



Leadership and Counseling Psychology: What Should We Know? Where Could We Go? Ψ

The Counseling Psychologist

2017, Vol. 45(7) 927–964

© The Author(s) 2017

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0011000017744253

journals.sagepub.com/home/tcp



Ruth E. Fassinger¹ and Sandra L. Shullman²

Abstract

In this article, we present an introduction to the scholarly literature in leadership, especially as related to counseling psychology. Although many counseling psychologists engage in professional leadership roles across various settings in which they function, there is little formal knowledge about leadership represented in principal books and journals in the field, nor is leadership addressed formally in most programs providing education and training for counseling psychologists. In this article, we first summarize the most important theories, constructs, and processes in the body of knowledge regarding leadership. We also consider the applicability of this knowledge to the field of counseling psychology, particularly noting values and commitments that may position counseling psychologists for effective leadership. We then outline several cross-cutting issues in leadership for counseling psychologists that arise across settings and roles, concluding with a call for more formal attention to leadership by counseling psychologists.

Keywords

leader, leadership contexts, leadership application, professional issues

¹University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

²Executive Development Group, LLC, Columbus, OH, USA

Corresponding Author:

Ruth E. Fassinger, Department of Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education,
University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA.

Email: rfassing@umd.edu

This issue of *The Counseling Psychologist* (TCP) contains the second set of articles that comprise the special issue of TCP on counseling psychology and leadership. The introductory article (Fassinger, Buki, & Shullman, 2017) to the special issue summarizes the articles in the contribution, in which counseling psychologists considered many aspects of leadership in the field, including practice applications, multicultural interpretations, and leadership development. Most of the articles, however, did not rely on or reference any kind of foundational leadership concepts and processes that are relevant to the work of counseling psychologists, and this gap is indicative of the wider absence of scholarly literature on leadership in our field.

Thus, we take the opportunity in this article to present an introduction to the scholarly literature on leadership, especially as relevant to counseling psychologists. Our somewhat Seussian title reflects our belief that present-day counseling psychologists can learn from past knowledge to position themselves optimally for future possibilities. To this end, we first summarize historical and contemporary approaches to the study of leadership. We next discuss counseling psychology values and foci relevant to leadership, as well as the relevance of leadership theory and processes to the work of counseling psychologists in their roles as leaders. We include an examination of the representation of counseling psychologists in selected professional leadership roles, and we then consider several cross-cutting issues regarding counseling psychology as a field in relation to leadership. We conclude with brief comments regarding training for leadership in counseling psychology, and a call for greater attention to leadership within our field.

Core Leadership Theories, Constructs, and Processes

Leadership has been a topic of interest in the field of psychology almost since its inception, as its founders and early thought leaders sought to define psychology as a science and establish it as a discipline distinct from philosophy (Hothersall, 2004). The American Psychological Association (APA), the official voice of psychology since 1892, publishes journals that regularly include scholarly articles on leadership theories, processes, and applications, such as the *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research* and the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (see Lord, Day, Zaccaro, Avolio, & Eagly, 2017, for a history of leadership research in the latter). Psychologists who are experts in leadership research have published special issues of journals (e.g., *American Psychologist*, Chin, 2010; Sternberg, 2007) and comprehensive reviews (e.g., *Annual Review of Psychology*, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009) of the

leadership literature. Psychologists have been described in the literature as particularly well-suited to leadership roles in areas as diverse as business (Kelly & Finkelman, 2011) and patient-centered medical homes (Beacham et al., 2017).

What are the theories, constructs, and processes that have dominated the professional discourse and guided the work of psychologists who study leadership? In this section, we outline some of the most important approaches to the study of leadership to orient counseling psychology readers to this important literature. We organize this section according to the evolution of important schools of thought. We have chosen this sequence because we believe it is important to recognize that notions of leadership are evolving in the context of international cultural change, and because evolving leadership approaches largely build upon previous approaches rather than replacing them. This cumulative notion of leadership helps to explain why leadership may seem more difficult today than historically: Our ways of understanding it and the expectations for leaders have grown over the course of time.

“Great Man” Leadership Approaches

The “great man” idea is not a formal theory, but rather a set of collective cultural assumptions in Western culture about leaders, going back at least as far as Plutarch. These assumptions were described more formally in the West starting in the mid-19th century (Carlyle, 1841), when scholars examined the skills, physical characteristics, and talents of men who had risen to power. These assumptions included the understanding that great leaders were male and that some men of privilege were intrinsically born to be leaders, understanding that these inbred qualities would produce great leadership once the situation presented itself. Hence, leaders typically were seen as heroic figures who had fulfilled their destinies.

Francis Galton (1869, 1880) took these assumptions one step further and studied the leadership attributes of the families of men who had risen to power. In noting that more direct relatives of powerful men tended to become leaders more frequently than less direct relatives, Galton concluded that leadership was heritable, thus lending support to the notion that leaders were born, not made. It is important to note, of course, that these very assumptions limited the potential pool of leaders and thus became a self-fulfilling prophecy rather than a testable theory. Herbert Spencer, an English philosopher, established one of the earliest rebuttals to the “great man” view in 1860 by describing heroes as simply those persons who were a product of their times and that their actions resulted from the social conditions in which they were present (cf. Hook, 1950).

Although the “great man” view was eventually absorbed into formal trait and attribute theories of leadership that emerged in the 1930s, its basic premise of leadership capacity (or “greatness”) residing inside uniquely endowed men is deeply embedded in our culture. It manifests in literary discourse about famous men such as Lincoln (White, 2009) or Churchill (Manchester, 1983), and in the well-documented, firmly entrenched, sexist assumption that leaders are male, and that leadership is something men enact best and most appropriately (Eagly & Carli, 2007). These cultural assumptions about power, gender, and leadership permeate workplace cultures (e.g., military and paramilitary settings), despite whatever approach to leadership is formally endorsed or claimed within that workplace (an issue we return to in later sections of this article).

Trait and Attribute Leadership Approaches

Trait and attribute leadership theories evolved out of the “great man” assumptive underpinnings, and postulated that some people are either born with or somehow come to possess certain attributes that would inevitably make them successful in leadership roles and situations. Gordon Allport’s (1937, 1955; Allport & Allport, 1921) work on trait theory of personality provided some pioneering methods and perspectives for identification of traits of those deemed effective leaders or heroes. Researchers in the 1940s and 1950s conducted qualitative reviews of the trait approach to leadership, concluding that leaders did demonstrate some common characteristics across situations, although the overall evidence suggested that leaders in one situation may not be considered leaders in other situations (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948). As methods for the study of trait theory and personality evolved and improved, research in the 1970s and 1980s indicated that there are some persons who do emerge as leaders across situations or tasks (Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983), a pattern borne out in more recent research using the trait theory approach. Moreover, findings have shown a significant relationship between persons emerging as leaders and certain individual traits such as intelligence, extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and adjustability (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt 2002; Lord, de Vader, & Alliger, 1986; Tagger, Hackett, & Saha, 1999). Thus, there is some support for a trait approach to conceptualizing leadership.

Zaccaro (2007), however, observed that modern trait-based leadership approaches exhibit major limitations. For instance, these approaches have remained focused on a relatively small number of traits, neglected to focus on clusters of leadership traits or attributes, failed to make distinctions between more fixed characteristics and situational factors, and lacked any explanation for

how more stable traits or characteristics explain the behavioral variety required for leaders. In addition, we note that these theories have failed to account for any individual or cultural social identity differences that might be salient.

Despite limitations in the trait and attribute approaches, they are used widely in contemporary practice, especially by major assessment and consulting (e.g., “head-hunter”) organizations, which use trait-based methods for identifying leadership talent for purposes of selection and hiring of personnel. In the emerging leadership competency movement of the current decade, much of this assessment work is now giving more focus to cognitive abilities, motivators, values, and problem-solving and learning skills, utilizing traits as part of a cluster of assessment variables (Dai, Tang, & DeMeuse, 2011). The enduring presence of trait-based ideas in both research and social discourse about leadership suggests that perceptions of leadership capacity will always rest, at least to some degree, upon an underlying belief in individual talent.

Behavioral Leadership Styles Approaches

In response to the criticisms and limitations of trait approaches, leadership researchers began to focus on the behavioral patterns of emerging leaders, attempting to develop a core set of behaviors that were identified as *leadership behaviors*, clustered together as *leadership styles*, including early labels such as authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Much of the behavioral leadership work can be traced to early studies at The Ohio State University on behaviors related to tasks and people (Stogdill & Coons, 1957; Stogdill, Goode, & Day, 1962), as well as studies at the University of Michigan on task and people orientation and participative leadership, which led to research on leaders and teams (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Likert, 1961). Blake and Mouton (1964) synthesized these ideas into the development of the *managerial grid*, which generated five behaviorally-based leadership styles; these reflected combinations of consideration for people and concern for production and/or goal achievement. McClelland (1984) later expanded the behavioral styles approach by focusing on motivation and ego strength as key indicators of leadership styles. In contemporary leadership practice, a focus on specific behaviors (or clusters of behaviors known as styles) appears commonly in leadership training and development, where identifying, understanding, practicing, and incorporating specific leadership skills into one’s behavioral repertoire can instill confidence in potential leaders. This approach also serves to democratize an arena in which leadership may be widely viewed as open only to a privileged few—that is, if leadership relies on behaviors and skills that can be learned (however complex), then anyone who can learn well can become a leader.

