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Abstract

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG SCHOOL COUNSELORS’ MULTICULTURAL SELF-EFFICACY AND LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

Tracey R. Albert, Ph.D.

George Mason University, 2016

Dissertation Director: Dr. Regine Talleyrand

This quantitative research study aimed to examine the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. Specifically, this study attempted to determine if school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., knowledge of multicultural concepts, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice) predicted their leadership practices. This study included a nationwide sample of 212 school counselors. Findings from this study revealed positive, statistically significant correlations between school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. Findings also revealed that school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy accounted for over a third of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices, suggesting that school counselors’ multicultural capabilities are strongly related to their leadership practices. Results from this study could assist counselor educators and researchers in identifying multicultural factors that might impact school counselors’ effectiveness as leaders in the diverse contexts of today’s schools.
Chapter One

Introduction

Achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps persist in the United States between students of color and White students and between students from low income families and students from middle- and upper-income families (Chen-Hayes & Gertch, 2015). For instance, only 18 percent of Native American fourth-graders are proficient or advanced in reading, based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as compared with over 40 percent of White fourth graders (Education Trust, 2014). Similarly, NAEP scores indicate that White eighth graders are over twice as likely to be proficient or advanced in math compared to Latino students (Education Trust, 2014).

Many high achieving students of color and students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, leave high school with lower AP exam rates, lower SAT/ACT scores, and lower GPAs than their high achieving white and more advantaged peers (Bromberg, & Theokas, 2014). For example; African American students comprise 14.7% of the national student population yet they make up only 9% of the AP student population, compared to White students that comprise 57.1% of AP exam takers (Collegeboard, 2012).

After high school, these achievement gaps continue. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (Kena et al., 2015), between 1990 and 2013, the size of
the White-Black gap and White-Hispanic gap in levels of educational attainment has widened significantly. In 2013, the percentage of 25 to 29 year olds that attained a bachelor’s or higher degree was highest for whites at 40 percent compared to only 20 percent for Blacks and 16 percent for Hispanics (Kena et al., 2015).

Research has shown that these academic inequities are a result of historical, sociopolitical, sociocultural, and institutional factors rather than students’ capabilities (Bemak, 2005; Bemak & Chung, 2008; Bemak, Chung, & Sirosky-Sabado, 2005). Racial/ethnic minority students have suffered greatly due to racism and, as a result, have often been systematically overrepresented in at-risk programs and intellectual and learning disabilities categories, and systematically underrepresented in advanced and gifted academic programs (Huber, Hynds, Skelton, Papacek, Gonzalez, & Lacy, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Plucker, Burroughs, & Song, 2010).

School counselor educators have written extensively on the critical roles of advocacy and leadership by school counselors to promote college and career readiness and increase academic achievement, particularly for historically marginalized, racial/ethnic minority students (Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Chen-Hayes, Ockerman, & Mason, 2013; Janson, 2009; Ratts, DeKruijf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007). Given persistent achievement gaps that disproportionately impact students of color, the school counseling profession has described leadership as one of the most critical skills of school counselors in the 21st century (ASCA, 2003, 2005, 2010, 2012).

School counselor leadership is needed to address the rising ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity in U.S. schools and ensure that all students have equitable access to a
high-quality education. Between 2002 and 2012, the number of White students enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. decreased from 28.6 million to 25.4 million and their percentage of enrollment decreased from 59 to 51 percent (NCES, 2015). In contrast, the number of Hispanic students enrolled during this same time period increased from 8.6 million to 12.1 million, and their percentage of enrollment increased from 18 to 24 percent (NCES, 2015). Further, by fall 2024 racial/ethnic minority students are expected to become the “majority” within U.S. schools with population projections for White students at 46%, Hispanic students at 29%, Black students at 15%, Asian/Pacific Islander students at 6%, Multiracial students at 4%, and American Indian/Alaska Native students at 1% (NCES, 2015).

As diversity within the U.S. educational system continues to grow rapidly, school counselors’ leadership skills in the realm of multiculturalism have become increasingly important (Evans, Zambrano, Cook, Moyer, & Duffey, 2011; Lee, 2001). The American School Counselor Association (ASCA), the national organization that provides standards for the profession of school counseling; has charged school counselors with being leaders in schools that advocate for students regarding equity and access, that help students and their families navigate systems of oppression and injustice, and that act as agents of change within their school communities (ASCA, 2010).

Numerous researchers have highlighted that school counselor leadership is needed to promote the academic success of culturally diverse students that have been historically marginalized and underserved (e.g., Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Chen-Hayes, Ockerman, & Mason, 2013; Janson, Stone, & Clark, 2009; Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007).
However; despite the need for school counselor leadership cited in literature, little is known about school counselors’ leadership practices (Mason & McMahon, 2009), and research that explores school counselors’ leadership practices in relation to any multicultural considerations is relatively non-existent. This is a serious issue.

Additional research is needed to provide insight on school counselors’ leadership practices, particularly exploring multicultural factors that might impact school counselors’ effectiveness as leaders. Literature from within the field of educational leadership supports that educational leaders must acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to create multiculturally and socially just school communities (e.g., Barakat, Witte, & Witte, 2013; Gerstl-Pepin & Aiken, 2012; Horsford, Grosland, & Gunn, 2011). Scholars have noted that achievement gaps might be, in part, perpetuated by educational leaders lack of multicultural knowledge and skills (Huber et al., 2012; Sirin, Rogers-Sirin, & Collins, 2010). It seems imperative to examine school counselors’ leadership practices while simultaneously gaining insight on their multicultural capabilities, to ensure that school counselors are adequately equipped to promote the academic achievement and personal/social success of ethnically and culturally diverse students.

As a construct, multicultural self-efficacy reflects professional 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 ethnically and culturally diverse needs of K-12 students (Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008). According to Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008), professional school counselors with higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy are more likely to believe that they have the capacity
to understand multicultural and diversity concepts, are more likely to identify student inequities, are more likely to challenge barriers to academic achievement, and are more likely to be satisfied with their work with culturally diverse students and families.

Extending the limited body of school counseling leadership literature to include an examination of multicultural self-efficacy could provide insight regarding what is lacking in school counselors’ development or effectiveness as leaders. Thus, this study will examine the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. The findings from this study could help us understand if how school counselors internalize how competent they believe they are to work with diverse youth impacts their ability to engage in leadership practices.

Further, this study will address a significant void in counseling literature through conducting a quantitative study of school counseling leadership that explores the relationship between school counselors’ leadership practices and a multicultural construct (i.e., multicultural self-efficacy). There has not been a study in school counseling, to date, that has explored the relationships among these constructs. The results from this study have potential implications for enhancing future leadership development training of practicing school counselors and counselors in training.

**Background.** The current discourse on school counselor leadership can be traced to the “Transforming School Counseling Initiative [TSCI]” from the late 1990’s (Education Trust, 1996). The TSCI was a national initiative that articulated a “new vision” of school counseling that depicted school counselors taking on leadership roles within schools and working systemically to help all students succeed (McMahon, Mason,
The emphasis of this reform effort was to provide school counselors with the knowledge and skills that they needed in order to close achievement gaps between underserved populations of students (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008).

A national conversation on school counseling emerged calling for school counselors to use leadership skills in the design, implementation, and evaluation of comprehensive school counseling programs that advocated for better outcomes for all students (Martin, 2002). The goal of the TSCI was ultimately to ensure that school counselors served as leaders as well as effective team members working with teachers, administrators, and other school personnel to make sure that each student succeeded (Education Trust, 1996). Within this vision existed a concentrated effort on closing the achievement gap between poor and minority children and those who are more advantaged, through targeted intervention.

The “new vision” of school counseling was further articulated by The American School Counseling Association (ASCA), through the creation of the ASCA National Model (2003) which emphasized four essential skills for the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program: leadership, advocacy, collaboration, and systemic change. Since the TSCI, ASCA has published seminal works to support the emerging role of school counselors as educational leaders, such as the Ethical Guidelines for School Counselors (ASCA, 2010), the National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), and additional versions of the ASCA National Model (2005, 2012).
After the initial publication of the ASCA National Model in 2003, the model was adopted by many states and school districts as a framework for a comprehensive school counseling program and utilized for training within counselor education programs (ASCA, 2012). The ASCA National Model (2012) revised previous versions of the model through expanding sections describing the model’s core themes of leadership, collaboration, advocacy, and systemic change further emphasizing the school counseling profession’s stance on the importance of school counselors serving as leaders and change agents in schools.

ASCA’s ethical standards (2010), serve as the legal & ethical foundation of the school counseling profession, and asserts that professional school counselors should act as leaders in schools to create equity based school counseling programs that help close any achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps that deny all students the chance to pursue their educational goals. ASCA’s ethical standards (2010) are currently being revised and proposed draft standards highlight the importance of leadership for the school counseling profession, noting in the preamble that school counselors are advocates, leaders, collaborators and consultants who create systemic change by providing equitable educational access and success and by connecting their school counseling programs to the district’s mission and improvement plans (ASCA, 2016).

In addition to articulating the overall importance of school counselors serving as leaders, ASCA (2012) notes that as educational leaders, school counselors must develop their cultural proficiency and acknowledge how prejudice, power, and various forms of oppression affect students. In order to accomplish this, ASCA’s standards (2010) assert
the importance of school counselors’ monitoring and expanding their multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills.

**Statement of the Problem**

There is a national call for school counselor leadership to reverse institutional barriers that lead to achievement and opportunity gaps, increase multicultural awareness for school district personnel, address diversity issues that impede educational reform efforts, and improve the educational experiences of traditionally marginalized students (ASCA, 2012; Dollarhide, 2003; Ndura et al., 2003; Ohrt et al., 2009). However, the problem is that (despite these national calls for leadership) a large number of school counselors are still not serving as leaders within their schools and research to identify factors that might enhance school counselors’ leadership capabilities is limited (House & Sears, 2002; Janson et al., 2009; Mason & McMahon, 2009).

This is concerning given the complex multicultural issues that are inherent in today’s schools such as achievement gaps, demographic divides, and racial disparities. These multicultural challenges require effective leadership (Agost et al., 2013; Horsford, 2010; Horsford, Grosland, & Gunn, 2011; Valencia, & Solorzano, 1997). For instance, while the student population in the U.S. continues to grow increasingly diverse, more than 80% of teachers and educational administrators, and over 70 percent of counselors remain White (Bitterman, Goldring, & Gray, 2013; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). The widening demographic divide, and cultural mismatch, between students and school staff present unique challenges for leadership in schools that require multicultural skills.
Within the diverse contexts of today’s schools, school counselors have tremendous challenges presented to them that require multiculturalism to be embedded within their leadership practices (Evans et al., 2011). The rich cultural diversity of students and families represented in today’s public school system requires school leaders who possess not only the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effectively educate and advocate for diverse students but also the will to use them (Horsford et al., 2011). As school leaders, school counselors must have the capacity and motivation to lead culturally diverse school communities and address complex issues of diversity (Horsford et al., 2011). In order for school counselors to effectively address the complex issues of diversity; they must have the multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills to lead this challenging work.

