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ABSTRACT

THE INFLUENCE OF COUNSELOR DEMOGRAPHICS, WORK EXPERIENCE, AND TRAINING ON COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY AND MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING SELF-EFFICACY AMONG URBAN SCHOOL COUNSELORS

by Franco A. Gordillo

The purpose of this study was to examine the predictive value of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy in urban school counselors. In addition, the predictive relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy was examined. A correlational analysis was used to determine significance among the predictor variables and the constructs of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Several regression analyses were then applied to determine the predictive relationship of the significant variables and the stated constructs. Lastly, a regression analysis was used to examine the predictive relationship of demographics, work experience, training, and school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Implications for counselor training and practice are provided, as well as suggestions for future research.
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Chapter One
The Influence of Counselor Demographics, Work Experience, and Training on Counselor Self-Efficacy and Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy among Urban School Counselors

Introduction

For school counselors, the landscape of the profession is continually evolving to meet the many demands of a changing society. Much of this change stems from a necessity to address the challenges associated with an increasingly racially and ethnically diverse nation. Recent Census data highlight such changes by reporting a majority of population growth (9.7 percent or 27.3 million) from individuals identifying their race as something other than White (Humes, Jones, & Ramirez, 2011).

This population growth has subsequently impacted the make-up of our nation’s schools today. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, from the year 2010 to 2021 student enrollment for public elementary and secondary schools is projected to increase by 5% for Black students, 24% for Hispanic students, 26% for Asian/Pacific Islander students, 16% for American Indian/Alaska Native students, and a 2% decrease for White students (Hussar & Bailey, 2013). This change in the make-up of our nation’s schools will undoubtedly impact the work of school counselors who will need multicultural counseling skills more than ever to address the needs of such a quickly, growing, diverse student-body.

As suggested by the national census data, several issues of concern will become more pressing as schools encounter the increasing number of minority students.
According to Washington (1996), minority students are “members of oppressed ethnic groups or more specifically Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos or Latinos, and Afro-Americans, as well as handicapped students and women” (p. 69). One major area of concern is the educational achievement gap that currently exists between White and minority students within schools. Holcomb-McCoy (2007) describes this achievement gap as “the widespread inequity in educational achievement across ethnic and socioeconomic groups” (p. 5). According to Noguera (2009), in many ways this achievement gap is an educational manifestation of the social inequality present within the United States resulting from poor funding, segregation, and the continued unmet needs of children of low socioeconomic status (SES).

Another issue of concern is the oppression experienced by minority students that results from prejudice and discrimination. According to Holcomb-McCoy (2007), multiple forms of oppression (e.g., racism, classism, ableism, sexism, & heterosexism) continue to “undermine the emotional and interpersonal well-being of students and thus potentially result in student underachievement and mental and emotional distress” (p. 18). Moreover, the experiences of prejudice and discrimination influence how minority students perceive themselves and relate to others, particularly within the counseling relationship (Hays, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007).

Lastly, given the anticipated growth of immigrant children within schools, school counselors will also be required to provide culturally responsive services to address the challenges experienced for students acculturating to the U.S. (Burkard, Martinez & Holtz, 2010). Throughout this acculturative process, individuals undergo various social, cultural...
and physical changes that require them to make immediate decisions about who they will become when entering the country (Kopala, Esquivel, & Baptiste, 1994; Miranda, Bilot, Peluso, Berman & Van Meek, 2006; Tong, Huang & McIntyre, 2006).

For school counselors, the ability to provide multicultural counseling interventions is an important part of the effort initiated by schools to target the inequities prevalent among minority and low socioeconomic status students. In addition, becoming a social justice advocate has become a mainstay of their role within schools in applying multicultural counseling interventions. Because of their position within the school system, school counselors possess a broader school-wide perspective, allowing them to assess for systemic barriers impacting the academic success of all students (Martin, 2002). This ability to provide culturally appropriate interventions is also a crucial service for the many immigrant students undergoing the transition into U.S. schools. Through the use of cross-cultural activities, school counselors can facilitate “positive cross-cultural understanding and appreciation among immigrant students, their families, their peers, teachers, school administrators, and staff” (Goh, Wahl, McDonald, Brissett, & Yoon, 2007).

In order to begin addressing issues of equity and access and to provide culturally responsive services within schools, counselors must first gain multicultural competency (Lee, 2001). Counselors must acquire the essential knowledge and skills that are necessary for addressing the needs of a multicultural student population (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). By acquiring multicultural competency, counselors attain an understanding of their clients’ worldviews and of their own assumptions and biases,
allowing them to implement culturally appropriate intervention strategies (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Multicultural competency provides school counselors with a greater understanding of the issues surrounding minority and low SES students in order to effectively address their needs. According to Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, and Stadler (1996) multicultural counseling is said to focus on ethnicity, race, and culture. This distinction was made to distinguish multiculturalism from diversity, which instead focuses on other individual differences such as “age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, physical ability or disability, and other characteristics by which someone may prefer to self-define” (Arredondo et al., 1996, p. 43).

Research has also supported the importance of cultural competency as it has been found that racial and ethnic minority perceptions of the multicultural competence of their counselors mediated the relationship between general counseling competence ratings and satisfaction with counseling (Constantine, 2002). Furthermore, the attainment of multicultural competency also assists school counselors in promoting social justice advocacy by reducing the effects of oppression, while increasing equity and access to educational services (Bemak & Chung, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Lee, 2001).

Given the importance of multicultural competency to school counselors, there is a need to better understand how counselors perceive their multicultural counseling competency or sense of self-efficacy (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008). Generally, self-efficacy is a critical mediating factor that influences “how people think, feel, motivate themselves, and act” (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005, p. 14). According to Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005), self-efficacy is an important mediating
function of one’s behavior. As a result, self-efficacy is significant with respect to the performance and effectiveness of school counselors (Sutton & Fall, 1995), particularly in relation to counselors addressing the achievement gap (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). According to Bodenhorn et al. (2010), school counselors with higher self-efficacy are more likely to report being aware and having narrowed the achievement gap within their schools compared to those with lower self-efficacy scores.

For school counselors having the knowledge and skills to work with diverse clients may not ensure that they have the level of self-efficacy necessary to implement effective multicultural counseling. Research about self-efficacy has been conducted on distinct aspects of a school counselor’s work including: the effect on the achievement gap (Bodenhorn et al., 2010), school climate (Sutton & Fall, 1995), supervision (Cinotti, 2013), school counselor service delivery (Ernst, 2012), and working with gifted students (Goldsmith, 2011) and recent immigrant students (Na, 2012). Crook (2010) specifically examined the relationship between general school counseling self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. He found that school counselors were self-efficacious when it came to multicultural school counseling tasks and activities. While this study is important, it focused on a broad sample of school counselors, rather than a sample of school counselors in culturally diverse schools such as those usually found in urban school settings.

In addition, while it appears that the attainment of higher levels of general and multicultural self-efficacy are important beliefs for school counselors working with
culturally diverse populations, other factors have been found to potentially impact counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. These factors include: type of counselor preparation program (CACREP or non-CACREP) (Tang, Addison, LaSure - Bryant, Norman, O’Connell, & Stewart - Sicking, 2004), gender (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Dillon, Worthington, Soth, McNett, & Schwartz, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Wester & Vogel, 2002), years of counseling experience (Chandler, Balkin, & Perepiczka, 2011; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996), prior teaching experience (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Cinotti, 2013), ethnicity (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2000; 2003), and counselor training (Johnson, Baker, Kopala, Kiselica, & Thompson, 1989; Larson, Clark, Wesely, Koralesski, Daniels, & Smith, 1999).

To contribute to the understanding of the general and multicultural counseling self-efficacy of school counselors (Crook 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008), I examined the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy specifically among urban school counselors. In addition, my study also focused on the predictive value of general school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

**Background Research**

With the steady increase of diversity within our nation’s schools, school counselors are being asked to play a larger role in addressing the many issues affecting minority students within the educational system (Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; House &
Martin, 1998; Lee, 2001; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007). Some of these issues range from the increasing achievement gap, to the challenges of immigrant students and the experience of oppression by minority students (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Tong, Huang, & McIntyre, 2006). Therefore, when working with minority students, the need for the attainment of multicultural competency by school counselors cannot be overstated. Attainment of this competency, however, will not necessarily ensure that school counselors will have the adequate levels of self-efficacy to effectively implement multicultural interventions.

Given the ability of self-efficacy to mediate the thoughts, motivation, and actions of counselors (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), further inquiry into the general and multicultural counseling self-efficacy of school counselors may provide greater insight into what may affect these constructs. As a result, I examined the predictive value of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, my study explored the predictive relationship of school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, specifically among urban school counselors.

**Theoretical Framework**

The guiding theoretical framework for this study is based on Bandura’s social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997) as viewed through the multicultural counseling literature provided by Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992). With the attainment of multicultural competence, counselors should be able to effectively implement multicultural counseling interventions with individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds.
According to Sue et al. (1992), multicultural counseling competence is based on a counselor’s beliefs/attitudes, knowledge, and skills in counseling culturally diverse clients. For school counselors, the attainment of these competencies is a crucial asset given the vast differences between a counselor and the culturally diverse students he or she may encounter.

Even with the attainment of multicultural competence, if school counselors do not believe they are capable of implementing culturally responsive interventions, they will most likely avoid such tasks or minimize the necessity for these types of interventions (Bandura, 2001; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Therefore, Bandura’s social cognitive theory is an important framework for understanding how self-efficacy beliefs impact a counselor’s role-related behaviors when working with clients (Lent, Hoffman, Hill, Treistman, Mount, & Singley, 2006). According to Bandura (2001), self-efficacy beliefs are an essential component in self-regulating one’s motivation as to what tasks to undertake, the effort applied, the amount of perseverance, and how one interprets failure either as motivating or demoralizing.

Given the steady increase of diversity within our nation’s schools, higher levels of perceived self-efficacy beliefs are helpful when dealing with the challenges urban school counselors may encounter, particularly with diverse students. According to Sheu, Rigali-Oiler, and Lent (2012), the more counselors feel confident in their work with racially diverse clients, the more likely they will “develop interests in, and commit themselves to, providing services to such clients in the future” (p. 531). Given the need for greater multicultural self-efficacy beliefs when working with culturally diverse populations, the
study of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counselor self-efficacy in relation to urban school counselors is an important area of inquiry.

**Self-Efficacy**

In order to effectively implement interventions with multiculturally diverse populations, the belief in one’s ability to serve such clients is an important consideration for any counselor. This perception in one’s ability is related to a counselor’s sense of self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1997), perceived self-efficacy is defined as the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3).

For any counselor, perceptions related to capability can be extremely crucial when attempting to address the issues encountered in any session, particularly with culturally diverse clients. Self-efficacy is also important for counselors as it not only impacts a counselor’s perception of skills and abilities, but also his/her commitment and resilience in achieving a stated goal (Bandura, 1986).

In the case of school counselors, having a better understanding of self-efficacy as it relates to general and multicultural counseling can serve in achieving set goals such as helping to narrow the achievement gap amongst students of color and lower SES, while also addressing issues through the use of social justice advocacy. This will be particularly important for school counselors working in areas comprised predominantly of lower SES and ethnically and racially diverse students such urban schools, where these interventions will be most needed. Having this perceived ability will serve in providing culturally responsive interventions for all students.
Multicultural Counseling

Multicultural counseling is defined as “counseling when participants differ as a result of their varying racial and ethnic backgrounds (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Caucasian/European, and Native American or indigenous groups)” (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999, p. 294). With the increasing diversification of our nation’s schools, professional school counselors must be able to effectively provide multicultural counseling interventions for the growing number of racially and ethnically diverse student groups. In doing so, competencies were developed to guide practitioners in working with diverse populations. Initially, the competencies were created in response to research indicating that counselor education programs were operating from a culturally encapsulated framework; a framework that neglected the needs of racial and ethnic minorities (Ponterotto & Casas, 1987). As a result, competencies were developed to guide practitioners and counselor educators in educating future counselors.

In their landmark paper, Sue et al. (1992) identified the following three characteristics of culturally competent counselors as those who: (a) are aware of their own assumptions, values, and biases; (b) understand the worldviews of culturally different clients; and (c) utilize appropriate intervention strategies. Within each of the characteristics, there were three additional dimensions added for each of the characteristics including: (a) beliefs and attitudes, (b) knowledge, and (c) skills (Sue et al., 1992). According to Arredondo (1999), the first of the three dimensions focused on the beliefs and attitudes of the counselor, client, and their respective model of identity
development. In other words, the biases and assumptions associated with a counselor and client’s belief system. The second dimension referred to knowledge pertaining to the worldview of counselors and clients, but also the strategies that may best serve clients. Lastly, the third dimension highlighted the skills necessary for counselors to effectively prepare and work with diverse clients. When completed, the multicultural competencies contained nine competency areas that provided counselors and counselor educators with ethical guidelines for practice and a direction for the development and evaluation of future counselors (Arredondo, 1999).

**Multicultural counseling self-efficacy**

For school counselors, attaining the necessary levels of multicultural counseling self-efficacy can be an important determinant in implementing effective culturally responsive interventions. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) defined school counselor multicultural self-efficacy as the “perceived abilities (i.e., beliefs) to carry out and perform tasks that are relevant and specific to equity among students in K-12 schools, and the ethnicity and culturally diverse needs of K-12 students” (p.169). Given the increase in cultural diversity and the need for increased levels of multicultural counseling self-efficacy amongst school counselors, research has been limited, despite the increasing attention given to multicultural counseling competence. In one of the few studies conducted, Constantine (2001) found that as a result of multicultural training and supervision, counselor general self-efficacy was significantly related to self-perceived multicultural competence. In addition, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) contributed to the literature by developing the first school counselor multicultural self-efficacy assessment.
In their research, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) found that ethnicity and the number of multicultural courses taken were significantly related to higher multicultural self-efficacy among school counselors. Additionally, in his dissertation utilizing the school counselor multicultural counseling assessment, Crook (2010) examined school counseling self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy finding a moderate to strong relationship between the two constructs.

**American Public Schools in the 21st Century**

Due to the steady increase in cultural diversity within our nation, the demographics of our schools have radically reflected these changes throughout the country’s school systems. For example, many rural and suburban schools are beginning to experience many of the changes in student diversity that are traditionally associated with the inner city or urban areas (Green, Conley, & Barnett, 2005). According to Green et al. (2005), our country is increasingly becoming an *urban nation-state* because individuals of varied cultural groups are increasingly living in closer proximity to one another. As a result, our schools are reflecting these changes prevalent within the larger nation.

However, while our nation is becoming increasingly diversified, schools in urban areas continue to experience significant issues that are qualitatively distinct from those in rural and suburban areas (Lee, 2005). According to Lee (2005), when compared to students outside of urban areas, some of these challenges include: the achievement gap, higher rates of poverty, unlicensed or under qualified teachers, larger schools characterized by violence, truancy, lack of parental involvement and inadequate funding.
In addition, urban school counselors are at times the only resource for students and parents when it comes to navigating the school system and making important school choices decisions (Sattin-Bajaj, 2014).

**Minority Students**

With many of the issues above being predominantly prevalent within urban schools, minority students are the group most impacted by these challenges (Bemak, Chi-Ying, & Siroskey-Sabdo, 2005; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Lee, 2005). According to Washington (1996), minority students are considered “members of oppressed ethnic groups or more specifically Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos or Latinos, and Afro-Americans, as well as handicapped students and women” (p. 69). For these students, urban schools present many challenges that school counselors must be prepared to address. One issue in particular affecting ethnic and racial minority students, as well as low SES students, is the achievement gap between these students and White or more affluent students. According to McKinsey and associates (2009), the achievement gap is most prevalent amongst African American and Latino students who are on average two to three years behind in learning when compared to White students; while lower SES students are two years behind more affluent students of the same age. Other issues affecting students include the effects of prejudice and discrimination and acculturation on the personal and social development of immigrant and minority students. According to Kopala (1994) changes resulting from the effects of acculturation affect individual coping mechanisms and even link migration to mental illness. Similarly, cultural and social factors such as prejudice and discrimination are also suggested to contribute to the
prevalence of mental illness amongst minorities (Bemak et al., 2005; Chung, Bemak, Ortiz, & Sandoval-Perez, 2008; Hays, 2008). Findings such as these further emphasize the importance of multicultural competency for school counselors, because an awareness of the effects of racism and discrimination are an integral part in providing culturally responsive services.

**The Role of the School Counselor**

In defining the role of a school counselor, The American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 2004) created standards in working with students that were originally left out of the educational reform movements of the late 20th and early 21st centuries (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, 2000). According to the *ASCA National Standards for Students*, the role of a school counselor is to provide services that focus on the following areas with students: (a) academic development, (b) career development, and (c) personal/social development (ASCA, 2004). In defining these areas, the standards served as the foundation for the *ASCA National Model* (2003), which was created to provide school counselors with a comprehensive framework to implement, manage, and ultimately evaluate school-counseling programs.

In acknowledging the increasing diversity of our nation’s students, the ASCA model (2012) challenged school counselors to address issues like the achievement gap between White and minority students, as well as any institutional barriers that have disenfranchised certain groups. Similarly, Education Trust’s (2009) *Transforming School Counseling Initiative* emphasized a shift towards advocacy, leadership, and the use of data in redefining the role of a school counselor. This systematic attempt was the first of
its kind to examine and transform the role of school counselors in contributing towards equity for all students (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Dahir & Stone, 2007), while addressing institutional school barriers to narrow the achievement and opportunity gaps (Eschenauer & Chen-Hayes, 2005). In doing so, it further emphasized the importance of multicultural competency for school counselors and their role as advocates.

In further redefining traditional counseling models to service culturally diverse students, the focus has shifted towards social justice advocacy as a means of addressing inequality amongst students of color and low-income students (Bemak & Chung, 2005). According to Holcomb-McCoy (2007), this social justice approach identifies the impact of oppression and systematic societal inequities by urging school counselors to play a more active role in their position. For example, to prepare counselors, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP) provides standards for the professional development of students within counselor education programs. The 2009 Standards were created to ensure quality across counselor preparation programs, while acknowledging the importance of multicultural competency and advocacy as an integral part of the standards (CACREP, 2009). Since then advocacy has become an essential component of effective urban school counseling (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Field & Baker, 2004).

However, the role of urban school counselors continues to be shaped by the distinct challenges encountered within these communities that are unlike that of rural or suburban areas, which include: increased student diversity, lack of resources, poverty, family issues, violence, and high dropout rates (Holcomb-McCoy, 1998). According to
Green, Conley, & Barnett (2005), to address such issues, school counselors are urged to use an ecological perspective that will allow them to identify and better understand the needs of urban students in order to implement effective school counseling programs and services.

**Responsibilities of the Urban School Counselor**

In working in an urban school, the responsibility of a school counselor is based on promoting the academic, career, and personal/social development of all students, while specifically addressing the needs of students of color, immigrants, and those of low SES (Lee, 2005). As a result, urban school counseling is distinct from that of other geographic areas because of the characteristics inherent within the urban setting. For example, urban school counselors are at times the only resource to students and parents in navigating the school system in making important school choice decisions such as applying to secondary schools. In urban school districts such as New York City that utilize this type of school choice policy, the counselor is often the point person responsible for disseminating information and guiding families throughout the application process, particularly families who lack the language skills or technical resources to do so on their own (Sattin-Bajaj, 2014).

Another issue in particular, given the high rates of minority students within urban areas is the educational achievement gap between White students and students of color and low SES. In attempting to help narrow this achievement gap, the responsibilities of school counselors underwent a transformation through a standards-based reform within the profession (Education Trust, 2009). *The National Center for Transforming School*
Counseling (2009) initiated this vision by suggesting the use of the following skills for school counselors: leadership, advocacy, counseling, teaming/collaboration, and the use of data. Through this transformation, the responsibilities of urban school counselors became more focused on advocacy in promoting educational equality for all students and as leaders in enacting organizational change (Bemak & Chung, 2005). Advocacy is defined as “action taken by counselors to facilitate the removal of external and institutional barriers for students’ well-being” (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007, p.40). In becoming advocates through this newly focused vision, school counselors can ensure that all students have equitable access to an education, while collaborating with parents, staff, and the community. This type of transformed school counseling also allowed for school counselors to begin focusing on the interactions between students and the school, while addressing any environmental or institutional barriers that may be impeding academic success (Education Trust, 2009).

Despite the increasing diversification of our nation’s schools and the noted importance of counselor self-efficacy beliefs, additional research is still needed to better understand the constructs of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. In particular, examining the relationship between school counselor multicultural self-efficacy and the influence of certain variables (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, years of counseling and teaching experience, type of counselor preparation program [CACREP or nonCACREP], extent of multicultural training, and experience with ethnically diverse students, low SES students, and immigrant students) may provide important information as to the effect of these variables on the self-efficacy beliefs of
school counselors. While Crook (2010) examined school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy utilizing a broad sample of school counselors, no study to date has examined these constructs nor variables in relation to only urban school counselors. According to Lee (2005), the practice of school counseling in an urban setting has been overlooked in recent years in favor of school counseling within rural settings. However, given the steady increase of cultural diversity within urban schools and the need for providing effective culturally responsive services, further inquiry into the relationship between the two constructs among urban school counselors cannot be overstressed.

**Statement of the Problem**

Despite the attention on identifying competency areas to guide school counselors when working with culturally diverse populations, less of a focus has occurred on understanding self-efficacy with respect to implementing multicultural counseling in urban school counseling. In addition, there is a scarcity of literature on research examining school counselor self-efficacy (Sutton & Fall, 1995).

Given the importance of self-efficacy in determining a counselor’s behavior and perception, a need still exists to further examine the construct as it relates to counseling culturally diverse students and within urban school counseling. This is particularly the case as we see a tremendous growth in cultural diversity within our nation’s schools (Goh, Wahl, McDonald, Brissett, & Yoon, 2007; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Lee, 2001, 2005). As a result, this study was guided by the following research questions:
1. What is the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity), counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school where a counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops), and school counselor self-efficacy?

2. What is the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity), counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school where counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops), and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy?