One particular leadership behavior is worth noting in this brief review because it has received a great deal of attention during the past two decades and is likely to influence future conceptualizations of leadership. Salovey and Mayer (1990) coined the term *emotional intelligence* (EI) to describe a constellation of behaviors that include awareness of self and others and the ability to manage emotions and relationships, behaviors presumed to give leaders high in emotional intelligence an advantage in interpersonal flexibility and social networks.

Goleman (2000) popularized and translated the EI concept into behavioral styles of leadership. The EI concept has received both support and criticism, but it continues to offer “a receptive audience...a way to think about the relative importance of intellectual and social skills, arguing that managers with high IQ but low EI are a danger to themselves and others” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 177). Moreover, EI is being increasingly invoked in relation to leadership diversity; members of marginalized groups highlight EI as a strength of their leadership ability to read and respond to others that their outsider status has imbued in them (e.g., see Chin & Trimble, 2015).

Situational or Contingency Leadership Approaches

Another set of approaches to explaining leader emergence that emanated from the limitations of trait theory were *situational* or *contingency theories*, which posited that the inherent differences in situations determine the needed traits and attributes required for leaders, thus implying that there was no one model of a leader but rather that the situation determined the leadership needed (Hemphill, 1949; Vecchio, 1987). The most frequently referenced situational or contingency theories are the Fiedler contingency model (Fiedler, 1964), the leadership decision styles approach (Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973), the path-goal leadership theory (House, 1971), and the situational leadership model (Hersey, 1985; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2008).

Fiedler's (1964) model described a situational contingency, which results from the interaction of the style of leadership and situational control. Two types of leadership styles, people-oriented and task-oriented, were defined, with the understanding that there was no ideal leader but rather each style could be effective if the leader has good relations with members, the task is well-structured, and the leader has appropriate position power—in essence, when the leader has a favorable context to enact leadership. Vroom and Yetton (1973) created a normative decision-making model, based on situational variables such as the quality, timeliness, and necessity of follower acceptance to implement the decision. House (1971) identified four leader

behaviors (achievement-oriented, directive, participative, and supportive) presumed to be determined by the characteristics of followers and environmental factors. Hersey and Blanchard's (2008) approach generated four leadership styles based on both the characteristics of the leader and the characteristics (i.e., developmental needs) of followers.

As these theories demonstrate, evolving contingency theories put much greater emphasis on the relationship with and characteristics of followers than did previous leader-oriented approaches, a focus that has expanded in leadership theory over time. In the current leadership competency movement, for example, emerging values-based models emphasize not just transitory (i.e., situational or developmental) needs of followers, but their deeply held values and worldviews as well, which are expected to be reflected in the integrity and ethical behavior demonstrated by the leader (Kramer, 2011; Mackey & Sisodia, 2013; Seidman, 2011). Thus, contingency theories, in their attention not just to leaders but also to those being led, foreshadowed the emergence of the more follower-oriented transactional and, later, transformational leadership theories.

Transactional Leadership Approaches

Transactional leadership theories define leaders in terms of an exchange of labor for the capacity to reward. For example, Burns (1978) defined the leader as having certain tasks to accomplish and the ability to reward or punish a group for performance in those tasks. The leader creates a situation in which a group or team agrees to follow the leader to achieve a goal in exchange for something considered of value to the followers, and the leader is given the power to direct the followers and reward them for meeting the goal.

One very specific and widely studied example of a transactional leadership theory is *leader-member exchange (LMX) theory*. According to this approach, leaders form stronger relationships with some members of a group or team than with others (Bauer & Ergoden, 2015). LMX theory presumes that leaders do not treat each follower in the same manner, and the followers' behaviors and attitudes depend upon the leader's treatment (Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang, & Shore, 2012). Used primarily to describe work group leaders and followers, LMX theory has been tested in multiple countries and cultures, with recent studies emphasizing the leader's responsibility in forming the necessary relationships for successful use of the leader-member exchange approach (Dulebohn et al., 2012). One interesting area of contemporary leadership research that may be presumed to fit broadly into a transactional paradigm is the neuroscience of leadership, in which scholars are using brain

research to try to determine how to best move people in a particular direction based on their inherent, neurally-based reward mechanisms (Rock & Ringleb, 2013; Rock & Schwartz, 2006).

Transformational Leadership Approaches

Transformational leadership is distinguished from transactional leadership (Bass, 1997) by its concern for followers beyond simply rewarding performance. Transformational leadership is defined by how the leader influences and empowers the followers, specifically in (a) enhancing awareness of the value and importance of tasks, (b) providing a group vision bigger than a single individual, and (c) stimulating the push for meeting higher-order needs. Bass noted that aspects of charisma are necessary but not sufficient for effective leaders, and he asserted more recently that authentic transformational leadership is grounded in a moral base, which includes idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and consideration of the followers as individuals. The followers' emotional commitment and identification with the leader, in turn, are based on the leader's moral character and the perceived moral worthiness of the leader's goal, project, or program. Burns (1978) similarly described transformational leaders as focused on engaging the followers into "raising one another to higher levels of morality and motivation" (p. 20).

Kouzes and Posner (1995, 2002) operationalized their notion of transformational leadership by designing and administering a questionnaire, the Leadership Practices Inventory, to 75,000 respondents who described both the characteristics and behaviors of leaders whom they would follow willingly. Trait characteristics were identified, along with five key processes: (a) challenging the process, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way, and (e) encouraging the heart. The researchers noted similarities between the respondents' descriptions of leader characteristics and processes and Burns's (1978) and Bass's (1997) notions of transformational leadership, supporting the basic tenets of the theory. Thus, the transformational leadership approach not only integrates leader and follower agendas into something new and transcendent, but it also brings a focus to the actual processes involved in effecting leadership according to the model.

Transformational leadership has become a widely known and well-supported approach to leading others successfully across a broad range of settings, from workplaces (e.g., Arnold, 2017) to individual psychotherapy (Gabel, 2013), perhaps in part because of the inherent optimism of the approach. Recent work on *authentic transformational leadership* is gaining attention in the research literature and is likely to be particularly important in

the current U.S. context of political upheaval, as it emphasizes developing the legitimacy of the leader by starting with an ethical foundation and establishing honesty-based relationships with followers, whose input is valued. Descriptions of authentic leaders emphasize the positive aspects of ego and self-concept, characterized by attempts to promote openness as part of the leadership process (Gardner, Coligser, Davis, & Dickens, 2011; George & Sims, 2007). Thus, transformational leadership theories have embraced the notion of empowerment and mutuality as part of what the leader and the group create together to accomplish defined and desired goals. It is perhaps these relational and values-based features of transformational leadership that have rendered it the preferred and most successful approach of leaders from marginalized groups (such as women and people of color; Eagly & Chin, 2010), whose leadership may emanate from their strongly held identities related to status characteristics such as gender, race or ethnicity, sexual orientation, and the like.

Learning Leadership Approaches

A newly evolving area of leadership study focuses heavily on context, examining how leaders are successful under contemporary societal and global conditions of rapid change, first time dilemmas, heightened ambiguity, and uncertainty. A number of researchers have taken the approach of defining leadership in such circumstances as the ability to learn, grow, and change, thus creating an environment where all can perform to maximum capacity by responding to continuous change in the environment (Hodgson & White, 2001). Some have described this as leadership in a “VUCA” (volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous) world (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014; Jacobs, 2002), with specific skill sets required to lead successfully in such settings.

Eichinger and Lombardo (2004) defined this set of skills as *learning agility*, found to be predictive of future success when the leader is confronted by new or novel situations. Hodgson and White (2001) identified a set of behaviors characteristic of leaders who were viewed as having led successfully during periods of heightened ambiguity and concomitant uncertainty; these included (a) seeking mysteries, (b) tolerating risk, (c) future scanning, (d) tenacious challenging, (e) exciting and invigorating oneself and others, (f) flexibly adjusting, simplifying, and (g) focusing on the critical few. White and Shullman (2010) demonstrated the relationship of these behaviors to perceptions of leader success with an international pool of leaders. They found that the presence of these behaviors in dealing with ambiguity were positively correlated with leader success. Jacques (1997) related the need for increasing cognitive complexity to the expanding time frame leaders must

address, asserting that the higher in the group or organization the leader moves, the more uncertain and broader the perspective required and the further out in time the leader must consider, with expanding time perspective creating increasing uncertainty about the nature of future outcomes.

Learning approaches rely on collaboration to be successful. Concepts of collaborative leadership emerged from 1990s' trends as private and public sector organizations developed strategic alliances to address massive infrastructure challenges that were seemingly unsolvable by either sector. Kanter (1994), for example, described the contribution of certain private sector relationships as being less formally controlled by organizations and more comprised of dense interpersonal networks in pursuit of common goals, whereas Archer and Cameron (2013) emphasized obtaining value from difference and coming together to learn how to reach a shared goal, unachievable by any one party. Applying these learning theories of leadership to psychology, Shullman (2017 [this issue]) describes the need for psychologists to embrace learning leadership approaches in both their identities and their work focus, referring to psychologists as potential learning leaders for the future.