Despite an increased emphasis on cultural competence within the counseling profession; many counselors enter the field without adequate multicultural skills suggesting that school counselors may not have the multicultural capabilities needed to serve as effective leaders in schools (Arredondo, 2008). Researchers have noted various internal and external challenges that impede school counselors’ leadership efforts such as role inconsistencies, lack of administrative support, fear of failure and risk taking, and lack of leadership training (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Janson et.al, 2009; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). Further; research has noted that time constraints and the assignment of “non-counseling” duties pose significant challenges to school counselors assuming leadership roles in schools (McLendon, 2015). However, research has yet to
explore if school counselors’ lack of multicultural skills might also pose significant barriers to their leadership efforts.

Research is needed to explore this further. Currently, there is only a limited body of literature in school counseling leadership (Clemens et al., 2009; Janson, 2009; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010) and studies that explore any multicultural considerations related to school counselor leadership are relatively non-existent. Although literature asserts that leadership and advocacy are intertwined; such that school counselors must develop leadership skills to effectively advocate for culturally diverse students in order to promote equity and systemic change (ASCA, 2012; Chen-Hayes et al., 2013; Hartline & Cobia, 2012; Janson, 2009), leadership has received far less attention than advocacy in counseling literature (Mason & McMahon, 2009).

Additional research is needed to understand how to better train and support school counselors in employing leadership practices, particularly since leadership within the diverse contexts inherent in today’s schools can be challenging and school counselors simultaneously possessing leadership and multicultural skills could lead to improved outcomes and decreased achievement gaps for students (Horsford et al., 2011; McLendon, 2015). The lack of school counselor leadership research related to multiculturalism has significant implications for identifying the leadership development needs of school counselors relevant to the diverse contexts of today’s schools. Without adequate training in leadership that attends to multicultural issues, school counselors will be ill equipped to respond to the needs of culturally diverse students and their families (Evans et al., 2011).
Significance of the Problem

As noted by Mason and McMahon (2009), greater attention to leadership is critical, given that leadership is considered the foundation of all other essential skills in the counseling profession (i.e., advocacy, collaboration, and promoting systemic change). For example, acting as an advocate; using data to identify the needs of marginalized or underserved student groups; and collaborating with stakeholders and other educators to remove barriers to student success, all fall within the realm of leadership (Mason, McMahon & Paisley, 2009).

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has called for school counselors to be leaders that take action to ensure students of culturally diverse backgrounds have access to appropriate services and opportunities which promote the maximum development of the individual (ASCA, 2012). However, how can school counselors take such actions (to ensure that the needs of culturally diverse student populations are being addressed) without having the multicultural capabilities to engage in this work? What type of multicultural skills could enhance school counselors’ effectiveness as leaders?

In order to answer these questions, additional research is needed regarding the relationship between school counselors’ leadership practices and multiculturalism. Counselor education programs could benefit from research to enhance leadership development training given that a key role of these preparation programs is to help school counseling students develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to act as educational leaders (ASCA, 2012). A lack of research on factors (and in particular
multicultural factors) that might impact school counselors’ leadership practices, makes it challenging for counselor education programs to provide adequate leadership development training reflective of the multicultural skills that counselors will need to lead in today’s schools.

**Purpose of the Study**

Thus, the purpose of this study is to understand the relationship among school counselors’ leadership practices and multiculturalism. Specifically, this study will attempt to determine if school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., knowledge of multicultural concepts, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice) predicts their leadership practices. That is, if how confident school counselors believe they are in meeting the needs of ethnically and culturally diverse students impacts their engagement in leadership practices in schools. An examination of the relationship between the constructs in this study can provide insight regarding how school counselors’ beliefs in their own multicultural capabilities might impact their ability to engage in leadership practices in schools, which has implications for identifying the leadership development needs of practicing school counselors and counselors in training.

This study will extend the limited body of school counseling leadership research (Clemens et al., 2009; Janson, 2009; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010) to include an examination of a multicultural construct (i.e., multicultural self-efficacy). Results from this study can have significant implications for counselor
education as well as inform the discourse surrounding the professional development needs of practicing school counselors, specifically as it relates to leadership. Given that there has not been a study to date that has examined the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices, and there is a lack of empirical school counseling research on each of these constructs respectively; this study will address a significant void in research and provide a unique contribution to the counseling literature base.

**Theoretical Framework**

Informed by multiculturalism; the current study utilizes Bandura’s (1977, 1982, 1986) self-efficacy theory. As noted by Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008); self-efficacy theory can be used as a framework for understanding professional school counselors’ motivation and capabilities to perform tasks that are relevant and specific to promoting equity for diverse student populations. As an increasing number of students from culturally diverse backgrounds participate in the U.S. educational system; greater insight regarding school counselors’ beliefs in their ability to apply appropriate techniques and interventions to meet the needs of these culturally diverse students is needed (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992).

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, 1977). Self-efficacy theory is based on the premise that how people judge their own capabilities affects their motivation and behavior (Bandura, 1977). Individuals who perceive themselves as highly efficacious activate sufficient effort that, if well executed, produces
successful outcomes, whereas those who perceive low self-efficacy are likely to cease their efforts prematurely and fail on the task (Bandura, 1986).

As a construct, self-efficacy provides insight into the significance of examining school counselors’ beliefs in their own capabilities and how stronger, perceived self-efficacy can positively impact counselor performance and motivation to address challenging issues (Bandura, 1997; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Larson & Daniels, 1998). The challenging issues of diversity inherent in today’s schools (i.e., achievement gaps, demographic divides, and racial disparities) make it imperative to examine school counselors’ self-efficacy in relation to multiculturalism.

In addition to the complexity of the multicultural issues themselves, researchers have noted that leadership on behalf of multicultural issues can be very challenging and counselors often encounter systemic resistance (Arredondo, 2008; Evans et al., 2011; Wines, 2013). For instance, Bemak and Chung (2008) noted that there are personal, professional, and political challenges faced by school counselors who seek to become leaders and advocates for diverse student populations.

Consistent with self-efficacy theory, expectations of personal efficacy determine whether an individual’s coping behavior will be initiated, how much task-related effort will be expended, and how long that effort will be sustained despite disconfirming evidence (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy theory provides a framework to understand how school counselors with stronger self-efficacy may possess more motivation and commitment to successfully persist through challenges that may arise as a result of attempting to provide culturally responsive services for racially and culturally diverse
students, and attempting to advocate for programs and initiatives to address systemic inequities and achievement gaps in schools (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). Examining school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy could be useful in identifying key multicultural skills (related to providing culturally responsive services and advocacy) that might support school counselors’ capacities to serve as leaders in schools.

**Definitions**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms will be defined: leadership, leadership practices, multicultural competence, multicultural self-efficacy, self-efficacy, and transformational leadership.

**Leadership.** Leadership is defined as the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations and involves a learnable set of practices accessible to anyone (Kouzes & Posner, 2003).

**Leadership practices.** For this study, leadership practices are measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), which is a self-report instrument that measures the following exemplary practices of leadership outlined by Kouzes and Posner (2012): model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart.

**Multicultural competence.** Multicultural competence is a counselor’s attitudes/beliefs, knowledge, awareness, and skills in working with culturally diverse individuals (Sue et al., 1992).

**Multicultural self-efficacy.** The term multi-cultural self-efficacy is defined as professional 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 ethnically and culturally diverse needs of K-12 students (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

**Self-efficacy.** 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, 1977). Self-efficacy theory (Bandura 1977, 1982, 1986) assumes that how people judge their own capabilities affects their motivation and behavior.

**Transformational leadership.** Transformational leadership theory, first introduced by James Burns (1978), assumes that people who exhibit particular leadership behaviors can inspire others to higher levels of performance, dedication, motivation, and morality.
Chapter Two

Review of Literature

The reality of the current state of education in the United States can be described by the following: (a) only about 69 percent of Native American high school students graduate from high school on time, compared with over 85 percent of white students; (b) among Latino students with high potential for success in AP math, only 30 percent enroll in any such course; and (c) African American students are highly likely to be disciplined in ways that take them out of the classroom: making up only 16 percent of the total U.S. student population, yet 33 percent of students suspended once, 42 percent of students suspended more than once, and 34 percent of students expelled (Education Trust, 2014).

Professional school counselors are needed to act as leaders in schools to create equity based school counseling programs that help close any achievement, opportunity, and attainment gaps that deny all students the chance to pursue their educational goals (ASCA, 2010). Arredondo (2008) argued that counselors’ leadership skills and multicultural competency are intertwined by describing how culturally skilled counselors can recognize and discuss examples in which racism or bias might be imbedded in an institution and then, take action.

Throughout employing multicultural and leadership skills; school counselors can challenge teachers who have low expectations for students of color and administrators who promote policies and practices that perpetuate school systems that maintain inequities for minority students (Bemak & Chung, 2008). In a longitudinal study
following 8,400 10th grade students; researchers found African-American students were disproportionately subject to low teacher expectations (Gershenson, Holt, & Papageorge, 2016). It is clear that school counselor leadership is needed to uncover and challenge any systemic issues (such as racial biases) that might contribute to the academic underachievement of students of color. After uncovering systemic inequalities, school counselors can inspire and empower other stakeholders from within schools and communities to address the issues undermining the achievement of racial/ethnic minority students (ASCA, 2012; Chen-Hayes & Getch, 2015; Galassi & Akos, 2004).

School counselors possessing both leadership and multicultural skills could significantly impact student outcomes and decrease achievement gaps (McLendon, 2015). However, empirical research regarding the relationship between school counselors’ leadership and multiculturalism is relatively non-existent. Given this void in research; examining studies related to self-efficacy, and specifically multicultural self-efficacy, can serve as a starting point to build insight regarding motivational and multicultural factors that might impact school counselors’ capabilities to employ leadership practices in schools.

A review of literature on school counselor leadership, multicultural self-efficacy (and their related theories and constructs) suggests that exploring the relationships between these constructs could address the void in research, through building understanding of how school counselors’ beliefs in their own multicultural capabilities might impact their leadership practices. In Chapter 2, a review of the literature and the issues are provided.
Self-Efficacy Theory

Self-efficacy theory can be used as a basis for understanding professional school counselors’ motivation and capabilities to perform tasks that are relevant and specific to promoting equity for diverse student populations (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). 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. Further, self-efficacy refers to the beliefs in one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Bandura’s (1977, 1982, 1986) self-efficacy theory is used as a framework for researching behavioral tasks due to its predictive power in a variety of applications (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). In a meta-analysis of 114 empirical self-efficacy studies, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) found self-efficacy to be positively and strongly related to work related performance. The results of this study were consistent with two decades of empirical research that have generated a positive relationship between self-efficacy and different motivational and behavioral outcomes in clinical, educational, and organizational settings (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998).