3. What is the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, training, and school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the predictive relationship of counselor demographics (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity), work experience (i.e., type of school where a counselor works, years of counseling experience, teaching experience, and percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), and training
(i.e., attended an accredited counseling program [e.g., CACREP], number of multicultural classes and number multicultural workshops taken) on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors. This is an important area of inquiry given the increasing diversification of our nation’s schools, particularly within urban areas. In addition, the study examined the predictive influence of school counselor self-efficacy on the multicultural counseling self-efficacy of urban school counselors.

**Significance of the Study**

The study of self-efficacy within school counseling is a significant area of inquiry because it has been previously reported to assist students in achieving success within schools, and cited as an important construct in understanding and improving counselor performance (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Sutton & Fall, 1995). In addition, counselor self-efficacy beliefs may be an important determinant for effective counseling action (Bodenhorn et al., 2010; Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998). However, despite its noted significance in counseling, there continues to be a lack of research with respect to the study of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy, 2008). Researchers also have not focused solely on urban school counselors, who are more likely to work with diverse student populations that frequently encounter issues such as discrimination, prejudice, and lower academic achievement. While researchers (e.g., Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Sutton & Fall, 1995) have indicated the importance of self-efficacy in the work of counselors, more research is still needed to understand this construct in relation
to general school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. This gap within the research is of concern given the rapidly growing number of culturally diverse students in American schools who will require culturally appropriate interventions. In addition, Lent, Hoffman, Hill, Treistman, and Singley (2006) reported that counselors tend to gravitate toward clients with whom they believe they are being more effective, while avoiding certain clients or issues where they feel less efficacious. This finding is significant because it supports the need for increased levels of multicultural counseling self-efficacy amongst school counselors.

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE) (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) and the School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy Scale (SCMES) were developed to measure both self-efficacy constructs within school counselors. One of the first studies (Crook, 2010) to utilize both instruments examined the constructs and found a strong to moderate relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. However, this initial study focused on a broad sample of school counselors throughout the U.S., solicited primarily through ASCA. In addition, Crook did not include the type of counselor preparation program a counselor attended (i.e., CACREP accredited programs vs. non-CACREP) nor how (if any) it related to general self-efficacy or multicultural counseling self-efficacy, which was listed as a limitation and suggestion for future research (Crook, 2010).

In building upon Crook’s (2010) study, the present research is significant because it focused solely on urban school counselors with respect to examining the relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling
self-efficacy. Furthermore, it examined the predictive relationship of counselor
demographics (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity) and work experience on the two constructs,
while also including the variable of counselor training, which had not been previously
analyzed in Crook’s study. According to Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) future research
utilizing the *School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy Scale* (SCMES) should include
diverse school counselor samples, as well those from distinct schools settings, which
were included in this study. In addition, my study provided an examination of the
predictive relationship of attending an accredited counseling program such as CACREP,
on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-
efficacy. While not all counselor preparation programs are accredited by CACREP, an
examination of its relationship with multicultural counseling self-efficacy is an important
area of inquiry because it remains the accrediting body for most counselor education
programs and has included additional multicultural content within its standards
(Holcomb-McCoy, 2000).

My study is also significant because it examined factors that had not been
previously studied in relation to multicultural counseling self-efficacy and urban school
counselors. These factors include: counselor demographics (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity),
work experience, training (i.e., number of courses), and school counselor self-efficacy.
According to Tang et al. (2004) counseling experience and the number of counseling
courses had been previously found to be positively correlated with counselor self-
efficacy. In addition, gender (particularly among females), as well as prior teaching
experience, has been shown to increase self-efficacy beliefs among school counselors and
master’s-level school counseling students (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). While previous studies have not examined either of these factors in relation to multicultural counseling self-efficacy, my study did so and included only urban school counselors.

Given the importance of these factors and the lack of research on urban school counselors and multicultural counseling self-efficacy, a closer examination of the aforementioned counselor variables and the two constructs was further warranted. In doing so, my study provided information as to the predictive influence of various factors on school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, the study examined the predictive value of counselor self-efficacy on multicultural counseling self-efficacy. According to Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) further inquiry with respect to school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy is needed. It may also provide greater insight as to why many of the issues affecting minority students continue to persist, despite many counselors reporting high levels of multicultural competence and self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy, 2008).

**Definition of Terms**

**Advocacy**

Defined as “action taken by counselors to facilitate the removal of external and institutional barriers for students’ well-being” (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007, p.40)

**Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)**

An independent agency utilized for the accreditation of master’s degree programs. According to CACREP (2009), accreditation is defined as:
a system for recognizing educational institutions and professional programs
affiliated with those programs for a level of performance and integrity based on
review against a specific set of published criteria or standards. The process
includes (1) the submission of a self-study document that demonstrates how
standards are being met; (2) an onsite review by a selected group of peers; and (3)
a decision by an independent board or commission that either grants or denies
accredited status on the basis of how well the standards are met. (p. 59)

Counselor self-efficacy

Larson and Daniels (1998) defined counselor self-efficacy as “one’s beliefs or
judgments about her or his capabilities to effectively counsel a client in the near future”
(p. 180).

Gender

For the purposes of this study, participants will be given the choice of identifying
their biological sex as either male or female.

Lower SES student

Lower SES students are those from low-income households entitled to Title I
funding (U.S. Department of Education, 2011) in schools that research has shown to be
underserved, negatively impacting student academic progress (Aikens & Barbarin, 2008).

Minority student

According to Washington (1996), minority students are described as “members of
oppressed ethnic groups or more specifically Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos
or Latinos, and Afro-Americans, as well as handicapped students and women” (p. 69).
For the purposes of this study, minority students will also include immigrant students, and low SES students.

**Multicultural competence**

A multiculturally competent counselor is aware of his or her assumptions, understands the distinct worldviews of others, and is actively developing and practicing appropriate skills and interventions in working with culturally diverse clients (Sue et al., 1992).

**Multicultural counseling**

According to Arredondo et al. (1996), multicultural counseling refers to the “preparation and practices that integrate multicultural and culture-specific awareness, knowledge, and skills into counseling interactions” (p. 42).

**Professional school counselor**

ASCA (2004) defines a professional school counselor as “a certified/licensed educator trained in school counseling with unique qualifications and skills to address all students’ academic, personal/social and career development needs” (as cited in Thompson, 2012, p. 3).

**School counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy**

Holcomb-McCoy et al., (2008) defined this as “professional school counselors’ perceived abilities (i.e., beliefs) to carry out and perform tasks that are relevant and specific to equity among students in K-12 schools, and the ethnicity and culturally diverse needs of K-12 students” (p.169).
School counselor self-efficacy

A school counselor’s beliefs in his/her ability to perform a given behavior as measured through the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE) (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

Self-efficacy

Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p. 3).

Training

For the purposes of this study, counselor training was examined based on the type of counselor preparation program (e.g., CACREP or non-CACREP) attended and the extent of multicultural training received whether through course work, workshops, or in-service training.

Urban school

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), an urban school is a city school inside an urbanized area within a principal city categorized according to the following population sizes: large (250,000+), midsize (100,000+), or small (less than 100,000).

Urban school counselor

Green et al. (2005) defined an urban school counselor as school counseling personnel that specifically gear programmatic services towards “meeting the multiple and often complex needs of students living and attending school in culturally diverse environments” (p. 189).
Years of teaching experience in an urban school

For the purposes of this study, years of teaching experience is the total number of years serving as a teaching pedagogue.

Years of urban school counseling experience

For the purposes of this study, this experience is the total number of years as a professional school counselor in an urban setting.

Organization of Study

The following study is presented in five chapters, with the first including an introduction of the topic, background research, statement of the problem, purpose and significance of the study, and key definitions. The second chapter includes an in-depth review of the literature pertaining to the study at-hand. The third chapter describes the methodology of the study. The fourth chapter presents the results ascertained from the data analysis. Lastly, the fifth chapter provides a discussion of the results, along with any limitations of the study, as well as implications for counselor educators, school districts, and school counselors, and suggestions for future research.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Given the increase in racially and ethnically diverse populations within the United States in recent years, school systems across the nation are steadily becoming increasingly diverse (Goh et al., 2007; National Center for Education Statistics, 2013; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Throughout this growth in diversity, there also continues to exist a great disparity in academic achievement between students of color and their White counterparts within schools (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; McKinsey & Company, 2009; Ushomirsky, 2011). As a result, the role of school counselors has undergone many transformations to help address the inequities facing the nation’s school systems (ASCA, 2003, 2004, 2008; House & Martin, 1998; The Education Trust, 2009). Therefore, for school counselors, having the skills and abilities to effectively serve culturally diverse student populations has become a necessary competency area (Holcomb-McCoy, 2000, 2004, 2005; Lee, 2001). In addition, having the self-efficacy or belief in one’s capability to provide culturally responsive services to all students is also equally important in providing effective counseling services.

Even with all the knowledge related to multicultural counseling, the attainment of self-efficacy in providing culturally responsive services is a critical factor to explore with respect to school counselors providing such services. Social cognitive theory provides an important framework for understanding the factors through which these self-belief systems function within individuals. Within social cognitive theory, a person’s perceptions are hypothesized to be more effective than even indicators of an objective
environment. Such perceptions ultimately affect the activities a counselor will select and their motivation to endure any of the challenges that may be encountered (Bandura, 2001; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Sutton & Fall, 1995).

The purpose of this study was to examine the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors. This area of inquiry is particularly important given the steady increase of diversity among the nation’s schools. In doing so, the study may provide additional information as to predictors of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy to better prepare counselors for work in diverse settings such as urban schools. This study also examined the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy in addition to the afore-mentioned variables on the school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy of urban school counselors, to better ascertain the impact of this first construct on the latter.

This chapter provides an overview of the theoretical framework guiding this inquiry by first examining social cognitive theory in its application within self-efficacy as it relates to counselor self-efficacy, multicultural counseling self-efficacy, and school counselor self-efficacy. In addition, several demographic variables and contributing factors (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, counselor experience, and counselor training) that have been previously studied, and in some cases found to impact counselor self-efficacy, will be discussed. Additionally, multicultural counseling will be examined as the second guiding construct by discussing the development of the Multicultural Counseling
Competencies, the ACA Advocacy Competencies, and the eventual transformation of the role of school counselors. This discussion will also include a present look at the role of school counselor within the 21st century, particularly within urban areas, and the current state of American public schools.

Theoretical Framework

The structure of this study is an examination of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1994, 1997, 2001) through a multicultural counseling framework (Sue et al., 1992). First, social cognitive theory is utilized as a guiding theory because it provides an important framework in understanding an individual’s capacity for human agency or the ability to produce a certain outcome (Bandura, 1997). Within social cognitive theory, this ability to attain an outcome is based on one’s beliefs or sense of self-efficacy that is said to affect the activities an individual selects and his/her motivation to persevere despite the challenges encountered (Bandura, 1997). For school counselors, this is an important construct to understand given the many challenges they are regularly required to address (Dimmitt, 2003; Green et al., 2005; Lee, 2005). Furthermore, it is an important framework in comprehending a school counselor’s continually evolving role that is meant to address the rapidly changing cultural make-up of today’s schools (Bemak et al., 2005; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Paisley & Hayes, 2003).

To further support this need for culturally responsive services within schools, multicultural counseling provides another important framework in understanding the interventions required by school counselors to service culturally diverse populations. Multicultural counseling provides an opportunity to examine a distinct aspect of self-
efficacy among school counselors that is greatly needed within the literature (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012). In integrating social cognitive theory with multicultural counseling, the findings of this research will serve to better understand the factors influencing a school counselor’s self-efficacy or his/her belief in one’s ability to work with racially and ethnically diverse clients (Sheu et al., 2012). In doing so, it may provide an understanding of the factors that serve to influence a counselor’s motivation to persist despite any challenges that may be encountered when working with culturally diverse students.

**Social Cognitive Theory**

According to Bandura (2001), intentional actions that make things happen for individuals are the functions of human agency. Such agency allows for individuals to play an important role in their development, adaptation, and renewal. Through human agency, individuals carry out certain actions believed to produce results, which can at times be either beneficial or detrimental (Bandura, 1997). Despite the outcome, agency provides the impetus for individuals engaging in behavior to produce a certain outcome (Larson, 1998).

In understanding this capacity to exert control over one’s life, social cognitive theory provides an important framework in examining the functioning of the brain as it engages in personal agency. Through this perspective, an individual is described as a generative and proactive person rather than simply a reactive being (Bandura, 1997). Furthermore, this perspective offers a crucial paradigm shift from earlier theoretical models of psychology.
**Paradigm shift from prior psychological models.** The agentic perspective central to social cognitive theory is an important shift from earlier models of psychological theorizing, which focused extensively on the influence of the environment. According to Bandura (2001) prior models of theorizing were based on behaviorist principles, which focused on environmental stimuli that automatically or mechanistically influenced an individual’s behavior. Within social cognitive theory, this agentic sociocognitive perspective purports that individuals have the ability to exercise control over their thought processes, motivation, affect, and actions rather than just being shaped automatically by external events (Bandura, 1999). In fact, social cognitive theory rejects the notion that behavior is based solely on external rewards and punishment, central to behavioral theory (Bandura, 1997). While stimuli may influence behavior as a result of its predictive function, this function is not simply the result of pairing with a response but rather shifting the locus of regulation of behavior from stimuli to the individual (Bandura, 1997). In doing so, cognitive processes and in particular mastery experiences, play an important role in mediating changes within the individual (Bandura, 1977).

**Triadic reciprocal causation.** Given the emergent interactive agency found within social cognitive theory, individuals are reported to engage in triadic reciprocal causation whereby internal personal factors operate as interacting determinants (Bandura, 1999; Larson, 1998). According to Bandura (1999) these personal factors include: cognitive, affective, and biological events; behavioral patterns; and environmental events. Through this model, each of the factors work in influencing one another bidirectionally within the individual. However, the triadic reciprocity within the model does not imply
that the interacting determinants are of equal strength. Instead, each of the personal factors will vary depending on differing activities and circumstances, which then take time to exert their influence on the individual (Bandura, 1997).

In addition, through this triadic reciprocal causation model, the environment is no longer represented as a sole entity but rather distinguished among three types of structures that include: the imposed environment, the selected environment, and the constructed environment (Bandura, 1997). Within these structures, the imposed environment is that which is forced upon an individual with very little ability to control other than dictating how he/she will react or construe it (Bandura, 1999). According to Bandura (1999), this potential environment is based on reactions by the individual, which in-turn affect the nature of the interactions between personal, behavioral, and environmental factors.

**The features of human agency.** Bandura (2001) states that human agency within social cognitive theory is characterized by several features that function through phenomenal and functional consciousness. These features include: intentionality, forethought, self-reactiveness, and self-reflectiveness. Through intentionality, individuals maintain a representation and commitment to a future course of action. This is an important component of personal agency as it refers to the intentional action of focusing on a plan of action rather than having an expectation or predicted future action (Bandura, 1999). In other words, rather than simply holding an expectation of some future action, the individual has taken steps towards committing him/herself to an intended plan.
Through the feature of forethought, individuals begin to motivate and direct their actions in anticipation of a future event. This cognitive process serves in providing an individual with the necessary motivation to regulate one’s behavior in anticipating an intended future event. This feature also provides direction, consistency, and meaning over a long period of time (Bandura, 2001).

With the feature of self-reactiveness, individuals utilize their prior intentions and forethought to begin to motivate and self-regulate their actions. This self-regulatory process links thought to action through several self-referent subfunctions that include: “self-monitoring, performance self-guidance via personal standards, and corrective self-reactions” (Bandura, 2001, p. 8). Through these subfunctions, an individual actively engages in regulating their motivation and action, while serving to shape their behavior.

Lastly, through the feature of self-reflectiveness, individuals begin to examine their metacognitive functioning and action, which is a central part of human agency. This ability to self-reflect, allows individuals the opportunity to examine their thinking in making a decision about the outcomes of certain actions. According to Bandura (2001) through self-reflectiveness, individuals are able to evaluate their motivation and values, while addressing any motivational conflicts through the process of selecting one over the other.

**Self-Efficacy**

Within social cognitive theory, perceived self-efficacy is defined as the “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). This belief in the capability to exercise control over
one’s functioning and events within the environment, is a central component of social
cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (2001) these efficacy beliefs
are fundamental to human agency in determining the types of activities and environments
individuals select, thereby shaping the course of their lives. Unlike confidence, which is
used to describe an individual's strength in one’s belief without specification, perceived
self-efficacy refers to the belief in one’s capability to produce a given level of attainment
(Bandura, 1997). These beliefs are crucial for many school counselors who often find
themselves in challenging situations without any of the expected and necessary support
systems (Sutton & Fall, 1995). As a result, this study further examined these self-
efficacy beliefs and the variables that influence these perceptions among urban school
counselors.

In understanding the causal structure of social cognitive theory, perceived self-
efficacy plays an important role in influencing whether an individual thinks
pessimistically or optimistically through the self-regulating of motivation towards goals
and outcome expectations (Bandura, 2001; Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998). As a
result, efficacy beliefs are crucial in dictating the activities an individual will engage in
and his/her motivation to endure any challenges associated with these actions. According
to Bandura (2001), through efficacy beliefs individuals select the challenges to undertake,
the effort expended, how long to persevere, and whether any failures are perceived as
motivating or demoralizing. Within this cognitive process, motivation is an important
component as it offers the ability to represent future consequences in thought by creating
expectations of whether certain behaviors will produce either benefits or avoid any difficulties (Bandura, 1977).

Furthermore, Bandura (1977) stated that various psychological procedures serve to create and strengthen both efficacy and outcome expectations regardless of their form. This functioning of psychological processes forms the principle assumption within self-efficacy theory. According to Bandura (1977) outcome expectations are defined as an individual’s estimate that certain behaviors will produce an outcome, while efficacy expectations are based on the conviction to successfully execute the necessary behavior in producing an outcome. In understanding the influence between outcome and efficacy expectations, there is an important distinction in that an individual may believe certain behaviors will produce a given outcome through the former, while the latter can provide the necessary conviction to produce a desired outcome. As a result, the attainment of greater efficacy beliefs is an important determinant in a sustained effort to produce a given outcome.

**Contribution factors of efficacy expectations.** In understanding the origins of self-efficacy, such beliefs are constructed from several principle sources of information: enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states (Bandura, 1997; Barnes, 2004). Through each or all of these sources of information, self-efficacy beliefs are constantly shaped within the individual. According to Bandura (1997), the information gleaned from each of these sources is only informative after there has been some form of cognitive processing through reflective thought. In doing so, the self-appraisal process within the individual begins after the
processing of specific factors selected from each of the sources or the trial and error used to integrate the efficacy information.

The first of these sources of information are enactive mastery experiences. According to Bandura (1977, 1997) these experiences serve as the most influential source of information in providing the greatest authentic evidence of successful experiences to build stronger efficacy beliefs within a person. These mastery experiences utilize successful performance accomplishments as the primary vehicle for change through the following modes of induction: participant modeling, performance desensitization, performance exposure, and self-instructed performance (Bandura, 1977). Conversely, within enactive mastery experiences, encountering failure, particularly before efficacy beliefs have been firmly established, serve to weaken self-efficacy beliefs within the individual. Moreover, easy success leading an individual to expect quick results can also undermine efficacy beliefs when faced with failure (Bandura, 1997). However, not all experiences of failure are necessarily negative when encountered within self-efficacy theory. In fact, Bandura (1997) stated that certain difficulties and obstacles while in pursuit of a desired outcome could be highly beneficial in teaching the importance of a sustained effort in achieving success. In addition, obstacles provide a resilient sense of efficacy as an individual begins to learn to persevere when faced with adversity. In establishing stronger efficacy beliefs after overcoming adversity, these newly acquired efficacy beliefs are said to then generalize to other areas where weaker efficacy beliefs might exist (Bandura, 1977).
While enactive mastery experiences may provide the most influential source of evidence about an individual’s capabilities, it is not the only method to provide such information. Vicarious experiences through modeling, serves as an important tool in promoting efficacy beliefs within an individual (Bandura, 1997). Modeling offers a method for appraising one’s efforts to compare to that of others. According to Bandura (1997) social comparison serves as a primary factor in appraising one’s capabilities because with most activities there are no absolute measures of adequacy. Therefore, the modeled attainment by those similar to the individual, serves as an important method for appraising one’s capabilities. In addition, it provides an expectation of what is possible by persevering in one’s efforts. According to Bandura (1977) the mode of induction for vicarious experiences functions through live and symbolic modeling. Through associated networks or people connected to the individual, he/she determines through choice or imposition what will be observed providing live modeling, while television and other visual media sources offer symbolic modeling (Bandura, 1997). Although vicarious experiences may be a less dependable source of information than mastery experiences, it still provides the observer with a reasonable basis for increasing his/her own sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

The third source of self-efficacy information is the result of verbal persuasion. According to Bandura (1977) this source of information is introduced through the following modes of induction: suggestion, exhortation, self-instruction, and interpretive treatments. While this method does provide a means for strengthening self-efficacy beliefs, it is also very limited in terms of its influence on an individual when used alone.
This limitation stems from the inability of verbal persuasion to provide authentic experiential experiences to individuals, which are offered through the sources previously mentioned. Despite its limitations, verbal persuasion is the most widely used method because of its availability and ease in applicability (Bandura, 1977). The ability of verbal persuasion to strengthen self-efficacy beliefs results from the positive appraisal of an individual by significant others through the use of realistic bounds (Bandura, 1997). Furthermore, the use of performance aids can maximize the effect of verbal persuasion than if used without any aids.

The last and fourth source of self-efficacy information is gathered through physiological and affective states. According to Bandura (1997) individuals judge their capabilities based partly on somatic indicators within the domains of physical accomplishments, health functioning, and encountered stressors. In such situations, an individual will interpret high physiological arousal during stressful situations as an indicator of weakness. For example, the tension experienced in carrying out a task during a stressful situation may not only impact the individual’s performance but also become an indicator of susceptibility for that person. As a result, the lack of tension or physiological arousal when carrying out certain tasks may lead an individual to expect a successful performance (Bandura 1977, 1997). In doing so, the expectation of success may also lead in reducing any anticipated emotional arousal of certain tasks.