Diversity and Leadership Approaches

In most areas of leadership research, notions of diversity, culture, and globalization have been sorely neglected in the formulation of leadership (Chin & Trimble, 2015). Chin and Trimble offered a critique of leadership theories as neglectful of major contextual variables, namely individual and group social identities. Trait theories, for instance, are criticized as both ethnocentric and overly focused on what leaders do rather than what they bring to leadership roles, suggesting the need for a shift in focus to leader identity intersecting with dimensions of social identities. Situational theories are critiqued for focusing too much on specific contexts (thereby compromising the applicability of the approach across broader situations) as well as for the potential for unconscious bias to be left unchallenged. These critiques suggest the need for greater focus on leader adaptability across diverse contexts and inclusion of the possibility of enhanced cognitive complexity skills derived from bicultural experience. Transformational theories are criticized for emphasizing Western and male notions of charisma and inspiration, suggesting obvious benefit to be derived from the inclusion of non-Western perspectives on leadership. Finally, we note that LMX leadership theory neglects the notion that leadership can be cocreated in groups and may engender socially unjust relationships between leaders and members in the creation of favored or in-groups, where minority and historically oppressed members often compose the out-groups.

As an alternative to existing leadership theories, Chin and Trimble (2015) offered an expansion of LMX theory, described as *diverse leader-member organization exchange* (DLMOX) *theory*, which focuses on “diverse leaders and members interacting within the context of their organizations and lived experiences” (p. 41). Their conceptualization bears strong similarities to other recent attempts to infuse diversity into leadership formulations, including, for example, women (e.g., Eagly & Carli, 2007), women of color (e.g., Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010), and sexual minorities (e.g., Fassinger, Shullman, & Stevenson, 2010). All of these diversity-oriented conceptualizations of leadership emphasize leader and follower identities and social locations, as well as complex aspects of the social and organizational context in which leadership is being enacted. In addition, these expanded views of leadership are all rooted in social justice goals of community empowerment and change, and they all endorse leadership processes that can be described as collaborative, values-based, identity-affirming, ethical, inclusionary, and socially responsible. Thus, we see in contemporary leadership research the beginnings of the infusion of diversity considerations, and we assert that the strong need for individual learning and personal growth that is the hallmark of successful diversity work is particularly well-suited to the learning leadership approach, in both its emphasis on openness to new information and novel ways of thinking, and its dependence upon collaboration and shared responsibility for solving problems and moving forward.

Summary of Leadership Approaches

In summary, the leadership approaches we have presented briefly can be organized (and easily remembered) in three conceptual groupings (Hodgson & White, 2001) and one overarching construct (Chin & Trimble, 2015). “Command-and-control” approaches (including much of trait, situational and contingency, behavioral and styles, and transactional approaches) are primarily leader-focused, sharing the assumption that the leader knows both what to do and how to do whatever is needed for the group to reach defined goals; the leader’s main task is to communicate the direction to followers. In contrast, transformational and empowerment approaches focus more on followers and leader-follower relations, in which the leader knows where the group needs to go but cannot get there without the group figuring out how to accomplish the goal or task; the leader models integrity and builds commitment and engagement to meet group goals. Learning approaches focus on learning within context, where the leader is likely uncertain about what to do and how to do it, and must rely on continuous group learning to identify evolving needs and to create adaptive methods to achieve the desired goal; the leader

models openness and leverages group learning. Finally, the diversity perspective reminds us that all three of these groupings of leadership approaches occur within strong cultures, contexts, and lived group and individual social identities. As such, traditional leadership assumptions must be re-examined, and evolving leadership approaches must always include these critical contextual factors.

How Is Leadership Theory Relevant to Counseling Psychology?

What do we do with this theoretical knowledge about leadership? How do we make sense of it so that we can apply it directly to one field, such as counseling psychology? One way to think about these evolving, cumulative theories of leadership is to view them as highlighting traits, behaviors, processes, and relationships involving leaders and group members in pursuit of some goal. We see great parallels between characteristics and behaviors of counselors and clients, as well as counseling processes and relationships that result in desirable learning outcomes and change processes. Counseling psychology typically approaches counseling from an individual or small group level. But could counseling psychology take these same concepts to another level and approach existing challenges with an expanded professional identity?

Gabel (2013) highlighted the parallels between psychotherapy and transformational leadership as relationship-based change processes, arguing that conducting psychotherapy is, in fact, a form of (transformational) leadership. In a similar vein, Fassinger and Good (2017) point to well-honed therapy skills as highly applicable to addressing the relational realities of academic leadership. We agree with these observations, and suggest that, taken to larger group or organizational levels, leadership roles and behaviors address issues that are not substantively and procedurally very different from working with individuals to bring about desired change. Individual and group leadership traits, behaviors, processes, and relationships are designed to help people learn, grow, and change. One definition of leadership (i.e., learning leadership; Hodgson & White, 2001) defines itself exactly that way. Moreover, counseling psychology has been one of the few areas in psychology with a focus on context that is defined in terms of individual and group social and cultural identities, which is core to understandings of diversity and leadership.

Thus, the merging of traditional views of counseling applied to leadership (particularly in the highly congruent transformational and learning perspectives), all enacted within a diverse, multicultural context, could become a

major path forward for the expansion of counseling psychology identity into the broader arena of systems change. However, beyond the clear similarities between leadership and counseling processes lies the key question of whether counseling psychologists are professionally ready (perhaps distinctly so, although this is an empirical question), to embrace leadership as part of our core identity and incorporate leadership consciously into our science, practice, education and training, and advocacy activities. We explore this question in the remainder of the article.

Counseling Psychology and Leadership

We consider here the relevance and applicability of a knowledge base in leadership to the field of counseling psychology. Leadership scholars who posit that psychologists in general may be well-suited to leadership roles cite factors such as humanistic training, high ethical standards, and a network-dependent (vs. lone “warrior”) leadership style as potential strengths (Kelly & Finkelman, 2011). We refine this notion to capture more specifically the distinct location of counseling psychologists within the larger discipline of psychology. We particularly note the values and commitments of our field that may position counseling psychologists well to understand and enact effective leadership.

Foci, Themes, and Values of Counseling Psychology

As Hall (2012) reminded us, the field of counseling psychology emerged out of an historical press during its period of growth and definition in the 1950s and 1960s to distinguish itself from clinical psychology and from its closely-related counselor education, educational, and vocational guidance roots. These forces were critical in the development of the guiding foci and commitments of the field, and that legacy is evident in three important overarching perspectives that scaffold our work as counseling psychologists: (a) embracing intervention goals beyond ameliorating pathology, (b) assuming a systems perspective in our work, and (c) valuing shared relationships and collaboration (Altmaier & Ali, 2012).

These perspectives have been delineated as five enduring, unifying themes of counseling psychology (Gelso & Fretz, 2001; Gelso, Williams, & Fretz, 2014); applicable to science, practice, and advocacy; and likely taught in every graduate training program in counseling psychology today. These themes include strong emphases on (a) assets and strengths, (b) person–environment interactions, (c) educational and career development, (d) brief interventions, and (e) intact personalities. These unifying themes are articulated in

the description of counseling psychology as a field on the website for the Society of Counseling Psychology (SCP), Division 17 of the APA (quoted here in its entirety):

Counseling Psychology is a specialty within professional psychology that maintains a focus on facilitating personal and interpersonal functioning across the life span. The specialty pays particular attention to emotional, social, vocational, educational, health-related, developmental, and organizational concerns. The practice of Counseling Psychology encompasses a broad range of culturally-sensitive practices that help people improve their well-being, alleviate distress and maladjustment, resolve crises, and increase their ability to function better in their lives. With its attention to both normal developmental issues and problems associated with physical, emotional, and mental disorders, the specialization holds a unique perspective in the broader practice-based areas of psychology. Counseling Psychologists serve persons of all ages and cultural backgrounds in both individual and group settings. They also consult regularly with organizations seeking to enhance their effectiveness or the well-being of their members. Interventions used by Counseling Psychologists may be either brief or long-term; they are often problem-specific and goal-directed. These activities are guided by a philosophy that values individual differences and diversity and a focus on prevention, development, and adjustment across the life span. (SCP, 2017)

With unifying themes of counseling psychology focused on positive, strengths-based views of individuals in their environmental contexts, living out normative life span developmental processes (e.g., being educated, obtaining work), and occasionally needing brief, targeted assistance in confronting life problems, it is understandable that attention to diversity and multiculturalism would have become such a strong value in counseling psychology. Indeed, this focus is a natural outgrowth of the desire to understand individuals in their contexts and to help with problems emanating from those contexts. Helping diverse people in their cultural contexts also leads directly to efforts to eliminate inequities that systematically disadvantage or harm particular groups within those contexts, and, coupled with the historical foundation of the field on educational and vocational intervention, the emphasis of counseling psychology on organizational and systems change in the service of social justice is entirely congruent as another strongly held value of the field. Moreover, implicit in a strengths-based and individuality-based view of people that is fundamentally positive and respectful is a perspective on helping that is person-centered and collaborative, perhaps captured best in the indelible historical influence of Carl Rogers (e.g., 1940) and Leona Tyler (e.g., 1953) on the field of counseling psychology. Also closely related to this

core value of collaborative relationships is another of counseling psychology's foundational values—the critical importance of and interplay between both science and practice, particularly as articulated in the Boulder model of graduate education that guides current training in our field (see Altmaier & Ali, 2012).

Thus, conscious adherence to the unifying values and foci of our field might be expected to produce professionals who possess certain characteristics, predispositions, skills, and commitments—that is, strengths they bring to their work. These strengths include: (a) a fundamentally positive view of human beings and human endeavor; (b) a collaborative approach to human relationships of all kinds; (c) a respect for both the science of practice and the practice of science; (d) an ability to serve individuals, groups, and organizations with sensitivity and flexibility; (e) an attitude of humility and openness toward the full range of human diversity; (f) an awareness of the impact of contexts in which diverse people function (especially as they affect education and work); (g) a capacity to intervene quickly and efficiently while also taking a long-range view of developmental possibilities in both individuals and contexts; and (h) a consciousness about one's own positionality and impact as a professional psychologist interacting in complex systems. Can these strengths potentially influence the leadership behavior of counseling psychologists? We believe they can—and probably do.