Self-efficacy theory is based on the premise that how people judge their own capabilities affects their motivation and behavior (Bandura, 1977). The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goals people set for themselves and the firmer is their commitment to them (Bandura, 1981). Personal efficacy expectations can determine whether individuals take on challenging tasks and how much effort and persistence will
be employed to achieve those tasks (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacy is an important motivational construct that influences individual’s choices, goals, effort, coping, and persistence (Bandura, 1977). Thus, counselor self-efficacy may be a critical factor in examining counseling performance and persistence (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Larson & Daniels, 1998).

According to Bandura’s (1977, 1982, 1986) self-efficacy theory, expectations of personal self-efficacy determine whether coping behaviors will be initiated, how much effort will be expended, and how long it will be sustained in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences. The strength of people’s convictions in their own effectiveness is likely to affect whether they will even try to cope with given situations (Bandura, 1977). Furthermore, as stated by Bandura (1977), people fear and tend to avoid threatening situations they believe exceed their coping skills, whereas they get involved in activities and behave assuredly when they judge themselves capable of handling situations that would otherwise be intimidating.

As a construct, self-efficacy provides insight into the significance of examining school counselors’ beliefs in their own capabilities and how stronger, perceived self-efficacy can positively impact counselor performance and motivation to address challenging issues (Bandura, 1995; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Consistent with Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy theory; Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) argued that school counselors who do not possess multicultural competence and a belief in their capabilities to perform tasks relative to ethnically diverse students may neglect to see the importance of such tasks, and may even avoid these tasks altogether.
Evans and colleagues (2011) noted that many counselors enter the profession ill equipped to respond to the underlying needs of culturally diverse students and families. As a result, school counselors may perceive themselves as less efficacious in regards to addressing tasks relative to diverse populations, which may contribute to avoidance of these multicultural tasks all together (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). School counselors with stronger self-efficacy may possess more motivation and commitment to address multicultural issues and successfully persist through challenges that may arise as a result of attempting to advocate for racially and culturally diverse students.

Researchers have noted the resistance and challenges school counselors face when they attempt to advocate for the needs of culturally diverse students in schools (Arredondo, 2008; Bemak & Chung, 2008; Evans et.al, 2011). Perceived self-efficacy affects people’s choice of activities, how much effort they expend, and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences (Bandura, 1977). Given the professional mandates for school counselor leadership to address complex issues of diversity, it seems imperative to examine school counselors’ capacities to persist through these various challenges that they might encounter by examining school counselors’ self-efficacy beliefs in their multicultural capabilities and the relationship between these beliefs and their leadership practices.

**Counselor self-efficacy.** Counselor self-efficacy refers to counselors’ beliefs or judgments about their capability to perform specific counseling related behaviors and activities (Larson et al., 1999; Lent et.al., 2006). A considerable amount of research has examined the importance of counselor self-efficacy in relation to counseling variables
such as counselor performance, counselor anxiety, and the supervision environment (Daniels & Larson, 2001; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Leach, et al., 1997). Studies have found that counseling self-efficacy is positively related to counselor training level and supervision, counselor self-concept, counselor development, and expectations of counseling outcomes (Leach et al., 1997).

Sutton and Fall (1995) were the first to examine the role of self-efficacy in explaining the effectiveness of school counselors. The study’s sample included 316 public school counselors. Results from the study found that school counselor self-efficacy was influenced by school climate factors, with staff support and administrative support contributing significant variance to self-efficacy (Sutton & Fall, 1995). Scarborough and Culbreth’s (2008) study further confirmed these findings with administrative support also accounting for significant variance in self-efficacy. These findings indicated that external support can potentially account for variance in school counselors’ self-efficacy. Despite the important insight gained from these studies regarding external factors that might impact school counselors’ self-efficacy, these studies failed to address multicultural factors that might also impact school counselors’ self-efficacy beliefs, which is particularly important given the growing diversity in U.S. schools and persistent achievement gaps between racial groups.

Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) developed the first self-efficacy measure specific to school counseling. The School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale (SCSE) included five factors or subscales: Personal and Social Development, Leadership and Assessment, Career and Academic Development, Collaboration, and Cultural Acceptance. Utilizing a
sample of 222 school counselors; Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found that counselors with 3 or more years of experience reported significantly higher self-efficacy. This finding has been supported by additional studies that have found a significant, positive relationship between school counselors’ years of experience and self-efficacy (Ernst; 2012; Gordillo, 2015; Owens, Bodenhorn, & Bryant, 2010). Although it is understandable that novice school counselors may perceive themselves as less efficacious than more experienced school counselors, the reality is that the nation’s student population is growing increasingly diverse. As achievement gaps persist, all school counselors, regardless of experience level, must possess the self-efficacy to confront the various complex challenges that exist in today’s education system.

Bodenhorn, Wolfe, and Airen (2010) conducted a national study examining school counselors’ perceptions of the status of the achievement gap and equity in their schools and (utilizing the SCSE) found that school counselors with higher self-efficacy were more likely to be aware of academic achievement gap data and narrow achievement gaps in their schools. The authors concluded that higher levels of self-efficacy might have a larger effect on school counselors’ capacities to increase equity in schools. Thus, self-efficacy as a construct seems important to examine in relation to the capacity of school counselors to address multicultural and social justice issues in schools (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010).

School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy

Multicultural self-efficacy is a relatively new construct that has appeared in the counseling literature. Distinct from general self-efficacy; Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008)
defined multicultural self-efficacy as professional 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 ethnically and culturally diverse needs of K-12 students.

According to Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008), professional school counselors with higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy are more likely to believe that they have the capacity to understand multicultural and diversity concepts, are more likely to identify student inequities, are more likely to challenge barriers to academic achievement, and are more likely to be satisfied with their work with culturally diverse students and families. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) operationalization of multicultural self-efficacy suggests a potential relationship between this construct and school counselors’ leadership practices. That is, counselors with higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy might be more likely to employ the leadership practices needed to challenge inequitable policies and practices within schools.

The first (and only existing) measure of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy was developed by Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008). The School Counseling Multicultural Self Efficacy Scale (SCMES) was developed for the purpose of assessing school counselors perceived capabilities to perform tasks in schools that are related to increasing minority student achievement, increasing parental involvement of minority parents, and advocating for students from culturally and racially diverse backgrounds (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) argued that although the School Counselor Self- Efficacy Scale (SCSE: 2005) included some multicultural
considerations, it did not sufficiently cover multicultural and equity issues relevant to professional school counselors’ work in schools.

The SCMES is a 52 item scale that measures school counselor multicultural self-efficacy across six dimensions: (factor 1) knowledge of multicultural counseling concepts, 14 items that assess professional school counselors’ perceived abilities to discuss multicultural concepts such as the influence of racism on counseling; (factor 2) using data and understanding systemic change, 9 items that assess school counselors’ perceived abilities to address equity and utilize data as an advocacy and equity tool; (factor 3) developing cross-cultural relationships, 7 items that assess school counselors’ perceived abilities to develop relationships with culturally diverse people; (factor 4) multicultural counseling awareness, 9 items that assess school counselors’ perceived multicultural self-awareness which includes understanding how one’s culture may affect interactions and interventions with students; (factor 5) multicultural assessment, 7 items that assess school counselors perceived abilities to identify culturally appropriate and fair testing practices in schools and identify discriminatory policies and practices that impact culturally diverse students; and (factor 6) application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice, 6 items that assess school counselors’ perceived capability to integrate and apply awareness of racial and cultural concepts (i.e., racism and discrimination) into actual practice (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) conducted an initial study, with 181 participants from the American School Counseling Association (ASCA), to test the reliability of the SCMES and to examine the perceived multicultural self-efficacy of professional school
counselors. The results of the study provided initial support for the validity and internal consistency of the SCMES (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) found that school counselors reported lower levels of self-efficacy on the SCMES subscale, factor 2 (using data and understanding systemic change), compared to the other sub-scales. These findings suggested that school counselors are lacking in their confidence in using data to uncover student inequities and advocate for systemic change in schools.

Based on Bandura’s (1977) self-efficacy theory, people tend to avoid tasks where they have lower personal efficacy expectations; thus, school counselors’ lower self-efficacy in using data to advocate for students might contribute to them not engaging in this critical work. Considering that school counselors have been called to be leaders that use data to advocate for equitable programs and services for students (ASCA, 2012), the results of the Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) study highlighted the importance of additional research related to school counselors’ efficacy in this area.

Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) initial study with the SCMES also found that ethnicity and years of experience were the only demographic variables that were significantly related to school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy. Ethnic minority school counselors reported higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy than White American counselors on five of the SCMES factors: knowledge of multicultural concepts, using data and understanding systemic change, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Holcomb-McCoy, et al, 2008). The findings from Holcomb-McCoy and colleagues
(2008) suggested that novice, White school counselors have distinct multicultural training needs related to multicultural awareness and the application of multicultural skills (such as utilizing data for advocacy) that subsequently might impact their capacities to employ effective leadership practices.

School counselor multicultural competence has been discussed in the literature (Holcomb-McCoy, 2001, 2004, 2005, 2007; Holcomb & Chen-Hayes, 2011), yet there has been limited additional research on multicultural self-efficacy, despite its ability to assist in the understanding of counselor’s motivation to perform tasks related to promoting equity in schools. With respect to the limited research in this area, Crook (2010) utilized the SCMES measure on a sample of 173 school counselors and found significant differences among the demographic variables of race/ethnicity and years of experience. Consistent with findings of Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008), the study found that, compared to White counselors, racial/ethnic minority counselors rated themselves significantly higher on the following SCMES factors: using data, understanding systemic change; developing cultural relationships; multicultural counseling awareness; and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Crook, 2010).

Also consistent with the findings of Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008), Crook (2010) found that school counselors with 11-14 and 15-19 years of experience reported being more confident about their abilities to perform tasks and activities associated with multicultural school counseling compared to school counselors with less than 1 year, 1-3 years, and 4-7 years of experience. These studies (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al.,
2008) suggest that the demographic variables of race/ethnicity and years of experience might be significantly related to school counselors’ levels of multicultural self-efficacy.

Building upon this research, Na (2012) surveyed a national sample of 381 school counselors exploring the relationship between school counselor multicultural counseling competence and self-efficacy in working with recent immigrant students. Results found that training experiences in a graduate program, years of experience as a school counselor, age, race/ethnicity, and school urbanicity all influenced a school counselor’s self-efficacy. The findings related to years of experience and race/ethnicity were consistent with Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) and Crook (2010) such that racial/ethnic minority school counselors with more years of experience reported being more confident about their abilities to perform tasks and activities associated with multicultural school counseling.

With a very limited amount of studies on school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy, there is still much to be done regarding how professional school counselors perceive their abilities to intervene effectively with culturally diverse clients and to perform tasks that promote equity in schools (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). Despite the limited research in this area, current school counselor multicultural self-efficacy literature suggests that (a) counselors with more years of experience report higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008); (b) counselors report a lower degree of self-efficacy on the SCMES subscale, using data and understanding systemic change, compared to the other sub-scales (Crook, 2010; Durden, 2011; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012); and (c) racial/ethnic minority counselors
report higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy than White American counselors (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012).

