partnerships with families from linguistically diverse backgrounds. To the extent that language barriers may present challenges to school counselor involvement, the importance of recruiting bilingual school professionals is necessary. School counselors who utilized translators were often in a better position to help dismantle communication barriers to implement partnership programs, a critical action in closing the achievement gap.

Nearly half of all school counselors did not receive any specialized training in partnerships, which influenced their degree of involvement and accentuated the
importance of integrating curricular training. Compared to specialized training, generalized training in partnerships shows a positive effect, but was not as strong. Counselor training enhances factors related to a school counselor’s professional role perception (e.g., self-efficacy), which in turn influences attitudes toward school-related factors (e.g., collaborative school climate).

School counselor-related factors, such as school principals’ expectations, self-efficacy about partnerships, commitment to advocacy, and role perceptions regarding partnerships predicted involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF. Additionally, while school and school counselor-related factors were associated with school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF, the relationship varied by the type of involvement (i.e., school-family partnerships, school-community collaboration, and inter-professional collaboration). Differing from Bryan and Griffin’s (2010) study, results indicated that inter-professional collaboration was related to a number of school counselor-related factors. While school counselors reported inadequate training specifically when working with LDF, they were aware of the importance of involvement on an inter-professional level, responding to the wide-ranging needs of LDF, even with time constraints and number of students as part of their caseload.

An additional school counselor-related factor, race and ethnicity, was an important aspect related to involvement in SFC partnerships. School counselors who were non-White had statistically significant higher involvement scores, compared to school counselors from White backgrounds. Knowing that race and ethnicity and bilingual status were negatively correlated, White school counselors may have experienced limitations to building SFC partnerships.

The use of translators was influenced by the percentage of LDS served. School counselors frequently utilized translators, as enrollment in LDS increased at their schools. Percentages of LDS served significantly correlated with FRPL status and caseload; bilingual status and race and ethnicity also related to percentages of LDS. Whenever
school counselors had higher percentages of LDS, they inclined to have a higher number of students as part of their caseload, speak another language, come from diverse backgrounds and have higher number of students on FRPL status. These issues illuminate the complex interplay of challenges that LDS experience, such as limited resources for bilingual students, limited number of bilingual school staff and a need for bilingual education.

In conclusion, this study extended earlier findings regarding school and school counselor-related factors’ influence on involvement. However, non-school-related factors which influence involvement have not been examined here. Results of this study call attention to the consideration of other non-school-related factors and their influence on school counselors, family and community partnership dynamics (e.g., poverty), and school counselor-related factors, such as bilingual status and the use of translators. Given the limitations and unexamined non-school influences outside the focus of this study, the statistical significance of results needs to be interpreted with caution.

Chapter V provided a discussion of the results, implications, and the conclusion for this study. This chapter presented (a) discussion of findings, (b) implications for training and practice, (c) implications for counselor educators, (d) limitations, (e) directions for future research, and (f) conclusion.
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APPENDIX A:
EXEMPT INFORMATION SHEET
Dear School Counselor,

I would like to invite you to participate in a research study being conducted by an investigator from The University of Iowa. The purpose of the study is to learn about school counselors’ work with linguistically diverse families in relation to school, family, and community partnerships.

If you agree to participate, I would like to ask you to complete The School Counselor Involvement in Partnership Survey (SCIPS). The survey consists of four sections: (a) an introduction page; (b) descriptive information; (c) school counselor involvement in school, family, and community partnerships; and (d) school and school counselor-related factors. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer. The survey takes about 20 - 30 minutes to complete.

I will keep the information you provide confidential. You will be asked to provide information over the Internet, which may be viewed by individuals who have access to the computers where the information is collected or stored. I will use a secure web site and password-protected computers to collect and store the study information. I will not collect any information that would identify you. It will not be possible to link you to your responses on the survey.

Taking part in this research study is completely voluntary. If you choose not to participate in this study, you do not need to continue. You may end your participation at any time by closing the web browser window without submitting your survey.

If you have questions about the rights of research subjects, please contact the Human Subjects Office, 105 Hardin Library for the Health Sciences, 600 Newton Rd, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, (319) 335-6564, or e-mail irb@uiowa.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this research study.
APPENDIX B:

RECRUITMENT E-MAIL
Dear School Counselor,

My name is Gulcin Aydin and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education program at The University of Iowa. Like you, I am a school counselor. I am conducting a research study about school counselors’ work with linguistically diverse students’ families in relation to school, family, and community (SFC) partnerships.

I invite you to participate in this study because you are a school counselor. If you agree to participate, I will ask you to complete the survey, School Counselor Involvement in Partnership Survey (SCIPS). Access the study site by clicking on the survey’s hyperlink below. You will be asked to read additional information about the study before completing the survey. The survey takes about 20 - 30 minutes to complete.

If you choose not to participate, please do not click on the hyperlink and you do not need to do anything else.

I will keep the information you provide confidential, and your participation is completely voluntary. If you have questions regarding the survey, please e-mail me at gulcin-aydin@uiowa.edu. To access the on-line survey, please click the following link or place this address in your web browser:

http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/859/scipsr2.htm

I will be sending a reminder e-mail in approximately one week.

Sincerely,

Gulcin Aydin, MA, NCC
APPENDIX C:
FIRST REMINDER E-MAIL
Dear School Counselor,

My name is Gulcin Aydin and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education program at The University of Iowa. Approximately one week ago, I sent an invitation to participate in my research study about school counselors’ work with linguistically diverse students’ families in relation to SFC partnerships.

I am very thankful to those who already completed this survey. If you have not yet participated, I ask that you again consider participation in the study.

If you agree to participate, I will ask you to complete the survey, *School Counselor Involvement in Partnership (SCIPS)*. Access the study site by clicking on the survey’s hyperlink below. You will be asked to read additional information about the study before completing the survey.

If you choose not to participate, please do not click on the hyperlink and you do not need to do anything else.

I will keep the information you provide confidential, and your participation is completely voluntary. If you have questions regarding the survey, please e-mail me at gulcin-aydin@uiowa.edu. To access the on-line survey, please click the following link or place this address in your web browser:

http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/859/scipsr2.htm

I will be sending a final reminder e-mail in approximately one week.