Counseling Psychology Strengths and Leadership

Fassinger and Good (2017), in an article on counseling psychologists in academic administration, assert that the volatile environment in contemporary higher education provides an opportunity for counseling psychology to demonstrate that its strengths and commitments, consciously applied and enacted, represent an effective fit between the challenging needs of academic institutions and the attitudes and skills that counseling psychologists might be presumed to bring to bear on leadership roles. Citing the five unifying themes of counseling psychology, Fassinger and Good (p. 759–760) asserted:

these values and roles are precisely the kinds of characteristics that can maximize success in academic leadership: focusing on strengths and positive aspects of people and places; effecting rapid amelioration of immediate difficulties while also addressing the long-term needs of people and places; understanding people, places, and problems in context and addressing diversity issues competently and consciously; and retaining the big picture of higher education as a primarily educational, developmental, and vocational endeavor.

We agree with this characterization, and would argue further that the strengths that are vitally important in academic leadership today also apply to many other organizations and institutions in which counseling psychologists function. Moreover, we posit that counseling psychology emphases on relational, collaborative, flexible, multiculturally aware, strengths-based, developmental, contextual, and self-reflective approaches to intervention fit particularly well with both transformational and learning approaches to leadership, the two approaches found in research to be most successful in, and appropriate to, contemporary leadership. We present here several brief examples of the kinds of roles and behaviors counseling psychologists might exhibit in common leadership situations due to their training and values.

1. Counseling psychologists leading professional committees or organizations may be well equipped to focus more on collaboration than others in the group, might be more conscious of the impact of the committee or organization's potential actions on diverse constituents and communities being served, might consciously use many basic counseling skills (e.g., listening, reflecting) in their interpersonal interactions, and might be more focused than others on bringing scholarship to bear in decision-making.
2. Counseling psychologists who are leading collaborative university-community intervention studies might find themselves consciously upholding both the short-term goal of expedient and cost-effective intervention and the long-term aim of retention of gains and improved community functioning. Additionally, counseling psychologists might be more keenly aware than others in the group of the ethical issues involved in being a researcher in the community, might understand and anticipate both the within-group and between-group diversity of the communities under study better than others, and might be more likely than others to treat community members as collaborators rather than research subjects.
3. Counseling psychology practitioners who assume leadership of a patient case with a collaborating healthcare organization might find themselves more inclined than other team members to focus on the patient's strengths and assets, might be more knowledgeable in diversity and multicultural issues (particularly with populations who are severely underserved and largely invisible in the healthcare system, such as immigrants and transgender people), and might be more likely than others on the team to focus on the patient's capacity to engage in meaningful work.

4. Counseling psychologists who serve as training directors in VA sites may find themselves more attuned than other staff members to trainee diversity and context (particularly the challenges for women in a masculinist environment), might be more likely than some other staff members to help trainees explore and embrace client strengths and assets, might be more knowledgeable than other staff regarding the vocational issues of VA clients being seen by trainees and how to address them effectively, and might be more collaborative with trainees than other, perhaps more hierarchical, staff members.

As these examples suggest, counseling psychologists may enact in their leadership (consciously or not) the commitments and foci that emanate from their professional training in, and adherence to, the values and emphases of counseling psychology. And, much like the conscious application of specific counseling approaches and techniques elevates an empathic, interpersonally skilled individual into a competent therapist, we believe that the conscious and deliberate use of specific knowledge regarding leadership can sharpen a leader's focus and transform random or accidental gains into more consistent success. For example, counseling psychologist leaders in the VA system often find that the positive, public aspects of the federally controlled environment in which they work (such as protections for sexual minority employees) mask a deeper, masculinized, command-and-control culture that emanates from its military roots, creating a work environment in which counseling psychology's values of collaboration, flexibility, and strengths-based views of people may be somewhat difficult to uphold. Our hypothetical training director in this situation may wish to enact a transformational leadership approach in which trainees are treated collegially, their contributions and perspectives valued, and the diversity among them affirmed and honored, but finds these approaches to leadership are dismissed or criticized. The time taken to obtain feedback and collaborate on a change or initiative, for example, may be viewed as inability to take action as a leader, and efforts to empower marginalized individuals may be perceived as abdicating transactional responsibility to punish and reward trainees or as undermining the necessity of a functioning hierarchy.

However, understanding distinctions among leadership theories can help counseling psychologist leaders plan their leadership approaches more consciously and strategically. For instance, if counseling psychologists know that the command-and-control environment that they work in demands transactional relationships, and they understand the behaviors that are expected under that model of leadership, they can then frame their language and behavior deliberately to fit expectations (e.g., speaking of "responsibility" instead of "empowerment" or "accountability" instead of "feedback"), while

they simultaneously work to infuse the system with a language and practice of collaboration and affirmation. Thus, the conscious use of leadership knowledge in this particular situation could not only enhance the leader's effectiveness in the moment, but also can help to mitigate the personal stress of engaging in socially just, but subversive, activity on a continuing basis.

Moreover, given the dominant default expectation in current U.S. society that leaders are male and White (Eagly & Carli, 2007), it is likely that most workplaces and organizations will be permeated by an implicit leadership model that relies, at least to some extent, on commanding and controlling others, including all of the examples above (e.g., academe, medical settings, and community or professional organizations). Thus, it is probable that the challenges facing our hypothetical VA training director will be similar to those encountered by many counseling psychologist leaders who find themselves drawn to enacting follower-centered, relational, transformational, and learning leadership approaches within leader-focused transactional, hierarchical, command-and-control situations (i.e., systems that may be incongruent with counseling psychology values). An ever-present awareness of competing models of leadership in one's environment, coupled with knowledge of specific strategies and processes that characterize the approaches, can help counseling psychologists to strengthen and expand their leadership repertoires, and to tailor their behaviors to meet external expectations while they also work from their most fundamental personal and professional core values.

Leadership in Professional Psychology

If our assertion that counseling psychologists may be well-positioned by their adherence to core values and practices to enact leadership effectively is true, it becomes relevant to explore the extent to which psychologists actually do lead effectively. What is our track record of leadership involvement and success? Given the paucity of research on leadership in counseling psychology, there are few data to inform a broad and comprehensive answer to this question. However, we do have a small sampling of observations, provided by our primary professional home, the APA. APA data offer a convenient snapshot of counseling psychology leadership in various kinds of professional activities; we review here counseling psychologists' leadership in the development of practice guidelines, involvement in APA governance, and recognition through the conferral of major APA awards.

Guidelines involvement. As Fassinger and Good (2017) and others (e.g., Gelso & Fretz, 2001; Gelso et al., 2014) have noted, counseling psychologists have been some of the leading scholars of diversity issues in psychology. These issues include gender (e.g., Enns, Williams, & Fassinger, 2013); race,

ethnicity, and culture (e.g., Fouad, 2009); sexual orientation and gender diversity (e.g., DeBord, Fischer, Bieschke, & Perez, 2017); and the intersection of diverse identities with educational and career development (e.g., Blustein, 2006; Richardson, 2012). Thus, it might be expected that counseling psychologists also have been key contributors to APA's development of guidelines for practice with diverse populations, and, indeed, this is the case. Counseling psychologists have been primary creators (APA, 2003, 2014, 2015, 2016b) or principal collaborators (APA, 2007, 2012, 2013) in the development of professional practice guidelines for populations such as women and girls; lesbian, gay, and bisexual people; transgender and gender nonconforming people; and people of color, as well as in arenas such as prevention; education and work; and telepsychology. Counseling psychologists are making a large investment in guiding clinical practice; firsthand experience of the first author in several of these guidelines-development projects attests to the attention of counseling psychology colleagues in ensuring the inclusion of diversity, science, education, and work across these guidelines.

APA governance. The governance of APA is handled through a wide array of member activities including divisions, APA boards and committees as well as task forces and work groups, the APA Board of Directors (BOD), and the presidency of APA. Documenting the involvements and leadership of counseling psychologists in these activities is somewhat difficult. Although a summary is presented annually in *The Counseling Psychologist*, numbers of participating counseling psychologists in APA governance have not been documented consistently over time, and some types of involvements are not documented at all. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, Division 17 began more formal monitoring of division members in APA governance activities, including instituting meetings at convention and at board and committee meetings for the purposes of tracking issues, providing member support, and coordinating responses across governance groups. This practice appears to have had some success, in that the numbers of division members serving on APA boards and committees has remained very consistent since the mid-2000s. A count of counseling psychologists on APA boards and committees since 2006, for example, indicates that in any given year, an average of about 65 people serve. When service in state and territorial psychological associations and APA task forces is factored in, the total number of counseling psychologists almost doubles (from a total Division 17 membership of approximately 2,100; M. Heesacker, personal communication, September 4, 2017).

Counseling psychologists' involvement in other APA leadership roles is difficult to determine as well, in large part because psychologists seeking election to the APA BOD or presidency often join the division around the time of their campaigning and may, in fact, have little identification with counseling

psychology. By our count using the APA website (APA, 2017), six (three women and three men) of the 125 presidents of the Association to date have been counseling psychologists by training, but only three of them (the women) actually identified with counseling psychology. Several other APA presidents have belonged to the division in recent years, but they have not identified as counseling psychologists. The BOD currently has two members serving who identify with counseling psychology and, by our observation, the BOD has had counseling psychologists on it fairly consistently in recent years.