Taken together, these studies suggest that additional research is needed regarding factors that can assist school counselors to develop the multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices needed to promote equity in schools. The fact that racial/ethnic minority counselors have been found to report higher levels of multicultural self-efficacy than White school counselors warrants additional examination given that, despite the fact that the student population in the U.S. is growing increasingly diverse, over 70 percent of counselors remain White (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014).

To explain the discrepancy in self-reported multicultural self-efficacy, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) described how ethnic minority school counselors may have life experiences that contribute to more heightened sensitivity, awareness, and willingness to address issues related to cultural and racial differences. However, additional research is needed to explore this further to enhance future counselor education and training, particularly as it relates to leadership development.

**Transformational Leadership**

Leadership is difficult to define and often does not have clearly identified outcomes (Northouse, 2004). As a concept, leadership is complex, and the large number of proposed leadership models and the vast literature base indicate a history of researchers and professionals struggling to define leadership (e.g., Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Northouse, 2004). One prevalent theory of leadership that applies to the emerging
role of school counselors is that of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Northouse, 2004).

Transformational leadership theory, first introduced by James Burns (1978), assumes that people who exhibit particular leadership behaviors can inspire others to higher levels of performance, dedication, motivation, and morality. Transformational leadership promotes the ability of leaders to challenge the status quo, inspiring others to think beyond their usual scope (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders motivate followers to perform beyond expectations by transforming followers’ values, attitudes, and beliefs (Burns, 1978).

According to Balyer (2012), transformational leadership behaviors involves the capacity to energize and motivate their followers, serve as an example for others, create relationships to acquire trust, and stimulate and challenge others. Transformational leaders are recognized as change agents who are good role models, who can create and articulate a clear vision for an organization, who empower followers to achieve a higher standard, who act in ways that make others want to trust them, and who give meaning to organizational life (Northouse, 2004).

In education, transformational leadership has been recognized as one the most effective leadership styles (Adams & Hambright, 2005; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Burns, 1978). Transformative leadership practices in schools focus on generating systemic changes that result in success for all students, through the development of solid stakeholder relationships and socially just beliefs and practices (Young & Bryan, 2015; Shield, 2012). Transformational school leaders have the capacity to develop a shared
vision and shared commitment to school change through helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative professional school culture and solve problems together more effectively (Leithwood, 1992).

Transformational leadership emphasizes shared leadership within an organization and the ability to generate significant influence through collaborative partnerships, without utilizing a “top-down” approach (Hallinger 2003). Transformational leadership promotes school counselors as visionaries who engage with others in a constant practice of change and development (Mason & McMahon, 2009). The philosophical underpinnings of transformational leadership include holistic and systems thinking (Dollarhide & Gibson, 2008) which are congruent with the evolving role of school counselors as visionaries, educational leaders, and change agents (ASCA, 2012).

Counseling literature asserts that when professional school counselors develop and maintain a school counseling program based on leadership, they are able to empower all stakeholders to challenge unjust institutional and systemic practices that deny the best career and college readiness opportunities to all students (ASCA, 2012; Chen-Hayes & Getch, 2015). The theory of transformational leadership provides a useful theoretical lens to better understand the capacities of school counselors to implement leadership practices that effectively inspire and engage stakeholders to create the systemic change needed to confront inequities in schools.

**School Counselor Leadership**

Within the limited body of school counselor leadership research, the most commonly used measure of leadership is The Leadership Practices Inventory, Self-
Instrument (Kouzes & Posner, 2013) which is based on the theory of transformational leadership. The Leadership Practices Inventory, Self-Instrument (LPI) consists of 30 items that measure the following five leadership practices: Model the Way (MTW), Inspire a Shared Vision (ISV), Challenge the Process (CTP), Enable Others to Act (EOA), and Encourage the Heart (ETH). The five leadership practices that the LPI measures stems from questionnaires that Kouzes and Posner have given to tens of thousands of individuals asking which leadership characteristics or qualities “they look for or admire in a leader, someone whose direction they would willingly follow (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2012).”

Kouzes and Posner’s research (2002, 2012) found that exemplary leaders model the way by finding their voice and by setting an example (they do what they say they will do); they inspire a vision by envisioning the future and enlisting others in a common vision; they challenge the process by searching for opportunities and by experimenting, taking risks, and learning from mistakes; they enable others to act by fostering collaboration and strengthening others; and they encourage the heart by recognizing contributions and celebrating values and victories. The LPI has been used with a variety of populations with regard to age, gender, ethnicity, education level, work setting, and it has been used in more than 250 doctoral dissertations and theses, including many that investigate the leadership practices of teachers and administrators (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

Mason and McMahon (2009) utilized the LPI to conduct a statewide study of 305 professional school counselors’ leadership practices. A demographic survey asked
participants about their personal demographics (i.e., age, gender, and ethnicity), their education and training experiences in school counseling, the school setting in which they worked, and their years of experience in school counseling. Results from Mason and McMahon (2009) study indicated the highest mean scores for school counselors across the enabling, encouraging, and modeling subscales and the lowest mean score for the “challenging the process” subscale. Also, in general, results indicated that older school counselors with more experience, and longer terms in schools, self-reported higher on leadership practices than younger, less experienced peers. The most consistent relationships with leadership were those of age and tenure at current school, as they occurred across all five leadership subscales (Mason & McMahon, 2009). The authors concluded that veteran school counselors may have more work-related self-efficacy which may lead to a stronger leadership identity.

Shillingford and Lambie (2010) also utilized the LPI to investigate the contributions of school counselors’ values and leadership practices to their programmatic service delivery. The study’s findings indicated that the majority of school counseling participants who participated in the study valued self-transcendence (adhering to the status quo) which may be inconsistent with the values necessary to contribute to programmatic service delivery (such as risk-taking). Further building on this point; the study’s findings were consistent with the findings reported by Mason and McMahon (2009) and Sebera (2005) in that the highest mean scores for school counselors were reported for enabling, encouraging, and modeling and the lowest mean scores were reported for inspiring and challenging. These findings suggested that the majority of
school counselors may be collaborators, doers, and motivators and less so risk-takers and visionaries (Shillingford & Lambie, 2010).

The “challenging the process” subscale of the LPI measures individual’s ability to make systemic changes and set appropriate goals (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). It is concerning that within the limited body of school counseling leadership literature, the leadership practice of “challenging the process” is reported least by school counselors (Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). This is also particularly concerning given professional mandates from the school counseling profession that call for school counselors to be change agents that challenge systemic inequities in schools (ASCA, 2003, 2005, 2012). Challenging a process entails risk taking (Kouzes & Posner, 2003) and in the diverse contexts of today’s schools, this also must involve school counselors having the self-efficacy expectations to initiate challenging tasks that disrupt systemic barriers that disproportionately impact racial/ethnic minority students.

Dollarhide, Gibson, and Sanjak (2008) conducted a qualitative study observing the leadership successes and failures of new counselors. Successful leaders had a clear sense of responsibility for bringing about improvements in whatever challenges they faced. In addition, the successful leaders maintained their sense of responsibility and exhibited courage in the face of doubts from a variety of other sources (e.g., other counselors, teachers, or others in the school/district, or themselves). On the contrast, unsuccessful leaders were stalled by a lack of control over the necessary conditions for
change. All study participants experienced resistance to their ideas; however, the successful leaders pushed through the negative reactions to achieve success.

Similarly, in an autophenomenography Wines (2013) described her successes and challenges in multicultural leadership as an African, American school counselor. The author describes how she encountered inner-departmental resistance from other counselors and from the paraprofessional staff that came in the forms of passive aggressive behaviors, refusal to honor requests, and blatant disrespect. Wines (2013) described how she experienced success as a leader by remaining cognizant of her purpose and remaining focused on her to desire to effect change. Qualitative studies such as Wines (2013) highlight that the capacity to lead in schools requires the courage to challenge the status quo (Singleton & Linton, 2006; Young & Bryan, 2015).

Consistent with Bandura’s self-efficacy theory (1977), the participants in Dollarhide, Gibson, and Sanjak (2008) and Wines (2013) study that persisted through barriers to their leadership efforts described a sense of responsibility and beliefs in their ability to achieve success. These studies suggest the importance of school counselors having the self-efficacy to persist through challenges to their leadership efforts. Several studies have noted that a large number of school counselors may not be serving as leaders in schools due to various internal and external challenges (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Janson et.al, 2009; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). Additional research to support school counselors having the self-efficacy to overcome such challenges is needed.

In another study capturing school counselors’ perceptions; Young, Dollarhide, and Baughman (2015), examined school counselors’ beliefs about essential school
counselor leadership characteristics. The researchers surveyed 1,316 school counselors from the ASCA database and found the top theme was “leadership attributes” from which top responses were “flexibility, adaptable (N = 136),” “confidence, strength (N = 117),” and “creative, problem solver (N = 79).” These findings suggested that school counselors perceived having certain leadership attributes (i.e., flexibility, confidence, and creativity) as being to the most essential to effective leadership.

Interestingly, one of the lowest themes found in Young, Dollarhide, and Baughman’s (2015) study was related to advocacy, where only 7% of the school counselors’ responses, regarding essential school counselor leadership characteristics, included references to advocacy or diversity issues. Despite the national call for school counselor leadership that is centered on advocacy for culturally diverse students, these study’s findings highlight a potential disconnect between school counselors’ perceptions of effective leadership and the importance of school counselor leadership (centered on multiculturalism and advocacy) that has been articulated by researchers in the school counseling profession (Chung, Bemak, & Grabosky, 2011; Evans et al., 2011).

Young, Dollarhide, and Baughman’s (2015) findings raise questions regarding how leadership is being addressed within counselor education programs and whether the importance of multiculturalism is being embedded within leadership development and training. While there is some evidence that multicultural training is being required and infused in counselor education, the same does not hold true for counselor academic preparation addressing advocacy and leadership (Evans et al., 2011). Without adequate training for school counselors in advocacy and multicultural leadership skills, novice
counselors will enter the profession ill equipped to respond to the needs of culturally different students and their families (Evans et al., 2011).

A review of the limited body of school counseling research highlights that additional research is needed to inform counselor education and enhance the training of practicing school counselors. Traditional leadership practices (i.e., relationship oriented behaviors; enabling and encouraging others) are reported most frequently used by school counselors, while nontraditional school counseling leadership practices (i.e., visualizing program initiatives, challenging, advocating, instigating change) that have been identified by ASCA (2003; 2005; 2012) to effectively advocate for the needs of culturally diverse student populations are reported least used by school counselors (Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010).