Sincerely,

Gulcin Aydin, MA, NCC
APPENDIX D:

CLARIFICATION E-MAIL
Dear School Counselor,

I have become aware that I did not clearly explain two issues related to my survey. As an addendum, I would like to clarify these two issues related to my research invitation:

1. All school counselors are eligible and encouraged to participate in this survey regardless of the number of linguistically diverse students in your school. The information you provide is still extremely important even if you work in a school setting where you have no linguistically diverse students.

2. Skipping several questions in no way invalidates your responses. I am asking that you make your best guess on questions where you do not know the answers even leave those blank but continue the survey. [I also understand that there may be questions do not apply to your setting]. The information that you do provide is still valuable and extremely helpful to my research. In fact, analyzing which questions were skipped by participants can also be very useful.

I am very thankful to those who already completed this survey. I hope these clarifications are helpful and you would consider participating in my study and providing knowledge that is important to the school counseling profession. So be assured that I am very appreciative of your time and willingness to help. If you have questions regarding the survey, please e-mail me at gulcin-aydin@uiowa.edu. To access the on-line survey, please click the following link or place this address in your web browser:

http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/859/scipsr2.htm

Best Regards,

Gulcin Aydin, MA, NCC
APPENDIX E:

SECOND REMINDER E-MAIL
Dear School Counselor,

My name is Gulcin Aydin and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education program at The University of Iowa. Approximately one week ago, I sent a reminder invitation to participate in my research study about school counselors’ work with linguistically diverse students’ families in relation to SFC partnerships.

I am very thankful to those who already completed this survey. This reminder e-mail is the LAST e-mail you will receive about this study. If you have not yet participated, I ask that you again consider participation in the study. I would like to inform you that the survey would be closing within a week, and if you had not participated yet and planned on participating, please do so within the next week.

If you agree to participate, please complete the survey, School Counselor Involvement in Partnership (SCIPS), by clicking on the survey’s hyperlink below. You will be asked to read additional information about the study before completing the survey. The survey takes about 20 - 30 minutes to complete. If you choose not to participate, please do not click on the hyperlink and you do not need to do anything else.

I will keep the information you provide confidential, and your participation is completely voluntary. If you have questions regarding the survey, please e-mail me at gulcin-aydin@uiowa.edu. To access the on-line survey, please click the following link or place this address in your web browser:

http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/859/scipsr2.htm

Sincerely,

Gulcin Aydin, MA, NCC
APPENDIX F:

SURVEY MEASURE
School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey

Dear School Counselor,

I would like to invite you to participate in a research study being conducted by an investigator from The University of Iowa. The purpose of the study is to learn about school counselors’ work with linguistically diverse families in relation to school, family, and community partnerships.

If you agree to participate, I would like to ask you to complete The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCII). The survey consists of four sections: (a) an introduction page; (b) descriptive information; (c) school counselor involvement in school, family, and community partnerships; and (d) school and school counselor related factors. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer. The survey takes about 20-30 minutes to complete.

I will keep the information you provide confidential. You will be asked to provide information over the Internet, which may be viewed by individuals who have access to the computer where the information is collected or stored. I will use a secure, web-based and password-protected computer to collect and store the study information. I will not collect any information that would identify you. It will not be possible to link the responses on the survey.

Taking part in this research study is completely voluntary. If you choose not to participate in this study, you do not need to continue. You may end your participation at any time by closing the web browser window without submitting your survey.

If you have questions about the rights of research subjects, please contact the Human Subjects Office, 105 Hardin Library for the Health Sciences, 600 Newton Rd, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, (319) 335-4504, or email hso@uiowa.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this research study.

School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCII)

The purpose of this survey is to examine school counselors’ involvement with linguistically diverse students’ families in relation to school, family, and community partnerships.

for the purposes of this survey “school, family, and community partnerships” are defined as collaborative partnerships with school personnel, parents, families, community members and other community organizations to promote equity and ensure opportunities and rigorous educational experiences to address academic, personal/social and career development needs for all students both at home, in school and in the community.

for the purposes of this survey “linguistically diverse students and families” are defined as those children in the school population and their parents who are either new English proficient or limited English proficient and most often come from homes and communities where the primary language of communication is not English. Here are just a few EXAMPLES of school counselor involvement in school-family-community partnerships:

- A school counselor works with teachers, administrators, school psychologists and student support personnel, families and community members to create a school environment that is accessible and welcoming to all families.
- Through using collaborative partnerships both inside and outside the school, a school counselor reaches out and offers the information (e.g., referrals) of support necessary for all families to be involved in education at home and in school.
- School counselors work as leaders, advocates, collaborative team members, and supporters of systemic change in order to empower students and families from all backgrounds (e.g., culturally and linguistically diverse).
- In collaboration with local community, health care, and university members, a school counselor promotes tutoring programs, health and safety training, and college prep for students; classes on parenting and community/networking opportunities for families.

Part 1: Descriptive Information

Complete this survey for the school in which you currently work. If you work in more than one school, answer the school-specific questions based on the school in which you spend the most time.

1) How many years of school counseling experience do you have?
   - 1-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-15 years
   - 16-20 years
   - over 20 years

2) What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

3) What is your racial/ethnic background?
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - African American/Black
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - White/European
   - Native American
   - Multiracial
   - Other (Please Specify)

   If you selected other, please specify:

4) What is the highest degree that you earned?
   - B.S.
   - B.A.

https://survey.uiowa.edu/wwwtop.dll/WSPreview?V=0
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© M.A., M.S., M.Ed.
© Ph.D., Ed.D.
© Advanced Specialist or Certification
© Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify:

5) What is the accreditation of your graduate school program? (check all that apply)

© ACEIP
© NCATE
© Non-accredited
© Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify:

6) What are the professional associations to which you belong? (check all that apply)

© A.S.C.A.
© A.C.A.
© A.A.
© State School Counseling Association
© Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify:

7) In which school setting(s) are you employed?

© Elementary
© Middle School or Junior High
© High School

8) What is the type of school in which you work?

© Public (Non-charter)
© Public (Charter)
© Private
© Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify:

9) What is the community setting in which your school is located?