Percentages of awardees. APA honors its leading members with prestigious awards each year in the domains of science, practice, education and training, and public interest. These awards denote the highest levels of leadership in the field of psychology, so it is instructive to explore how many of these awards have been given to counseling psychologists over the histories of these awards (the totals vary given that the historical timetables differ, as do the number of recipients in each category each year). Our counts reveal the following: in science, there are three major awards (including an early career award) that have been awarded to a total of 425 people; only three counseling psychologists (John L. Holland, Donald E. Super, and Bruce E. Wampold) have won these awards (0.7%). There are four professional (i.e., practice-related) awards (including a graduate student award); of 151 total recipients, eight (5%) have been awarded to counseling psychologists (including John L. Holland and John D. Krumboltz). The education and training category has two awards; out of a total of 64 recipients, 12 (19%) have been counseling psychologists. Additionally, there are two public interest awards. Out of 103 total recipients, eight (8%) have been counseling psychologists. There are two awards for international contributions; of 50 awards given, four (8%) have been awarded to counseling psychologists. Counseling psychologists have never won the Early Graduate Student Researcher Award, and in the past 3 years, of the 15 American Psychological Foundation Gold Medal awards given, two counseling psychologists have been honored.

Overall, these percentages are quite low—particularly the scientific numbers—considering the size of Division 17 (with almost 2,000 members in 2016) relative to some of the science-based divisions of APA (e.g., Divisions 6, 3, and 5 at 424, 635, and 946 members respectively, in 2016). It would appear that our presence is felt most strongly in education and training, where the influence of counseling psychology historically has been quite substantive. The numbers also suggest that counseling psychologists may be represented fairly reasonably in service roles (which certainly constitute one important kind of leadership), but do not appear to be garnering levels of honor and recognition in the larger psychology community

that are commensurate with their achievements. Although awards, of course, are not the only indication of leadership in the field, it can be argued that they are a barometer of the visibility of counseling psychologists' contributions within the larger professional psychology community of APA, and the awards data highlight the critical importance of promoting professional and public visibility of counseling psychology as a field (an issue to which we return later in this article).

Cross-Cutting Issues in Leadership for Counseling Psychologists

In this section of our discussion of counseling psychology and leadership, we consider several cross-cutting issues that counseling psychologists are likely to encounter across myriad settings and roles. Each of these issues involves both challenges and opportunities, and we assert that intentional, conscious, informed leadership can help counseling psychologists to address some of these challenges effectively and perhaps maximize their success.

Diversity

As one of the most important values held by counseling psychologists, and an area in which their influence in professional psychology is presumed to be especially strong (e.g., Altmaier & Ali, 2012; Gelso & Fretz, 2001; Gelso et al., 2014), human diversity represents a critical nexus for the intersection of societal problems and counseling psychologists' potential strengths in enacting leadership and effecting change. However, perhaps particularly obvious in the current U.S. political climate, there is tremendous backlash against human rights gains made in recent decades. Thus, the hard work of systems change has become even more fraught with barriers, setbacks, overt expressions of hatred, chaos, and confusion. How do well-meaning counseling psychologists navigate the storms of functioning in environments that may be increasingly hostile toward diversity? Can formal knowledge regarding leadership and related domains help them stay the course in honoring and prioritizing attention to human diversity in their leadership roles?

Fassinger and Good (2017) provided an example of how counseling psychologists might practice empowering leadership in the hierarchical, masculinist environment of higher education where current pressures arising from budgetary, technological, student, and community demands often pit upper administration against faculty in power struggles over programs and priorities. Acknowledging the importance of feminist multicultural approaches as one of the four dominant theoretical perspectives in

contemporary counseling psychology (Gelso et al., 2014), Fassinger and Good (2017) linked the literature on academic leadership to the counseling psychology literature on feminist mentoring to demonstrate how a midlevel leader might consciously apply principles of feminist multicultural mentoring to empower faculty in a conflictual situation with upper administration. Their example highlights the applicability and potential effectiveness of feminist perspectives in a leadership event that not only meets institutional demands, but also maintains the feminist multicultural commitment to collaborate with others, share power, give voice, obviate politics, and challenge hierarchy. Thus, an approach that may seem inimical (and possibly even incendiary) to the traditional structures of most higher education institutions can be quite useful when carefully and thoughtfully applied. Moreover, if an overlay of leadership theory is applied to this example, it becomes clear that a feminist, multicultural approach to mentoring is entirely consistent with transformational and learning approaches to leadership due to the collaborative, contextualized, flexible, growth-oriented, values-based, self-reflective, and empowering underpinnings of these approaches.

Eagly and Chin (2010) argued strongly for better integration of the leadership literature and scholarship on diversity. They noted that leadership theorists and researchers have been largely silent about diversity and social justice, and that scholarship on diversity (including gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender expression, disability, and the like) has neglected leadership. This is unfortunate because the complexity of leadership in an increasingly interconnected globalized world absolutely demands attention to the ways in which diversity in groups of people and organizations leads to particular behaviors when diverse individuals interact. Leader diversity is important, and the increased movement (albeit slow) of women and people of color into visible leadership roles in the United States is encouraging, but leaders themselves are only part of the story. Diversity among members of the groups that they lead, cultural norms of the organization and in the society in which the leaders and followers are embedded, and the influences of events happening far away in the larger global context all exert a profound impact on leadership behavior and outcomes. Eagly and Chin outlined the many ways in which stereotypes and discrimination (overt and subtle) against women and people of color prevent their access to leadership roles. They address the question of whether or not women and people of color leaders actually lead differently from their non-Latino White male counterparts, noting the problem of bias in performance judgments of women and people of color. These researchers also cited the reality of contemporary leadership as less leader-dependent and more reliant on the cooperation and contributions of others—both critically important issues needing additional scientific and

practical attention. We agree with their perspective, and we add that counseling psychologists are very well poised to engage in this kind of integrative science and practice.

Advocacy

The field of counseling psychology grew out of educational advocacy in the work of Parsons (1909) and the early vocational guidance movement, and advocacy has remained an integral (if sometimes relatively silent) cornerstone of the profession. More than two decades ago, Betz (1989) reminded counseling psychologists of the importance of taking an advocacy stance in our work, putting forth a strong argument against professional neutrality in favor of more proactive approaches to intervention. Using the well-documented disadvantage that women experience in educational environments as an example, Betz (as cited in Freeman, 1989) asserted that assuming a posture of neutrality (i.e., being neither encouraging nor discouraging) toward male and female students actually constitutes a form of passive discrimination against women because it ignores the vastly different social contexts from which women and men come, in terms of support for careers. This false neutrality creates a “null environment” for women, and Betz called for proactive approaches in countering the effects of null environments on women’s educational and vocational development. Betz’s point, widely accepted by counseling psychologists, is that in a society awash in social inequities and injustices, helping marginalized and disadvantaged individuals and groups must involve deliberate attempts to remove stigma and intervene in systems of oppression. Fassinger and O’Brien (2000) suggested a model of professional identity and training that actualizes this commitment to social justice in an expansion of the Boulder model to a *scientist-practitioner-advocate model of professionalism*, an idea that more recently has been extended into considerations for training in counseling psychology (Mallinkrodt, Miles, & Levy, 2014).

Thus, the strong diversity focus of counseling psychology reaches well beyond attention to specific populations with marginalized statuses to the broader framework of social justice (Toporek, Gerstein, Fouad, Roysircar, & Israel, 2006) with its goals of collective empowerment and systemic change. Moreover, the past decade has witnessed an especially strong upsurge in attention to advocacy and social justice, with some counseling psychology training programs now advertising their stated values in this arena to potential students. Again, we note that the field of counseling psychology is highly compatible with contemporary approaches to leadership—transformational leadership, as well as learning and diversity approaches—as all have at their core the valuing of diverse voices in flexible, adaptive, authentic, and empowering leadership processes.

Incongruent Environments

Most workers, including psychologists, may find themselves at some point in work environments that are incompatible or incongruent with their values, talents, needs, or even their ethical responsibilities. For instance, the disclosure about two non-APA psychologists involved in torture outlined in the Report of the Independent Reviewer (July 2015) and the Revised Report (September, 2015) to APA (www.apa.org/independent-review/index.aspx) brought public attention to the conflicts experienced by psychologists who work in certain kinds of settings (such as the military or in prisons) and the need for clarity about ethical and professional behavior in those settings. However, conflicts in values and organizational fit also can occur in more mundane, everyday experiences of working, especially when one is in a leadership role. For example, a psychologist who is an academic dean suddenly may be working under a new provost or president whose style, direction, and ethics make it impossible for the dean to lead the unit. A training director in a VA hospital may struggle with newly imposed federal priorities that displace training support or reduce services to clients, thus compromising leadership regarding clinical training. In such situations, it is reasonable for psychologists to make personal and professional decisions regarding a course of action, and they may elect to leave incongruent work environments to find more compatible settings (and, of course, vocational counseling psychologists have much to tell us, empirically, about the importance of person-environment fit in the workplace).