The focus of the majority of the existing studies in school counseling leadership literature have explored the relationship of school counselor leadership and demographic factors such as age, gender, school counseling experience, school setting, professional training (Mason & McMahon, 2009; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). Although these studies have been essential to developing a body of school counseling leadership literature, researchers in the school counseling field have emphasized the need for additional research (Dollarhide, 2003; Dollarhide et.al., 2008; Janson, 2009; Janson et.al., 2008; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Schillingford & Lambie, 2010).

As noted by Connerley and Pederson (2005), characteristics of leadership in monocultural environments are not sufficient for leadership in multicultural environments. The changing demographics in this country make it imperative that school
counselors become multicultural leaders and change agents (Evans et al., 2011). Research to identify multicultural factors that can support school counselors in engaging in effective leadership practices in schools is needed.

**School counselors as multicultural leaders.** The role of school counselors should encompass leadership that advocates for equity and justice for all students (ASCA, 2009; Bemak & Chung, 2005; Lee, 2011). As noted by Evans et al. (2011), it is essential that multicultural advocacy is a natural byproduct of who school counselors are as leaders within the profession.

Effective school counselor leaders have been described as culturally responsive change agents that can (a) serve as a cultural bridge between teachers and students and block the blaming that often derails efforts work with culturally diverse students and their families; (b) function as a pedagogical partner with teachers by connecting the curriculum more directly to students’ lives; (c) team with teachers, administrators, and community stakeholders to create a more welcoming school climate for families of diverse cultures; and (d) help school staff become more aware of differences in class privilege and sociopolitical power experienced by culturally diverse students (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007). All of these leadership tasks entail a certain degree of multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills.

The ASCA national model (2012) emphasizes that, as educational leaders, school counselors must attend to their own cultural proficiency and acknowledge how prejudice, power, and various forms of oppression impacts students. Further, Sue and Sue (1990) identified three behaviors that counselors working towards multicultural leadership
should exhibit: (a) they should become aware of their own values, biases, and assumptions about culturally different individuals; (b) they should actively work to understand the worldview of culturally different individuals; and (c) they should work to develop culturally appropriate counseling skills, strategies, and practices.

Chung, Bemak, and Grabosky (2011) conveyed multicultural social justice leadership strategies in working with immigrant populations and noted the importance of counselors being aware of the multicultural issues impacting clients (e.g., racism, intolerance, and xenophobia) and, more importantly, having awareness of their own biases that might influence their perceptions and interactions with diverse populations. As noted by Chung and colleagues (2011), counselors may unconsciously internalize negative messages about diverse populations and hence buy into xenophobia and intolerance that subsequently impedes their work with clients.

In order for school counselors to lead efforts in schools to advocate for racial/ethnic minority students, it is critical for school counselors to (first) examine their own values, biases, and assumptions about ethnically and culturally different students. School counselors are in a unique position to serve as multicultural leaders that can effect social change by challenging the institutions that have created and maintained the injustices that impact students (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Arredondo, 2008; Cox & Lee, 2007). However, literature suggests that school counselors must (first) be equipped with the appropriate multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills (Chung & Bemak, 2011; Evans et.al. 2011; Sue & Sue, 1990). As aforementioned, unfortunately, research
providing additional insight on multicultural factors that might impact school counselors’ leadership practices is relatively non-existent.

**Multicultural Leadership**

The lack of attention to multiculturalism that is evident in school counseling leadership research is also reflected within the field of educational leadership. Educational leadership as a field and discipline has been slow to respond to the realities of increased racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity and their implications at various levels of education (Santamaría & Santamaría, 2015). According to Brooks and Miles (2010), the educational leadership literature has not yet explored in deep and critical ways how sociocultural differences at the individual and group levels inform leadership dispositions and behaviors and how failure to acknowledge such differences problematizes the knowledge base on which we study issues of culture in educational leadership.

In the field of education, there has a growing body of research in multicultural education (e.g., Banks, 1993; Grant & Sleeter, 1996), culturally relevant pedagogy (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1992, 1995, 1998), culturally responsive instruction (e.g., Gay, 2002), and antiracist pedagogy (e.g., Lawrence & Tatum, 1997; Lee, 1998, 2006). However, these multicultural considerations are understudied in the field of educational leadership (Brooks, 2008; Horsford, 2010; Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009; Normore, 2008; Santamaría & Santamaría, 2013).

However, there is a growing body of research that suggests that culturally responsive educational leadership positively influences academic achievement and
students’ engagement with the school environment (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Riehl, 2000; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2006). Literature supports that culturally responsive leaders challenge the status quo and enforce high expectations for all students (Murrell, 2007; Touchton & Acker-Hocevar, 2001). Further, culturally responsive leaders have the courage to address multicultural issues related to race, class, social status, privilege, and equity which subsequently impacts student achievement (López, Magdaleno, & Reis, 2006).

Bustamante, Nelson, and Onwuegbuzie (2009) noted that school leaders often struggle with how to identify and promote inclusive practices in schools, particularly when underlying norms and assumptions that reinforce inequitable practices often are deeply embedded in a school’s culture and are reinforced by societal expectations and power differences. Johnson (2007) argued that culturally responsive leaders must be equipped to challenge the status quo of inequitable assessment practices, incorporate students’ cultural knowledge into the school curriculum, and work with parents and community activists for social change in the larger community.

In a qualitative study, Theoharis (2007) found that social justice oriented principals utilized a variety of strategies to build staff capacity to address the needs of marginalized students through having open and candid discussions with school staff about White privilege and issues of race, providing on-going staff development focused on building equity, and developing staff investment in social justice. The findings from this study supports the notion that the foundation for educational leaders advancing equity in schools is self-awareness to multicultural issues, such that leaders can model for
other stakeholders the importance of understanding and acknowledging racial biases that impede work with culturally diverse students.

It may be difficult to challenge the status quo and advocate for positions that are socially or politically unpopular, but researchers assert that these acts of leadership and advocacy are needed to close achievement gaps (White-Hood, 2007). Researchers argue that culturally responsive leadership in a high accountability context requires school leaders who can confront the underlying and systemic issues that perpetuate achievement gaps (Lindsey et al., 2013; Noguera, 2001). These type of actions take a great deal of personal strength and courage and school counselors must have the self-efficacy to engage in this critical leadership work and persist through the challenges that may inherently arise from challenging the status quo. Research is needed that can provide insight on how to better support school counselors in persisting through challenges such that they can effectively engage in leadership practices responsive to the multicultural needs of today’s schools.

**Summary**

As previously stated; given the growing diversity in U.S. schools, demographic divides between students and school-based staff, achievement gaps, and other racial disparities: additional research is needed to understand school counselors’ leadership practices in relation to their multicultural capabilities. A review of existing literature suggests that examining the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices could generate significant insight regarding school counselors’ capacities to provide effective leadership for the diverse contexts of today’s
schools (Chung & Bemak, 2011; Evans et al., 2011; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2015; Sue & Sue, 1992).

Multicultural self-efficacy was found to be significantly related to school counselors’ capacities to address achievement gaps in schools (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010), which is a key aspect of school counselor leadership. Although there has not been a study to date that has examined the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices; existing literature suggests the importance of school counselors acquiring the necessary multicultural knowledge and skills to serve as effective leaders (Gerstl-Pepin & Aiken, 2012; McMahon et al., 2010; Sirin, Rogers-Sirin, & Collins, 2010).

A review of research also further situated the importance of this study. For instance; multicultural self-efficacy studies have found that counselors report a lower degree of self-efficacy in leadership and assessment than any other dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012). Similarly; in school counseling leadership literature, the leadership practice related to challenging the status quo was reported least by school counselors (Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). These studies highlight the need for additional research to determine factors that might support counselors in utilizing the leadership skills needed to challenge systemic inequities that disproportionately impact ethnically and culturally diverse students.

Examining school counselors’ beliefs in their multicultural capabilities may provide insight into factors impacting school counselors’ leadership practices that have
not previously been examined. Thus, this study will serve as a significant contribution to the school counseling literature base. In the next chapter, details on the methodology utilized for this study will be provided including details regarding the research questions, research design, participants, measures, procedures, and analysis.
Chapter Three

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy and school counselors’ leadership practices in an effort to understand multicultural factors that might promote or impede school counselors’ capacities to serve as leaders within schools. This chapter details the methodology that was utilized to conduct this study and addresses the following: (a) research questions, (b) research design, (c) participants, (d) measures, (e) procedures, and (f) data analysis.

Research Questions

1) What is the relationship among dimensions of school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., knowledge of multicultural concepts, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice) and school counselors’ leadership practices?

- Null hypothesis: there will be no statistically significant relationship among dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy and school counselors’ leadership practices
- Alternative hypotheses: there will be a statistically significant relationship among dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy and school counselors’ leadership practices
2) Does school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy predict school counselors’ leadership practices?

- Null hypothesis: school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy will not predict school counselors’ leadership practices
- Alternative hypotheses: school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy will predict school counselors’ leadership practices

**Research Design**

In this quantitative research study, a correlational research design was utilized. Correlational research attempts to determine the relationship between sets of data collected from a group of study participants (Tuckman, 1999). It is important to note that correlation between two constructs does not prove causality; however, correlational research is still useful in determining the existence of relationships between variables and suggesting possible causal links that can be further explored through additional analysis and future studies (Tuckman, 1999). Since this study attempted to determine the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices; a correlational research design was appropriate. The strength in utilizing a correlational research design is that it allows researchers to identify and understand the relationship between multiple variables and how they may influence behaviors, attitudes, or perceptions (Tuckman, 1999).

Data was collected from participants at one point of time (between January and February 2016) utilizing an online survey consisting of instruments designed to measure school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy, leadership practices, and demographic
characteristics. Prior to initiating this study, the institutional review board at George Mason University approved this study (see Appendix A) and approval was obtained for all of the instruments included in this study, from each instrument’s author.

Participants

The participants targeted for this study were professional school counselors from across the United States. Only practicing K-12<sup>th</sup> grade professional school counselors were eligible to participate in this study. Counselors-in-training were purposively excluded given that the primary purpose of this study centered on examining the multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices of practicing school counselors. The researcher utilized a simple, random sampling method to recruit participants from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) online membership directory. The minimum sample size needed for this study was estimated to be 85. This estimate was based on a power analysis conducted by the researcher.

When using a power analysis to calculate sample size, the researcher must consider three things: the level of statistical significance ($p = .05$ or $p = .01$), amount of power desired (typically set at $.80$), and the effect size (Creswell, 2002). For this study, the researcher calculated the minimum sample size needed based on a power analysis that included a probability level of $.05$, a statistical power of $.80$, and a medium effect size of $.15$ (Soper, 2014). In order to obtain the desired number of responses, participants were offered a $5$ gift card (for Amazon.com or Starbucks) for participation in the study.