**Counselor Self-Efficacy**

In applying self-efficacy within one’s environment, Bandura (1982) states that it is not simply having the knowledge to do something but rather a generative capability
that involves organizing cognitive, social, and behavioral skills into action to serve a purpose. Within counseling, this process is crucial as self-efficacy is utilized in dealing with the many challenges encountered in session and in providing effective counseling services. Needless to say, the necessity for counselors to be efficacious is essential given the influence of efficacy beliefs on the capacity to perform various skills. According to Larson and Daniels (1998) counseling self-efficacy is defined as “one’s beliefs or judgments about her or his capabilities to effectively counsel a client in the near future” (p. 180). At least five significant dimensions exist with respect to counseling self-efficacy: confidence in performing microskills, attending to process, dealing with difficult behaviors, cultural competency, and an awareness of one’s values (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992). Although Bandura did not write about counseling self-efficacy per se, his theory on the role of self-efficacy is certainly adaptable for counseling, particularly with counselor trainees (Barnes, 2004; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Tang et al., 2004).

Through the Social Cognitive Model of Counselor Training (SCMCT), Larson (1998) modified social cognitive theory to apply it to counselor training. Through the SCMCT, Larson (1989) hypothesized that a counselor’s training environment and his or her personal agency factors mutually influence a counselor’s learning process and performance. As a result, a counselor’s performance then reciprocates by affecting his or her learning environment and perceptions of personal agency through a self-regulatory feedback loop or the triadic reciprocal causation described within social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1999; Larson, 1998).
This “feedback loop” process serves as the basis from where self-efficacy beliefs originate in shaping effective counseling performance. In fact, counseling self-efficacy beliefs are considered to be the main causal determinant for effective counseling action (Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Larson (1998) asserted that individuals with higher levels of self-efficacy will “tend to have more self-aiding thoughts; experience anxiety as challenging rather than debilitating; and set more realistic, moderately challenging goals” (p. 221). For counselors who are constantly being challenged and working to meet the needs of their clients, the attainment of greater self-efficacy beliefs serve as an important mediator in dealing with the many issues encountered. As a result, extensive research (Barnes, 2004; Daniels & Larson, 2001; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Sipps, Sugden, & Faiver, 1988; Tang et al., 2004) has been conducted on self-efficacy and its influence in the development of counselors. In such studies, findings have been consistent with self-efficacy theory when applied to counselor training (Barnes, 2004; Johnson et al., 1989; Larson, Clark, Wesely, Koraleski, Daniels, & Smith, 1999; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Sips et al., 1988; Tang et al., 2004) as well as counseling experience (Chandler et al., 2011; Melchert et al., 1996). In addition, counseling self-efficacy has been examined in relation to counseling supervision (Barnes, 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997).

Barnes (2004) presented implications for counselor educators by offering two distinct approaches for using self-efficacy theory to develop counselor training and supervisory interventions. These approaches are: the self-efficacy enhancement approach and the self-efficacy context approach. According to Barnes (2004), while each approach
may have its drawback in application, they may nonetheless be used simultaneously to assess the effectiveness of training and supervision.

Additionally, the differential aspects and predictive utility between general counselor self-efficacy and client-specific counselor self-efficacy has been examined (Lent et al., 2006). According to Lent et al. (2006), findings revealed that client-specific counselor self-efficacy was found to relate moderately to strongly with general counselor self-efficacy, while increasing over sessions, and accounting for the distinct variance in the perception of the quality of the sessions. This study is significant because the results indicate that counselors with higher client-specific self-efficacy is linked to greater congruence between the perceptions of session quality among counselors and their clients. Such inquiry provides a better understanding of counselor self-efficacy in working with the client-specific needs of individuals but also provides a direction for future research within counselor self-efficacy research.

In addition, research on the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and emotional intelligence has been conducted (Easton, Martin, & Wilson, 2008; Martin, Easton, Wilson, Takemoto, & Sullivan, 2004). From their research, Easton et al. (2008) revealed a significant correlation between the two constructs indicating the importance within counseling self-efficacy of identifying one’s emotions and counselor skills. They suggest that the perceived ability within counseling self-efficacy to identify emotions is particularly important because of the mix of emotions experienced in the counseling setting by the counselor.
Additional research was conducted that examined the effect of distinct variables on counseling self-efficacy, which were found to influence the construct. In examining the effects of performance feedback on counseling self-efficacy and counselor anxiety, findings have shown that feedback had a significant effect on both variables (Daniels & Larson, 2001; Larson & Daniels, 1992). In both studies, counseling self-efficacy was shown to improve with increased positive feedback, while correlating negatively with anxiety. Lastly, in a review of the counseling self-efficacy literature, Larson and Daniels (1998) found that self-efficacy appeared to be connected to counselor anxiety, counselor performance, and the supervisory environment.

**School Counselor Self-Efficacy**

With respect to school counseling, self-efficacy theory is an important framework in understanding the response being provided to meet the needs of students. Given the purported influence of perceived self-efficacy on behavior, thought patterns and emotional reactions to aversive situations (Bandura, 1982), it is reasonable to assume that school counselor self-efficacy can also inform the types of responses a counselor will provide with students, particularly when faced with adversity. According to Bandura (1994) the influence of efficacy beliefs was a factor when it came to teachers with greater levels of efficacy beliefs and their teaching ability. In such cases, teachers with higher levels of efficacy beliefs were reportedly able to motivate their students in increased cognitive development through the use of positive incentives, while those with lower efficacy beliefs tended to rely heavily on negative means to encourage students (Bandura, 1994; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Similarly, among school counselors, a counselors’
beliefs in their capability has an important impact on their students, particularly when it comes to affecting the achievement gap within a school (Bodenhorn et al., 2010), school climate (Sutton & Fall, 1995), counselor supervision (Cinotti, 2013), the delivery of counseling services (Ernst, 2012), working with gifted students (Goldsmith, 2011), and recent immigrant students (Na, 2012).

Within the past decade, there has been an increasing emphasis within school counseling in providing services to assist in narrowing the achievement gap for low-income students and students of color through the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (Education Trust, 2009) and most recently the American School Counselor National Model (2012). Within each of the school counseling initiatives, the services provided by counselors and the related self-efficacy beliefs, could have a major influence in their effort to effect change among students. Despite the importance of efficacy beliefs among counselors, very little inquiry into school counselor self-efficacy has been conducted (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Some of the more pertinent research related to school counselor self-efficacy has focused on the achievement gap. In a national study examining school counselor perceptions of the achievement gap, equity within their schools, school counselor self-efficacy, and the type of program implemented, Bodenhorn et al. (2010) found results to support self-efficacy theory. For example, school counselors with greater levels of self-efficacy had a distinct impact on students through activities consistent with self-efficacy theory such as goal setting, greater persistence and flexibility, and an increased awareness of the achievement gap data within their schools. Furthermore, school counselors who
indicated a specific type of school counseling program approach such as the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003) had higher self-efficacy beliefs and were more likely to report having helped to narrow the achievement gap within their schools (Bodenhorn et al., 2010). According to Bodenhorn et al. (2010) those with higher self-efficacy beliefs were also more likely to persist and meet their goals despite the challenges experienced, while those with lower efficacy beliefs were reportedly more ready to give up or maintain the status quo. Such results are significant because they support self-efficacy theory and also attempt to understand the efforts and responses provided by school counselors.

Additional research on school counselor self-efficacy examined the effect of distinct variables on school counselor self-efficacy. In a survey measuring the relationship between self-efficacy, school climate, climate roles, and a variety of demographic variables, Sutton and Fall (1995) found that colleague and administrative support was the strongest predictor of efficacy. In addition, the outcome expectancy for school counselor behavior was predicted by a high degree of support from staff and the involvement in less nonrelated counseling activities. According to Sutton and Fall (1995) these findings are significant because they suggest the importance of school climate and collegial support on self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. Furthermore, the results also propose a positive relationship between the grade level of a counselor’s position and their level of self-efficacy (Sutton & Fall, 1995). For example, the higher the grade level, the greater the self-efficacy of the school counselor.

Moreover, in a study examining aspects of supervision and school counselor self-efficacy, Cinotti (2013) found a relationship between the type of supervision received
whether from a non-counseling supervisor or a clinical supervisor, and the level of self-
efficacy of school counselor. However, these findings were not as predictive as
individual factors such as prior counseling experience or teaching experience on school
counselor self-efficacy. Such findings support prior research that also found significant
differences in school counselors that had prior teaching experience and greater levels of
self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

**Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy**

In addition to assisting in closing the achievement gap, recent trends within
school counseling have focused intently on the importance of multicultural competence
among school counselors. Much of this emphasis stems from the growing number of
culturally diverse students, which has prompted a call for culturally responsive school
counselors and counselor education programs (Cortland, 2001). In addition, prior
research has found that multicultural competence has predicted counseling satisfaction
and assisted clients of color to “satisfactorily address their mental health needs”
(Constantine, 2002, p. 260). As a result, inquiry into school counselor multicultural
competence has yielded extensive study and research (Alexander, Kruczek, & Ponterotto,
2005; Constantine, 2001; Holcomb-McCoy, 2004, 2005). Despite the interest and
research on school counselor multicultural competency, a scant amount of inquiry has
been conducted on school counselor multicultural self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy et al.,
2008).

While Sheu and Lent (2007) created an instrument to assess multicultural
counseling self-efficacy, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) developed the first measure of its
kind that assessed school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. In doing so, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) defined the construct of school counselor multicultural counseling as the perceived ability or belief “to carry out and perform tasks that are relevant and specific to equity among students in K-12 schools, and the ethnically and culturally diverse needs of K-12 students” (p.167). In operationalizing school counselor multicultural self-efficacy, several factors were identified that ranged from the knowledge of multicultural concepts, the use of data and understanding systemic change, and being able to apply racial concepts within practice. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) in their study found that each of these factors was significantly related to one another in identifying the construct of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. Moreover, the results revealed the importance of a school counselor’s ethnicity and the years of experience in relation to school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. A school counselor’s multicultural counseling training was also significantly related to higher scores on the assessment. With this assessment, researchers had the ability to finally measure the construct of multicultural counseling self-efficacy amongst school counselors (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Furthermore, in utilizing the School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy Scale (SCMES), Crook (2010) examined the relationship between counseling self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy amongst school counselors. The findings indicated that professional school counselors were generally efficacious when it came to general school counseling and multicultural school counseling tasks and activities. In addition, a moderate to strong positive relationship was found between general school counseling
self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy, while several demographic variables were shown to have significant differences. These variables included: race/ethnicity, years of counseling experience, and a school’s geographical setting. However, no significant differences were found when it came to the gender of a school counselor (Crook, 2010). These findings were significant in furthering the knowledge base of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, while also providing a tool for counselor educators to develop and evaluate their school counselor training programs.

**Demographic Variables and Contributing Factors of Counseling Self-Efficacy**

**Gender**

When it comes to gender and counseling self-efficacy, research has been limited within the field and has yielded mixed results when examining the relationship between the constructs of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). In a study of professional school counselors, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found that gender played a significant role in the self-efficacy of school counselors with women reporting higher levels of efficacy beliefs. While this may have been the case for the sampled professional school counselors, conversely master’s students within the study showed no significant differences based on gender.

However, these non-significant findings are also consistent with research conducted on school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. In a study on the relationship between school counselor multicultural self-efficacy and certain demographic variables,
Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) found a non-significant relationship when examining the variable of gender. This finding in many ways supports prior research within the field of multicultural counseling, which examined the relationship between gender and multicultural competency. Both Pope, Davis, Reynolds, Ding, and Nielson (1995) and Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) found no significant differences when studying multicultural competency and gender among graduate students and practicing professional counselor respectively.

However, when it came to examining predictors of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual (LGB)-affirmative counseling self-efficacy, gender-related variables were found to be a significant predictor of the construct (Dillon et al., 2008). According to Dillon et al. (2008) in a study of mental health clinicians, higher levels of LGB-affirmative counseling self-efficacy was found to be positively related to gender self-definition and sexual identity commitment. Additionally, Wester and Vogel (2002) suggested that male gender role conflict amongst psychologists may have a negative relationship on counselor self-efficacy, thus limiting the effectiveness of psychotherapy with challenging and diverse populations. Such mixed findings within the literature certainly encourage further inquiry within the field to better understand the influence of gender and the various forms of counselor self-efficacy.

**Ethnicity**

Similar to research on gender, research on the relationship between ethnicity and the various forms of self-efficacy, whether general, school or multicultural has also been limited within the literature. While the study of gender on multicultural competency has
yielded mixed results, ethnicity on the other hand appears to be the one demographic variable that plays a significant role when examining multicultural self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012), as well as multicultural competency (Pope-Davis et al., 1995; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2000, 2003). Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) in examining the factor structure of the SCMES found that ethnicity was significantly related to scores on the assessment. According to Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) ethnic minority school counselors attained greater levels of multicultural self-efficacy than White-American Counselors when compared along various factors of the instrument. Similarly, Na (2012) found that race and ethnicity had a significant influence on a school counselor’s self-efficacy when examining school counselor multicultural counseling competence.

Such findings are also consistent with research that examined ethnicity and multicultural counseling competency. Pope-Davis et al. (1995) found that graduate students of color in counseling and clinical psychology programs were related to greater self-perceived multicultural competency. Such findings were significant given that neither gender nor age were related to any of the factors on the Multicultural Counseling Inventory. Instead, the researchers suggest that the personal experiences of ethnic minority counselors, as well as their work with culturally diverse clients may have served as a contributor to the findings. Similarly, in studying racial identity development and multicultural counseling competency, Vinson and Neimeyer (2000, 2003) found that non-White counselor trainees reported greater levels of multicultural competency. According to Vinson and Neimeyer, non-White trainees also reported higher levels of multicultural
knowledge, skills, and the number of multicultural workshops attended, which may have accounted for the increase in multicultural competency. Additionally, Holcomb-McCoy and Meyers (1999) found that counselor ethnicity accounted for most of the variance within the multicultural competence of professional counselors. They described that in many ways an individual’s self-perceived multicultural competence could be explained by their membership to an ethnic minority group. While ethnicity appears to be an important variable for counselors when it comes to multicultural competency, membership within an ethnic minority group does not necessarily endow an individual with the skills necessary to be culturally skilled counselor (Sue et al., 1992). As a result, further study into the effects of ethnicity upon the school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy of urban school counselors is an important area for inquiry.

**Training**

Counselor training has been defined as “all the curricular experiences in counselor education” (Barnes, 2004, p.57). These curricular experiences have been examined within research to support self-efficacy theory, as well as in understanding the methods used to improve counselor self-efficacy (Johnson et al., 1989; Larson et al., 1999; Melchert et al., 1996; Sipps et al., 1988; Tang et al., 2004).

Johnson et al. (1989) in a study examining counseling self-efficacy and counseling skills in a graduate prepracticum class found that efficacy increased with training over time but had a weak relationship with performance skills. This study was the first of its kind to measure efficacy beliefs in relation to the performance skills of
graduate students and to use the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale. Johnson et al.´s (1989) findings supported self-efficacy theory by finding “real and persistent differences in the degree of confidence the students experienced” (p. 214). Similarly, Melchert et al. (1996) found that the level of training for graduate students accounted for slightly more professional self-efficacy and competency than the amount of clinical experience received. Such findings suggest the importance of extended training (i.e., doctoral programs) in addition to the clinical experiences received in undergraduate or graduate level programs, to provide an increase in efficacy beliefs. In addition, Sipps et al., (1988) in an examination of efficacy expectations and outcome expectations also found a significant relationship between elements of self-efficacy and the level of graduate training. In their study, 3rd & 4th year graduate students expressed higher efficacy expectations than 1st year students, further supporting self-efficacy theory with the findings.

Additional studies examined distinct methods for training counselors. For example, Larson et al. (1999) compared videos of counseling sessions versus student role-plays with mock clients in determining the differential effect on counseling self-efficacy. The Larson et al. (1999) findings revealed that through role-plays, a counselor’s performance success might affect the potency of counseling self-efficacy, while video sessions provided a more uniform type of intervention with minimal deleterious effect. According to Larson et al. (1999) these findings were significant because they supported Larson’s SCMCT (1998) by showing how perceptions of counseling performance increased and decreased counselor self-efficacy, while also revealing the importance of
modeling (i.e., video tapes) in helping to reduce potential harmful effects. These findings also supported efforts by counselor educators in providing opportunities to engage in actual counseling scenarios by demonstrating the importance of experience on counselor development. Lastly, in a study examining the effect of age, work experience, number of courses taken, and internship hours on counseling self-efficacy, the findings revealed that internship hours and work experience positively correlated with counseling self-efficacy (Tang et al., 2004).

**CACREP.** Within every graduate counselor education program, the attainment of counselor competency is a primary goal among its students. In evaluating the quality of services being rendered to students, graduate programs seek a method of program assessment in order to achieve accreditation. Through this form of program evaluation, graduate programs are able to provide objective evidence of its effectiveness to the public at large. For many counselor education programs, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) is one form of program evaluation that in many ways has become the standard for counseling education programs (Tang et al., 2004). As part of the CACREP standards, counselor education programs are required to have a diverse representation of faculty and students, as well as practicum and internships opportunities with culturally different clients (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999).

When evaluating differences in self-efficacy amongst counseling students of CACREP and non-CACREP programs, research has revealed mixed results amongst both groups. According to Tang et al. (2004), when controlling for various variables such as
the amount of course work, hours of internship, and prior work experience, no differences were found in the total scores of self-efficacy between groups. However, when looking at self-efficacy in counseling anxiety reactions, the results suggested higher self-efficacy amongst the CACREP group. Moreover, they also reported significant differences when looking at the amount of internships hours and course work between groups, supporting the higher number of course work and internship hours CACREP programs require. More importantly, the results provided support for Bandura’s theory in terms of the importance of counseling experience when considering the development of self-efficacy.

**Counseling Experience**

Given previous studies on counselor training and counseling self-efficacy, experience is a construct that has been shown to have a significant impact on self-efficacy (Chandler et al., 2011; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert et al., 1996). For example, in a study examining hypotheses based on self-efficacy theory and models of counselor development, Melchert et al. (1996) found significant differences in clinical experience and training amongst four participant groups. Within each of the four groups the variances in counselor self-efficacy corresponded to distinct stages within counselor development models. The findings indicate that counseling self-efficacy was stronger for individuals with some or more counseling experience than none at all. Furthermore, the study provided empirical support for the *Counselor Self-efficacy Scale (CSES)* in terms of reliability and validity, which had been developed for the study.

Chandler et al. (2011) examined the effect of training on the perceived self-efficacy of licensed substance abuse counselors. They found that regardless of the
amount of training, counselors identified moderately high levels of perceived self-efficacy, supporting self-efficacy theory, and asserting how an individual’s performance success can increase his/her confidence. For these counselors, being licensed and working with clients in the field provided all the necessary experience to increase their perceived self-efficacy in a manner that training alone may not have been able to do.

Leach and Stoltenberg (1997) examined counselor self-efficacy in relation to theoretical domains within the Integrated Developmental Model of supervision (IDM). The findings indicate that advanced students with more counseling experience had greater efficacy in: utilizing microskills, dealing with difficult behaviors, counseling culturally diverse clients, and attaining a greater awareness of one’s values and relationship to other clients (Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997). Such findings are particularly useful in informing counselor educator supervisory practices and counselor training. In addition, the study highlighted the importance of counseling experience as a potential influencing factor on counseling self-efficacy, warranting further research, which the present study intended to accomplish with urban school counselors.

**Teaching Experience.** While prior counseling experience has been shown to provide greater self-efficacy among counselors, research has also indicated that counselors with prior teaching experience also had increased levels of self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Cinotti, 2013). In developing and validating the *School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE)*, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found significant differences amongst school counselors with prior teaching experience but not for those with only previous counseling experience. As a result, the authors attribute the findings
to school counseling being a hybrid of teaching and counseling, where those with prior teaching experience had greater amounts of self-efficacy prior to becoming school counselors (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Similarly, in a study examining aspects of supervision and self-efficacy, Cinotti (2013) examined the variable of teaching experience on school counselor self-efficacy finding that individuals with at least one year of teaching experience had significantly greater self-efficacy than those without any pedagogical experience.

**Multicultural Counseling**

**The Development of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies**

In examining the development of the multicultural counseling competencies, Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) defined multicultural counseling as “counseling when participants differ as a result of their varying racial and ethnic backgrounds (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Caucasian/European, and Native American or indigenous groups)” (p. 294). Having originated from the inadequate and lack of training programs focused on working with distinct racial, ethnic, and cultural groups, Sue et al. (1992) were given the task of developing a multicultural competencies document to facilitate such services by the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD). In doing so, Sue et al. (1992) identified several characteristics of culturally skilled counselors based on the multicultural literature. The three distinct characteristics included a counselor who: is aware of his/her own assumptions, values, and biases; understands the worldview of culturally different clients; and develops appropriate intervention strategies and techniques (Sue et al., 1992). Furthermore, for the
three characteristics, Sue et al. (1992) described each as having the following three dimensions: beliefs and awareness, knowledge, and skills. As a result, these characteristics and dimensions created a matrix of nine competency areas for counselors to utilize.

Within the document, Sue et al. (1992) also went on to define the focus of the ethnic and racial groups within the multicultural counseling competencies which included: African Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, and Hispanics/Latinos. In a revision of the multicultural counseling competencies, Arredondo et al. (1996) further clarified this point by distinguishing between multiculturalism and diversity. According to Arredondo et al. (1996) the focus of multiculturalism is on ethnicity, race, and culture, while diversity centers on other individual differences such as: age, gender, sexual orientation, religion, physical ability/disability, or any characteristic used to self-define. This distinction between multiculturalism and diversity has been a contentious subject in defining multicultural counseling because proponents for the former support a more focused approach that incorporates racial and ethnic concerns, while the latter utilize a more “universal” approach to counseling (Sue et al., 1992). Despite the lack of consensus of what defines multicultural counseling competence, Sue et al.’s (1992) three-dimensional framework of multicultural competency continues to be the most used method in multicultural counseling training (Holcomb-McCoy, 2000).

Additional research by Holcomb-McCoy (2000) identified further underlying factors within the Multicultural Competencies to consider. Holcomb-McCoy (2000)
conducted an exploratory factor analysis among 151 professional counselors, revealing five underlying multicultural competencies within the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) competencies to include: awareness, knowledge, multicultural terms, racial identity development, and skills. Within the five factors, three of the domains naturally adhered to Sue et al.’s (1992) three-dimensional framework (i.e., awareness, knowledge, and skills) from which the AMCD competencies were based. However, two additional factors (i.e., multicultural terms and racial identity development) offered significant implications for counselors and counselor educators to emphasize within practice and counselor education programs.