These kinds of situational changes and shifts threaten workplace fit for any psychologist; however, they fail to capture a reality faced by many counseling psychologists specifically—that the most common location for academic counseling psychologists is in a department, school, or college of education, a unit where their disciplinary fit may be less than optimal. Fassinger and Good (2017) summed up the difficulties:

Counseling psychology programs in departments or schools of education . . . may be viewed as unessential to their unit's primary focus on K–12 educator preparation; thus, their affiliation with, and accreditation in, psychology (by APA) further distances them from education-related associations and accrediting bodies (e.g., American Educational Research Association, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation). Their tenuous position can be exacerbated further by confusion between counseling psychology and counselor education programs and accrediting bodies (e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs), placing them under threat in lean fiscal times or when those in more centrally-located, clearly-relevant, accreditation-similar, or revenue-generating programs want programs eliminated so that resources can be reallocated. (p. 757)

An additional problem for counseling psychology programs in education units lies with involvement in master's-level programs. With the exception of programs in freestanding professional schools, most of the small, training intensive (and thus costly) doctoral counseling psychology training programs in public universities are located in units where large numbers of undergraduates (typically in departments or schools of psychology) or master's-level students (most common in departments or schools of education) make possible the support of expensive doctoral programs. Thus, counseling psychologists in education units are likely to be contributing to master's programs within the unit as well. However, recent shifts in the long-standing collaboration of counseling psychologists with masters-level counselor training programs (see Jackson & Scheel, 2013) have exacerbated difficulties for counseling psychology doctoral programs residing in education units. APA, which has long maintained that the doctorate is the minimum standard of training for psychologists, currently is responding to psychology workforce issues by considering some master's-level training and certification to be under its purview, a situation likely to be helpful to counseling psychologists and in which leaders of SCP are very involved (M. Heesacker, personal communication, July 5, 2017). Regardless of the direction APA takes, it is apparent that ensuring the viability of counseling psychology doctoral training programs is a critical leadership challenge. The volatility, uncertainty, rapid change, and ambiguity (i.e., "VUCA world" characteristics) inherent in this struggle will necessitate the kind of collaborative, flexible learning leadership that engages counseling psychologists in constant learning, rapid response, complex problem-solving, and continual adaptation to an emerging climate.

Identity Focus of the Field

Unfortunately, one of the likely outcomes of the current shifts in masters-level program collaborations with counseling psychology is the continuation of a long-standing press in our field to focus on internal professional issues such as self-definition, differentiation from other closely related fields, and uniqueness of the specialty (Hall, 2012). Moreover, the field's continued effort to claim a distinct niche among the psychological specialties is further confounded by recent developments in other areas of psychology that have adopted (some might say co-opted) counseling psychology's traditional and publicly owned foci. For example, attention to diversity and multiculturalism is now firmly entrenched throughout psychology, and although (as we noted previously) many counseling psychologists were heavily involved in, and responsible for, that evolution, this unique strength is no longer fully owned by counseling psychology alone. Moreover, clinical psychology now claims to "promote human adaptation, adjustment, and

personal development” (Altmaier & Ali, 2012, p. 4), and a recent issue of the *APA Monitor on Psychology* (Stringer, 2016) gave notice that a “new psychology field” called “humanitarian work psychology,” which focuses on serving underserved populations, has been developed by industrial-organizational (I/O) psychologists.

The problem, of course, with the constant need to proclaim our uniqueness and shore up our professional identity is that it keeps us inwardly, rather than outwardly, oriented, and it prevents us not only from gaining much needed visibility both professionally and publicly (as we noted regarding awards and honors), but it also prevents us from moving our field forward. Rather, we tend to continue to pursue research topics and outlets that are based on our strengths and with which we are familiar, and we may miss important opportunities to demonstrate our expertise, not only more broadly throughout psychology, but also beyond psychology to the public arena. From a leadership point of view, it is interesting to observe where and how our expertise has been shared influentially and where it has not. That is, where have our foci permeated other fields, and where have they been excluded?

We posit that one reason for the heavy influence of counseling psychology in promoting diversity in APA may be that leaders in diversity issues (e.g., in gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender expression) also have been extensively involved in other divisions and sections of APA outside of SCP. The National Multicultural Conference and Summit is perhaps the best example of this kind of interdivisional cooperation, and although counseling psychologists just happened, by coincidence, to be in presidential roles in divisions that are now firmly established as the sponsors of the summit, it was their collaborative and sustained leadership reaching across division lines that has produced such robust engagement by many non-counseling psychologists for more than a decade. As a smaller but no less effective example, the SCP’s Section on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues has a long association and crossover of membership with Division 44, the Society for the Psychological Study of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues, and they host a successful annual dinner at the APA convention in which individuals from both divisions participate; the continued influx of new leaders in LGBT issues in both societies is attributable, at least in part, to this highly effective interdivisional activity. Finally, as we noted previously, much of APA’s critically important practice guidelines development has included the participation of counseling psychologists working closely with colleagues from many different governance groups, and this activity is particularly notable (and perhaps instructive) because it involves the integration of practice concerns and scientific literatures across fields and specialties that may diverge considerably in their approaches and perspectives—a typical

challenge for contemporary leaders. We note that a learning leadership approach can be highly effective in such situations, as myriad areas of expertise are brought together in a mutual learning process to address a common, but emergent, goal.

Vocational and Educational Issues

Although educational and vocational concerns formed the roots of counseling psychology as a field, the role and position of vocational counseling psychology have remained fairly elusive, not only within our field but in psychology more broadly. On the one hand, much of the most important theory and research that has guided our field for a century has been vocationally oriented, and many of the top scholars in the field historically and currently would avow identities as vocational counseling psychologists (it is notable that the only two recipients of top scientific awards in APA to which we can lay any claim were vocational psychologists). Within our field, vocational counseling psychologists have been editors of the leading journals in our field, have comprised almost half of the winners of the Leona Tyler Award since its inception in 1980 (SCP, 2017), and have been journal editors (e.g., *Journal of Vocational Behavior*) and leaders in vocational organizations (e.g., National Career Development Association) outside of psychology.

On the other hand, the work of vocational counseling psychologists is not widely known within psychology outside of the boundaries of our own specialty, and is largely absent from the literatures in organizational issues, consulting, and (particularly relevant to this discussion) leadership. Vocational counseling psychologists typically are not awarded top honors of the field of psychology, nor are they widely represented in APA governance activities beyond Division 17. Moreover, although counseling psychology graduate training programs teach vocational issues, many students find career counseling mechanistic and unappealing (Chope, 2012), and students are seldom exposed to the social justice aspects of career work that might have made Parsons proud (i.e., seeing clients who are in poverty, immigrants, in the criminal justice or welfare systems, homeless, or in shelters). In Gebhardt's (2016) article on executive coaching, the author asserted (erroneously, but attributed to the APA website) that counseling psychology "includes aspects of clinical, consulting, and I/O psychology and focuses on the individual's capacity to function, over a life span, both personally and in relationships, providing assessment, diagnosis, and treatment of more severe psychological symptoms" (p. 219), which is more closely aligned with clinical than I/O psychology; nowhere in the article are the vocational aspects of counseling psychology recognized in any way.

Finally, the first author offers anecdotal evidence of the invisibility of vocational psychology. When she was interviewed recently for an *APA Monitor on Psychology* article, she had to explain what vocational psychology is, what we study, and how vocational psychology is strongly embedded within counseling psychology and this was to a well-informed writer who writes about psychology as her job.

The invisibility of vocational psychology represents a serious problem in leadership in our field, not only because vocational counseling psychologists are not being perceived as thought leaders in psychology around key issues of their expertise, but they also are not contributing to the scholarship of leadership—and we argue that they are perhaps the most well-positioned researchers in our field to do this work. A shift in the focus of vocational research and practice toward individuals in systems, the effects of those systems, and interventions to change harmful systems, would align vocational psychology more clearly with the social justice priorities of contemporary counseling psychology, thereby fulfilling what is perhaps the most enduring legacy of the founder of our field. Moreover, the strong assessment component of vocational psychology offers an arena in which aspects of some of the more traditional leadership approaches (e.g., trait, behavioral styles, and contingency theories) can be fruitfully applied in counseling psychology.

Additional Issues

There are additional cross-cutting issues facing counseling psychologists to which we briefly draw readers' attention. All of these could be informed by learning leadership approaches, given the rapid change within which they are occurring as well as the uncertainty regarding the future.

Ethics and self-care. A significant amount of the work in psychology around professional impairment and support has been done by and with counseling psychologists (Elman & Forrest, 2007; Forrest, Miller, & Elman, 2008; Johnson, Barnett, Elman, Forrest, & Kaslow, 2012; Kaslow et al., 2007). This is not only an area with great opportunity for leadership in psychology, but it could be an area for leadership in professions more generally, as ethics concerns become more known to the public and within science more broadly (e.g., the National Science Foundation now requires ethics training for grantees). All professions deal with various issues of impairment or incompetence to perform professional roles. As process experts, counseling psychologists might expand their knowledge of ethics applications and their relationship to both self-care and impairment in counseling and therapy and graduate training to even broader audiences of professionals who may be looking for such expertise, not often internally available across professions.

International collaborations. In the early 21st century, counseling psychology has given increasing focus to the field in an international context (Douce, 2004). The fifth national counseling psychology conference in 2008 was the first international counseling psychology conference, and one of the earlier attempts to focus on international perspectives at a large U.S.-based psychology event. Although a number of counseling psychologists have expanded international collaborative efforts, international counseling psychology still appears to be marginalized (or invisible) in most programs and gatherings of counseling psychologists almost 10 years after that first historic event. In general, psychologists in the United States tend to engage individually in international efforts by going abroad, and U.S. psychology has not yet fully integrated internationally generated psychological research into its mainstream. Given the globalization and reduction of business sector boundaries internationally, it seems clear that there would be a role to lead efforts toward a more global understanding of many foundational psychological constructs, and to rigorously pursue understanding of the roles that nationalism, culture, and social identity play in the use of such constructs. Counseling psychology has leadership potential in this arena, as it has some important research networks already developed, along with key program relationships with a number of countries and cultures, but it is not clear at this juncture how such networks and relationships will evolve into a more comprehensive international counseling psychology.