A total of 230 surveys were electronically completed. Twelve surveys were not completed in entirety and were omitted from data analysis. Mean substitution could have
been used to replace missing data; however, Osborne (2012) recommends that researchers do not utilize mean substitution but rather are transparent and report all instances of missing data. The data was also prescreened for outliers in SPSS utilizing an inspection of histograms, boxplots, and descriptive statistics for the survey measures. As noted by Liu, Wu, and Zumbo (2010); outliers can significantly impact Cronbach’s coefficient alpha particularly in studies utilizing Likert item responses. For this study, six cases were identified as outliers and were omitted from data analysis. Overall, the prescreening of data for outliers and incomplete information resulted in 212 usable surveys.

**Measures**

The data for this study were collected using three self-reporting measures. All participants completed the following: (1) a sociodemographic questionnaire, (2) the Leadership Practices Inventory, Self-Form (LPI; Kouzes & Posner, 2013), and (3) the School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). The purpose, structure, and psychometric properties of these measures are explained in greater detail in the next section.

**Sociodemographic questionnaire:** The sociodemographic questionnaire, created by the researcher, consisted of 7-items (see Appendix D) to gather information regarding participants’ demographic characteristics such as sex, age, race/ethnicity, years of experience as a professional school counselor, tenure at current school, current school level (primary/elementary, middle/ junior high, high school, alternative school, and other), and school urbanicity (urban, suburban, or rural). Response categories for age
ranged from 1 ("20-30") to 5 ("61 or over"). Response categories for years of experience and tenure at current school ranged from 1 ("1-6 years") to 6 ("over 19 years").

**School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES)** (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008): The School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale (SCMES) was utilized in this study to measure school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (see Appendix F). The purpose of the SCMES is to assess professional counselors’ perceived abilities to perform tasks related to multicultural school counseling and advocacy for students from culturally and racially diverse backgrounds (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

The SCMES is a 52 item scale that measures school counselor multicultural self-efficacy across six dimensions: (1) knowledge of multicultural concepts, 14 items that assess professional school counselors’ perceived abilities to discuss multicultural concepts such as the influence of racism on counseling; (2) using data and understanding systemic change, 9 items that assess school counselors’ perceived abilities to address equity and utilize data as an advocacy and equity tool; (3) developing cross-cultural relationships, 7 items that assess school counselors’ perceived abilities to develop relationships with culturally diverse people; (4) multicultural counseling awareness, 9 items that assess school counselors’ perceived multicultural self-awareness which includes understanding how one’s culture may affect interactions and interventions with students; (5) multicultural assessment, 7 items that assess school counselors perceived abilities to identify culturally appropriate and fair testing practices in schools and identify discriminatory policies and practices that impact culturally diverse students; and (6) application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice, 6 items that assess school
counselors’ perceived capability to integrate and apply awareness of racial concepts (i.e., racism and discrimination) into actual practice (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Participants are asked to rate the degree to which the items in the SCMES describe their perceived self-efficacy in working with students of diverse cultures using a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (not well at all) to 7 (very well). In this study; consistent with previous researchers (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008), scores for each SCMES subscale were obtained by summing the scale items and then dividing by the number of items on each scale. Higher scores on each SCMES subscale indicated greater self-efficacy in that particular dimension of multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., multicultural knowledge, using data, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice).

Given the lack of research on multicultural variables that might impact school counselors’ leadership practice, the SCMES measure was selected as a viable instrument for this study.

Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) conducted an initial study, with 181 participants from ASCA, to test the reliability of the SCMES and to examine the perceived multicultural self-efficacy of professional school counselors. The results of the study provided initial support for the validity and internal consistency of the SCMES (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). 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. However, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) reported several limitations of the SCMES, which included a relatively small participants-to-item ratio in the exploratory factor analysis and the need for the dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy to be further defined which includes “fine tuning” the language of the subscale items.

Despite its limitations, the SCMES remains the only measure of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. Given that the SCMES has been previously used in other research studies (e.g., Crook, 2010; Na, 2012) to examine the multicultural self-efficacy construct where significant findings were reported; the SCMES was selected as an appropriate measure of multicultural self-efficacy for this study.

**Leadership Practices Inventory, Self-Form (LPI).** The Leadership Practices Inventory, Self-Form (LPI) was utilized in this study to measure school counselors’ leadership practices (see Appendix E). The LPI has been field tested and proven reliable in identifying behaviors that make a difference in leaders’ effectiveness (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Further, the LPI has been used with a variety of populations with regard to age, gender, ethnicity, education level, work setting, and it has been used in more than 250 doctoral dissertations and theses, including many that investigate the leadership practices of professionals within the field of education, such as teachers and administrators (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

The LPI consists of 30 items that measures the following five exemplary practices of leadership articulated by Kouzes and Posner (2002): model the way (MTW), inspire a shared vision (ISV), challenge the process (CTP), enable others to act (EOA), and encourage the heart (ETH). The five leadership practices that the LPI measures stems
from questionnaires that Kouzes and Posner have given to tens of thousands of individuals asking which leadership characteristics or qualities “they look for or admire in a leader, someone whose direction they would willingly follow (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; 2012).”

Kouzes and Posner’s research (2002, 2012) found that exemplary leaders model the way by finding their voice and by setting an example (they do what they say they will do); they inspire a vision by envisioning the future and enlisting others in a common vision; they challenge the process by searching for opportunities and by experimenting, taking risks, and learning from mistakes; they enable others to act by fostering collaboration and strengthening others; and they encourage the heart by recognizing contributions and celebrating values and victories.

The 30 items on the LPI asks participants to consider how often they engage in specific leadership behaviors being described using a 10-point Likert-type scale from 1(never) to 10 (almost always). The measure has six questions for each of the five practices it measures. A score for each of the five practices is calculated by simply adding the scores together for each of the six questions. A higher value on each subscale represented more frequent use of that specific leadership practice. The LPI total score was also utilized in this study to provide a general measure of school counselors’ engagement in leadership practices. Consistent with previous researchers (Ferrara, 2008; Wyse, 2014), the LPI total score was calculated by averaging the responses to all 30 questions into a single score.
Researchers have confirmed that the leadership characteristics measured by the LPI are related to transformational leadership (Carless; 2001; Fields & Herold, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2011; Lummus, 2010). Scholars within the counseling field have asserted that transformational leadership is applicable to the manner in which school counselors serve as leaders within schools, given that school counselors typically serve as leaders outside of traditional leadership roles (Dollarhide & Gibson, 2008; Mason & McMahon, 2009). Further, scholars have asserted that the philosophical underpinnings of transformational leadership include holistic and systems thinking which are congruent with the evolving role of school counselors as visionaries, educational leaders, and change agents (Dollarhide & Gibson, 2008; Mason & McMahon, 2009). Within the limited body of school counselor leadership research, the most commonly used measure of leadership is the LPI (Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). Thus, the LPI was selected as a viable measure of school counselors’ leadership practices for this study.

The reliability and validity of the LPI has been tested and reported in the literature (Lam, 1998; Laurent & Bradney, 2007; Potter, 2001). Internal reliability measurements indicate all subscales are at or above the .73 level using Cronbach’s alpha, regardless of the organizational features (Laurent & Bradney, 2007). Test-retest reliability is stable, generally reported at the .90 level or above (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Further, LPI scores have been found to be associated with leadership work behaviors and other measures of leadership demonstrating concurrent and construct validity (Kouzes & Posner, 2003).
Procedures

After obtaining IRB approval and permission to utilize the measures included in this study, a list of potential participants for this study were obtained from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) online membership directory. From the ASCA database, three separate searches were conducted at each of the three school levels (elementary, middle, and high school) which resulted in a population of 5199 elementary, 3437 middle, and 7097 high school counselors. From these initial searches, a random list of 1500 potential participants (500 potential participants per school level) was generated from the ASCA database which resulted in the survey being sent to 1500 school counselors.

The invitation emails that were sent to participants are included in Appendix B. The invitation emails were sent between January and February 2016. The invitation emails described the purpose of the study and the inclusion criteria for participation. The purpose of the study was described as examining school counselors’ leadership practices, and multicultural self-perceptions in an effort to enhance the future education and training of school counselors, in the area of school counselor leadership. The invitation to participate included a URL to the web survey site. After logging into the URL, participants were directed to an informed consent page (See Appendix C). On the informed consent page, participants were notified that they could elect to enter their name and email to receive an electronically delivered (i.e., by email) $5 Amazon.com or Starbucks gift card for participation in the study.
After consenting to participate in the study, participants completed three self-report measures: (1) a sociodemographic questionnaire, (2) the LPI, and (3) the SCMES. At the end of each instrument, participants clicked a “Next Section” button, or in the case of the final instrument, a “Submit Survey” button which automatically entered their data into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet that transferred into SPSS. On the last screen of the survey, respondents were thanked for their participation in the study and indicated interest in entering their name and email address to receive a $5 Amazon.com or Starbucks gift card by clicking on a link that took them to a web-based form. Information collected on the gift card page was stored in a secure database separate from the database containing participants’ responses to the survey. All participants that elected to receive the $5 Amazon.com or Starbucks gift card received their gift cards within 24 hours of completing their surveys. The participants’ personal information was destroyed after the gift cards were electronically delivered.

**Data Analysis**

After the data collection was completed; the responses from the sociodemographic questionnaire, the SCMES, and the LPI were analyzed utilizing The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (see Table 1). An alpha value of .05 was used for all statistical analyses.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the SCMES (subscale scores) and LPI (subscale scores and total score) using means and standard deviations. Internal consistency reliability of each measure was determined by calculating the Cronbach’s coefficient alphas. According to some scholars, such as Nunnally (1978), a measure with
Cronbach’s alpha of .70 or greater is determined to have moderate reliability. Thus, an acceptable Cronbach alpha of .70 was used for the current study.

Additional preliminary analyses included conducting one way-ANOVAs to determine the significance of differences in dimensions of participants’ multicultural self-efficacy (measured by the SCMES subscale scores) and school counselors’ leadership practices (measured by the LPI total score) according to the demographic characteristics race/ethnicity, years of experience, and school urbanicity. The findings from previous studies (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Na, 2012) suggest that significant differences in school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy or leadership practices might be found based on these demographics.

When significant differences were found using ANOVAs, Post-hoc analyses were conducted to show specifically where the significant differences were found within the demographic categories. Given the limited research on school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices, the analysis was conducted to extend the limited body of available research and contribute additional insight to the subsequent analysis performed in this study.

To address the primary research question examining the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices; Pearson r product-moment correlations were computed between the SCMES and the LPI. This type of analysis evaluates the linear relationship between two or more variables (Kirk, 1999). For this research question, the dependent variable was leadership practices (measured by
the LPI total score) and the independent variables were the six dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (measured by the SCMES subscales).

Correlational data analysis was appropriate for this study given the primary aim to understand the relationships among this study’s constructs. The results from this study could provide insight on the relative importance of school counselors’ multicultural capacities to utilizing leadership skills in schools which would have implications for counselor education and enhancing the professional development of practicing school counselors.