© Urban
© Rural
© Suburban

10) What is the size of your school district? (please select one)

© Less than 499 students
© 500 to 999 students
© 1,000 to 2,999 students
© 3,000 to 4,999 students
© 5,000 to 10,000 students
© 10,001 or more students

11) What is the region of the country in which you work? (please select one)

© Southern Region (Includes Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia)
© North Atlantic Region (Includes Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont)
© South Central (excluding Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin)
© Rocky Mountains (including Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming)
© Western Region (including Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington)
© Other Regions (including Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands)
© Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify:
School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey

School, family, and community partnerships are defined as collaborative partnerships with school personnel, parents, families, community members, and other community organizations to provide equity and access opportunities and rigorous educational experiences to address academic, personal, and career development needs for all students at home, in school and in the community.

(2) Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received specific to developing and implementing school, family, and community partnerships?

(3) Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received specific to school, family, and community partnerships from each of the following sources?

- Class presentation(s) ________
- Graduate course(s) ________
- Conference ________
- In-service workshop(s) ________
- Practicum/Internship ________
- Other ________

(4) Did you receive any training in school, family, and community partnerships specific to working with linguistically diverse students and families?

- Yes
- No
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1. Approximately how many clock hours of training have you received in school, family, and community partnerships specific to working with linguistically diverse students and families?
   - Class presentations(s)  
   - Graduate course(s)  
   - Conference  
   - In-service workshop(s)  
   - Training/internship  
   - Other (please specify)  

2. Please indicate the source(s) of any informal knowledge you have about linguistically diverse populations. (check all that apply)
   - Books  
   - TV program/movie  
   - Internet  
   - Trainees  
   - Professional conversations  
   - Consultation  
   - Interaction with students and families  
   - Other (please specify)

3. If you selected other, please specify:  

4. Please indicate the approximate total number of students enrolled in your school:  

5. Please indicate the approximate total number of linguistically diverse students enrolled in your school:  

6. Please indicate the number of school counselors currently employed at your school. Show part-time counselors to the nearest tenth (e.g., 3.5 would show three full-time counselors and one half-time counselor):  

7. Please indicate the number of students in your caseload. (student-to-counselor ratio - number of students assigned per counselor):  

8. Please indicate the number of students in your school on free or reduced-price lunch program:  

9. What is the most commonly spoken language of linguistically diverse students and families in your school?  
   - Spanish  
   - Vietnamese  
   - Hindi  
   - Chinese/Chinese  
   - Korean  
   - Arabic  
   - Other (please specify)

10. If you selected other, please specify:  

11. How frequently do you utilize translators to communicate with linguistically diverse students and/or families?  
   - Not at all  
   - Rarely  
   - Occasionally  
   - Frequently  
   - Very frequently

12. Are you proficient in more than one language? (e.g., are you bilingual/multilingual)?  
   - No  
   - Yes

https://survey.uiowa.edu/wswebtop.dll/WSPreview?n=0  
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21) What language(s) are you proficient in?

20) What are the most common issues you encounter while working with linguistically diverse students? (check all that apply)

- Depression
- Bullying/exclusion
- Language anxiety
- Acculturation anxiety
- Relationship issues
- Family issues
- Behavioral issues
- Learning difficulties
- Academic challenges
- Other (please specify)

If you selected other, please specify:

Additional comments:
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### School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey

**Part 2:**

Complete this survey for the school in which you currently work. If you work in more than one school, answer the school-specific questions based on the school in which you spend the most time.

LDH refers to Linguistically Diverse Families and LDS refers to Linguistically Diverse Students.

Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27) Collaborating with school, family, and community members to organize student support programs (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, enrichment programs) for Linguistically Diverse Families.</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Collaborating with family and community members to deliver services to Linguistically Diverse Students (e.g., parent volunteers and business professionals provide career guidance).</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Collaborating with community agency professionals to increase Linguistically Diverse Students' access to services (e.g., invite family/community connections to food groups or counsel Linguistically Diverse Students).</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Collaborating with local businesses and industries to provide enrichment experiences for Linguistically Diverse Students (e.g., mentoring, tutoring, job shadowing).</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Collaborating with community members on working committees (e.g., community task force, advisory committee) for Linguistically Diverse Families.</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Coordinating school-community outreach efforts to involve the community in the school (e.g., reaching out to local church and business leaders, police/fire officers).</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Coordinating the integration of community services into the school (e.g., mental health and social services housed in school) for Linguistically Diverse Families.</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Coordinating programs to help school staff understand Linguistically Diverse Families and their cultures in the community (e.g., in-service training related to working with Linguistically Diverse Families).</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) Coordinating programs to help family and community members understand the school (e.g., family resource center, parent and family seminars) for Linguistically Diverse Families.</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Coordinating parent education workshops to enhance Linguistically Diverse Families' parenting skills and knowledge.</td>
<td>Not at all, Rarely, Moderately, Frequently, Very Frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37) Training with school staff, family and/or community professionals to provide services for IEPs (e.g., school mental health team).

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently

38) Training with staff, family and community members to increase linguistically diverse families' involvement in their children's learning (e.g., partnership planning team, action team).

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently

39) Training with teachers, school social worker, or a parent liaison to conduct home visits.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently

40) Training staff to build effective school, family and community partnerships for linguistically diverse families.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently

41) Training linguistically diverse families and students to access services in the school and community.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently

42) Training staff to work collaboratively with families from linguistically diverse backgrounds.

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently

43) Teaching community services and resources for linguistically diverse students in need (e.g., family counseling, social services, food, clothing).

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU ACTUALLY INVOLVED in this partnership practice?

Not at all  Rarely  Moderately  Frequently  Very Frequently
School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey

Part 3:
Complete this survey for the school in which you currently work. If you work in more than one school, answer the school-specific questions based on the school in which you spend the most time.

LDF refers to Linguistically Diverse Families and LTD refers to Linguistically Diverse Students.
Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement.