Emphasis on the academy. Numbers suggest that many counseling psychologists gravitate toward academic careers (see APA, 2016a), and SCP has faced a long-standing tendency for much of the counseling psychology research literature and the SCP leadership to come from and be focused on the academy (due, at least in part, to the historic willingness of academic institutions to support such activities). Given that many counseling psychology doctoral programs housed in education units in their colleges and universities may face future challenges (as discussed previously), it seems critical to begin exploring other settings in which counseling psychologists might thrive and in which their presence currently is limited. Some of these settings include: (a) organizations serving those with severe mental illness, including individuals who are homeless and/or have substance abuse concerns (and who often are served through nonpsychological community agencies); (b) the military and VA system, as well as paramilitary settings such as police departments; (c) the health care arena, including integrated care teams and patient-centered medical homes (health care being an area in which women are thought to be particularly needed; McDonagh, Bobrowski, Hoss, Paris, & Schulte, 2014); (d) business settings beyond the “soft business” of private practice; (e) rural areas and poor urban areas (again, often served by

nonpsychology community agencies); (f) the judicial sector, including prisons; and (g) in technology, where dizzyingly rapid changes require attention to such issues as telepsychological therapy practice, electronic means of data collection for research, long distance instruction and training, and use of public media for disseminating mental health information. There are myriad settings which counseling psychologists have yet to enter in significant numbers (if at all), and they have the much-needed qualities that could result in successful and satisfying leadership in these occupational locations.

Conclusion

We have attempted to demonstrate that counseling psychologists can and should take on greater attention to leadership in research and practice. This also means that education and training must include leadership content and experiences, with appropriate mentoring to cement learning (Kois, King, LaDuke, & Cook, 2016). Unfortunately, recent research on female graduate students (who are the majority) in psychology indicates that women students lessen their leadership aspirations as they move through their training, and are more willing to compromise their aspirations for partners and children as they near graduation (Gregor & O'Brien, 2015). This represents a significant loss, particularly given that research increasingly demonstrates the benefits to organizations of female leadership (Catalyst, 2004).

There is documentation of successful leadership initiatives from which counseling psychologists might learn, for example with international students (Shalka, 2017) and by the Association of Counseling Center Training Agencies to promote leadership diversity (Renninger et al., 2015), suggesting that such efforts are not beyond reach. SCP currently offers a leadership academy offering training for students and early career professionals (Hewitt et al., 2017 [this issue]; Phillips et al., 2017 [this issue]), but it is open solely to a select few and is offered only every other year for budgetary reasons. We believe that it is critically important to the continued vitality of counseling psychology for the SCP to prioritize leadership training at all levels, so that counseling psychologists can add leadership knowledge to their repertoires of expertise, whether in research, practice, education and training, or advocacy and social justice activities. Leadership expertise, coupled with the values, skills, foci, and commitments that already comprise the counseling psychology competency repertoire, can provide the scaffolding necessary for a reimagined field in which leadership becomes a core element of our professional identity. We exhort our colleagues to seize this opportunity with creativity and enthusiasm. As Theodore Geisel (Dr. Seuss, 1990) proclaimed, "Oh, the places you'll go!" when you deliberately cocreate your future.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Altmaier, E. M., & Ali, S. R. (2012). A view across the life span of counseling psychology. In E. M. Altmaier, & J. C. Hansen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 3–10). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Allport, F. H., & Allport, G. W. (1921). Personality traits: Their classification and measurement. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 16, 6–40. doi:10.1037/h0069790
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Allport, G. W. (1955). *Becoming: Basic considerations for a psychology of personality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Arnold, K. A. (2017). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22, 381–393. doi:10.1037/ocp0000062
- American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines for multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 58, 377–402. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.58.5.377
- American Psychological Association. (2007). Guidelines for psychological practice with girls and women. *American Psychologist*, 62, 949–979. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.62.9.949
- American Psychological Association. (2012). Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *American Psychologist*, 67, 10–42. doi:10.1037/a0024659
- American Psychological Association. (2013). Guidelines for the practice of telepsychology. *American Psychologist*, 68, 791–800. doi:10.1037/a0035001
- American Psychological Association. (2014). Guidelines for prevention in psychology. *American Psychologist*, 69, 285–296. doi:10.1037/a0034569
- American Psychological Association. (2015). Guidelines for psychological practice with transgender and gender nonconforming people. *American Psychologist*, 70, 832–864. doi:10.1037/a0039906
- American Psychological Association. (2016a). Commission on Accreditation 2016 annual report online. Summary data: Doctoral programs. Retrieved from www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/research/2016-doctoral-summary.pdf
- American Psychological Association. (2016b). Professional practice guidelines for integrating the role of work and career into psychological practice. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/practice/guidelines/role-work-career.aspx>

- American Psychological Association. (2017). Former APA Presidents. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/about/governance/president/past-presidents.aspx>
- Archer, D., & Cameron, A. (2013). *Collaborative leadership: Building relationships, handling conflict and sharing control* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Arnold, K. A. (2017). Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22, 381–393. doi:10.1037/ocp0000062
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organization and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, 130–139. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.52.2.130
- Bauer, T., & Ergoden, B. (2015). *The Oxford handbook of leader-member exchange*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Beacham, A. O., Van Sickle, K. S., Khatri, P., Ali, M. K., Reimer, D., Farber, E. W., & Kaslow, N. J. (2017). Meeting evolving workplace needs: Preparing psychologists for leadership in the patient-centered medical home. *American Psychologist*, 72, 42–54. doi:10.1037/a0040458
- Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G. J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. *Harvard Business Review*, January–February. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2014/01/what-vuca-really-means-for-you>
- Betz, N. E. (1989). The null environment and women's career development. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17, 136–144. doi:10.1177/0011000089171008
- Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blustein, D. L. (2006). *The psychology of working*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Oxford, England: Harper & Row.
- Carlyle, T. (1841). *On Heroes, hero-worship, and the heroic in history*. London, England: James Fraser.
- Catalyst. (2004). *The bottom line: Connecting corporate performance and gender diversity*. New York, NY: Catalyst.
- Chin, J. L. (Ed.). (2010). Diversity and leadership [Special Issue]. *American Psychologist*, 65.
- Chin, J. L., & Trimble, J. E. (2015). *Diversity and leadership*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Chope, R. C. (2012). Career counseling. In E. M. Altmaier, & J. C. Hansen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 3–10). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dai, G., Tang, K. Y., & DeMeuse, K. P. (2011). Leadership competencies across organizational levels: A test of the pipeline model. *Journal of Management Development*, 30, 366–380. doi:10.1108/02621711111126837

- DeBord, K. A., Fischer, A. R., Bieschke, K. J., & Perez, R. M. (Eds.). (2017). *Handbook of sexual orientation and gender diversity in counseling and psychotherapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Douce, L. A. (2004). Society of Counseling Psychology Division 17 of APA presidential address 2003: Globalization of counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 32, 142–152. doi:10.1177/0011000003260009
- Dulebohn, J., Bommer, W., Liden, R., Brouer, R., & Ferris, G. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 36, 1715–1759. doi:10.1177/0149206311415280
- Dr. Seuss. (1990). *Oh, the places you'll go!* New York, NY: Random House.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chin, J. L. (2010). Diversity and leadership in a changing world. *American Psychologist*, 65, 216–224. doi:10.1037/a0018957
- Eichinger, R. W., & Lombardo, M. M. (2004). Learning agility as a prime indicator of potential. *Human Resource Planning*, 27, 12–16.
- Elman, N. S., & Forrest, L. (2007). From trainee impairment to professional competence problems: Seeking new terminology that facilitates effective action. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38, 501–509. doi:10.1037/0375-7028.39.4.471
- Enns, C. Z., Williams, E. N., & Fassinger, R. E. (2013). Feminist multicultural counseling psychology: Evolution, change, and challenge. In C. Z. Enns, & E. N. Williams (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of feminist multicultural counseling psychology* (pp. 3–23). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fassinger, R. E., Buki, L. P., & Shullman, S. L. (2017). Leadership in counseling psychology: Introduction to the special issue. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 45, 742–751. doi:10.1177/0011000017729755
- Fassinger, R. E., & Good, G. E. (2017). Academic leadership and counseling psychology: Answering the challenge, achieving the promise. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 45, 752–780. doi.org/10.1177/0011000017723081
- Fassinger, R. E., & O'Brien, K. M. (2000). Career counseling with college women: A scientist-practitioner-advocate model of intervention. In D. Luzzo (Ed.), *Career development of college students: Translating theory and research into practice* (pp. 253–265). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books.
- Fassinger, R. E., Shullman, S. L., & Stevenson, M. R. (2010). Toward an affirmative lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender leadership paradigm. *American Psychologist*, 65, 201–215. doi:10.1037/a0018597
- Fiedler, P. E. (1964). A contingency model of leader effectiveness. In L. Berlowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 149–190). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Forrest, L., Miller, D. S., & Elman, N. S. (2008). Psychology trainees with competence problems: From individual to ecological conceptualizations. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 2, 183–192. doi:10.1037/1931-3918.2.4.183