The ACA Advocacy Competencies

After the creation of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue at al., 1992) additional progress within the field of multicultural counseling came with the development of the ACA Advocacy Competencies (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2002). This latest charge for counselors has brought counselors, school counselors, and counselor educators together in becoming much-needed social change agents. Despite always being a part of “the real-life practice of counselors” (Toporek et al., 2009, p. 260), the role of advocacy within the competencies became solidified professionally within the field. According to Lewis et al. (2002) the advocacy competencies consist of three distinct levels of interventions for counselors to adhere to in enacting systemic change, which include the client/student level, school/community level, and the public arena level. In addition, within each of the levels there are two domains that highlight advocacy with and on behalf of individuals to include:
client/student empowerment, client/student advocacy, community collaboration, systems advocacy, public information, and social/political advocacy (Lewis et al., 2002).

In implementing the advocacy competencies, counselors are challenged to look beyond resolving issues solely at the individual level but rather the environmental barriers that may be impeding student learning. At the client/student level, the competencies urge counselors to work in advocating with and for students through the use of empowerment. Interventions at this level can range from lessons focusing on communication skills or developing self-advocacy tools through the use of client strengths (Ratts et al., 2007). At the school/community level, counselors can work either individually or collaboratively with relevant stakeholders in identifying and addressing environmental barriers. In doing so, counselors may be called upon to utilize their leadership skills to directly confront the status quo, or to work collaboratively with existing organizations. In addition, at this level the ability to analyze data is crucial for counselors to identify areas of need. Lastly, at the public arena level, counselors are challenged to operate within the social/political spectrum by informing the public of inequities or issues regarding access to education. At this public arena level, a counselor’s ability to develop relationships with the various community agencies is key to enacting systemic change. Many of the issues at this level are guided by the needs encountered at the client/student or school/community/levels (Lewis et al., 2002).

Transforming the Role of School Counseling

The Transforming School Counseling Initiative. According to Martin (2002) an important transformation occurred in the training and the role of school counselors during
the 1990s as a result of the standards-based educational reform focusing on accountability and academic achievement, and the increasing diversification of the nation’s schools.

The reform was initiated by the Education Trust (2009) through the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI), which sought to reshape how counselors were trained in an effort to improve school counseling. According to the Education Trust (2009), the TSCI sought to include school counselors within the education-reform discussions by providing them with the knowledge and data to raise student achievement, close achievement gaps, and become powerful change agents. Within the reform, there was an important emphasis on advocacy particularly with low-income students and students of color who had traditionally been disenfranchised by the achievement gaps within schools (Bodenhorn et al., 2010; Dahir & Stone, 2007; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Martin, 2002).

Through the TSCI, the emphasis was placed on the relationship between the school and its students in an effort to diminish the barriers preventing academic success by utilizing the following skills: leadership, advocacy, counseling, collaboration, and the use of data (The Education Trust, 2009). In doing so, the TSCI was able to influence how school counselors were trained within counselor education programs, while benefitting the individual receiving the services, as well as the school community at large (Eschenauer & Chen-Hayes, 2005).

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs. In addition to the TSCI, counselor educator programs were also influenced by the newly adopted standards in 2001 by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP). Much of the language and skills presented
within these new standards reflected the competency areas previously focused upon within the TSCI (Paisley & Hayes, 2003). Within the CACREP core values, the principles promoted counselor collaboration, as well as practices reflecting the needs of society, and protected the public (CACREP, 2009). In addition, the knowledge and skill components required by school counselors within the standards included “program development, implementation, and evaluation; counseling and guidance; and consultation” (Paisley & Hayes, 2003, p. 201). With these newly adopted standards, counselor training programs had a means for assessing their effectiveness, while also promoting excellence in their counselor development.

**The ASCA National Model.** While the TSCI and CACREP standards emphasized the pre-service training of counselors, the *American School Counselor Association* (ASCA) focused upon standards related to the actual practice of school counselors and school counseling programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dahir, 2000; Dahir & Stone, 2007). Throughout the educational reform movement, the focus of the transformation was on improving teacher quality and academic achievement, but neglected the emotional, social and economic obstacles preventing student success (ASCA, 2004).

As a result, the *ASCA National Standards for Students* (2004) were created, which focused on three academic domains for students: academic development, career development, and personal/social development. Within each of the academic domains were three standards, which combined for a total of nine competency areas for school counselors to focus upon with students. In developing these standards, school counselors
could then focus on skills, which students could demonstrate as a result of participating in the school’s counseling program (ASCA, 2004). With these newly adopted student standards, school counselors had a benchmark for assessing the effectiveness of their school’s counseling program, while redefining interventions that would emphasize the skills within each of the academic domains.

In having identified national standards for students, ASCA in 2001 met to create a school counseling model that would incorporate the student standards, along with past and current challenges within a common framework known as the *ASCA National Model* (ASCA, 2003). With its development, the ASCA model sought to provide school counselors with a comprehensive approach that was both preventative in design and developmental in nature. In addition, the model incorporated the four themes of leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change that were initially a part of the TSCI framework (ASCA, 2004). Through the model, the focus was on counseling and academic achievement through the collaborative efforts of counselors, teachers, administrators, parents and students (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). Furthermore, there was a focus on accountability through the use of school data, school counselor performance standards, and an audit of school counseling programs.

The original ASCA model (2004) was comprised of four program areas for counselors to focus upon which included: the foundation, delivery system, management system, and accountability. Within the foundation are the beliefs, philosophy, and mission from which the rest of the school counseling program is built upon. This section contains information as to what is to be expected from students as a result of their
participation in the school counseling program. Next, is the delivery system, which addresses how a program will be implemented within a school whether through a guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, or systems support. Within the third component, the management system works in conjunction with the delivery system, addressing when, why, and who will implement the services, along with what authority. According to ASCA (2004), this component is crucial because in order for a program to be effective, it must be managed efficiently through purposeful interaction amongst teachers, administration, staff, parents, and students. In addition, it makes use of data derived from a student needs analysis to support the use of activities implemented within the program. Lastly, the accountability component attempts to answer how students are different as a result of the school counseling program. Through this component, evaluation of the school counseling program becomes an essential function in identifying what worked and what did not in an effort to improve the delivery and management systems of the program.

In applying the ACA competencies to the ASCA model, the implications of the competencies can serve in providing school counselors and counselor educators with a framework for promoting the academic, career, and personal/social needs of students (Ratts et al., 2007). Through these competencies, many of the themes of the ASCA model such as leadership, advocacy, and systemic change, can be further implemented. However, Ratts et al. (2007) urged that in order for the competencies to be effectively instituted, counselors would need to work with school administrators to address many of the issues affecting students. In addition, school counselors will need to have an
awareness of their strengths and limitations as social change agents in implementing the interventions successfully.

Despite the calls for advocacy within the ASCA model, the model did not initially provide nor delineate for school counselors the knowledge and skills necessary for becoming advocates to their students (Trusty & Brown, 2005). As a result, Trusty and Brown (2005) introduced school counselor advocacy competencies that provided the necessary dispositions, knowledge, and skills that would offer school counselors directions as to how to advocate for students, and also inform the process. According to Trusty and Brown (2005) the dispositions, knowledge, and skills signified respectively the beliefs and values of a counselor, their knowledge of a particular setting, and the use of communication skills in advocacy.

Most recently, the ASCA National Model (2012) underwent changes in its third edition to include a greater focus on the use of data in goal setting, as well as incorporating other student standards such as state and district initiatives that may inform a school counseling program. The third edition of the model also incorporates the ASCA School Counselor Competencies (2008) that were developed years after the previous edition of the ASCA model. These school counselor competencies are organized around the components of the ASCA model (i.e., foundation, management, delivery, and accountability) by outlining the knowledge, abilities, skills, and attitudes necessary to meet the needs of pre K-12 students, as well as implement a school counseling program (ASCA, 2008). Through these school counselor competencies, each could be used to assist school counselors in assessing their abilities, informing school administrators in
meaningful school counselor performance evaluation, as well as establishing benchmarks for school counselor education programs.

**The Role of the 21st Century School Counselor**

**The Current State of American Public Schools**

**The achievement gap.** Throughout the educational reforms and initiatives that sought to transform the role of a school counselor, the various efforts had attempted to address one of the major issues facing the US educational system, the achievement gap amongst ethnically diverse and low-income students (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007, McKinsey & Company, 2009). According to Holcomb-McCoy (2007), this achievement gap is described as the “widespread inequity in educational achievement and opportunity across ethnic and socioeconomic groups” (p. 5). Such educational inequity is witnessed throughout various sets of measures such as: high school completion and college participation rates, advanced placement course enrollment, standardized achievement exams, and levels of achievement (with the exception of Asian-American students) among ethnically diverse and low-income students.

Various studies have reported on the preponderance of this achievement gap within the nation’s schools. Noguera (2009) stated that despite the improvements shown within certain school districts, large urban school districts throughout the country have drop-out rates exceeding 50 percent. According to Bridgeland, Dilulio, and Morison (2006) this is particularly the case for minority students (Black, Hispanic, or Native American) who are reported to have completed high school with a regular diploma approximately only 50 percent of the time, creating what is considered to be the nation’s
silent epidemic. Furthermore, in a recent study, McKinsey and Company (2009) found similar results reporting that: White students generally performed better on exams than Black students; affluent students generally performed better than poorer students; and those of similar demographic backgrounds performed dramatically different across school systems and classrooms. In addition, research has also suggested a possible link between the achievement gap and the disproportionate suspension and expulsion rates of Black, Latino, and American Indian students (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010).

These educational inequities are particularly pronounced when looking at the findings for low-income students. According to Rowan, Hall, and Haycock (2010) in states like Alaska, Arizona, and South Carolina, the performance of low-income fourth grade students is among the worst in the nation in reading, reporting no improvement since 2003. In particular, Oregon’s low-income students rank amongst the lowest performing in the country, losing ground since 2003 while significantly separating from their high-income peers. Another reported issue for low-income students is that of equal access to high-performing schools. Ushomirsky (2011) found that in states like Maryland, African-American and Latino students attending high performing schools on average did about as well or better in reading than their White peers in other schools. However, equal access to such schools still remained a challenge for many low-income students. For example, in states like Indiana, not only did low-income students trail behind their high-income peers, they were also found to have fewer opportunities in attending higher-performing schools (Ushomirsky, 2011).
McKinsey and Company (2009) also found that the achievement gap not only affected Black and Latino students or those of different income levels, but also similar students within different regions and school systems, as well as the U.S. and other nations. In their findings, McKinsey and Company (2009) reported that the impact of the educational gaps on the U.S. could be viewed as the economic equivalent of a permanent national recession. The research showed that if the achievement gap between Black and Latino student performance had been narrowed in 2008, the gross domestic product of the U.S. could have been 2 to 4 percent higher or the equivalent of $310 billion to $510 billion. This impact on the economy is concerning given the projected rise within the coming years of Blacks and Latinos within the population and U.S. workforce (McKinsey & Company, 2009).

**Changing demographics.** When looking at the overall population of the U.S., this change in the nation’s demographics is certainly reflected within the most recent U.S. Census data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). According to the data, the percentage of population change by Hispanic or Latino origin and Race from 2000 to 2010 was as follows: 43.0% Hispanic or Latino, 12.3% Black or African American, 18.4% American Indian and Alaska Native, 43.3% Asian, 35.4% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, 24.4% Some Other Race, and only 5.7% for White. In particular, the Hispanic and Asian populations grew tremendously from 35.3 million to 50.5 million and 10.2 million to 14.7 million respectively from 2000 to 2010.

This change in demographics is also being reflected within schools around the country as the racial and ethnic make-up of this nation’s students is becoming
increasingly diversified and projected to continue growing. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, this trend is reflected within the percentage distribution of students enrolled in prekindergarten through 12th grade in U.S. public schools by race and ethnicity from fall 2000 to fall 2021 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013). According to the data, the percentage of Hispanic students enrolled in prekindergarten through 12th grade, grew from 16% in 2000 to 23% in 2010, but are projected to grow to 27% in 2021. Similarly, Asian/Pacific Islander students have slowly but steadily increased from 4% to 5% in 2000 to 2010, and are projected to grow to 6% in 2021. In addition, students of two or more races are projected to grow from 2% in 2010 to 3% in 2021, which may account for the decrease amongst additional racial groups. Black students showed a slight decrease from 17% in 2000 to 16% in 2012 and although they are expected to increase from 7.9 million in 2011 to 8.3 million in 2021, their share of enrollment is expected to remain at 16% in 2021. As for White students, they have steadily declined from 61% in 2000 to 52% in 2010, and are projected to continue decreasing to 48% in 2021.

**Acculturative issues.** For school counselors working with such diverse populations, this will include dealing with issues related to the acculturation of many immigrant students. Acculturation has been described as the “dynamic process of change that individuals undergo as they interact with and adapt to a new or different cultural environment; it is an interactive process that occurs along different life domains (e.g., language, values) at different rates of change” (Rivera, 2010, p. 331). According to Chung et al. (2008) there may be mental health issues related to this transitioning
stemming from premigration trauma and migratory transitions, which present unique challenges for any counselor working with these populations. For some students, the transition to this country may have been for voluntary reasons such as educational or occupational opportunities, while others may have been left war-torn areas, experiencing the loss of loved ones, and a sudden disruption in their supportive networks (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007).

According to Miranda, Bilot, Peluso, Berman, and Meek (2006) language proficiency appears to also play a significant role in the functioning of an individual throughout the acculturative process, as it has been found to be a mediating factor between acculturation and acculturative stress. For school counselors, language can also serve as a barrier between the student-counselor relationship if a counselor is not bilingual or has limited proficiency in the primary language of the student (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). This can be particularly troublesome as school counselors play an important role in assisting students to process and develop an ethnic identity, which has been found to be a significant predictor of wellness amongst minority adolescents (Rayle & Myers, 2004).

**Urban School Counseling.** For school counselors within urban areas, many of the afore-mentioned issues are increased, as there is a greater concentration of minority and low-income students enrolled within these schools (Bemak et al., 2005; Lee, 2005; National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). An urban school is considered a city school within an urbanized area inside a principal city categorized according to the following population sizes: large (250,000+), midsize (100,000+), or small (less than
100,000) (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2013), the percentage distribution of Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students within public elementary and secondary students is reported at 66% within the city, while only 43% in suburban areas, and 25% in rural areas. Similarly, when looking at the percentage distribution of 5-to-17-year olds within the U.S. living in poverty, 25% are within the city, while 19% and 15% are in rural and suburban areas respectively. According to Lee (2005), along with the increase in the concentration of people of color and higher poverty rates, urbanized areas are also characterized by: higher concentrations of immigrants, higher rates of reported crimes, higher concentration of airborne pollutants, complex transportation patterns, lack of community connectedness, and inequities within the educational, legal and health system (to name only a few).

In working with these students, the role of the urban school counselor is very much influenced by the issues prevalent within these communities (Green et al., 2005). While suburban and rural areas are also reportedly facing many of the challenges typically associated with the inner city given the changing demographics of the nation (Green et al., 2005), these issues are reportedly more demanding and endemic to urbanized areas (Bemak et al., 2005; Lee, 2005). Within these schools, counselors must regularly contend with issues such as inadequate funding that inhibits the access to resources, as well hiring and maintaining qualified teachers (Holcomb-McCoy, 1998; Lee, 2005; Olson & Jerald, 1998). In addition, counselors must also deal with school
climate issues such as overcrowding, safety concerns, truancy, and the lack of parental involvement (Holcomb-McCoy, Olson & Jerald, 1998).

Furthermore, urban school counselors are at times the only resource for students when it comes to important issues such as school choice. According to Sattin-Bajaj (2014) New York City, like many districts around the nation (e.g., New Orleans, Milwaukee) has implemented a school choice policy when it comes to applying to high school. While this school choice policy is designed to offer equitable access to education regardless of income or racial/ethnic background, this goal has not always been the case. Research within New York City has shown that students are typically assigned to high schools mirroring the SES and racial/ethnic background of their middle school despite having selected more affluent or less racially isolated schools; less than 6% of Black and Latino students who test for the city’s top specialized schools are granted admission (Sattin-Bajaj, 2014). In addition, a strong trend has been found between demography and college readiness where factors such as single motherhood, unemployment rates, and the high percentage of Black and Latino residents are negatively correlated with college readiness (Fruchter, Hester, Mokhtar, & Shahn, 2012).

While the current school choice policies remain in place, there appears to be no end in sight for such staggering statistics. According to Sattin-Bajaj (2014) the failure of these school choice policies stems from faulty assumptions set forth by school districts in terms of the amount of parental involvement expected, the intensive student engagement required, and the lack of substantial school-based guidance that is available. The reality for many of these families and students, particularly immigrant families whose native
language is not English, is that they lack the institutional compass to navigate the school system in making informed school choice decisions (Sattin-Bajaj, 2014). As a result, a great deal of burden is placed on urban school counselors by school districts to be the “front-line representatives for interfacing with students and parents” (Sattin-Bajaj, 2014, p. 38).

Conversely, urban families that are able to obtain this institutional compass and follow the guidelines set forth by school districts, are able to make informed school choice decisions about the type of secondary schools their children attend. For many of these families this means attaining a desired high school placement rather than selecting low performing schools with graduation rates at about 50 percent, as is the case with many Hispanic and Black students within New York City (Satin-Bajaj, 2014). According to the New York City Department of Education (2011), the graduation rates for White and Asian students in 2011 was 78.9% and 82.9% respectively, while Hispanic and Black students reported 59% and 60.4% respectively (New York City Department of Education, 2011). While these unrealistic expectations placed by school districts on parents and students persist, urban school counselors will continue to be an important resource and in some cases, the family’s only institutional compass for navigating the school choice system.

As a result, today’s urban school counselors are faced with many distinct challenges that may not be as prevalent in other areas. Within these urban areas, school counselors have the challenge of providing multiculturally responsive interventions and a quality education for all culturally diverse urban youth (Bemak, & Chung, 2005; Bemak
et al., 2005; Eschenauer, & Chen-Hayes, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy & Mitchell, 2005; Lee, 2001; Sattin-Bajaj, 2014). According to Bemak and Chung (2005), the previous long-standing traditional role of a school counselor that has inadvertently served to maintain the educational and social inequities of students of color and low-income students is no longer a viable option. Instead, culturally responsive interventions through multicultural counseling and in particular advocacy are the means necessary to best serve the many diverse urban students across the nation. This social justice advocacy approach within school counseling has expanded the initial concept of multicultural counseling and also role of the school counselor by taking into account the inequity prevalent within schools and the community (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). By embracing advocacy as part of school counseling, it has now become a critical component of effective urban school counseling (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Field & Baker, 2004).

**Conclusion**

Given the need for access and equity in education, multicultural counseling and in particular advocacy, has become the latest charge for professional school counselors (Bemak, et al., 2005; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; House & Martin, 1999; Trusty & Brown, 2005). To meet this charge, Trusty and Brown (2005) published advocacy competencies to better inform school counselors and counselor educators in becoming the social change agents that schools desperately need. However, in order to effectively serve students, school counselors must not only obtain the skills and knowledge to effectively counsel culturally diverse youth but also the necessary efficacy to do so (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012). Although research has
been limited within the field, particularly on school counselor self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012; Sutton & Fall, 1995), factors such as counseling experience, training, gender, age, and ethnicity have all been examined and found to have anywhere from a mixed to significant influence on counseling self-efficacy. As a result, this study examined these factors and their predictive influence on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors. In addition, the study also explored the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy and the afore-mentioned variables on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.
Chapter Three

Methodology

With the growing diversification of this nation’s schools, the need for school counselors developing multicultural competency has been well documented (Alexander, Kruczek, & Ponterotto, 2005; Constantine, 2001, 2002; Holcomb-McCoy, 2001, 2004, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008; Lee, 2001). To become multiculturally competent, counselors need an awareness of their own beliefs and values, as well as the knowledge and skills to service ethnically and racially diverse clients (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). However, attaining these competency areas may not necessarily provide school counselors with the necessary self-efficacy or belief in their ability to service ethnically and racially diverse youth. Achieving a sense of self-efficacy is crucial for any counselor because it affects the activities an individual selects, as well as his/her motivation to persevere despite the many challenges encountered (Bandura, 2001).

While research is limited with respect to school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008), particularly among urban school counselors, my study was designed to explore both constructs, while contributing to the literature base on school counselor general self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In doing so, the purpose of my study was to examine the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, the study explored
the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy and the afore-mentioned variables on multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors.

This chapter provides the questions that guided my research along with the hypotheses tested. Furthermore, the chapter describes the type of study utilized for the inquiry, as well as a description of the sample obtained and the methods used. Next, an overview of the instruments implemented are provided, along with the psychometric properties for each of the measures. Lastly, the procedures of the study are described, including the method of data collection and data analysis.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

In this study, three questions were posed. As noted, the purpose of this study was to examine the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, the study explored the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy and the aforementioned variables on multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors. Following, I present the research questions that guided my study and the hypotheses tested.

**Research Question 1**

What is the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity), counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school where a counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of
multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops), and school counselor self-efficacy?

**Hypothesis 1.** A predictive relationship will be found between the counselor demographic of gender, work experience, training, and school counselor self-efficacy. However, the predictive value of age and ethnicity on school counselor self-efficacy will support the null hypothesis.

**Research Question 2**

What is the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity), counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school where counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops), and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy?

**Hypothesis 2.** A predictive relationship will be found between the counselor demographic variables of ethnicity, work experience, training, and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. However, the predictive value of gender and age on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy will support the null hypothesis.
Research Question 3

What is the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, training, and school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors?

**Hypothesis 3.** A predictive relationship will be found between the counselor demographic variable of ethnicity, work experience, training, and school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. However, the predictive value of the demographic variables of gender and age on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy will support the null hypothesis.