43) As a school counselor...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that building school, family and community partnerships is part of my role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know that I am able to build successful school, family and community partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the principal expects me to be involved in partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have the time to get involved in partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the skills to build partnerships programs with parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my involvement in partnerships with LTD is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that my involvement in community partnerships is important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am capable of developing school, family and community partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy building school, family and community partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the skills to build partnerships programs with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want LTD and LTD to believe that I am their advocate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a need to advocate for disadvantaged students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lack the training necessary to build effective partnerships with the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to include school, family and community partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a voice for LTD to ensure that the school meets their needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would actively advocate for LTD even if I did not consider it part of my role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lack the training necessary to build effective partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it necessary to build partnerships to obtain support for LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I must build partnerships to advocate for LTD effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make special efforts to advocate for students from culturally diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received sufficient training to implement EFC partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43) This school...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree Slightly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has a friendly atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values school, family and community partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a climate that is conducive to fostering partnerships with the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a climate that is conducive to fostering partnerships with LTD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 4.1 School, family and community partnerships with LEF...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are beneficial for the school counseling program.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enhance the school’s climate.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are important for an effective school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are very important for helping LEF succeed.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help counselors to be more effective in meeting the needs of LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide support for the counseling program.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Linguistically diverse parents and other family members...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feel welcome in this school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit our school often.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>became involved in their children’s education when teachers invited them to.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>became involved in their children’s education when school sessions invited them to.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not know how to help their children succeed academically.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are hard to reach.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are interested in their children’s education.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are active volunteers in this school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>play many different partnership roles in this school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not regularly involved in this school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 The principal...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is skillful in building relationships with LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is skillful in building relationships with community members.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports LEF involvement in the school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports community involvement in the school for LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports me in building partnerships with LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports me in building partnerships with community members and organizations.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actively networks with the community for LEF and LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supports those who lead partnerships activities and programs with LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourages teacher participation in planning partnerships with LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 In this school...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>there is clear communication between LEF and staff.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is difficult to get LEF involved in partnerships.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are insufficient funds for implementing partnerships with LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there are insufficient school resources for building partnerships with LEF.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many students face severe economic, social, and emotional needs.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey

1. Family involvement is a regular practice.

2. What kinds of school, family and community partnerships are you currently involved in? What role(s) do you play in these partnerships?

3. What are the personal and school-related factors that encourage you to be involved in partnerships?

4. What are the personal and school-related obstacles that hinder you from getting involved in school-family-community partnerships?

It would be appreciated if you would respond to ALL the items on this survey. All information will be kept strictly CONFIDENTIAL.

For further information related to this survey, please feel free to contact me.

Sally Aydin, MA, NCC
Doctoral Candidate at the University of Iowa
Counselor Education and Supervision Program
1555 University Center
Iowa City, IA 52242-1529

Tel: (319) 335-4400
Fax: (319) 335-5354
sally-aydin@uiowa.edu

Thank you so much for your valuable time and input to this study.

https://survey.uiowa.edu/wswebtop.dll/WSPreview?v=0 2/10/2011
APPENDIX G:

IRB APPROVAL
LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE FAMILIES

PI: Nader Aylin
IRB ID #: 201012783

Other Mod and/or Comments

Modifications

Enrollment as Reported on Previous Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Total Subjects Approved by IRB</th>
<th>Total Subjects Reported</th>
<th>Enrollment Stopped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>01/09/11</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form Content

I. Project Introduction

1.1 Project to be reviewed by:
IRB-02

1.2 Project Title:
A NATIONAL STUDY: SCHOOL COUNSELORS’ PERCEPTIONS WORKING WITH LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE FAMILIES IN SCHOOL, FAMILY, AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

1.3 Short Title (optional):
LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE FAMILIES

1.4 Provide a short summary of the purpose and procedures of the study proposed in this IRB application.

- DO NOT include information on studies not proposed in this application.
- Use LAY terminology only. This must be easily understandable by IRB community members and non-scientists.
- DO NOT cut and paste technical abstracts from funding applications that may not be understood by a general audience.

LDS, refers to linguistically diverse students; LDF, refers to linguistically diverse families; and SFC refers to school, family, and community.

The purpose of this research is to examine school counselors’ involvement in school, family, and community partnerships with linguistically diverse families and to understand factors that may help their involvement in school, family, and community partnerships with linguistically diverse families.

The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey (SCIPS), designed by Bryan (2003) and revised by Bryan and Griffin (2010), will be used for this study. The original SCIPS was developed by Bryan (2003) to assess school counselor involvement in school-family-community partnership practices and...
factors that influence their partnership involvement” (Bryan & Griffin, 2010, p. 76).

PI contacted the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) to find out ways to recruit the ASCA members. Through phone communications (i.e., 708-683-1033) with Jeff Everson at ASCA membership in July 2010, PI learned that her ASCA membership comes with benefit to access to the electronic membership directory and retrieve the e-mail list of the school counselors who have permission to release their names to other ASCA members by using her personal member log in information at the ASCA website (http://www.schoolcounselor.org/directory.asp). Utilizing this method, PI retrieved 13,120 school counselors’ e-mail. This sampling frame was screened for invalid and duplicate e-mails; and 11,779 usable e-mail addresses were saved in an Excel document. These usable e-mail contacts (N=11,779) created the study sampling frame. Random sampling is not being used within this study; all eligible participants will be contacted.

After IRB approval, school counselors in the sample frame will receive a recruitment e-mail, which will include an explanation about the purpose of the study, its voluntary nature, confidentiality, and a hyperlink to the WebSurveyor. When the participants follow the hyperlink, they will read the Informed Consent Sheet before taking the survey and continue to take the survey if they choose to participate in the study. One week after the recruitment e-mail, PI will send a first reminder e-mail; two weeks after the recruitment e-mail, the participants will receive the second reminder e-mail. These reminder e-mails will be very similar to the initial recruitment e-mail regarding the content. PI will thank those who already completed this survey and invite others who did not yet participate. In addition, the second reminder e-mail will state a) this would be the last e-mail and participants will not receive any more e-mails regarding this study, b) the survey would be closing within a week, and c) if they had not participated yet and planned on participating, they should do so soon.

The researcher will collect data through the WebSurveyor, which is an online data collection method through The University of Iowa. In order to manage sending 11,779 recruitment e-mails, and first and second reminder e-mails, PI created a Listserv through the University of Iowa. Using a Listserv will allow sending 11,779 recruitment, first and second reminder e-mails in one time, keeping the procedure very simple. PI will not collect any personally identifiable information about the subjects (e.g., computer IP addresses, who responded to the recruitment or first reminder e-mail). All participants will receive the first and second reminder e-mail, since PI will not keep any personally identifiable information about participants.

1.5 Specify your research question(s), study aims or hypotheses (do not indicate “see protocol”)

The research questions underlying the study are:

Research Question 1. Do school (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations) and school counselor variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnership, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and –lack of resources, time constraints, are caseload), and partnership-related training predict school counselors’ involvement in school, family and community partnerships with linguistically diverse families after controlling the number of students on free and reduced priced lunch and the percentage of linguistically diverse students served in school.