- Fouad, N. A. (Ed.). (2009). Multiculturalism and social justice [Major Contribution]. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37, 6–115.
- Freeman, J. (1989). How to discriminate against women without really trying. In J. Freeman, (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (2nd ed., pp. 217–232). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Gabel, S. (2013). Psychotherapy and relationship-based change: It's about leadership. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 23, 345–358. doi:10.1037/a0034362
- Galton, F. (1869, 1880). *Hereditary genius* (2nd American edition). New York, NY: D. Appleton.
- Gardner, W. L., Coligser, C. C., Davis, K. M., & Dickens, M. P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120–1145. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.09.007
- Gebhardt, J. A. (2016). Quagmires for clinical psychology and executive coaching? Ethical considerations and practice challenges. *American Psychologist*, 71, 216–235. doi:10.1037/a0039806
- Gelso, C. J., & Fretz, B. R. (2001). *Counseling psychology* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Gelso, C. J., Williams, E. N., & Fretz, B. R. (2014). *Counseling psychology* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- George, B., & Sims, P. (2007). *True north: Discover your authentic leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, March–April. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2000/03/leadership-that-gets-results>
- Gregor, M. A., & O'Brien, K. M. (2015). The changing face of psychology: Leadership aspirations of female doctoral students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 43, 1090–1113. doi:10.1177/0011000015608949
- Hall, J. E. (2012). Professional issues. In E. M. Altmaier, & J. C. Hansen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 3–10). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1949). Situational factors in leadership. Ohio State University. *Bureau of Educational Research Monograph*, 32(xii), 136.
- Hersey, P. (1985). *The situational leader*. New York, NY: Warner Books.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23, 26–34.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Johnson, D. E. (2008). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Hewitt, A. A., Watson, L. B., DeBlaere, C., Dispenza, F., Guzmán, C. E., Cadenas, G., . . . Ferdinand, L. (2017). Leadership development in counseling psychology: Voices of leadership academy alumni. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 45, 992–1016. doi:10.1177/0011000017740429
- Hodgson, P., & White, R. P. (2001). *Relax: It's only uncertainty*. London, England: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- Hook, S. (1950). *The hero in history: A study in limitation and possibilities*. New York, NY: Humanities Press.

- Hothersall, D. (2004). *History of psychology* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321–338. doi:10.2307/2391905
- Jackson, M. A., & Scheel, M. J. (2013). Quality of master's education: A concern for counseling psychology? *The Counseling Psychologist*, 4, 669–699. doi:10.1177/0011000011434644
- Jacobs, T. O. (2002). *Strategic leadership: The competitive edge*. National Defense University, Industrial College of the Armed Forces.
- Jacques, E. (1997). *Requisite organization: Total system for effective managerial organization and managerial leadership for the 21st century*. London, England: Gower.
- Johnson, W. B., Barnett, J. E., Elman, N. S., Forrest, L., & Kaslow, N. J. (2012). The competent community: Toward a radical reformulation of professional ethics. *American Psychologist*, 67, 557–569. doi:10.1037/a0027206
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765–780. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.765
- Kanter, R. M. (1994). Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, 72, 96–108. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/1994/07/collaborative-advantage-the-art-of-alliances>
- Kaslow, N. J., Rubin, N. J., Forrest, L., Elman, N. E., Van Horne, B., Jacobs, S., . . . Thorn, B. (2007). Recognizing, assessing, and intervening with problems of professional competence. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38, 479–492. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.38.5.479
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kelly, L., & Finkelman, J. M. (2011). The psychologist-manager: Uniquely qualified to address 21st century leadership challenges? *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 14, 196–210. doi:10.1080/10887156.2011.595980
- Kenny, D. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 678–685. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.4.678
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kois, L., King, C., LaDuke, C., & Cook, A. (2016). Cultivating student leadership in professional psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 10, 29–36. doi:10.1037/tep0000100
- Kramer, H. J. (2011). *From values to action: The four principles of values-based leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewin, K., Lippett, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271–299. doi:10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Lord, R. G., Day, D., Zaccaro, S. J., Avolio, B. J., & Eagly, A. H. (2017). Leadership in applied psychology: Three waves of theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 434–451. doi:10.1037/apl0000089
- Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leader perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 402–410. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.402
- Mackey, J., & Sisodia, R. (2013). *Conscious capitalism*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review.
- Mallinkrodt, B., Miles, J. R., & Levy, J. J. (2014). The scientist-practitioner-advocate model: Addressing contemporary training needs for social justice advocacy. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 8*, 303–311. doi:10.1037/tep0000045
- Manchester, W. (1983). *The last lion: Winston Spencer Churchill: Visions of glory, 1874-1932*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin, 56*, 241–270. doi:10.1037/h0044587
- McClelland, D. C. (1984). *Motives, personality and society: Selected papers*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- McDonagh, K. J., Bobrowski, P., Hoss, M. A. K., Paris, N. M., & Schulte, M. (2014). The leadership gap: Ensuring effective healthcare leadership requires inclusion of women at the top. *Open Journal of Leadership, 3*, 20–29. doi:10.4236/ojl.2014.32003
- Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Phillips, J. C., Hargons, C., Chung, Y. B., Forrest, L., Oh, K. H., & Westefeld, J. (2017). Society of Counseling Psychology Leadership Academy: Cultivating leadership competence and community. *The Counseling Psychologist, 45*, 965–991. doi:10.1177/0011000017736141
- Renninger, S. M., Phillips, J. C., Magnus, K., Armstrong, S. K., Cahill, B., Herman, M., . . . Vajk, F. (2015). Outcomes of an organizational diversity initiative: Diversifying trainers to diversify psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 9*, 229–234. doi:10.1037/tep0000089
- Richardson, M. S. (2012). Counseling for work and relationship. *The Counseling Psychologist, 40*, 190–242. doi:10.1177/0011000011406452
- Rock, D., & Ringleb, A. (2013). *Handbook of neuroleadership*. New York, NY: Neuroleadership Institute.
- Rock, D., & Schwartz, J. (2006). The neuroscience of leadership. *Strategy+Business, 43*(Summer), 2–10.
- Rockstuhl, T., Dulebohn, J. H., Ang, S., & Shore, L. M. (2012). Leader-member exchange (LMX) and culture: A meta-analysis of correlates of LMX across 23 countries. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*, 1097–1130. doi:10.1037/a0029978
- Rogers, C. R. (1940). The process of therapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 4*, 161–164.
- Sanchez-Hucles, J. V., & Davis, D. D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: Complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American Psychologist, 65*, 171–181. doi:10.1037/a0017459

- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9, 185–211. doi:10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG
- Seidman, D. (2011). *How: Why we do anything means everything*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shalka, T. R. (2017). The impact of mentorship on leadership development outcomes of international students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 10, 136–148. doi:10.1037/dhe0000016
- Shullman, S. L. (2017). Leadership and counseling psychology: Dilemmas, ambiguities, and possibilities. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 45, 910–926. doi:10.1177/0011000017744644
- Society of Counseling Psychology. (2017). Past recipients. Retrieved from <http://www.div17.org/about-scp/awards/scp-awards/past-recipients-scp/#LeonaTyler>
- Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). (2007). Leadership [Special issue]. *American Psychologist*, 62.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 25, 35–71. doi:10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business.
- Stogdill, R. M., Goode, O. S., & Day, D. R. (1962). New leader behavior description subscales. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 54, 259–269. doi:10.1080/00223980.1962.9713117
- Stringer, H. (2016, April). Humanitarian work psychology. *Monitor on Psychology*, 47(4), 61. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2016/04/humanitarian.aspx>
- Taggar, S., Hackett, R., & Saha, S. (1999). Leadership emergence in autonomous work teams: Antecedents and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(4), 899–926. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00184.x
- Toporek, R. L., Gerstein, L. H., Fouad, N. A., Roysircar, G., & Israel, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology: Leadership, vision, and action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tyler, L. E. (1953). *The work of the counselor*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Vecchio, R. P. (1987). Situational leadership theory: An examination of a prescriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 444–451. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.72.3.444
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The new leadership: Managing participation in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- White, R. P., & Shullman, S. L. (2010). Acceptance of uncertainty as an indicator of effective leadership. *Counseling Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62, 94–104. doi:10.1037/a0019991
- White, Jr., R. C. (2009). *A. Lincoln: A biography*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Zacarro, S. J. (2007). Trait-based perceptions of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 6–16. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.6

Author Biographies

Ruth E. Fassinger, PhD, is professor emerita at the University of Maryland, College Park, and former dean of both the College of Graduate and Professional Studies at John F. Kennedy University and the College of Education at California State University, Stanislaus. She is a Fellow in the Society of Counseling Psychology as well as Divisions 35 and 44 of the American Psychological Association (APA). She is a founding faculty and executive committee member of the APA Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology, and she is president-elect of the Society of Counseling Psychology.

Sandra L. Shullman, PhD, is a managing partner of the Executive Development Group, LLC, based in Columbus, OH, which is engaged in training leaders globally. She has taught for the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University, is part of the Duke Corporate Education Global Educator Network, and has taught for the HEC Business School in Paris, Doha, Shanghai, and Beijing. She is a Fellow of the Society of Counseling Psychology and Divisions 1 and 31 of the American Psychological Association (APA). She is a founding faculty member and executive committee Chair of APA's Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology, and she currently serves on the APA Board of Directors.