To address the secondary research question examining if multicultural self-efficacy predicted school counselors’ leadership practices, a hierarchal multiple regression analysis was used to determine which dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy were higher predictors of school counselors’ leadership and the overall variance explained by the combination of the six dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy. For this question, the dependent variable was school counselors’ leadership (measured by the LPI total score) and the independent variables were the six domains of multicultural self-efficacy (measured by the SCMES subscales).

Hierarchal multiple regression was selected for this study given that it allows the researcher to examine the influence of several predictor variables in a sequential way, such that the relative importance of a predictor may be judged on the basis of how much it adds to the prediction of the criterion over and above that which can be accounted for by other important predictors (Petrocelli, 2003). As such, SCMES subscales were entered into the regression model based on the strength of their correlations to school counselors’
leadership practices in an effort to understand which dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy might be stronger predictors of school counselors’ leadership practices. The results from this study could provide insight on specific areas of school counselors’ multicultural capabilities that require greater attention in the school counselor leadership discourse.

Table 1

Data Analytic Techniques for Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the relationship among dimensions of school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., multicultural knowledge, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice) and school counselors’ leadership practices?</td>
<td>1. SCMES 2. LPI</td>
<td>1. 7-point scale 2. 10-point scale</td>
<td>Pearson r product-moment correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy predict school counselors’ leadership practices?</td>
<td>1. SCMES 2. LPI</td>
<td>1. 7-point scale 2. 10-point scale</td>
<td>Hierarchal Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SCMES= School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale; LPI= Leadership Practices Inventory
Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. Specifically, to determine if school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy predicted their leadership practices. The researcher collected data as described in Chapter 3. Chapter four presents the results of the analyses, including descriptive statistics and reliability of the instruments and results of the research questions and hypothesis.

Participants

Out of the 1500 surveys that were sent to potential participants through the ASCA membership directory, a total of 230 surveys were electronically completed which constituted a response rate of 15%. A visual analysis of the data in coordination with SPSS tools showed that twelve (N = 12) participants did not fully complete one or more of the measures in this study, resulting in data from these cases being removed from the data file. Further, the prescreening of data for outliers resulted in data from an additional six (N = 6) participants being removed from this study. Overall, the prescreening of data resulted in 212 usable surveys. The total number of participants in the sample was 212 (N = 212). According to the power analysis conducted by the researcher, the total number of participants (N = 212) exceeded the minimum sample size needed for this study.
Descriptive statistics for the sample are included in Table 2. The participants were primarily female (89.4%). The largest percentage of the sample fell within the age range of 31-40 (37.7%) followed by nearly a third (29.2%) of the sample that fell within the age range of 41-50. The predominant racial/ethnic background of the participants was White (77.8%) followed by Black/African-American (13.7%), Latino/Hispanics (5.2%), Biracial/Multi-racial (1.4%), Asian/Pacific Islander (.9%), and Native American (.9%). The years of experience of the sample’s participants were relatively evenly distributed across ranges between 1 and 19 years; however, the 4-7-year range represented the highest percentage (21.2%). A small percentage (4.7%) of the sample reported their years of experience at the lowest range (less than 1 year) and less than ten percent of the sample (9%) reported their years of experience at the highest range (over 19 years).

A little over a third (32.5%) of the participants reported working at their current school for 1-3 years followed by another third (30.7%) of the sample that had either 4-7 years or 8-10 years of tenure at their current school. Only 16 percent of the participants reported working at their current school for less than 1 year. The sample was relatively evenly distributed by school level with 72 (34%) elementary, 65 (30.7%) middle, and 61 (28.8%) high school counselors represented in the study. Less than seven percent of participants reported working at an alternative, multi-level, or school classified as other. The majority (45.8%) of the sample reported working in suburban schools, followed by a little over a third (33.5%) of the sample that reported working in rural schools, and approximately 20 percent (20.8%) of the sample that reported working in urban schools.
Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 212)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 or over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)/Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial/Multi-racial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Years of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 19 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure at Current School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 19 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Urbanicity
Suburban 97 45.8
Urban 44 20.8
Rural 71 33.5

Descriptive Statistics

SCMES. Data from the SCMES was analyzed by calculating the mean score, standard deviation, and Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability for each of the six subscales (See Table 3). Consistent with previous studies on school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (Crook, 2010; Gordillo, 2015), mean scores for each SCMES subscale were obtained by summing the scale items and then dividing by the number of items on the scale.

Overall, the data indicated that school counselors felt “pretty well” (factor 1, M = 5.79, SD = .75; factor 2, M = 5.35, SD = .91; factor 3, M = 6.41, SD = .52; factor 4, M = 5.77, SD = .71; factor 5, M = 5.51, SD = .85, factor 6, M = 5.65, SD = .77) regarding their ability to perform tasks related to multicultural school counseling. However, participants’ perceptions of multicultural self-efficacy were strongest in developing cross-cultural relationships (M = 6.41, SD = .52) and lowest in using data and understanding systemic change (M = 5.35, SD = .91) and multicultural assessment (M = 5.51, SD = .85).

These findings were consistent with results from previous studies (e.g., Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008) and suggested that (overall) school counselors felt relatively confident in tasks related to multicultural counseling, particularly in building
relationships with diverse populations; however, school counselors felt less confident in utilizing data as an advocacy tool and advocating for multicultural considerations in school policies and practices, such as testing.

Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability was calculated for each SCMES factor and yielded a coefficient alpha of $\alpha = .93$ for factor 1, $\alpha = .86$ for factor 2, $\alpha = .80$ for factor 3, $\alpha = .91$ for factor 4, $\alpha = .87$ for factor 5, and $\alpha = .83$ for factor 6. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for this study were similar to the results of Crook (2010) that found $\alpha = .93$ for factor 1, $\alpha = .87$ for factor 2, $\alpha = .86$ for factor 3, $\alpha = .88$ for factor 4, $\alpha = .90$ for factor 5, and $\alpha = .86$ for factor 6. Given research that has shown that an alpha coefficient of .80 or greater indicates that an instrument has good internal reliability (Pedhazur & Selmélin, 1991), it can be determined that all SCMES subscales had good reliability in this study.

Table 3

*Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the SCMES (N=212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCMES Subscales</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1)</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3)</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural assessment (Factor 5)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1) = SCMES subscale “knowledge of multicultural concepts”; Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2) = SCMES subscale “using data and understanding systemic change”; Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3) = SCMES subscale “developing cross-cultural relationships”; Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4) = SCMES subscale “multicultural counseling awareness”; Multicultural assessment (Factor 5) = SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment”; Application of racial and cultural knowledge (Factor 6) = SCMES subscale “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice”

**LPI**. Data from the LPI was analyzed by calculating subscale scores as well as a LPI total score. Descriptive statistics for the LPI are included on Table 4. Subscale scores were calculated by summing the responses to the six items included in each subscale. The LPI total score was calculated by averaging the responses to all 30 items into a single score.

With the highest possible score of any LPI subscale being 60, the mean of school counselors’ LPI total score was relatively high (M = 48.47, SD = 6.56) suggesting that (overall) participants perceived themselves as “usually” engaging in leadership practices in schools. The LPI subscale measuring “enable others to act” had the highest mean score (M = 51.65, SD = 5.48) whereas the lowest scores were reported on the “inspiring a shared vision” subscale (M = 46.14, 8.62) and “challenging the process” subscales (M = 46.95, 7.73). These results are consistent with previous research findings (Mason, 2008; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005) and suggest that participants more frequently engaged in leadership practices related to fostering collaborative partnerships and less frequently engaged in leadership practices related to motivating others towards organizational goals and generating systemic change.
Cronbach’s coefficient of reliability was calculated for each LPI subscale and the LPI total score and were as follows: model the way (MTW, $\alpha = .78$); inspire a shared vision (ISV, $\alpha = .88$); challenge the process (CTP, $\alpha = .86$); enable others to act (EOA, $\alpha = .75$); encourage the heart (ETH, $\alpha = .88$); and the LPI total score ($\alpha = .96$). The alpha coefficients for the LPI subscales were slightly higher, however relatively consistent, with the results of Mason & McMahon (2009) that found Cronbach alphas for the LPI subscales ranged from $\alpha = .73$ to $\alpha = .85$. According to some scholars, such as Nunnally (1978), a measure with Cronbach’s alpha of .70 or greater is determined to have acceptable reliability (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Given that, in this study, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for the LPI subscales ranged in size from $\alpha = .75$ to $\alpha = .88$, it can be determined that all LPI subscales had acceptable levels of reliability with this group of study participants. Further, the coefficient alpha ($\alpha = .96$) for the LPI total score was consistent with the results of Wyse (2014) that also found excellent reliability ($\alpha = .95$) in this study for the LPI total score.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Measure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTW subscale</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>48.43</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISV subscale</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP subscale</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>46.95</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOA subscale</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH subscale</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Total</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MTW = LPI subscale “model the way”; ISV = LPI subscale “inspire a shared vision”; CTP = LPI subscale “challenge the process”; EOA = LPI subscale “enable others...
Preliminary Analysis: One-Way ANOVAs

Given the limited research on school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices, preliminary analysis was conducted to extend the limited body of available research and contribute additional insight to the subsequent analysis performed in this study. A series of one way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to determine the significance of differences in participants’ self-reported multicultural self-efficacy (measured by the SCMES subscales) and leadership practices (measured by the LPI total score) according to the demographic characteristics race/ethnicity, years of experience, and school urbanicity. Where significant differences were found, post hoc analyses was conducted and effect size was calculated utilizing eta squared.

SCMES and race/ethnicity. On four of the SCMES subscales (factor 1, knowledge of multicultural concepts; factor 2, using data and understanding systemic change; factor 5, multicultural assessment; and factor 6, application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice), there were statistically significant differences found based on the demographic characteristic race/ethnicity (see Table 5).
### Table 5

*One-Way Analysis of Variance by Race/Ethnicity (N = 212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pη²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1)</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural assessment (Factor 5)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Factor 6)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1) = SCMES subscale “knowledge of multicultural concepts”; Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2) = SCMES subscale “using data and understanding systemic change”; Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3) = SCMES subscale “developing cross-cultural relationships”; Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4) = SCMES subscale “multicultural counseling awareness”; Multicultural assessment (Factor 5) = SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment”; Application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Factor 6) = SCMES subscale “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice”

* *p < .05

The Levene’s test of equality of variance was met for the “knowledge of multicultural concepts” subscale, $F(5, 206) = .10, p = .42$; “using data and understanding systemic change” subscale, $F(5, 206) = .69, p = .63$; “multicultural assessment” subscale, $F(5, 206) = 1.00, p = .42$; and “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice” subscale, $F(5, 206) = 1.84, p = .11$. On the “knowledge of multicultural concepts” subscale, the statistically significant difference found by race/ethnicity, $F(5, 206) = 3.59, p < .001, pη² = .08$ implied that 8% of the variance in multicultural knowledge was...
accounted for by participants’ race/ethnicity. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting $\eta^2$ demonstrated that the effect size of .08 was relatively medium (Cohen, 1988). The Tukey HSD post-hoc test indicated that Black/African-American school counselors self-reported higher self-efficacy in multicultural knowledge than White school counselors ($p < .001$).