**Type of Study**

The present study was based on descriptive research in that it utilized a correlational research design throughout the inquiry. In doing so, there was no manipulation of an independent variable or random assignment to groups, but rather a focus on previously established groups (i.e., school counselors) (Houser, 2008). In this case, the focus was on school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural self-efficacy specifically among urban school counselors. The strength in utilizing a correlational research design is that it allows for researchers to identify and understand the relationship between multiple variables and how they may influence behaviors, attitudes or perceptions (Houser, 2008). In addition, descriptive research is a form of quantitative research that involves making careful descriptions of phenomena, particularly within the field of education (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003).
In utilizing a correlational design, I examined the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on the constructs of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Within the design school counselor self-efficacy served as both a dependent and independent variable (i.e., as a predictor of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable (Multiple Linear Regression)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable (Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Counselor Self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Type of school</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-efficacy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Years of experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % of time working w/:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Minority students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Low SES students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Immigrant students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accredited program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CACREP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of multicultural courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- # of multicultural workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Self-efficacy*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Research Design with a list of the specific variables used to measure counselor demographics, work experience, and training. *Included only as a predictor variable within the second model of the hierarchical multiple linear regression with school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy serving as the dependent variable.
self-efficacy), with school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy serving as the dependent variable (see Figure 1). In addition, the study provided predictive knowledge in examining the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy and the aforementioned variables on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Houser, 2008). According to Sheperis, Young, and Daniels (2010) predictive designs are particularly useful when examining highly related variables in order to predict a pattern. The counselor demographics of gender and ethnicity, as well as work experience, and training have all been previously found to influence counselor self-efficacy.

**Sample**

In addressing the research questions, the study focused specifically on urban school counselors. As a result, a sample of school counselors was drawn from urban areas throughout a Northeastern state. A second northeastern state was considered if more participants were needed, but an adequate sample was garnered from the first state. I attained a sample of 154 participants, which satisfied the recommendation for correlational research of a minimum of 30 subjects per variable (Gall et al., 2003; Houser, 2008). Potential participants were identified through the state’s published school counselor association directory. All school counselors in the state were contacted by an invitation email (see Appendix A), which asked the counselors to self-select if they worked in an urban school. Counselors in these schools work within urbanized areas in principal cities ranging from less than 100,000 to over 250,000 people (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).
The study used convenience sampling for selecting school counselor participants because they were readily accessible through pre-existing groups, such as the state school counselor directory (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). Although convenience sampling may limit the generalizability to other school counselor groups, in this case it was an appropriate method for sampling because it attained the intended target population of the study.

Through the state’s school counselor association directory, school counselor information such as names and emails were utilized in soliciting participants for the study through online survey methods. According to Evans and Mathur (2005) there are many strengths in the use of online surveys. The strengths include: global reach, flexibility, speed and timeliness, convenience, low administration cost, controlled sampling, ease of data entry and analysis (to name only a few). However, online surveying also has potential weaknesses that should be addressed to increase response rates before proceeding. These weaknesses include: the perception of junk mail, respondent lack of online experience/expertise, unclear answering instructions, impersonal solicitation, privacy issues, and low response rates. In addressing these challenges, Evan and Mathur (2005) provided several possible solutions that were utilized in this study. For example, participants received an invitational email to participate in the study, which was brief and directed respondents straight to the survey URL. This method was used in an attempt to distinguish it from junk mail and reduce the perception of being impersonal. In addition, the measures included in the survey were made as clear and as simple as possible. Simplicity and clarity were used to assist respondents with a lack of online expertise and
to avoid confusion regarding answering instructions. Lastly, privacy and security issues were clearly stated within the invitational email, as well as the informed consent page (see Appendix B) in order to facilitate responsible survey administration.

**Instrument**

The instrument utilized for this study was an integration of three distinct measures. Participants were asked to complete an online survey consisting of questions from a demographics questionnaire, the *School Counselor Self-Efficacy* (SCSE) scale, and the *School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale* (SCMES). Through the demographics questionnaire, participants responded to prompts about their gender, ethnicity, work experience and counselor training (see Appendix C). This information was used in the data analysis to examine the influence of these variables on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Next, participants answered 43-items as part of the *School Counselor Self-Efficacy* (SCSE) scale (see Appendix D). The SCSE measures a counselor’s sense of general self-efficacy with school counselor responsibilities. Lastly, to examine a school counselor’s multicultural counseling self-efficacy, respondents answered 52-questions from the *School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale* (SCMES) (see Appendix E). The SCMES assesses a school counselor’s ability to do tasks related to multicultural school counseling.

**Measures**

**Demographics questionnaire.** Within the questionnaire, participants were first asked to indicate their gender, age, and ethnicity (see Appendix C). Although research
has been limited on self-efficacy and gender and ethnicity, prior inquiry has shown ethnicity to have an influence on multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008) and multicultural counseling competency (Holcomb-McCoy & Meyers, 1999; Pope et al., 1995; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2000, 2003). Gender, on the other hand, has had more mixed results among the various constructs, playing a significant role within school counselor self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), but yielding no significant findings among school counselor multicultural self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008) and multicultural competency (Holcomb-McCoy & Meyers, 1999; Pope-Davis et al., 1995). In further examining the influence of gender and ethnicity on school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy, this study was one of the first to examine its role in relation to urban school counselors.

The demographic questionnaire also had questions related to a counselor’s work experience and training. This information was pertinent to the study as significant findings have been found within self-efficacy research in regards to counseling experience (Chandler et al., 2011; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert et al., 1996) and counselor training (Johnson et al., 1989; Melchert et al., 1996; Sipps et al., 1988). In order to assess work experience, the questionnaire asked participants about their years of counseling experience, and the percentage of time spent working with minority, low SES, and immigrant students. In addition, teaching experience was also included because it had been previously found to have an influence on school counselor self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Cinotti, 2013). In assessing counselor training, participants were asked whether they had attended an accredited counselor preparation program such
as a CACREP or non-CACREP program. Past research (Tang et al., 2004) has yielded mixed results in regards to CACREP programs and self-efficacy, but it has not been examined in relation to urban school counselors. In addition, multicultural training was assessed by the number of multicultural courses or multicultural workshops a respondent had taken in the past. This information was crucial in examining the impact of multicultural-related training on multicultural counseling self-efficacy given past research on the influence of counselor training on general counselor self-efficacy (Johnson et al., 1989; Melchert et al., 1996; Sipps et al., 1988). In examining the relationship between multicultural counseling courses and multicultural self-efficacy, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) similarly assessed the number of courses taken by ASCA members and found that more multicultural counseling training was significantly related to higher school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale. In order to assess school counselor self-efficacy, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) developed the School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale to measure the construct across school counselor settings, levels, and situations (see Appendix D). According to the authors, the SCSE was the first of its kind to be validated and to measure school counselor self-efficacy given the transitions within the counseling profession after the creation of the ASCA model (2003) and the Education Trust (2009) initiative.

In creating the SCSE, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) conducted four distinct studies to develop and validate the scale. Within the first study, an initial list of items was identified from documents used to define the practice and training of school
counselors. This list generated 44-items, which were evaluated by a panel of five experts in the field of school counseling and school counseling education. Members of the panel were all leaders from within the field who taught and/or conducted research and held offices within professional organizations such as ASCA and CACREP. After evaluating the list, 51-items were included by the panel of experts, as three initial items were dropped from the scale and 10 additional items were added. According to the authors, the outcome of the evaluation yielded a scale that emphasized actions performed by school counselors that were all consistent with self-efficacy theory.

Within the second study, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) mailed the revised scale to attendees of the ASCA 2000 national conference to be analyzed by current practicing school counselors for item analysis, representativeness of sample, reliability, and group differences. After conducting the item analysis, eight items from the scale were deleted for either confusing wording or being nondiscriminatory, which resulted in a scale of 43-items. The remaining 43-items were then analyzed for representativeness of the sample. In doing so, responses from the attendees were compared to demographics of other school counselor studies in professional journals within the past 15 years. After a comparison to results of six studies, the findings revealed that with the exception of a slightly elevated female population, the sample was considered demographically representative of school counselors in the United States.

The reliability of the 43-items was then tested using SPSS software, revealing a coefficient alpha scale score of .95. Responses on the scale were based on a 5-point Likert scale with the mean of all responses being a 4.21, standard deviation of .67, and a
range of mean scores from 3.5 to 4.85. According to the authors, the scores were predictably high because the participants were all active professionals in the field. In addition, a correlation matrix was produced, which found that all the items correlated positively, between .2 and .6 for 93% of the item responses. In examining group differences among respondents, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used which found no significant difference among those working at different levels of settings. In addition, an analysis for racial/cultural groups was conducted for individual groups and combined groupings finding no significant differences between underrepresented groups (which was reportedly small), as well as for those who had experience as a counselor in other settings or only in schools. However, significant differences were found between the following group who all reported stronger self-efficacy beliefs: female participants over males participants, those with teaching experience in comparison to those without, participants practicing for three or more years, and those who reported using the ASCA standards and who had received training in implementing the standards. Given the significant differences based on gender, experience, and training found between groups, these factors were variables of interest in the present study.

Within the third study, the purpose was to ascertain validity information on the SCSE by comparing it to other preexisting instruments. Surveys were sent to 2nd year master’s-level school-counseling students within counselor education programs across 22 universities within the U.S. to complete. One-hundred and sixteen master’s level students responded, yielding for the SCSE a coefficient alpha score of .96, mean of 3.91, standard deviation of .77, and a range of mean scores of 3.4 to 4.7. The SCSE was
related to the following established instruments to obtain construct validity: the Counseling Self-Efficacy scale (COSE), The Social Desirability Scale (SDS), the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, second edition (TSCS: 2). When compared to the COSE, which was intended to measure counseling self-efficacy within individual counseling but not necessarily school counseling, the SCSE had a positive correlation of .41, with some of the COSE subscales correlating at moderate levels. When compared to the SDS, the scores between the two instruments showed little correlation at .30, indicating that respondents were “not answering the items in a ‘faking positive’ direction” (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005, p.22). In comparing the SCSE to the STAI, which was designed to gather information on how a participant generally feels with respect to anxiety, the scores showed a significant negative correlation of -.42 indicating that as self-efficacy increased, anxiety decreased. However, when comparing the SCSE to the TSCS: 2, a scale designed to measure general self-confidence, no significant correlations were found between the two instruments.

According to the authors, this lack of correlation between both instruments was actually a positive result because it validates the theoretical differences between self-efficacy and self-confidence. When examining for group differences between the groups analyzed, as well as to those who participated within the second study, no significant difference was found in SCSE scores when comparisons were made between groups.

Lastly, the fourth study sought to determine the factor structure of the responses within the 43-items of the SCSE. Utilizing a sample of 342 master’s-level students and practicing school counselors, principal component analysis with an oblique rotation was
conducted producing eight components. However, after reviewing for interpretability based on the consistency with prior research on self-efficacy and school counseling, the simplest structure according to Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) was based on the following five components upon which questions were assigned: Personal and Social Development, Leadership and Assessment, Career and Academic Development, Collaboration, and Cultural Acceptance. The coefficient alphas for the five components respectively were: .91, .90, .85, .87, and .72. According to the authors, all of the components correlated positively with one another from .27 to .43, with the exception of the third component, Career and Academic Development, which negatively correlated with the others ranging from -.28 to -.41.

In validating the SCSE, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) have provided a scale that can be used across the various school counselor settings. Although a larger study of the SCSE did not confirm the factor structure to be stable in a confirmatory factor analysis (Crook, 2010), the SCSE continues to be widely-used when studying school counselor self-efficacy research (Bodenhorn et al., 2010; Cinotti, 2013; Ernst, 2012; Goldsmith, 2011; Na, 2012; Owens, Bodenhorn, & Bryant, 2010).

The lack of significant differences found among the groups sampled in developing the SCSE will serve the present study in its ability to assess self-efficacy among the various school counselor settings, particularly urban school counselors. In addition, the inclusion of questions related to recent trends within the profession, reflects the transforming of the role of school counselors not currently assessed through other self-efficacy instruments.
The School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES). In order to measure school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) developed the School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES), the first scale of its kind (see Appendix E). In doing so, the authors generated an initial list of 81-items after reviewing interdisciplinary scholarly writings, research, and literature in the areas of: multicultural counseling competence, self-efficacy, counselor self-efficacy, multicultural school counseling, and multicultural education. Utilizing the guidelines set forth by Bandura in developing the self-efficacy measure, the authors later added an additional nine items generated by doctoral students who had experience as professional school counselors. The students were asked to list knowledge and skills they believed to be important for culturally conscious school counselors resulting in nine items. The SCMES was then piloted on a small group of school counselor educators (n=3) from which small modifications were made on the scale.

The SCMES was first mailed to a random sample of drawn American School Counselor Association (ASCA) members, and then distributed electronically online to ASCA members who attended the 2005 National Conference, yielding a sample of 181 respondents. The sample consisted primarily of practicing school counselors (86%), guidance supervisors (4.4%), counselor educators (4.4%), and a small group (4.4%) who responded as “other.” Participants were asked to assess their ability to perform tasks related to issues of equity and diversity within schools utilizing a Likert-type scale of 1(not well at all) to 7 (very well) on items that were positively stated.
In examining the psychometric properties of the SCMES items on the scale were factor analyzed to clarify the preliminary structure of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. In doing so, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) submitted 90-items to a principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation utilizing the Kaiser-Guttman rule. In the analysis, items were retained that loaded higher than .50 and that were interpretable. As a result, six factors were kept that accounted for 59.49% total variance, while thirty-eight items were omitted because they did not load greater than .50. The analysis resulted in 52-items that corresponded to the following six factors: (1) Knowledge of Multicultural Concepts, (2) Using Data and Understanding Systemic Change, (3) Developing Cross-Cultural Relationships, (4) Multicultural Counseling Awareness, (5) Multicultural Assessment, and (6) Application of Racial and Cultural Knowledge to Practice. The 52-items of the SCMES revealed a coefficient alpha of .93 and the following alphas for each of the six factors: .95 for the first, .91 for the second, .89 for the third, .93 for the fourth, .89 for the fifth, and .88 for the sixth. In addition, all of the factors correlated significantly and highly with one another from .50 to .84.

Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) also examined the relationships between demographic variables and the SCMES because of reported unequal cell sample sizes. They found no significant differences based on gender and years of experience. However, ethnic differences were found to be statistically significant on all of the subscales and factors, with ethnic minority participants reporting significantly higher perceived capabilities than White participants in five of the areas except for factor 3, (Developing Cross Cultural Relationships). In addition, when examining the relationship
between the number of multicultural courses taken and multicultural counseling self-efficacy, participants who had taken more courses rated themselves significantly higher than those who had taken less on four of the factors with the exception of factor 3 (Developing Cross-Cultural Relationships), and factor 6 (Application of Racial and Cultural Knowledge to Practice). As a result of the findings within the demographic variables studied, I also examined for the relationship between the demographics of urban school counselors and multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) reported several limitations of the SCMES, which include a relatively small participants-to-item ratio in the exploratory factor analysis and a conceptualization of multicultural counseling that may need further defining. In addition, the authors report selection bias within the sample of the SCMES, given its predominant White, English-speaking sample that may not be reflective of the diversity within the professional school counselor population.

Despite the limitations, the SCMES remains one of the only measures of its kind to measure school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. According to Bandura (2006), when creating a self-efficacy scale, a measure should target factors, which have an impact on a specific area of functioning since efficacy beliefs are not global traits but rather “linked to distinct realms of functioning” (p. 307). In this case, the SCMES was used to target school counselor multicultural self-efficacy, which had been previously utilized within research to study the construct and reported significant findings (Crook, 2010).
School counselor participants completed the survey through the online website SurveyMonkey. The final survey was comprised of the *School Counselor Self-Efficacy* (SCSE) scale, the *School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale* (SCMES) and a demographic survey. The demographic survey gathered information about a participant’s gender, age, ethnicity, work experience, and training. In ascertaining information about a school counselors’ work experience, the following questions were asked: the number of years as a school counselor; prior teaching experience; the type of school where a counselor works (e.g., public, private, or charter); and the percentage of time working with minority students, lower SES students, and immigrant students. To gather information about a counselor’s training, school counselors were asked whether they had attended an accredited counseling program such as CACREP and the number of multicultural courses and/or multicultural workshops taken since undergraduate school to further assess multicultural training (see Appendix C).

**Data Collection**

After receiving permission from the university Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see Appendix F), an initial e-mail was sent to 3250 school counselors listed within the targeted state school counselor directory. This initial email (see Appendix A) was sent by the state school counselor association on behalf of the researcher and contained the purpose and procedures of the study, as well as a link to the survey. Upon receiving the email, all were asked to self-select and invited to partake in my study. Upon clicking on the link, counselors were directed to the SurveyMonkey® website that contained an
informed consent page with all the necessary information about the study including the risks, benefits, and statement of consent prior to beginning the survey (see Appendix B). After consenting to participate, counselors were then asked to complete a 109-item survey containing demographic questions, the School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) and the School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES) (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). Both the directions for completing the survey and the amount of time needed to complete the instrument were included within the initial email and informed consent page. After several weeks, school counselors were then sent a second email (see Appendix G) by the state school counselor association inviting them to participate again if that had not done so already.

In total, the survey was made available to school counselors for a period of two months, which resulted in 157 participants responding to the survey. However, upon further review, three participants had not completed the survey producing a final sample of 154 participants. My sample was comprised of 121 (78.6%) females and 33 (21.4%) males including 55.2% White/Caucasian, 21.4% Latino(a)/Hispanic, 14.9% Black-African American, 3.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, 3.2% multiethnic, and 1.3% Black – non-African American. In addition, participant ages included 6.5% in the 20 to 30 year old range; 31.8% in the 31 to 40 year old range; 24.7% in the 41 to 50 year old range; 28.6% in the 51 to 60 year old range; and 8.4% in the 61 years old or older range.

Data Analysis

Once the information had been gathered, the data was analyzed using SPSS software. Participant data was entered into SPSS through the use of dummy variables to
analyze categorical information from respondents. Upon entering the data, it was examined for any missing variables through the use of visual analysis and SPSS tools, and then replaced via mean substitution (Somasundarum & Nedunchezhan, 2012). Next, the SCSE and the SCMES were scored by summing the scale items and then dividing by the number of items, upon which measures of central tendency and variability were computed.

Prior to hypothesis testing, preliminary analyses were conducted through the use of Spearman’s rho correlations to examine if multicollinearity among independent variables was evident and to determine significance between independent and dependent variables. After having identified significant variables, a multiple linear regression was conducted to address question one of the proposed research questions. Then, a hierarchical multiple linear regression was used for question two and a second hierarchical multiple linear regression model for question three. Multiple regression analyses were selected because they serve in making a more accurate prediction of variables that are known to individually correlate with the criterion (Sheperis et al., 2010). In addition, a testing of assumptions for linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of errors was conducted on the multiple linear regression and the hierarchical multiple linear regression.

For the study, the alpha level was set at .05, although various levels were reported. According to Gall et al., (2003) in practice the alpha level of a study is usually set at .05 rather than a more stringent .01, while statistical inference logic suggests that this level of significance be established at the outset before the data is computed. In
addition, a .05 alpha level was consistent with Crook’s (2010) study, which had previously examined similar constructs. Within each of the regression analyses, the influence of counselor demographics, work experience, and training were examined on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, a regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictive relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.
Chapter Four

Results

Given the increasing social issues confronting students and the growing ethnic and cultural diversity of schools, school counselors are required to have both general self-efficacy and self-efficacy as it relates to multiculturalism (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Lee, 2001). Counselors who feel efficacious in their ability to interact and engage with students, especially those from diverse cultures and backgrounds, are more likely to promote social justice advocacy and identify and address students’ strengths and needs (Bemak & Chung, 2008; Bodenhorn et al., 2010). Despite the importance of self-efficacy factors in enhancing school counselors’ ability to work with students, few studies exist that have examined the various factors that may influence self-efficacy. The purpose of this study was to examine if counselor demographics (gender, age, ethnicity), work experience, and training factors play a role in school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, and if school counselor self-efficacy and/or the aforementioned variables were predictive of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results from my data analysis including the multiple linear regression and hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses conducted in addressing the three hypotheses proposed within my study. The chapter opens with an examination of the study data and sample. Next, a review of the data, including an examination and addressing of missing variables is presented, followed by descriptive statistical information on participant demographics, work experience, and
counselor training variables. The descriptive statistics for school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy variables are also presented. The chapter continues with a presentation of preliminary statistical analyses where results from the Spearman’s rho correlations are discussed. In this study, Spearman’s rho correlations were conducted for two reasons: (a) to determine if multicollinearity among independent variables was evident, and (b) to determine which variables were significantly correlated with the dependent variables and thus entered as predictors in the regression analyses. Results from the two regression analyses (i.e., one multiple linear regression and one hierarchical multiple linear regression) are then examined in the chapter. Lastly, each of the study’s research questions is presented with the results noted, as well as a statement regarding the null and alternative hypotheses.

**Study Sample**

One hundred and fifty-seven participants responded to the survey on SurveyMonkey®. A review of the data showed that three participants did not complete the two self-efficacy questionnaires resulting in data from these three cases being removed from the data file. The final sample was $N = 154$ participants, which consisted of 98.1% of the original sample. A visual analysis of the data in coordination with SPSS tools, which counted responses per variable showed that less than 5% of the data was missing for any study variable. The majority of variables had no more than three missing data points with only one variable, (i.e., number of multicultural workshops participants had attended since undergraduate school) having the most missing data points with eight. The missing data for this and other variables were determined via SPSS unusual cases
analysis to be missing at random (MAR), and the missing data points were then replaced via mean substitution (Somasundaram & Nedunchezian, 2012).

**Sample: demographics.** Demographic information of participants is provided in Table 1. Of the 154 participants, 121 (78.6%) were female and 33 (21.4%) were male.

The participants were relatively equivalent across two sets of age groups. The first set was across the following three age groups: (a) 31 to 40 years old, \( n = 49 \) (31.8%), (b) 41 to 50 years old, \( n = 38 \) (24.7%), and (c) 51 to 60 years old, \( n = 44 \) (28.6%). The second set was across the final two groups: (d) 20 to 30 years old, \( n = 10 \), 6.5%; and (e) 61 or older, \( n = 13 \), 8.4%. The majority (\( n = 85 \), 55.2%) of participants identified as White/Caucasian, while 33 (21.4%) identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic, 23 (14.9%) as

Table 1.
*Descriptive Statistics: Demographic Variables of Sample (N = 154)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or older</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-African American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-non-African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)/Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Ethnicities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Black-African American, 6 (3.9%) as Asian/Pacific Islander, 5 (3.2%) as multiethnic, and two (1.3%) as Black – non-African American.