Research Question 2. Is the percentage of linguistically diverse students served in school related to the use of translators, school counselors’ bilingual status, caseload, ethnicity, the number of students on free and reduced priced lunch, and geographic region of work?

1.6 Background and significance and/or Preliminary studies related to this project. (do not indicate “see protocol”)

The number of linguistically diverse students in the U.S. public school system has increased significantly in recent years (Aramjo, 2009). In 2018, primary and secondary public school enrollment is projected to grow to 54 million (Planty et al., 2009). In the 2003-2005 school year, 10.9% (i.e., 5.1 million) of students were linguistically diverse (Payer & Nettles, 2006). In 2007-2008, (i.e., 16.8 million) of children ages 5-17 spoke a language at home other than English, and 3% (i.e., 0.3 million), spoke English with difficulty, 75% of those who had difficulty in speaking English spoke Spanish (Planty et al., 2009). According to National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA), in the 2007-2008 academic year, total U.S. EL-12 enrollment was 49,914,453 and total ELL enrollment was 5,398,154; while PK-12 enrollment growth was 84.45% and ELL growth was 53.25% (2008). By the year 2026 the number of linguistically diverse students in America is estimated to rise to 25% (Gurcia, 2002).

Studies have explored how these demographic changes will impact the educational experiences of students (Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jordan, Oroazo, & Averett, 2001). No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001)
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In order to ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to succeed, the purpose of Title I is to help make sure that English Language Learners (ELL) master English and meet the same standards as their age peers. Effective school programs promote a collaborative endeavor among parents, school staff, and community members (Henderson & Mapp). The sense of welcome families feel has a direct effect on their involvement in their children’s education (Caspe & Lopez, 2007; McGrath, 2007; Resto & Alston, 2006; Stewart, 2008).

Evidence points to a wide gap between native English speakers and English Language Learners (ELL) on achievement tests (Albow, Tchauh, & Lao, 2002). ELL students are more likely to attend public schools with low achievement test scores, where the student-to-teacher ratios, student enrollments, number of students living in (or near) poverty levels. The achievement gap narrows when they are “isolated in these low-achieving schools” (Fry, 2008, p. 15). Many studies report “the deleterious effects of low socio-economic status on academic achievement hold true for ELL populations” (Ballantyne, Sunderman, & McLaughlin, 2006, p. 15). There are still achievement gaps between low-income students and students of color and their White peers (House & Sears, 2002; NCES, 2005). Ballantyne, Sunderman, and Levy noted that “6 in 10 ELL adolescents qualify for free or reduced-price lunch,” experiencing the hardships of poverty alongside a language barrier (2008, p. 7).

Federal mandates and state legislations enforce school districts and schools to develop SPC partnership policies and programs, however, “the implementation and effectiveness varies tremendously within and across districts” (Morris, 2009, p. 2). School counselors believe that SPC partnerships are important (e.g., Bryan, 2007; Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007; Donnell, 2003; Simeon, Njoo, & Lee, 2006) and collaborative partnership programs are effective, despite the lack of resources and time to implement them (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007). Evidence suggests SPC partnerships minimize achievement gap (Shilling & Lipton, 2005). However, the existing research on school counselors’ perceptions working with LDF in SPC partnerships is limited (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007). There are concerns whether or not school counseling training prepares school counselors in SPC partnerships (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2006, 2007). While facing many obstacles, school counselors believed in the efficacy of implementing collaborative partnership programs (Bryan & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2007). However, school counselors felt uncomfortable working with LDF than with LDR, due to their self-perceptions of their incompetence working with LDF (Schwaller-Gibson et al., 2004), highlighting the importance of school counselors’ involvement in SPC partnerships to close the achievement gap for all students.

1.7 Literature cited / references (of attaching a grant or protocol enter N/A).

References
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II. Research Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadire Aydin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gulin-aydin@uiowa.edu">gulin-aydin@uiowa.edu</a></td>
<td>Graduate College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UI Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>COI VAMC COI</th>
<th>Consent Process Involvement</th>
<th>Activity Location</th>
<th>Subjects Conceived</th>
<th>Deactivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadire Aydin, MA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gulin-aydin@uiowa.edu">gulin-aydin@uiowa.edu</a></td>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Doys, BS, MS, PHD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david-doys@uiowa.edu">david-doys@uiowa.edu</a></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-UI Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FWA</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>DHHS</th>
<th>COI</th>
<th>VAMC</th>
<th>COI</th>
<th>Consent Process Involvement</th>
<th>Activity Location</th>
<th>Subjects Conceived</th>
<th>Deactivated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nothing found to display

II.3 The Principal Investigator of this study is:

Graduate student

III. Funding/Other Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://hawkirb.research.uiowa.edu/hawkirb/summary/forms.page?mode=pf&amp;OID=202144">https://hawkirb.research.uiowa.edu/hawkirb/summary/forms.page?mode=pf&amp;OID=202144</a>... 2/10/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III.3**

Do any member of the research team have a significant financial interest related to this project according to the **Conflict of Interest in Research** policy? If yes, please indicate which members below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Has Conflict of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nadire Aydin, MA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Doys, BS, MS, PhD</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Project Type**

**IV.1**

Do you want the IRB to give this project Exempt status

**VI. Subjects**

**VI.1**

*How many adult subjects do you expect to consent or enroll for this project?*

3600

**VI.2**

*What is the age of the youngest adult subject?*

22.0

**VI.3**

*What is the age of the oldest adult subject?*

65.0

**VI.4**

*What is the percentage of adult male subjects?*

20

**VI.5**

*What is the percentage of adult female subjects?*

80

**VI.6**

*How many minor subjects do you expect to consent or enroll for this project?*

0

**VI.13**

Describe EACH of your subject populations

- Include description of any control group(s)
- Specify the Inclusion/Exclusion criteria for EACH group

School counselors who work at elementary, middle or junior high or high school setting in American schools.

**VI.14**

Provide an estimate of the total number of subjects that would be eligible for inclusion in each of your study populations (Include your control population if applicable)

School counselors who work in K-12 school settings who are ASCA members and who have access to the internet. There are 24,236 ASCA school counselor members. Among those members, 11,779 of them are willing to release their names to other ASCA members; this 11,779 school counselors make up the study sample frame. Random sampling is not being used within this study; all eligible participants will be contacted.