**Sample: work experience.** The study participants were asked questions pertaining to their work experience as a school counselor (see Table 2). Of the 154 participants, the majority \( n = 137, 89.0\% \) worked as counselors at a public school. Seventy-five (48.7%) were high school counselors, while the remaining participants were relatively equally divided between elementary school counselor \( n = 39, 25.3\% \) and middle school/junior high counselor \( n = 37, 24.0\% \). The majority of participants \( n = 123, 79.9\% \) had more than six years of experience as a school counselor, while the remaining participants \( n = 31, 20.1\% \) had between one and six years of experience as a school counselor. Fifty-three (34.4%) participants had previous experience as a teacher.

Participants were asked how much of their day was spent working with ethnic minority, lower socioeconomic, and immigrant students (see Table 2). The majority of participants spent the majority of their day \( 75\% \) \( n = 30, 19.5\% \) or \( 100\% \) \( n = 95, 61.7\% \) working with ethnic minority students. Twenty-one (13.6%) spent 25% of their day and eight (5.2%) spent 50% of their day working with ethnic minority students. Results were diverse with regard to time spent with lower socioeconomic and immigrant students. Fifty-five (35.7%) of the participants reported spending 75% of their day and 43 (27.9%) participants reported spending 100% of their day working with lower sociodemic and immigrant students.

---

1 Due to the small sample size of participants who identified as an ethnicity other than White/Caucasian, this variable was recoded for regression analyses as a dichotomous variable where 0 = White/Caucasian and 1 = Ethnicity other than White/Caucasian.

2 Of the remaining 17 participants, \( n = 11 \) (7.1%) worked as counselors at private schools, \( n = 5 \) (3.3%) worked as counselors at charter schools, and \( n = 1 \) (0.6%) participant did not provide an answer. The substantial sample size difference precluded the use of this variable in statistical analyses for hypothesis testing (Judd & Kenny, 2010).
socioeconomic students. Fewer participants reported spending 50% \((n = 25, 16.2\%)\), 25% \((n = 25, 16.2\%)\), or 0% \((n = 6, 3.9\%)\) of their day working with lower socioeconomic students. With regard to immigrant students, the largest group of participants \((n = 60, 39.0\%)\) reported spending 25% of their day working with immigrant students. Fewer participants reported spending 50% \((n = 29, 18.8\%)\), 75% \((n = 27, 17.5\%)\), 0% \((n = 21, 13.6\%)\) or 100% \((n = 17, 11.0\%)\) of their day working with immigrant students.

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics: School Counselor Work Experience Variables \((N = 154)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of School Counselor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Counselor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School/Junior High Counselor</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Counselor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of School Counselor Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6 Years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 Years</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Day Working with Ethnic Minority Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Day Working with Lower SES Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Day Working with Immigrant Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample: School counselor training. Participants were asked about their counselor training. The majority \((n = 118, 76.6\%)\) of participants had attended a CACREP-accredited counselor education graduate program. With regard to multicultural counseling courses, the largest group of participants \((n = 44, 28.6\%)\) reported having taken two multicultural counseling courses, followed by 37 (24.0%) participants who reported having taken three multicultural counseling courses and 35 (22.7%) participants reported having taken one multicultural counseling course. Fewer participants reported having taken four or more multicultural courses \((n = 16, 10.4\%)\) or more than five multicultural courses \((n = 22, 14.3\%)\).

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics: School Counselor Training Variables \((N = 154)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended CACREP Accredited Counselor Education Graduate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Counseling Courses Taken in Graduate Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Workshops Taken Since Undergraduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were also asked how many multicultural workshops they attended since completing their undergraduate work. The largest group of participants \((n = 48, 31.2\%)\) reported having participated in three multicultural workshops, followed by 33 \((21.4\%)\) participants who reported having participated in one multicultural workshop, and 26 \((16.9\%)\) participants who reported having participated in two multicultural workshops since completing their undergraduate work.

**Descriptive Statistics: School Counselor Self-Efficacy Variables**

Two self-efficacy variables, school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, were the focus of this study. Descriptive statistics for both self-efficacy scales are presented in Table 4. School counselor self-efficacy served as both a dependent and independent variable (i.e., as a predictor of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy) and was computed by summing all scale items and dividing by 43 (i.e., the number of items that comprised the scale). A review of the school counselor self-efficacy data showed that there was one outlier, which was

Table 4

**Descriptive Statistics: School Counselor Self-Efficacy and School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy Scales \((N = 154)\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>(Min)</th>
<th>(Max)</th>
<th>(Sk)</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Self-Efficacy(^a)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy(^b)</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \(M\) = mean, \(SD\) = standard deviation, \(Min\) = Minimum score, \(Max\) = Maximum score, \(Sk\) = skewness statistic, derived by dividing skewness value by skewness standard deviation. \(\alpha\) = Cronbach’s alpha. \(^a\) A higher score denotes higher school counselor self-efficacy, with possible scores ranging from 1.00 to 5.00. \(^b\) A higher score denotes higher school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, with possible scores ranging from 1.00 to 7.00.*
winsorized (i.e., the next highest score was substituted in place of the outlier value) (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013).

The mean score for the school counselor self-efficacy scale was $M = 4.29$ ($SD = 0.46$), with scores ranging from 3.26 to 5.00. In this case, a higher score indicates greater counselor self-efficacy. The scale had excellent inter-item reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .94. The skewness of the school counselor self-efficacy scale was computed by dividing the skewness value by the skewness standard deviation, and results showed that the skewness was acceptable, as it was 1.82, less than 2.00 (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013). The acceptable skewness value showed that the data were normally distributed (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013).

School counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy served as the dependent variable of the study and was computed by summing all scale items and dividing by 52 (i.e., the number of items that comprised the scale). A review of the school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy data showed that there were no outliers. The mean score for the school counselor multicultural efficacy scale was $M = 5.68$ ($SD = 0.80$), with scores ranging from 3.60 to 7.00. Again, a higher score indicates greater multicultural counseling efficacy. The scale had strong inter-item reliability, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .96. The skewness of the school counselor multicultural efficacy scale was computed by dividing the skewness value by the skewness standard deviation, resulting in a skewness that was acceptable, as it was 0.52, less than 2.00 (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013). The acceptable skewness value showed that the data were normally distributed (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013).
Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses were conducted prior to hypothesis testing within the study. The first sets of analyses were Spearman’s rho correlations\(^3\), which were calculated between all study variables. These analyses were conducted for two reasons. The first reason was to determine if multicollinearity existed between the independent variables. Multicollinearity is evident if a correlation is \( r \geq .80, p < .001 \) (Garson, 2012). For those relationships that were close to the \( r \geq .80 \), a variance inflation (VIF) was also conducted. In such cases, multicollinearity is evident if the VIF is greater than 4.00 (Garson, 2012; O’Brien, 2007). The second reason for a Spearman’s rho correlation was to determine significance between the independent and dependent variables, as only those variables shown to be significant would be included as predictors in the regression models for hypothesis testing. Once these analyses were completed, additional analyses to test for the assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity and independence of errors were conducted with only the significant variables.

**Spearman’s rho analyses.** Results from the Spearman’s rho correlations are presented in Table 5. In the first part of the analyses, there was no evidence of multicollinearity between independent variables. In fact, the variance inflation factor between the variables was a 1.00, which indicates a lack of multicollinearity. According to O’Brien (2007) a variance inflation factor that is less than 4.00 indicates a lack of multicollinearity. Moreover, results from the Spearman’s rho analyses also documented which independent variables were significantly associated with the two dependent variables.

---

\(^3\) Spearman’s rho correlations were conducted instead of Pearson bivariate correlations as many of the variables were categorical (Judd & Kenny, 2010).
variables of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Results from the Spearman’s rho correlations are presented in Table 5. None of the three demographic variables of gender, age, and ethnicity was significantly associated with either school counselor self-efficacy or school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. The demographic variables were thus not included in the regression analyses for hypothesis testing. With regard to the remaining variables, significance varied across the school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy variables.

Table 6 presents those variables that were significantly associated with the respective school counselor self-efficacy variables and thus were included in the regression analyses. Two school counselor work experience variables, years of counselor experience and percent of the day spent with immigrant students, were significantly associated with school counselor self-efficacy, \( r_s(154) = .18, p = .029 \) and \( r_s(154) = .17, p = .040 \), respectively. In addition, two school counselor training variables, attended an accredited school counselor education graduate program and the number of multicultural workshops attended were significantly associated with school counselor self-efficacy, \( r_s(154) = -.16, p = .045 \) and \( r_s(154) = .23, p = .004 \), respectively. Based on the coding of the variables, the results showed that the years of counseling experience, the percentage of the day working with immigrant students, attending an accredited counseling program, and the number of multicultural courses attended were significantly associated with increased school counselor self-efficacy. Spearman’s rho correlation results also showed that five variables were significantly associated with school counselor multicultural
Table 5.

**Spearman’s Rho Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age Group</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethnicity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Years of</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Experience</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. % Day with</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. % Day with</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SES Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. % Day with</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Attend</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accredited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Number of</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Counselor</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Counselor</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.
counseling self-efficacy. Three of the five variables were school counselor work experience variables: (a) years of school counselor experience, $r_s(154) = .21, p = .009$, (b) percent of day spent with lower socioeconomic status students, $r_s(154) = .26, p = .001$, and (c) percent of day spent with immigrant students, $r_s(154) = .26, p = .001$. In addition, two school counselor training variables, the number of multicultural courses taken during graduate school and the number of multicultural workshops attended, were significantly associated with school counselor multi-cultural self-efficacy, $r_s(154) = .25, p = .002$ and $r_s(154) = .29, p = .001$, respectively. Finally, school counselor self-efficacy was also found to be significantly associated with school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, $r_s(154) = .76, p < .001$.

Table 6.

*Spearman’s Rho Correlations: Significant Associations between School Counselor Work Experience and Training Variables and School Counselor Self-Efficacy Variables* (*N* = 154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Counselor Work Experience Variables</th>
<th>School Counselor Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Counselor Experience</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching Experience</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Day Spent with Ethnic Students</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Day Spent with Low SES Students</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Day Spent with Immigrant Students</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Training Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Accredited Program</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Courses</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Workshops</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.76***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * $p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$*
In summary, having more than six years of school counselor experience, spending a significant amount of the day working with lower socioeconomic and immigrant students, having taken an increasing number of multicultural courses and multicultural workshops during graduate school, and higher levels of school counselor self-efficacy were significantly associated with increased school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

**Multiple Linear Regression: School Counselor Work Experience and Training Variables Predicting School Counselor Self-Efficacy**

A multiple linear regression was conducted to address research question one. The independent variables were the two school counselor work experience variables of (a) years of counselor experience and (b) percent of day spent with immigrant students, and the two school counselor training variables of (c) having attended a CACREP accredited graduate school counselor education program and (d) number of multicultural workshops attended since undergraduate school. Each of these variables had been previously found in the Spearman’s rho correlation to be significant predictors of school counselor self-efficacy. As a result, the four counselor variables were entered collectively as predictors in the first model of the multiple linear regression. Entering the counselor variables simultaneously into one regression model determined “which predictors were important and the size of their effects (as well as) the structure by which multiple predictors simultaneously related” to the dependent variable (Slinker & Glantz, 2008, p. 1732). Statistical analysis testing of the assumptions for multiple linear regression, which include testing for linearity, homoscedasticity, and independent of errors are presented prior to the results of the multiple linear regression.
Testing of assumptions: Linearity. The assumption of linearity was determined by computing a normal P-P plot of observed and expected regression residuals (Judd & Kenny, 2010). Linearity is evident if the plot follows a straight line, which was seen in the P-P plot that was computed for this regression model (see Figure 2). Based on the linear alignment of the residual scores, the assumption of linearity between the independent variables and the dependent variable was met.

Figure 2. Normal P-P Plot

Testing of assumptions: Homoscedasticity. Homoscedasticity, or similarity in variances of the dependent variable scores across the range of scores for the independent variables (Garson, 2012), was assessed via a scatterplot of residual scores plotted against predicted residual scores. If the data is equally dispersed above and below the horizontal
line at zero, homoscedasticity is met (Garson, 2012; Judd & Kenny, 2010). As seen in Figure 3, the data are equally dispersed above and below the horizontal line on the scatterplot, which determined that the assumption of homoscedasticity had been met.

**Figure 3. Scatterplot of residuals**

**Testing of assumptions: Independence of errors.** The final assumption for linear regression tested was to determine if the residuals or errors are independent of one another (i.e., there is a lack of autocorrelation between residuals). Independence of errors is determined by calculating the Durbin-Watson statistic: if the Durbin-Watson value is between 1.00 and 3.00, the assumption of independence of errors has been met (Garson, 2012; Judd & Kenny, 2010). In this case, the Durbin Watson value was 2.31, which indicates that the assumption of independence of errors has been met for the multiple linear regression analysis.
Multiple Linear Regression: Results. Results from the multiple linear regression are presented in Table 7. Results showed that the overall regression model was significant, $F(4, 148) = 4.87, p = .001, R^2 = .116$. Based on the $R^2$ of .116, this model of predictors explained 11.6% of the variance in the dependent variable of school counselor self-efficacy. When examining the individual effects of each predictor on the dependent variable, two of the four predictors were significant: (a) having attended a CACREP accredited counselor education graduate program, $\beta = -.19, p = .015$, and (b) the number of multicultural workshops attended, $\beta = .17, p = .035$. The percent of time spent working with immigrant students was close to significance, $\beta = .15, p = .055$, whereas years of experience as a school counselor was not significantly predictive, $\beta = .12, p = .132$, with regard to school counselor self-efficacy. These results suggest that attending an accredited counseling graduate program, participating in numerous multicultural workshops, and to a lesser extent, spending a substantial amount of time
working with immigrant students significantly predicted increased school counselor self-efficacy.

Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression: School Counselor Work Experience and Training Variables Predicting School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy

A hierarchical multiple linear regression was conducted to address research questions two and three. In this hierarchical multiple linear regression, the following school counselor work experience and training variables were entered collectively in the first model of the hierarchical multiple linear regression: the three school counselor work experience variables of: (a) years of counselor experience, (b) percent of day spent with lower socioeconomic students, and (c) percent of day spent with immigrant students, and the two school counselor training variables of: (a) the number of multicultural courses a participant took during graduate school, and (b) the number of multicultural workshops a respondent participated in during graduate school. In addition, the independent variable of school counselor self-efficacy was entered by itself along with the aforementioned variables in the second model of regression. School counselor self-efficacy was entered as an additional predictor in the second model of the regression so that its importance could “be judged on the basis of how much it added to the prediction” of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy “over and above that which could be accounted for” by the counselor work experience and training predictors (Petrocelli, 2003, p. 10). Prior to the presentation of the hierarchical multiple linear regression results are results pertaining to the testing of assumptions of: (a) linearity, (b) homoscedasticity, and (c) independent of errors.
Testing of assumptions: Linearity. The assumption of linearity was determined by computing a normal P-P plot of observed and expected regression residuals (Judd & Kenny, 2010). When plotted, the residual data followed a straight line, as seen in Figure 4. Based on the linear alignment of the residual scores, the assumption of linearity between the independent variables and the dependent variable had been met.

Figure 4. Normal P-P Plot

Testing of assumptions: Homoscedasticity. Homoscedasticity was determined by computing a scatterplot of residual scores plotted against predicted residual scores. As seen in Figure 5, the data were equally dispersed above and below the horizontal line on the scatterplot determining that the assumption of homoscedasticity had been met.
Testing of assumptions: Independence of errors. The final assumption for linear regression tested was to determine if the residuals or errors are independent of one another (i.e., there is a lack of autocorrelation between residuals). This was determined by the Durbin Watson value being between 1.00 and 3.00 (Garson, 2012; Judd & Kenny, 2010). In this case, the Durbin Watson value was 2.14, which indicates that the assumption of independence of errors has been met for the multiple linear regression analysis.

Results. Results from the hierarchical multiple linear regression are presented in Table 8. Results showed that the first regression model was significant, \( F(5, 148) = 6.20, p = .001, R^2 = .173 \). Based on the \( R^2 \) of .173, this model of predictors explained 17.3% of the variance in the dependent variable of school counselor multicultural self-
efficacy. An examination of the individual effects of each predictor on the dependent variable showed that three variables were significant predictors: (a) years of experience as a school counselor, $\beta = .15, p = .050$, (b) percent of time spent during the day working with immigrant students, $\beta = .17, p = .039$, and (c) attending multicultural workshops since undergraduate school, $\beta = .19, p = .027$. These results suggest that years of experience as a school counselor, percent of time spent with immigrant students, and number of multicultural workshops attended can predict a level of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy.

Table 8

Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression: Years of Counselor Experience, Percent of Day Spent with Immigrant Students, and Attended Accredited Program Predicting School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy ($N = 154$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Counselor Experience</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Day Spent with Lower SES Students</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Day Spent with Immigrant Students</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Courses</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Workshops</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2/R^2_{\text{change}}$ = .173/ .455

$F$ for $R^2/R^2_{\text{change}}$ for $R^2_{\text{change}}$ = 6.20

$p$ for $F/F_{\text{change}}$ = .001

Note. *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

Results from the second model of the hierarchical multiple linear regression showed that the second regression model was significant, $F(1, 147) = 180.21, p < .001$, $R^2 = .455$. Based on the $R^2_{\text{change}}$ of .455, school counselor self-efficacy explained an additional 45.5% of the variance in the dependent variable of school counselor
multicultural counseling self-efficacy. An examination of the individual effects of each predictor on the dependent variable verified that school counselor self-efficacy was significantly predictive of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, $\beta = .71, p < .001$. Results from the second hierarchical multiple linear regression model furthermore showed that number of multicultural courses taken by the participant also significantly predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, $\beta = .16, p = .006$. The school counselor work experience variables of years of experience as a school counselor, and percent of time during the day working with immigrant students, and the school counselor training variable of number of multicultural workshops attended since undergraduate school were no longer significant predictors of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy within the second model.

Given that school counselor self-efficacy explained for an additional 45.5% of the variance of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, this finding suggests the unique variance of school counselor self-efficacy as a predictor of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, but also a shared or common variance with other variables, particularly those that were no longer significant (see Table 9). According to Field (2009) the total variance for a particular variable contains two components which include the variance “specific to that measure (unique variance)” and that which is “shared with other variables or measures (common variance)” (p. 637). In the case of those variables that were previously significant in the first model (i.e., years of experience as a school counselor, percent of time working with immigrant students, number of multicultural workshops), there appears to be a shared variance between
school counselor self-efficacy and the variables in predicting school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

Evidence of this is first suggested within the Spearman’s rho correlations as each of the variables positively correlated with both of the constructs (i.e., school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy) (see Table 5). In addition, within the first model of the hierarchical multiple linear regression, the variables serve as predictors of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (see Table 8). This suggests that school counselor self-efficacy may be accounting for much of the variance previously occupied by the significant variables within the first model given the established relationship between two. As a result, the findings of both

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings: Significant Predictors of School Counselor Self-Efficacy and School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy (N = 154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Accredited Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Multicultural Workshops Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Day Spent with Immigrant Students**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Variables significant in predicting school counselor multicultural self-efficacy within the first model of the hierarchical multiple linear regression prior to entering school counselor self-efficacy as an additional predictor variable (see Table 8). **Variable approaching significance.

models suggest that the following variables are predictors of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy: years of counseling experience, the percent of day spent with immigrant students, the number of multicultural workshops taken, school
counselor self-efficacy, and the number of multicultural courses taken by a counselor (see Table 9)

**Summary of Results: Research Questions**

In this study, three questions were posed. Question one inquired as to whether school counselor demographics, work experience, and training factors predicted school counselor self-efficacy. Question two inquired as to whether school counselor demographics, work experience, and training predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. The third and last question, inquired as to whether school counselor self-efficacy along with the afore-mentioned variables predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

To address the three research questions, a multiple linear regression and a hierarchical multiple linear regression analyses were conducted. The multiple linear regression analysis included the school counselor work experience and training variables found to be significant via Spearman’s rho correlations as predictors of school counselor self-efficacy. These variables were entered together in the first step of the multiple linear regression model, resulting in one regression model. The hierarchical multiple linear regression was conducted to address research questions two and three. In the first step of the model, school counselor work experience and training variables found to be significant via Spearman’s rho correlations were entered as predictors of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, followed by school counselor self-efficacy as a predictor of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy in the second step of the hierarchical multiple linear regression model.
Research question one. The first research question was “What is the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity), counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school where a counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops), and school counselor self-efficacy?”

Results from Spearman’s rho correlations showed that participant gender ($r_s[154] = .03, p = .726$), age ($r_s[154] = .10, p = .217$), and ethnicity ($r_s[154] = .06, p = .455$) were not significantly correlated with school counselor self-efficacy. In addition, results from the multiple linear regression showed that only one school counselor work experience variable, percent of time spent working with immigrant students, showed a trend toward significance, $\beta = .15, p = .055$. However, results from the multiple linear regression showed that two school counselor training variables, attending an accredited counseling graduate program ($\beta = -.19, p = .015$) and participating in numerous multicultural workshops since undergraduate school ($\beta = .17, p = .035$) significantly predicted increased school counselor self-efficacy.

Based on the lack of significance between counselor demographics, and school counselor work experience variables on school counselor self-efficacy, the null hypothesis was retained and the alternative hypothesis was rejected. Conversely, due to the significance of two of the three school counselor training individual predictors and the regression model, $F(4, 148) = 4.87, p = .001, R^2 = .116$, the null hypothesis was
rejected and the alternative hypothesis was retained with respect to school counselor training variables.

**Research question two.** The second research question was, “What is the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity), counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school where counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students), counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops), and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy?”

Results from Spearman’s rho correlations showed again that participant gender ($r_s[154] = -.06, p = .726$), age ($r_s[154] = .13, p = .101$), and ethnicity ($r_s[154] = .07, p = .405$) were not significantly correlated with school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. In addition, significance of individual results was determined by the second hierarchical multiple linear regression model. Results from the second model indicate that none of the school counselor work experience variables significantly predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. However, the second model showed that the number of multicultural courses taken by the participant significantly predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, $\beta = .16, p = .006$.

Based on the lack of significant results in the second model of the hierarchical multiple linear regression between counselor demographics and work experience on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the null hypothesis was retained
and the alternative hypothesis was rejected. In addition, the null hypothesis was retained and the alternative hypothesis rejected for the school counselor variables of attending an accredited counselor education graduate program and the number of multicultural workshops attended. However, based on the significant finding of the school counselor training variable of number of multicultural courses taken, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was retained for that school counselor training variable.

**Research question three.** Lastly, the third research question was, “What is the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, training, and school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors?”

Results from the second hierarchical multiple linear regression model showed that school counselor self-efficacy was significantly predictive of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, $F(1, 147) = 180.21, \beta = .71, p < .001, R^2 = .455$, as well as the number of multicultural courses taken by the participant, $\beta = .16, p = .006$ (as previously reported). Based on these findings, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis retained for research question three with regard to school counselor self-efficacy and the training variable of the number of multicultural courses taken. However, based on this second model, the null hypothesis was retained and the alternative hypothesis rejected for the variables of counselor demographics, work experience, and the training variables of attending an accredited counselor education graduate program and the number of multicultural workshops attended.
Chapter Five

Introduction

With the growing number of ethnically and culturally diverse students in our nation’s schools, school counselors will undoubtedly need multicultural counseling skills more than ever to address issues encountered in working with such populations (Holcomb-McCoy 2007, Hussar & Bailey, 2013, Lee, 2001). For school counselors, this ability to effectively serve ethnically and culturally diverse students is greatly dependent on her/his sense of counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Counselors who are efficacious, or have a greater sense of self-efficacy, are reported to have a distinct impact on student achievement, as well as various aspects of the school environment (Bodenhorn et al., 2010; Ernst, 2012; Sutton & Fall, 1995).

While counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy remain crucial factors in effectively serving all students, research on the constructs is limited within the school counseling literature in terms of the factors that influence the constructs, as well as inquiry focusing exclusively on urban school counselors. As a result, the purpose of this study was to examine the predictive relationship of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, as well as explore the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy and the afore-mentioned variables on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors.

Data for the study were obtained via online survey methods where a sample of 154 participants was obtained. Participants were urban school counselors throughout a
northeastern state that worked in various settings (i.e., public, private, and charter schools) and at all grade levels. Participants were asked to complete a 109-item survey that gathered information about the demographics of the counselor, school counselor self-efficacy, and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. The data were initially analyzed using a Spearman’s rho correlation, and then several multiple regression analyses for the hypothesis testing. In this final chapter, the findings of the analyses are discussed in relation to the proposed research questions. In addition, limitations of the study are provided, as well as implications for practice and suggestions for future research.

Discussion

School Counselor Self-Efficacy and School Counselor Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy

In evaluating school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, participant responses indicated that urban school counselors are highly self-efficacious when it came to general school counseling and multicultural school counseling tasks and activities. On average urban school counselors responded that they were “generally confident” in their ability to perform general school counseling tasks when assessed through the School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale where the mean score was $M = 4.29$ ($SD = 0.46$). On this scale, a higher score indicates greater counseling self-efficacy with 5.00 as the maximum score (see Appendix D). In addition, when asked about performing multicultural school counseling related tasks, on average urban school counselors responded similarly that they performed such activities “pretty
well” on the School Counselor Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES) with a mean score of $M = 5.68 \ (SD = 0.80)$. A higher score on this scale also indicates greater multicultural counseling efficacy where the maximum score is a 7.00 (see Appendix E). This efficaciousness is further evident as no counselor reported on both survey instruments low levels of self-efficacy with scores in the 1.00 to 2.00 range. Instead, all participant scores ranged between 3.00 to 5.00 and 3.00 to 7.00 on the SCSE and the SCMES, respectively.

These findings, specific to urban school counselors, support prior research (Crook, 2010), which found school counselors nationwide to be generally self-efficacious when it came to general school counseling and multicultural school counseling duties. Considering that urban school counselors are reportedly efficacious when it comes to performing general school counseling and multicultural school counseling tasks and activities, examining the factors that might influence the constructs was a major focus of this study.

**Counselor demographics.** In looking at the first and second research questions that inquired about the predictive relationship between counselor demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity) and school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy, the findings within the preliminary analyses revealed that demographic factors such as gender, age, or ethnicity did not correlate significantly with either construct. As a result, these factors were not included in the regression analyses because of the lack of significance between the variables and constructs.
Although research has been limited, the findings that gender, age, and ethnicity did not correlate with school counselor self-efficacy or school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy run counter to current thinking in regards to the influence of counselor personal attributes and school counselor self-efficacy. However, when previously studied, researchers had found mixed results when examining personal attributes such as gender, age, or ethnicity. For example, gender was found to have a significant influence on the self-efficacy of school counselors (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) but not when it came to master’s level students or the study of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). In addition, Pope-Davis et al. (1995) previously found no differences when it came to gender or age on scores of the Multicultural Counseling Inventory with counseling and clinical psychology students. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) suggest that a possibility for the significant findings with females and gender has to do with school counseling being a predominantly female profession where males lack the professional role models necessary to develop similar levels of self-efficacy. While this reasoning may be plausible given that a recent survey of national school counselors found women to outnumber men by more than three quarters (77%) (Bridgeland & Bruce, 2011), the findings of this study do not support such results even though it does also contain a larger female sample (78.6%) reflective of the national average.

Similarly, in examining the variable of ethnicity, although limited in the school counseling literature, I found no relationship between ethnicity and school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. While prior
research had shown ethnicity to be related to school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008), an argument can be made that the current inquiry into ethnicity and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy utilized a very unique sample when compared to these prior studies. Although the current study obtained a diverse sample in comparison to prior studies with 55% White/Caucasian and 45% non-White, the non-significant findings between ethnicity and school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy might suggest that additional factors such as counselor experience and training may have been a more significant influence on both of the constructs. For example, 80% of the present sample reported having more than six years of counseling experience, with 48.7% and 61.7% reported having taken three or more multicultural courses and multicultural workshops respectively. In addition, school counselors reported spending most of the day or all day with ethnic minority students (82%), lower SES students (64%), and part or half of the day with immigrant students (58%). As a result, the vast experience and training of this group of school counselors might have impacted their sense of general and multicultural counseling self-efficacy in a far greater way than their reported ethnicity. For this group of urban school counselors, the constant immersion in working with minority, lower SES, and immigrant students may have greatly contributed to their sense of general and multicultural counseling self-efficacy over ethnicity, which is reflected throughout the analyses.

**Work experience.** The first and second research questions also examined the predictive relationship between counselor work experience variables (i.e., type of school
where a counselor works, years of counseling experience, prior teaching experience, percentage of time working with minority, low socioeconomic, and immigrant students) and school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Findings of the preliminary analysis revealed that two of the work experience variables correlated with school counselor self-efficacy: years of counseling experience and the percent of day working with immigrant students. Similarly, these two variables also correlated with school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, with the addition of percent of day working with lower socioeconomic status students.

When further examining for the predictive value of these significant variables on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the first multiple linear regression analysis revealed that neither variable was significant in predicting school counselor self-efficacy, although the percent of day working with immigrant students did show a trend towards significance. In addition, when looking at school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the first model of the hierarchal multiple linear regression did show that years of counseling experience and the percent of day working with immigrant students significantly predicted the construct. However, when it was examined again within the second hierarchal multiple regression model with school counselor self-efficacy included as an additional variable, none of the work experience variables significantly predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

Based on the findings of the second hierarchical multiple linear regression model, none of the work experience variables significantly predicted either school counselor
self-efficacy or school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy within urban school counselors. These findings contradict prior research that found counseling experience (Chandler et al., 2011; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert et al., 1996) and teaching experience (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Cinotti, 2013) to have an influence on counselor self-efficacy. However, with the exception of Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) and Cinotti (2013), these prior studies focused on general counselor self-efficacy rather than school counselor self-efficacy, which focuses specifically on the duties of a school counselor. Furthermore, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) and Cinotti (2013) both utilized broader samples of school counselors which reported greater teaching experience amongst counselors than the current study sample where only 34.4% of respondents stated having had any pedagogical experience. In addition, prior researchers who studied school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (e.g., Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008), found significant findings with regard to work experience by again utilizing a broad sample of school counselors rather than a specific group such as urban school counselors.

The results found within this study may be unique to the constructs of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy in relation to an urban school counselor population. Given the greater concentration of minority and low-income students enrolled within urban schools (Bemak et al., 2005; Lee, 2005; National Center for Education Statistics, 2013), such diverse settings may provide early exposure to, and/or immersion experiences for urban school counselors that may not be the case in suburban or rural settings. For these counselors, this early
exposure and/or immersion experiences may rapidly lead to the development of multicultural competency necessary to work with racial/ethnic low income and immigrant students. Based on Bandura’s theory (1977, 1997), this exposure and/or immersion experiences may provide the enactive mastery experiences through performance exposure and performance desensitization necessary to increase self-efficacy. As a result, the years of experience in the field may not be as relevant to urban school counselors as to school counselors from other areas due to this early exposure and/or immersion with diverse cultures, leading to greater multicultural competence and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

**Training.** The first and second research questions also focused on the predictive relationship between counselor training variables (i.e., attended accredited counseling program, number of multicultural classes, number of multicultural workshops) and school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. The findings of the preliminary analysis revealed that two counselor training variables correlated with school counselor self-efficacy: attending an accredited counselor program (i.e., CACREP), and the number of multicultural workshops attended. In addition, the following two counselor training variables, the number of multicultural courses and workshops attended, significantly correlated with school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

When examining for the predictive value of these variables on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the findings were similar to that of the preliminary analysis. In the first multiple regression, the
variables of attending an accredited counselor program (i.e., CACREP) and the number of multicultural workshops significantly predicted school counselor self-efficacy. However, when looking at school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, initially only the number of multicultural workshops attended by a counselor significantly predicted the construct in the first hierarchal regression model. Yet, when examined again in the second model, only the variable of number of multicultural courses attended significantly predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.

In conclusion, only attending an accredited counselor program (i.e., CACREP) and the number of multicultural workshops taken by a counselor had a significant impact on school counselor self-efficacy. In addition, the number of multicultural courses attended also significantly predicted school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. These findings support prior research (Johnson et al., 1989; Larson et al., 1999; Melchert et al., 1996; Sipps et al., 1988) that found counselor training to impact counselor self-efficacy. However, prior research had also shown mixed findings when studying the impact of a counselor’s course work and attending a CACREP program. Tang et al. (2004) previously found that a counselor’s course work and attending a CACREP program did not produce any significant differences between groups when looking at counselor self-efficacy. The findings of the present study differs from that of Tang et al. (2004) which focused on counselor education students and counselor self-efficacy, while the present study focused specifically on practicing urban school counselors and the constructs of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor
multicultural counseling self-efficacy. As a result, such differences may account for the contrasting results with the Tang et al. (2004) study and the current analyses.

**School counselor self-efficacy.** Lastly, the third and final research question inquired about the predictive relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Unsurprisingly, the findings of the preliminary analyses revealed that school counselor self-efficacy significantly correlated with school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Moreover, when further examining the predictive value between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the results of the hierarchal multiple linear regression also found a significantly predictive relationship between the constructs. Such findings support previous research (albeit limited within the field), which had previously found a moderate to strong relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy (Crook, 2010). In addition, the findings support the importance of school counselor self-efficacy in predicting school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, particularly within urban school counselors.

In conclusion, the findings suggest that the following variables were predictors of school counselor self-efficacy: attending an accredited counselor education program, the number of multicultural workshops attended by a school counselor, and to some extent the percent of the day spent with immigrant students. In terms of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the variables of school counselor self-efficacy and the number of multicultural courses attended by a school counselor were significant
predictors of the construct of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. However, given that school counselor self-efficacy accounted for 45.5% of the variance when introduced as a predictor variable in the second model, this suggests a unique variance in predicting school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, but also a shared variance with other previously significant variables. In this case, the previously significant variables were: years of experience as a school counselor, percent of time working with immigrant students, and the number of multicultural workshops attended by a counselor. When introduced as a separate variable into the analyses, school counselor self-efficacy accounted for a great deal of the variance previously held by the above-mentioned variables. As a result, when taking into account both models, the findings suggest the following variables may be considered predictors of school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy: years of counseling experience, the percent of day spent with immigrant students, the number of multicultural workshops taken, school counselor self-efficacy, and the number of multicultural courses taken by a counselor (see Table 9).

Findings in Relation to Theoretical Framework

The guiding theoretical framework for this study was based on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1986, 1994, 1997, 2001) as seen through a multicultural counseling framework (Sue et al., 1992). The study focused specifically on perceived self-efficacy beliefs in relation to general school counseling and multicultural school counseling. Perceived self-efficacy within social cognitive theory is the belief in an individual’s capability to exercise control over one’s functioning and events within the
environment (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (1977, 1997) enactive mastery experiences are the most influential source for shaping these self-efficacy beliefs in addition to vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states. These mastery experiences utilize successful performance accomplishments through participant modeling, performance desensitization, performance exposure, and self-instructed performance (Bandura, 1977).

In terms of counseling, an individual’s counseling self-efficacy is the belief in their capabilities to effectively counsel a client (Larson & Daniels, 1998). When examined through a multicultural counseling framework, the focus shifts to counseling individuals of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Caucasian/European, and Native American or indigenous groups) (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999; Sue et al., 1992). For school counselors, multicultural self-efficacy is an important construct as it is the belief in one’s ability to perform tasks in relation to providing equity among students and meeting the needs of ethnically and culturally diverse students (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). This ability is crucial if urban school counselors are to effectively serve this population through advocacy, while also implementing the ASCA model within their schools (Field & Baker, 2004; Gysbers & Henderson, 2001).

When examining the findings of this study, the results support social cognitive theory by demonstrating the importance of enactive mastery experiences in shaping self-efficacy beliefs. Within the study, urban school counselors were highly efficacious when it came to general school counseling self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural
counseling self-efficacy. Certain variables were shown to have a significantly predictive relationship on both of the constructs. These variables included attending an accredited counselor education program (i.e., CACREP) and the number of multicultural workshops taken on school counselor self-efficacy; as well as the number of multicultural courses attended on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. Each of the variables appeared to provide for urban school counselors the opportunity to engage in enactive mastery experiences, which may have subsequently impacted their efficacy beliefs. For example, participants who attended an accredited counselor education program would have been required to complete extensive internship requirements. Through these internship requirements, counselor trainees would have been exposed to various modes of induction such as participant modeling, performance desensitization, or performance exposure that may have led to successful counseling performances. In addition, through these fieldwork experiences trainees may have had vicarious experiences with other counselors or supervisors in the field that could have potentially enhanced their efficacy beliefs.

Moreover, accredited counselor education programs have increased course requirements in comparison to other programs, which may have resulted in additional course work for participants, particularly in the areas of multicultural counseling. This is of particular interest given that within this study the amount of multicultural workshops and multicultural coursework significantly predicted general school counseling self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy respectively.
Having had additional multicultural coursework supports the multicultural counseling literature because it provides school counselors the opportunity to develop greater multicultural competency. According to Sue et al. (1992), the three distinct characteristics of a culturally competent counselor include being aware of one’s own values and biases, understanding the worldview of culturally different clients, and developing appropriate intervention strategies and techniques. Having had extensive multicultural coursework and workshop opportunities provides for school counselors additional knowledge in each of the three areas to develop greater multicultural competency, leading to increased multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In doing so, this may provide for school counselors improved general and multicultural counseling self-efficacy as found within this sample of urban school counselors.

To summarize, having attended an accredited counselor education program, as well as taking additional multicultural coursework and workshops may provide the opportunity to engage in the mastery experiences and vicarious experiences necessary for increased self-efficacy, as well as the development of greater multicultural competency. These findings support social cognitive theory by illustrating the importance of such variables on school counselor general self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, the findings provide support for the multicultural counseling literature by emphasizing the importance of continued and increased training in multicultural topics to develop greater multicultural competency and perceived self-efficacy. In attaining multicultural competency, school counselors will then be able to implement culturally appropriate interventions through the form of advocacy for students.
There were several limitations within the study. Therefore, caution should be taken when interpreting the results of the study. Many of these limitations had to do with the sample obtained for this inquiry. For example, participants within the sample were primarily female (78%) which may have influenced the analyses when it came to examining gender as a variable. However, this sample was comparable to other studies (Cinotti, 2013; Crook, 2010) that had measured gender and school counselor self-efficacy. In addition, the sample was equivalent to the U.S. school counselor population as a whole (Bridgeland & Bruce, 2011). Despite the similarities, the small male sample (21.4%) may have limited the ability for an accurate assessment of gender as a variable.

In addition, while the sample obtained was a very diverse sample (White/Caucasian - 55%; non-White – 45%) in comparison to the national average where three out of four school counselors identified as “White” (Bridgeland & Bruce, 2011), during the analysis the variables of race/ethnicity had to be grouped together because of the small number of diverse school counselors if analyzed separately. As a result, ethnicity had to be coded within the analysis as a dichotomous variable as either White/Caucasian or non-White. For the purposes of accurately measuring ethnicity, this study may have benefitted from a larger sample that might have allowed for each ethnic or racial group to be coded individually and analyzed separately to determine the relationship between each ethnic/racial group and school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy.
Furthermore, because of the predominance of public school counselors within the sample (89%), counselors who worked in private schools (7.1%) and in charter schools (3.3%) had to be precluded from the statistical analyses of the study. As a result, the sample was comprised solely of urban public school counselors. By having a more diverse sample of urban school counselors from distinct school settings, may have provided additional insight into the study of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy rather than just that of public school counselors.

Moreover, 48.7% of participants reported having taken 3 or more multicultural courses since undergraduate school. This high number in multicultural courses taken is unusual given that graduate programs typically require one multicultural course (particularly CACREP programs), while other programs may not require one at all. This finding suggests that there may have been some confusion by participants in distinguishing between taking a graduate-level multicultural course and taking a multicultural workshop when asked within the questionnaire. As a result, this lack of a precise definition for what constituted a "multicultural course" or a "multicultural workshop" may have prevented participants from responding accurately.

Lastly, the use of self-report measures may have presented additional limitations. Given that the study’s instrument was comprised of two self-report measures that measured school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, the potential for bias by participants can occur because of the “wish to give socially desirable responses, to present themselves in a more positive way” (Houser,
School counselors who participated in this study may have wanted to present themselves as being “competent” in their profession because of the growing emphasis on advocacy and cultural diversity within the field (Education Trust, 2009; Holcomb-McCoy, 2007; Ratts et al., 2007). In addition, participants may have wanted to answer the questions according to what they believed was expected since the focus of the study was to understand the factors predicting school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy in providing effective counseling services to multiculturally diverse students.

**Implications for Practice**

Given that attending an accredited school counselor education program and the number of multicultural workshops and multicultural courses taken influenced school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy respectively, the findings have certain implications for counselor educators, school districts, and urban school counselors alike. Moreover, the findings suggest the importance of multicultural training with urban school counselors, and school counselors as a whole.

For counselor educators, the findings suggest the importance of training standards and multicultural coursework in developing school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. According to the results, the standards and requirements provided by accrediting bodies such as CACREP, appear to offer students the necessary opportunities for developing the perceived sense of efficacy that will later support them as school counselors.
Today, school counseling is the most accredited CACREP counseling specialty in the U.S. with 224 programs, boasting 3,680 graduates, and 10,221 currently enrolled students (CACREP, 2013). Presently, students in accredited school counseling programs are required to complete a minimum of 48 semester credit hours or 72-quarter credit hours to earn a master’s degree (CACREP, 2009). In addition, students have to complete supervised fieldwork in the form of a 100-hour practicum and 600-hour internships, while being knowledgeable about eight common-core CACREP areas (Perusse, Goodnough, & Noel, 2001). Non-CACREP programs, on the other hand, do not have the same unified standards in their requirements or consistency in the number of hours and coursework required to complete their programs (Provost, 2009). While the point here is not necessarily to promote CACREP programs or debate its value as done previously (e.g., Schmidt, 1999; Smaby & D’Andrea, 1994), these findings do suggest that providing students with instructional opportunities that offer an increase in coursework and internship experiences regardless of program type, may lead to the development of greater school counselor self-efficacy.

In addition, the findings of my study suggest that an increase in multicultural coursework may promote greater school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy within counselors. While programs such as CACREP (2009) currently incorporate social and cultural diversity as part of its common core curricular experiences, the implication is to have multicultural issues embedded throughout a counseling program. In other words, rather than just offering multicultural topics as a part of a stand-alone course, instead making it an integral part of all coursework and internship experiences. This will allow
counselor trainees to learn how multicultural topics are an important aspect of all counseling coursework and how to begin to address these issues accordingly. In addition, to further enhance multicultural competency within these courses, experiential activities such as games can be used in adjunct to didactic methods to provide a more safe and meaningful way to explore a trainees’ cultural values and norms in developing their counseling style (Kim & Lyons, 2003). By increasing multicultural coursework and infusing it throughout a school counseling program, counselor trainees will be exposed to current issues and topics as it relates to all aspects within the student’s training. Furthermore, school counselors can learn about the ways to effect change throughout the various systemic levels in applying a multicultural approach to counseling but more specifically, becoming a school justice advocate within the field.

For school districts, the findings suggest the importance of urban school counselors attending multicultural workshops in developing school counselor self-efficacy. While a recent nationwide study reported that a majority of school counselors had achieved post baccalaureate degrees, when it came to post-masters degrees only 1% was reported for either public or private schools (Bridgeland & Bruce, 2011). Such findings suggest the importance of school districts continuing to provide educational opportunities through either workshops or in-service training to further a counselor’s development. Such workshops can include training on a host of issues related to multicultural topics or other related issues that will assist in furthering a counselor’s multicultural competency. In doing so, school counselors will be continually updated
with any advances in the field in better serving culturally diverse youth, while also increasing their sense of perceived self-efficacy in the process.

More specifically, when it comes to issues such as school choice which has been shown to negatively affect many minority and lower SES students within the inner city, urban school districts are urged to provide mandatory, additional training to school personnel, in particular to school counselors who in many ways are typically the only resource for parents and students (Sattin-Bajaj, 2014). These workshops could provide school counselors with information on how to better serve these students and parents in making such an important decision, but also present the research surrounding the policy and ways to improve it.