**VI.15**

Describe how you will have access to each of your study populations in sufficient number to meet your recruitment goals.

School counselors nationwide make up the study population. Participants will be recruited through ASCA; 11,779 ASCA members make up the sample frame. PI created a Listserv using The University of Iowa ITS where participants' e-mail uploaded to the Listserv. Using a Listserv will allow sending 11,779 e-mails in one time, making the process safe. Using The University of Iowa ITS, PI created a WebSurveyor where the study survey is uploaded to and survey data will be collected from. PI expects to achieve 25% response rate (i.e., 2,945) for 11,779 participants.

Before taking the survey, school counselors in the sample frame will receive a recruitment e-mail, which will

include an explanation about the purpose of the survey, its voluntary nature, confidentiality, and a hyperlink to the Websurveyor. When the participants follow the hyperlink, they will read the consent information sheet before taking the survey and continue to take the survey if they choose to participate. One week after the recruitment e-mail, the researchers will send the first reminder e-mail; two weeks after the recruitment e-mail, the participants will receive the second reminder e-mail. These e-mail will remind those who did not yet participate but plan on participating in the study. In addition, second reminder e-mail will indicate that this would be the last e-mail that participants will receive and the survey would be closing within a week, and if they had not participated yet and planned on participating, they should do so soon by clicking the hyperlink.

The researcher will not collect any personally identifiable information about the subjects, including who responded or who did not to the survey after the recruitment and first reminder e-mail. All participants will receive first and second reminder e-mails.

VI.16 Do you plan to recruit/enroll non-English speaking people?
No

VI.18 Do you propose to enroll any of the following in this study as subjects?
• Employee of the PI or employee of a research team member
• Individual supervised by PI or supervised by member of research team
• Individual subordinate to the PI or subordinate to any member of the research team
• Student or trainee under the direction of the PI or under the direction of a member of the research team
No

VII.A. Project Description (A)

VII.A.1 Where will project procedures take place (check all that apply)?
• Other U1 campus site - College of Education

VII.A.2 Is this project also being conducted by other researchers at their own sites (e.g. a multi-site collaborative project)?
No

VII.D. Project Description (D)

VII.D.1 Check all materials/methods that will be used in recruiting subjects (you will need to attach copies of all materials at the end of the application):
• E-mail -
  • Existing Registry/database - PI contacted the ASCA member she could access to the ASCA electronic membership directory as part of her membership benefit. Using her member log in information at the ASCA website, she retrieved 13,120 e-mails of those who have permission to release their names to other ASCA members. After the removal of invalid and duplicate e-mails, PI saved 11,779 usable e-mails to an Excel file. PI created a listserve through the U of I and will send the e-mails through this listserve.

VII.D.8 Will a member of the research team discuss the study with the subject in person prior to the subject agreeing to participate?
No

VII.D.10 Will a member of the research team discuss the study with the subject by phone prior to the subject agreeing to participate?
No

VII.D.15 Check all materials that will be used to obtain documented informed consent:
• Exempt Information Sheet

VII.D.29 Provide a description of the enrollment and consent process for adult subjects:
• Describe each study population separately including control population
• Include when recruitment and consent materials are used
• Use 3rd person active voice: "The Principal Investigator will identify subjects. For example, the
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principal investigator will identify potential subjects, the study coordinator will discuss the study with subjects over the telephone and schedule the first study visit, etc."

- Describe the steps that will be taken by the research team to minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence during the consent process.

In this study, school counselors nationwide make up the population of interest. PI canvassed the ASCA and learned that as a member she could access the electronic directory. Using this method, PI retrieved 13,230 e-mails of those who gave permission to release their names to other ASCA members. After the removal of invalid and duplicate e-mails, PI saved 11,779 usable e-mails to an Excel file.

PI will be satisfied with a 25% response rate as a target percentage return rate (i.e., 2,945 school counselors). Web surveys often have a lower response rate in comparison to mail surveys (Cooper, 2000; Solomon, 2001). Killeen stated, "One can expect between a 25-30% response rate from an e-mail survey when no follow-up takes place. Follow-up reminders will approximately double the response rate for e-mail surveys" (1997, p. 156).

Participation consists of the school counselors completing the survey using hyperlink via WebSurveyor. Before taking the survey, school counselors in the sample frame will receive a recruitment e-mail, which will include an explanation about the purpose of the survey, its voluntary nature, confidentiality, and a hyperlink to the WebSurveyor. When the participants follow the hyperlink, they will read the Exempt Information Sheet before taking the survey and continue to take the survey if they choose to participate.

One week after the recruitment e-mail, PI will send the first reminder e-mail, two weeks after the recruitment e-mail, the participants will receive the second reminder e-mail. These e-mail will remind those who did not yet participate but plan on participating in the study. In addition, second reminder e-mail will indicate that this would be the last e-mail that participants will receive and the survey would be closing within a week, and if they had not participated yet, please consider participating, they should do so soon by clicking the hyperlink.

In order to manage sending 11,779 recruitment e-mails and first and second reminder e-mails to mass number of participants, the researcher created a Listserv through the University of Iowa (i.e., COEAYUHSC- LIST@UIOWA.EDU). Number of other options explored and using a Listserv seemed to be the best option to send the e-mails. Using a Listserv not only will allow sending 11,779 e-mails in one time, making the process very simple and also sending the first and second reminder e-mails. The researcher will not collect any personally identifiable information about the subjects including who responded who did not to the survey. All participants will receive first and second reminder e-mails.

VILE. Project Description (E)

VILE.1 Will subjects be randomized?
Non

VILE.3 Will any questionnaires, surveys, or written assessments be used to obtain data directly from subjects in this study?
Yes

VILE.4 List all questionnaires, surveys, written assessments and ATTACH each one to the application. (NOTE: You are NOT prohibited from attaching copyrighted materials to this application)
THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR INVOLVEMENT IN PARTNERSHIPS SURVEY (SCIPS) will be used in this study.