As previously noted, my current findings indicate that an increase in multicultural coursework and workshops are related to school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy. This suggests the importance of school counselors themselves seeking opportunities for continued growth and education. These opportunities can come in the form of advanced degree coursework or additional workshops or training outside of school that may provide any form of continued education in multicultural-related topics. For example, any type of continued education or growth opportunity (e.g., peer consultation, supervision, or immersion experiences) that enables counselors to become aware of their own assumptions, the worldview of culturally distinct people, or develop culturally specific intervention strategies and techniques, will foster greater multicultural counseling competency within counselors (Sue et al., 1992).
For school counselors, additional coursework or workshops can also provide training in applying culturally diverse intervention strategies and techniques such as: strengths-based counseling, empowerment-based counseling, or ethnic identity development (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). Through strengths-based counseling, counselors work with students in identifying certain character strengths in order to build upon and enact change within their lives (Park & Peterson, 2008; Wong, 2006). This approach has been noted for its effectiveness particularly with at-risk youth and culturally diverse students (Smith, 2006; Unger, 2006).

Another culturally appropriate approach is empowerment-based counseling. According to Holcomb-McCoy (2007) empowerment-based counseling is an alternative to traditional counseling approaches where counselors instead assist students-of-color and low-income students to achieve their goals through the use of advocacy and empowerment. Through advocacy, school counselors work in removing external and institutional barriers at the various systemic levels (Toporek et al. 2009), while empowering students to develop life strategies to meet their needs (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). This use of advocacy is not only an integral part of empowerment-based counseling, but also part of the role of a multiculturally competent school counselor and effective urban school counseling (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Field & Baker, 2004).

School counselors can assist in facilitating a student’s ethnic and racial identity development within schools. For ethnic minority and immigrant students, the importance of one’s ethnic identity cannot be overstated as the pressure to assimilate or give up one’s sense of identity can result in anger, depression or even in some cases violence (Phinney,
1990; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). Therefore, school counselors can work to make a student’s ethnic or racial identity development a priority by encouraging the exploration of one’s ethnic background, the use of ethnic exploration groups, or even examining school resources for cultural sensitivity and appropriateness (Holcomb-McCoy, 2007). By learning how to implement the approaches mentioned above, school counselors will be provided with the tools and strategies necessary for working with culturally diverse youth in becoming multicultural. In addition, these types of interventions and strategies provide for school counselors the opportunity for enactive mastery experiences that are central within Bandura’s theory in developing a greater sense of self-efficacy.

Lastly, while the focus of this study may have been urban school counselors, the findings and implications presented here may also be generalized to school counselors within suburban or rural areas. School counselors within these areas are also experiencing issues similar to those in urban areas given the increase in ethnic/racial minority and immigrant students throughout the U.S. (Humes, et al., 2011). This change in demographics is being reflected in suburban and rural areas with a 43% and 25% distribution of Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander students within public elementary and secondary schools respectively (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2013). As a result, these areas are undergoing an influx in immigrant students that will require school districts and school counselors alike to better serve these students. For school districts this will include preparing school counselors through workshops and in-service training and supervision to further enhance a school counselor’s multicultural
competency. Similarly, school counselors will need additional training to not only develop multicultural competency but also greater multicultural counseling self-efficacy in effectively serving this population.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

This study focused on the predictive relationship between counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy. In addition, the study examined the predictive value of school counselor self-efficacy on school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy within urban school counselors. Given that research in this area is limited, future studies can focus on distinct aspects not covered within this inquiry or that may have been unattainable because of the limitations mentioned above.

For example, due to the limitations based on coding of ethnicity within the analyses, future researchers can attempt to study the relationship between distinct ethnic/racial school counselors and the constructs. In doing so, ethnicity as a variable can be further examined as a predictor of school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy as it pertains to carrying out general and multicultural counseling tasks and activities.

In addition, future researchers could attempt to ascertain data from urban school counselors employed in private or charter schools. Exploring these factors may offer additional information about the influence of working in non-public school settings on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, as well as the type of immersion experiences obtained by school counselors.
within these distinct urban school settings. Moreover, while this study focused specifically on urban school counselors, further inquiry could address other unique populations of school counselors such as those in rural or suburban settings to compare levels of counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy to that of urban school counselors.

Given that years of counseling experience did not have a significant impact on school counselor general self-efficacy or multicultural counseling self-efficacy within the second model despite reporting high levels of self-efficacy, future inquiry can further explore the experiences of urban school counselors. In other words, by understanding the types of experiences and/or exposure in which urban school counselors are regularly immersed may provide additional insight as to why these counselors reported high levels of self-efficacy regardless of their years of experience as a counselor.

Lastly, this study did not include any inquiry into a counselor’s familiarity with the ASCA model or its use within the school counselor’s practice. This would be an important area of inquiry because the SCSE contained items based on the ACSA model and the national standards in developing the scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Given that this study and prior research (Crook, 2010) had found school counselors to be generally efficacious in their counseling practice, inquiry into whether counselors who did not implement the ASCA model would also achieve the same high levels of school counselor self-efficacy would be interesting to explore in determining other factors that may influence the construct.
Conclusion

In studying the predictive value of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy, training surpassed all the other variables in predicting greater efficacy in urban school counselors. In particular, attending an accredited counselor education program, and the more multicultural courses and multicultural workshops attended by counselors all had a predictive value on the efficacy of an urban school counselor. In addition, attaining school counselor self-efficacy appeared to predict school counselor multicultural counseling self-efficacy within urban school counselors.

The findings of my study strongly indicate for counselor educators, school districts, and school counselors alike, the importance of continued education in further developing a counselors’ sense of efficacy in serving multicultural youth. Furthermore, there is a clear relationship between the standards and requirements set by accredited programs such as CACREP and counselors’ perceived self-efficacy, in preparing future counselors for work in urban areas. In developing greater self-efficacy, school counselors will be better prepared to meet the every day challenges of a growing ethnically and racially diverse student body. More importantly, school counselors will have the efficacy necessary to provide more effective and responsive counseling services to all students.
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Appendix A

Initial Contact E-mail

NYSSCA encourages researchers in our field by helping them distribute surveys that gather information for their research. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey described below.

Bob Rotunda, NYSSCA Executive Director

Dear Professional School Counselor,

You are invited to participate in a study on school counselor general and multicultural self-efficacy. All urban school counselors within the state of New York are eligible to participate in this doctoral dissertation study by a student at Montclair State University.

This study hopes to gather information on the relationship between school counselor general and multicultural self-efficacy amongst urban school counselors and the impact that certain demographic factors may have on this relationship. As school counselors, especially those working within urban areas, the ability to provide multicultural counseling interventions has become an important part of the role of an urban school counselor. As a result, understanding the factors that may influence this ability to provide multicultural counseling services may offer a better understanding of how to deliver effective counseling services to diverse students.

If you take part in this study, you would complete a brief, anonymous online survey that should take you about 20-25 minutes to complete. All survey responses will remain anonymous and confidential. The study has received approval from the Montclair State University Institutional Review Board.

If you are an urban school counselor and interested in participating, please click on the following link:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/TRJBOPQ

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at gordillof1@mail.montclair.edu or my faculty sponsor and dissertation committee chair,
Dr. Leslie Kooyman at kooymanl@mail.montclair.edu.

Thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,

Franco Gordillo
Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education Ph.D. Program
Montclair State University

Dr. Leslie Kooyman
Faculty Sponsor
Montclair State University
Appendix B

Informed Consent

Dear School Counselor,

Below is the information you will need to know about the study on school counselor general and multicultural self-efficacy. Please take a few minutes to read the consent document below before clicking below. You can email me questions at any time, now or later.

Study's Title: The Relationship between Multicultural Counseling Self-Efficacy and Counselor Self-Efficacy Among Urban School Counselors as Influenced by Gender, Ethnicity, Work Experience, & Training.

Why is this study being done? The purpose of this study is to look at your perceptions of “self-efficacy” in examining the relationship between school counselor self-efficacy and school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. In this study, school counselor self-efficacy and multicultural self-efficacy are respectively described as the beliefs in your ability to perform the duties of a school counselor, as well as provide multicultural counseling to students within k-12 schools. Given the increase of minority students within urban areas, school counselor are very frequently asked to provide a variety of tasks that are relevant and specific to ethnically and culturally diverse students. This study hopes to gather information at to whether any relation exists and what these relations are among counseling self-perceptions and multicultural counseling self-perceptions in providing counseling interventions to the many ethnically and culturally diverse students within your school.

What will happen while you are in the study? If you choose to participate in this study you will be asked to complete a survey containing questions about yourself and your confidence regarding the many school counselor responsibilities and activities you perform daily. The survey will be taken online and can be completed in less than 25 minutes. Once you have completed it, you will not be asked to do anything else. You may stop at any time during the survey if you wish.

Time: This study will take about 20-25 minutes of your time.

Risks: Data will be collected using the Internet and we anticipate that your participation in this survey presents no greater risk than everyday use of the Internet. However, this survey does ask sensitive questions including your feelings about your confidence in performing many of the activities and responsibilities as a school counselor. You may feel uncomfortable answering questions about your confidence in your ability to perform certain tasks as a school counselor particularly if answering these questions at work. As a result, we advise that you do not use an employer issued device (laptop, smart phone,
etc.) to respond to this survey. Though we are taking precautions to protect your privacy, you should be aware that information sent through the Internet is neither private nor secure and could be read by a third party (i.e. your employer). No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third party.

**Benefits:** There are no direct benefits to you at this time. We hope you may benefit from this study in the future because the information may be used to improve counselor training in providing services to ethnically and culturally diverse students. In doing so, we hope to gather information that may serve to increase counselor self-efficacy when providing counseling services to such populations. Similarly, others may benefit from this study by providing information that may assist school counselors serving a multicultural population in other areas.

**Who will know that you are in this study?** No one will know your participation in this study unless you share this information. Again, we urge you to complete the survey outside of school. You will not be asked your name, school name, or any information that could be used to identify you. Once you submit your answers to the survey, they will be anonymous.

**Do you have to be in the study?** You do not have to be in this study. You are a volunteer! It is okay if you want to stop at any time and not be in the study. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Nothing will happen to you.

**Do you have any questions about this study?** If you have any questions regarding this study or what is expected of your voluntary participation, please feel free to contact Franco Gordillo at gordillof1@mail.montclair.edu or the faculty sponsor and dissertation committee chair, Dr. Leslie Kooyman at kooymanl@mail.montclair.edu.

**Do you have any questions about your rights as a research participant?** If you have any questions about your rights or problems with this survey, you may phone or email the Montclair State University Institutional Review Board Phone Chair, Dr. Katrina Bulkley, at 973-655-5189 or reviewboard@mail.montclair.edu.

**Future Studies:** The information you provide may also be used in future studies. You should only participate if you are comfortable with the information you share being used in the future.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read this form and decided that I will participate in the study described above. Its general purposes, the particulars of involvement, and possible risks and inconveniences have been explained to my satisfaction. I understand that I can stop at any time. By clicking below, you will be taken directly to the survey. Doing so will signify that you have read and understand this information and consent to participate. If this is true, you may begin the survey by clicking below.
Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If you are not sure of the answer to any of the items, you may approximate as best you can.

1. What is your gender?
   a. Female  
   b. Male  
   c. Other  

2. Age?
   a. 20-30  
   b. 31-40  
   c. 41-50  
   d. 51-60  
   e. 61 or over  

3. What best describes your race/ethnicity?
   a. African-American  
   b. Latino(a)/Hispanic  
   c. Asian/Pacific Islander  
   d. Caucasian  
   e. Native American/Alaskan Native  
   f. Other  

4. What percent of your day is spent working with racial/ethnic minority students in your school?
   a. None at all – 0%  
   b. Part of the day – 25%  
   c. Half of the day – 50%  
   d. Most of the day – 75%  
   e. All day – 100%  

5. What percent of your day is spent working with lower SES students in your school?
   f. None at all – 0%  
   g. Part of the day – 25%  
   h. Half of the day – 50%  
   i. Most of the day – 75%  
   j. All day – 100%  

6. What percent of your day is spent working with immigrant students in your school?
   k. None at all – 0%
1. Part of the day – 25%
   m. Half of the day – 50%
   n. Most of the day – 75%
   o. All day – 100%

7. What type of counselor preparation program did you attend?
   a. CACREP accredited
   b. nonCACREP program
   c. Not sure

8. Prior to becoming a counselor, did you work as a certified teacher?
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. If you answered Yes, how many years of experience do you have as a certified teacher?
   a. 1-2 years
   b. 3-4 years
   c. 4+ years

10. How many years of experience as a school counselor do you have? Please include the current year and years in all other school districts or at other levels in your current district.
    a. 1-3 years
    b. 3-6 years
    c. More than 6 years

11. How many multicultural counseling courses have you taken since undergraduate work (include ones currently attending)?
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 2-3
    d. 4-5
    e. More than 5

12. How many multicultural counseling workshops have you taken since undergraduate work (include ones currently attending)?
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 2-3
    d. 4-5
    e. More than 5
13. What is your current school level?
   a. Elementary
   b. Middle/Junior high
   c. High

14. What type of school do you currently work in?
   a. Public
   b. Private
   c. Charter
Appendix D

School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale
Developed by Nancy Bodenhorn, Ph.D., Virginia Tech, 2004

(Permission received from author)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of activities representing many school counselor responsibilities. Indicate your confidence in your current ability to perform each activity by selecting the appropriate answer next to each item. Please answer each item based on your current school, and based on how you feel now, not on your anticipated (or previous) ability or school(s). Remember, this is not a test and there are no right answers.

1. I can advocate for integration of student academic, career, and personal development into the mission of my school.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

2. I can recognize situations that impact (both negatively and positively) student learning and achievement.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

3. I can analyze data to identify patterns of achievement and behavior that contribute to school success.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

4. I can advocate for myself as a professional school counselor and articulate the purposes and goals of school counseling.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

5. I can develop measurable outcomes for a school counseling program which would demonstrate accountability.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

6. I can consult and collaborate with teachers, staff, administrators and parents to promote student success.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

7. I can establish rapport with a student for individual counseling.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

8. I can function successfully as a small group leader.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

9. I can effectively deliver suitable parts of the school counseling program through large group meetings such as in classrooms.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

10. I can conduct interventions with parents, guardians and families in order to resolve problems that impact students’ effectiveness and success.
11. I can teach students how to apply time and task management skills.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

12. I can foster understanding of the relationship between learning and work.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

13. I can offer appropriate explanations to students, parents and teachers of how learning
    styles affect school performance.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

14. I can deliver age-appropriate programs through which students acquire the skills
    needed to investigate the world of work.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

15. I can implement a program which enables all students to make informed career
    decisions.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident
16. I can teach students to apply problem-solving skills toward their academic, personal and career success.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

17. I can evaluate commercially prepared materials designed for school counseling to establish their relevance to my school population.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

18. I can model and teach conflict resolution skills.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

19. I can ensure a safe environment for all students in my school.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

20. I can change situations in which an individual or group treats others in a disrespectful or harassing manner.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident
21. I can teach students to use effective communication skills with peers, faculty, employers, family, etc.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

22. I can follow ethical and legal obligations designed for school counselors.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

23. I can guide students in techniques to cope with peer pressure.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

24. I can adjust my communication style appropriately to the age and developmental levels of various students.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

25. I can incorporate students’ developmental stages in establishing and conducting the school counseling program.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident
26. I can find some way of connecting and communicating with any student in my school.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

27. I can teach, develop and/or support students’ coping mechanisms for dealing with crises in their lives – e.g., peer suicide, parent’s death, abuse, etc.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

28. I can counsel effectively with students and families from different social/economic statuses.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

29. I can understand the viewpoints and experiences of students and parents who are from a different cultural background than myself.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

30. I can help teachers improve their effectiveness with students.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

31. I can discuss issues of sexuality and sexual orientation in an age appropriate manner with students.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

32. I can speak in front of large groups such as faculty or parent meetings.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

33. I can use technology designed to support student successes and progress through the educational process.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

34. I can communicate in writing with staff, parents, and the external community.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

35. I can help students identify and attain attitudes, behaviors, and skills which lead to successful learning.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

36. I can select and implement applicable strategies to assess school-wide issues.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

37. I can promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community to enhance a positive school climate.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
38. I can develop school improvement plans based on interpreting school-wide assessment results.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

39. I can identify aptitude, achievement, interest, values, and personality appraisal resources appropriate for specified situations and populations.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

40. I can implement a preventive approach to student problems.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

41. I can lead school-wide initiatives which focus on ensuring a positive learning environment.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident

42. I can consult with external community agencies which provide support services for our students.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident
43. I can provide resources and guidance to the school population in times of crisis.
   1- not confident
   2- slightly confident
   3- moderately confident
   4- generally confident
   5- highly confident
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School Counselor Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES)
Developed by Cheryl Holcomb-McCoy, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University

(Permission received from author)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following questions are designed to assess your ability to do the following tasks related to multicultural school counseling. Please rate how well you can do the things described below by selecting the appropriate number.

1. I can challenge others’ racist and/or prejudiced beliefs and behaviors.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

2. I can discuss the relationship between student resistance and racism.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

3. I can assess my own racial/ethnic identity development in order to enhance my counseling.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

4. I can discuss how interaction patterns (student-to- student, student-to-faculty) might influence ethnic minority students’ perceptions of the school community.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
SCHOOL COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY AND MULTICULTURAL SELF-EFFICACY

5. I can discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of students.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

6. I can use data to advocate for students.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

7. I can develop culturally sensitive interventions that promote post secondary planning for minority students.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

8. I can identify when a counseling approach is culturally inappropriate for a specific student.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well
9. I can develop a close, personal relationship with someone of another race.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

10. I can verbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students.
    1 - not well at all
    2
    3 - not too well
    4
    5 - pretty well
    6
    7 - very well

11. I can discuss how culture influences parents’ discipline and parenting practices.
    1 - not well at all
    2
    3 - not too well
    4
    5 - pretty well
    6
    7 - very well

12. I can evaluate assessment instruments for bias against culturally diverse students.
    1 - not well at all
    2
    3 - not too well
    4
    5 - pretty well
    6
    7 - very well

13. I can identify when my helping style is inappropriate for a culturally different student.
    1 - not well at all
    2
    3 - not too well
    4
    5 - pretty well
    6
    7 - very well
14. I can give examples of how stereotypical beliefs about culturally different persons impact the counseling process.
   1- not well at all  
   2  
   3- not too well  
   4  
   5- pretty well  
   6  
   7- very well  

15. I can nonverbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students.
   1- not well at all  
   2  
   3- not too well  
   4  
   5- pretty well  
   6  
   7- very well  

16. I can analyze and present data that highlights inequities in course enrollment patterns and post secondary decisions among student groups.
   1- not well at all  
   2  
   3- not too well  
   4  
   5- pretty well  
   6  
   7- very well  

17. I can discuss the influence of self-efficacy on ethnic minority students’ achievement.
   1- not well at all  
   2  
   3- not too well  
   4  
   5- pretty well  
   6  
   7- very well  

18. When counseling, I can address societal issues that affect the development of ethnic minority students.
   1- not well at all  
   2  
   3- not too well  
   4
19. I can work with community leaders and other community members to assist with student (and family) concerns.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

20. I can use culturally appropriate counseling interventions.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

21. I can discuss the influence of racism on the counseling process.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

22. I can discuss how school-family-community partnerships are linked to student achievement.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well
23. I can assess how my speech and tone influence my relationship with culturally different students.
    1- not well at all
    2
    3- not too well
    4
    5- pretty well
    6
    7- very well

24. I can discuss how school-family-community partnerships influence minority student achievement.
    1- not well at all
    2
    3- not too well
    4
    5- pretty well
    6
    7- very well

25. I can identify when the race and/or culture of a student is a problem for a teacher.
    1- not well at all
    2
    3- not too well
    4
    5- pretty well
    6
    7- very well

26. I can recognize when my beliefs and values are interfering with providing the best services to my students.
    1- not well at all
    2
    3- not too well
    4
    5- pretty well
    6
    7- very well

27. I can identify when specific cultural beliefs influence students’ response to counseling.
    1- not well at all
    2
    3- not too well
28. I can identify whether or not the assessment process is culturally sensitive.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

29. I can live comfortably with culturally diverse people.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

30. I can explain test information with culturally diverse parents.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

31. I can discuss how environmental factors such as poverty can influence the academic
    achievement of students.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well
32. I can help students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

33. I can identify when my helping style is appropriate for a culturally different student.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

34. I can discuss what it means to take an “activist” approach to counseling.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

35. I can develop friendships with people from other ethnic groups.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well
36. I can challenge my colleagues when they discriminate against students.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

37. When implementing small group counseling, I can challenge students’ biased and prejudiced beliefs.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

38. I can develop interventions that are focused on ‘systemic change’ rather than ‘individual student change.’
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

39. I can identify racist and/or biased practices in schools.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
   6
   7- very well

40. I can integrate family and religious issues in the career counseling process.
   1- not well at all
   2
   3- not too well
   4
   5- pretty well
41. I can identify when my own biases negatively influence my services to students.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

42. I can identify when my helping style is inappropriate for a culturally different parent or guardian.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

43. I can define and discuss racism.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

44. I can advocate for fair testing and the appropriate use of testing of children from diverse backgrounds.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

45. I can discuss how assessment can lead to inequitable opportunities for students.
   1 - not well at all
   2
3- not too well
4
5- pretty well
6
7- very well

46. I can identify when a teacher’s cultural background is influencing his/her perceptions of students.
1- not well at all
2
3- not too well
4
5- pretty well
6
7- very well

47. I can identify unfair policies that discriminate against students of culturally different backgrounds.
1- not well at all
2
3- not too well
4
5- pretty well
6
7- very well

48. I can adjust my helping style when it is inappropriate for a culturally different student.
1- not well at all
2
3- not too well
4
5- pretty well
6
7- very well
49. I can utilize career assessment instruments that are sensitive to student’s cultural differences.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

50. I can develop positive relationships with parents who are culturally different.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

51. I can identify when to use data as an advocacy tool.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well

52. I can use culturally appropriate instruments when I assess students.
   1 - not well at all
   2
   3 - not too well
   4
   5 - pretty well
   6
   7 - very well
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