The survey is developed by Bryan in 2003 and revised by Bryan and Griffin in 2010.
http://survey.uiowa.edu/oshb.dll/RSS0/scipart2.htm

VILE.5 Does this project involve creating any audiotapes, videotapes, or photographs?
Non

VILE.6 Provide a detailed description in sequential order of the study procedures following the consent process - DO NOT cut and paste from the Consent Document.

Describe study populations separately if they will be participating in different procedures - include CONTROL population if applicable.

DESCRIBE:
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What subjects will be asked to do what happens in the study (in sequential order)
- The time period over which procedures will occur
- The time commitment for the subject for individual visits/procedures
- Long-term follow-up and how it occurs

After the IRB approval, 11,779 school counselors will be invited to take part in this study. Random sampling is not being used in this study since all eligible participants will be contacted.

Participation consists of the school counselors completing the survey using hyperlink via WebSurveyor. Before taking the survey, participants will receive a recruitment e-mail, which will explain the purpose of the survey, its voluntary nature, confidentiality, and a hyperlink to the WebSurveyor. When the participants follow the hyperlink, they will read the Exempt Information Sheet before taking the survey and continue to take the survey if they choose to participate. One week after the recruitment e-mail, the researchers will send the first reminder e-mail; two weeks after the recruitment e-mail, the participants will receive the second reminder e-mail. These e-mails will remind those who did not yet participate in the study. In addition, second reminder e-mail will indicate that this would be the last e-mail that participants will receive and the survey would be closing within a week, and if they had not participated yet and planned on participating, they should do so soon by clicking the hyperlink.

Participation involves participants taking the self-administered The School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships Survey via e-mail hyperlink in their employed school. Participation consists of the school counselors completing the WebSurveyor and completion of the survey will indicate informed consent. The survey consists of four sections: (a) an introduction page; (b) descriptive information; (c) school counselor perceived involvement in school-family-community partnerships; and (d) school characteristics and school counselor attitudes and the questions are based on a five-point Likert scale.

The study requires only one-time participation and there is no long-term follow up. The study will be completed within three weeks time period.

VILE.7 Will you attempt to recontact subjects who are lost to follow-up?
No - follow-up is not required in this study

VILE.9 Will subjects be provided any compensation for participating in this study?
No

VIII. Risks

VIII.1 What are the risks to subjects including
- emotional or psychological
- financial
- legal or social
- physical?

There is no foreseeable risk to the subjects. However, there is a risk that confidentiality may not be guaranteed due to the public nature of the Internet as someone possibly intercepting the data, but highly unlikely. Principal investigator’s decision to use The University of Iowa WebSurveyor as a means to collect data is a precaution taken for Internet security since WebSurveyor is being monitored by the U of I Information Technology Services.

Additionally, the subjects may feel uncomfortable about their own competency level on the topic as the survey questions may ask them to reflect on personal experiences and opinions which may be sensitive in nature and may result in some discomfort (e.g., realizing how little they know about school, family, and community partnerships).

VIII.2 What have you done to minimize the risks?

If applicable to this study ALSO include:
- If you (members of your research team at Iowa) will monitor the safety of individual subjects.
- If you (members of your research team at Iowa) will monitor the availability of medical or psychological resources that subjects might require as a consequence of participating in this research and how referral will occur if necessary (e.g., availability of emergency medical care, psychological counseling, etc.)

There are no predictable risks in participating in this study except 30 minutes of participants’ time. Participation is completely voluntary [and there is no penalty if they chose not to participate]. There are no costs or compensation for participating in the study. The investigator will use a secure web site to collect the data (i.e., UI WebSurveyor) and password-protected computers to collect and store the study information. It will not collect
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any information in the on-line questions that would identify the subjects (name or contact information). Participants will read the Exempt Information Sheet prior to taking the survey, which will indicate that the data will be combined all together so that the participants cannot be identified individually and it will not be possible to link participants and their responses on the survey.

To reduce risk of sending e-mails to 11,779 participants from a personal e-mail account, a U of I based Listserv will be used, which will allow sending 11,779 e-mails at one time. Since P will not collect any personally identifiable information about the subjects, including who responded or who did not participate in the survey, all participants will receive the first and second reminder e-mails.

IX. Benefits

IX.1 What are the direct benefits to the subject (do not include compensation or hypothesized results)?

There are no individual or immediate benefits for participating in this study.

IX.2 What are the potential benefits to society in terms of knowledge to be gained as a result of this project?

The research does not personally benefit participants, but the main benefit of participation is the contribution to research on this little studied topic.

However, the results may contribute to the school counseling literature (i.e., training and practices) in relation to services with linguistically diverse students’ families. The results may contribute to the school counseling literature on the areas related to partnership practices (i.e., collaborating, coordinating, training, and using services outside the school) that predict the level of involvement and role perceptions of school counselors working with linguistically diverse students’ families. The results may contribute to the school counseling literature factors related to partnerships in the school (i.e., the school characteristics, school climate, and school principal) and how these factors predict school counselors’ perceptions about partnership with linguistically diverse families.

X. Privacy & Confidentiality

X.1 What are you doing to protect the privacy interests of the subjects?

Study subjects will be provided with the link to the secure website where the survey will be presented. They will be able to choose a computer for the completion of the survey which provides them the privacy they wish.

X.2 Are you collecting the Social Security Number of any subjects for any purpose?

No

X.4 How will information/data be collected and stored for this study (check all that apply):

- Electronic records (computer files, electronic databases, etc.) - The data will be collected through WebSurveyor electronically and will be stored only in P’s personal computer. Thus, computer password protected system will be used between the usage. The access to the information will require password which will be kept strictly confidential. For example, password will not be written anywhere (manually or electronically) to protect data. When data analysis is completed data will be transferred from the computer to a disk to store in a locked closet. It is important to ensure that all data and information related to participants is securely removed from the WebSurveyor portal and The University of Iowa Information Technology Services will be utilized for such matters. I will disconnect my computer from the internet connection when entering, analyzing, and storing my data.
  - Title - Doctoral Student in Counselor Education Program
  - University/VA Job Classification - Community Assistant at the University Housing

X.5 Do the confidentiality protections indicated above allow only members of the research team to access the data/specimens?

Yes

XI. Data Analysis

https://hawkirb.research.uiowa.edu/hawkirb/summary/forms.page?node=pfOID-20214... 2/10/2011
XL1 Describe the analysis methods you will use, including, if applicable, the variables you will analyze.

Preliminary analyses will be done to identify if school (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations) and school counselor variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnership, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints, school counselor caseload), overall partnership-related training, and other descriptive variables (e.g., the use of translators, bilingual status, the percentage of LSD served in schools, and the percentage of students on free or reduced priced lunch) are related to school counselor involvement in SFC partnerships with LDF.

Using preliminary correlation analyses will identify the most significant variables to be entered into the multiple regression models in Research Question 1. In other words, this method will be used to reduce the number of variables to 30 entered into the multiple regression models.

Research Question 1. Do school (i.e., collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations) and school counselor variables (i.e., role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnership, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints, school counselor caseload), and partnership-related training predict school counselors' involvement in school, family and community partnerships with linguistically diverse families after controlling the percentage of students on free or reduced price lunch and the percentage of linguistically diverse students.

Dependent Variables: school counselor involvement with linguistically diverse families.

Independent Variables entered in the 1st step: the percentage of students on free or reduced priced lunch and linguistically diverse students.

Independent Variables entered in the 2nd step: collaborative school climate, principal support, and principal expectations.

Independent Variables entered in the 3rd step: role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnership, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and lack of resources, time constraints, school counselor caseload.

Independent Variables entered in the 4th step: overall partnership-related training.

Scores on the SCIPS defined by Bryan and Griffin (2010) will be used for the subsequent hierarchical regression analysis. Multiple regression analysis will be used to examine the relationship between one dependent variable and a set of independent or predictor variables using ordered entry method to enter the predictor variables in several steps (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In the first step, control variables (the percentage of students on free or reduced price lunch and the percentage of linguistically diverse students) will be entered. In the second step, school variable (i.e., collaborative school climate) will be entered as a predictor independent variable to examine if it contributes a significant proportion of variance in school-level involvement in school, family and community partnerships. In the third step, seven other school counselor variables (i.e., principal support, role perceptions about partnership, self-efficacy about partnership, commitment to advocacy, attitudes about partnerships, attitudes about families, and barriers to partnerships—lack of resources, time constraints, and caseload) will be entered to examine if they contribute a significant proportion of variance in school counselor perceived involvement in school, family and community partnerships above and beyond the school variable. In the fourth step, after controlling variables entered earlier, hours of partnership training will be entered to examine if it will contribute significantly explaining school counselor perceived involvement in school, family and community partnerships.

Research Question 2. Is the percentage of linguistically diverse students served in school related to use of translator, school counselors' bilingual status, caseload, ethnicity, the number of students on free or reduced price lunch, and geographic region of school?

Dependent Variable: the number of linguistically diverse students served in school.

Independent Variables: use of translator, bilingual status, caseload, the number of students on free or reduced price lunch, ethnicity, and geographic region of school.

T-tests will be used to answer if the number of LSD served in school related to the use of translator (i.e., Yes or No), school counselors’ bilingual status (i.e., Yes or No), and ethnicity (i.e., White or Non-White). Correlation analyses will be used to answer if the number of linguistically diverse students served in school related to school counselors’ caseload and the number of students on free or reduced price lunch. ANOVA will be used to answer if the number of linguistically diverse students served in school related to school counselors’ geographic region of school.

XL2 Provide the rationale or power analysis to support the number of subjects proposed to complete this study.

Recently, Bryan and Griffin (2010) explored the SCIPS further from the prior Bryan and Holden-McCoy (2007)’s study on SFC partnerships. Bryan and Griffin (2010) examined other variables, which were not explored before (e.g., principal expectations, time constraints, and partnership-related training), in addition to...
school and school counselor factors related in SFC partnerships. This study examined how school counselor involvement in partnership were correlated with factors related to (a) school (collaborative climate, principal support, and principal expectations), (b) school counselor role perceptions, attitudes toward partnerships, attitudes toward families, commitment to advocacy, self-efficacy related to building partnerships, lack of resources, and time constraints, school counselor caseload, and (c) partnership-related training. Findings supported the ways in which multiple interactions of external and internal factors shape school counselors’ role performance (Brott & Myers, 1998). Overall, school counselor involvement in partnerships were found to be related to a collaborative school climate, school principal expectations, school counselor role perceptions, self-efficacy about partnerships, time constraints, and partnership-related training. However, these relationships may differ by the types of SFC partnerships that school counselors engage (Bryan & Griffin, 2010). Review of the literature highlights the importance of exploring other descriptive information such as the use of translator, school counselors’ bilingual status, caseload, efficacy, the percentage of students on free or reduced priced lunch, and geographic region of work is related the percentage of LDS served in school.

Survey concludes with three open-ended questions. These questions includes in the original instrument (SCIPS) and will be used to report any patterns or themes related to school and school counselor factors that help school counselor involvement in partnerships with LDF and LDS, which contribute to the LDS’ school success by narrowing the achievement gap. The main purpose to include them is to gain an in-depth understanding about participants’ motivation to respond in the way they did to the survey, which in turn may explain what factors contribute building SFC partnerships with LDF.

XII. Future Research

XII.1 Do you wish to keep any information about subjects involved with this research project so that members of the current research team may contact them in the future for your own research projects? No

XII.2 Do you wish to keep any information about subjects involved with this research project so that other researchers may contact them for future research? No

XIII. Other Mod and/or Comments

XIII.1 Most modifications should be made in the appropriate section (e.g. Index) of the project itself. If you need to describe other changes, or wish to add comments about something you changed, please do so here.

Project Modification Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parent-information.pdf</td>
<td>Consent &amp; Assent Forms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49 k</td>
<td>01/05/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST REMINDER E-MAIL.pdf</td>
<td>Recruitment Script: Email</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46 k</td>
<td>01/05/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECRUITMENT E-MAIL.pdf</td>
<td>Recruitment Script: Email</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45 k</td>
<td>01/05/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND REMINDER E-MAIL.pdf</td>
<td>Recruitment Script: Email</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46 k</td>
<td>01/05/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Documentation.pdf</td>
<td>Subject Data Collection Instruments</td>
<td>2 444 k</td>
<td>01/04/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galvin Ardlin - Assurance Document.pdf</td>
<td>Assurance Document</td>
<td>1 127 k</td>
<td>12/20/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX H:
SURVEY RESPONSE RATE PATTERNS
Figure H1. Survey Response Rate Patterns