On the “using data and understanding systemic change” subscale, there was also a statistically significant difference found by race/ethnicity, $F(5, 206) = 2.66$, $p = .02$, $\eta^2 = .06$ which implied that 6% of the variance in using data and understanding systemic change was accounted for by participants’ race/ethnicity. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting $\eta^2$ demonstrated that the effect size of .06 was relatively medium (Cohen, 1988). The Tukey HSD post hoc test indicated that Black/African-American school counselors reported higher self-efficacy in using data and understanding systemic change than White school counselors ($p = .01$).

On the “multicultural assessment” subscale, there was a statistically significant difference found by race/ethnicity, $F(5, 206) = 2.35$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .05$ which implied that 5% of the variance in multicultural assessment was accounted for by participants’ race/ethnicity. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting $\eta^2$ demonstrated that the effect size of .05 was relatively small (Cohen, 1988). The Tukey HSD post hoc test indicated that Black/African-American school counselors reported higher self-efficacy in multicultural assessment than White school counselors ($p = .05$).

On the “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice” subscale, there was also a statistically significant difference found by race/ethnicity, $F(5, 206) = 2.57$, $p$
\[ p = .03, \eta^2 = .06 \] which implied that 6% of the variance in application of racial and cultural knowledge was accounted for by race/ethnicity. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting \( p \eta^2 \) demonstrated that the effect size of .06 was relatively medium (Cohen, 1988). The Tukey HSD test indicated that Black/African-American school counselors reported higher self-efficacy in applying racial and cultural knowledge than White school counselors \((p = .02)\).

Overall, findings indicated that Black/African-American school counselors self-reported higher self-efficacy in particular dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (factor 1, multicultural knowledge; factor 2, using data and understanding systemic change; factor 5, multicultural assessment; and factor 6, application of racial and cultural knowledge) compared to White school counselors. These results were consistent with previous researchers (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012) that also found significant differences in school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy based on school counselors’ self-identified race/ethnicity. However, these results should be interpreted with caution given the low numbers of Black/African-American school counselors that participated in this study. The predominant racial/ethnic background of the participants in this study was White \((N = 165)\) with significantly less Black/African-American participants \((N = 29)\).

Although this study did not find significant differences between other racial/ethnic groups; it should be also noted that (similar to Black/African-American school counselors) only a small percentage of this study’s sample consisted of participants that self-identified as Latino/Hispanics (5.2%), Biracial/Multi-racial (1.4%),
Asian/Pacific Islander (.9%), or Native American (.9%) which could have also limited this study’s findings as it relates to those groups.

**SCMES and years of experience.** For the demographic variable, years of experience, there was a statistically significant difference found on factor 3, developing cross-cultural relationships (see Table 6).

Table 6

*One-Way Analysis of Variance by Years of Experience (N = 212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$p\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3)</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural assessment (Factor 5)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of racial and cultural concepts to practice (Factor 6)</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1) = SCMES subscale “knowledge of multicultural concepts”; Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2) = SCMES subscale “using data and understanding systemic change”; Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3) = SCMES subscale “developing cross-cultural relationships”; Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4) = SCMES subscale “multicultural counseling awareness”; Multicultural assessment (Factor 5) = SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment”; Application of racial and cultural knowledge (Factor 6) = SCMES subscale “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice”.

*p < .05*
In this study, the Levene’s test of equality of variance was not met for Factor 3 (developing cross-cultural relationships), $F(6, 205) = 2.15, p = .04$ so the researcher obtained Welch’s adjusted F ratio (Welch, 1951). The violation of the homogeneity of variance assumption has been proven to frequently invalidate the use of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) F test in one-way independent groups design (Lix, Keselman, & Keselman, 1996). However; Welch’s F test is considered a robust approach for performing an ANOVA analysis, when the homogeneity of variance assumption has been violated, and was consequently utilized for this study (Field, 2013). Results indicated that $F(6, 66.40) = 3.34, p = .07, \eta^2 = .06$, which implied that 6% of the variance in developing cross-cultural relationships was explained by participants’ years of experience. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting $\eta^2$ demonstrated that the effect size of .06 was relatively medium (Cohen, 1988). The Games-Howell post hoc test indicated that school counselors with over 19 years of experience reported higher self-efficacy in developing cross-cultural relationships than school counselors with 4 to 7 years of experience ($p = .01$).

Overall, these results suggested that school counselors with the most experience (over 19 years) self-reported higher self-efficacy in developing cross-cultural relationships than school counselors with moderate experience (4-7 years). Within the limited body of research on school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy, results have been somewhat mixed regarding the impact of school counselors’ years of experience. Consistent with results from this study, previous researchers (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012) found school counselors’ years of experience significantly
related to their self-reported multicultural self-efficacy. However, in a study centered on urban school counselors Gordillo (2015) study found that school counselors’ work experience was not predictive of their multicultural self-efficacy.

**SCMES and school urbanicity.** For the demographic variable, school urbanicity, there was a statistically significant difference found on factor 1, knowledge of multicultural concepts and factor 6, application of racial and cultural concepts to practice (see Table 7).

**Table 7**

*One-Way Analysis of Variance by School Urbanicity (N = 212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1)</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural assessment (Factor 5)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Factor 6)</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1) = SCMES subscale “knowledge of multicultural concepts”; Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2) = SCMES subscale “using data and understanding systemic change”; Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3) = SCMES subscale “developing cross-cultural relationships”; Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4) = SCMES subscale “multicultural counseling awareness”; Multicultural assessment (Factor 5) = SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment”; Application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Factor 6) = SCMES subscale “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice”. *$p < .05$*
On the “knowledge of multicultural concepts” subscale, the Levene’s test of equality of variance was met, $F(2, 209) = 2.304, p = .10$ and the statistically significant difference found by school urbanicity $F(2, 209) = 4.91, p = .01, \eta^2 = .05$ suggested that 5% of the variance in multicultural knowledge was accounted for by participants’ school urbanicity. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting $\eta^2$ demonstrated that the effect size of .05 was relatively small (Cohen, 1988). The Tukey HSD test indicated that school counselors that worked in urban school settings reported higher self-efficacy in multicultural knowledge than school counselors that worked in suburban school settings ($p = .01$) and rural school settings ($p = .01$).

On the “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice” subscale, the Levene’s test of equality of variance was met, $F(2, 209) = 1.55, p = .21$ and the statistically significant difference found by school urbanicity $F(2, 209) = 3.74, p = .03, \eta^2 = .04$ implied that 4% of the variance in applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice was accounted for by school urbanicity. Cohen’s recommendations for interpreting $\eta^2$ demonstrated that the effect size of .04 was relatively small (Cohen, 1988). The Tukey HSD test indicated that school counselors that worked in urban school settings reported higher self-efficacy in applying racial and cultural knowledge than school counselors that worked in suburban school settings ($p = .04$) and school counselors that worked in rural school settings ($p = .03$).

Overall, these results suggested that school counselors working in urban areas self-reported higher self-efficacy in certain dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (multicultural knowledge and applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice) than
school counselors working in suburban and rural schools. These results were consistent
with previous studies which found that school counselors that work in schools where
there might be larger caseloads of students from diverse backgrounds self-report higher
multicultural self-efficacy (Crook, 2010; Gordillo, 2015; Na, 2012).

**LPI and race/ethnicity, years of experience, and school urbanicity.** There
were no statistically significant differences found in school counselors’ leadership
practices based on race/ethnicity ($p = .88$), years of experience ($p = .07$), or school
urbanicity ($p = .13$). Kouzes and Posner (2002), noted that, in general, studies have
found LPI scores to be unrelated with various demographic characteristics such as age
and years of experience. Within the limited body of research on school counselor
leadership, previous researchers (Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005) have not
found significant differences in school counselors’ leadership practices based on
race/ethnicity or school urbanicity.

However, results for years of experience have been mixed. Mason &
McMahon’s (2009) study found that school counselors with more years of experience
self-reported higher on leadership practices than their less experienced peers. However,
Sebera’s (2005) study found no significant differences in school counselors’ leadership
practices based on years of experience. Although the total years of experience of this
sample’s participants were relatively evenly distributed between 1 and 19 years, only a
small percentage of the sample reported having less than 1 year of experience or over 19
years of experience, which could have masked potentially significant differences between
the most novice and experienced school counselors.
**Correlational Analyses**

To address the primary research question in this study examining the relationship among dimensions of school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., multicultural knowledge, using data, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and applying racial and cultural knowledge) and school counselors’ leadership practices, Pearson r correlations were performed. Preliminary analysis was performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The null hypothesis was that there would be no statistically significant relationships among dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (measured by the SCMES subscales) and school counselors’ leadership practices (measured by the LPI total score). The null hypothesis was rejected as this study found that all correlations were positive and significant at the \( p < .01 \) level (see Table 8).

Cohen (1988) suggested some guidelines for interpreting the strength of linear correlation: that a weak correlation typically had an absolute value of \( r = .10 \) (about one percent of the variance explained), a moderate correlation had an absolute value of \( r = .30 \) (about nine percent of the variance explained), and a strong correlation typically had an absolute value of \( r = .50 \) (about 25 percent of the variance explained).

Table 8

*Pearson Linear Correlation between School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy and Leadership (N = 212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using data, systemic change (Factor 2)  
3. Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3)  
4. Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4)  
5. Multicultural assessment (Factor 5)  
6. Application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Factor 6)  
7. LPI Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.51**</th>
<th>.72**</th>
<th>.82**</th>
<th>.64**</th>
<th>.52**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3)</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4)</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Multicultural assessment (Factor 5)</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice (Factor 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LPI Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Knowledge of multicultural concepts (Factor 1) = SCMES subscale “knowledge of multicultural concepts”; Using data and understanding systemic change (Factor 2) = SCMES subscale “using data and understanding systemic change”; Developing cross-cultural relationships (Factor 3) = SCMES subscale “developing cross-cultural relationships”; Multicultural counseling awareness (Factor 4) = SCMES subscale “multicultural counseling awareness”; Multicultural assessment (Factor 5) = SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment”; Application of racial and cultural knowledge (Factor 6) = SCMES subscale “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice”; LPI Total = all items on the LPI measure for all subscales  
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Using Cohen’s (1988) criteria, this study found strong correlations between the following dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (SCMES subscales) and school counselors’ overall leadership practices (the LPI total score): factor 2, using data and understanding systemic change ($r = .52, p < .01$); factor 4, multicultural counseling awareness ($r = .50, p < .01$); factor 5, multicultural assessment ($r = .58, p < .01$); and factor 6, application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice ($r = .50, p < .01$). The strongest correlation found between the SCMES subscales and the LPI total score was between factor 5, multicultural assessment and the LPI total score ($r = .58, p < .01$). Sample items for factor 5, multicultural assessment include: “I can discuss how assessment can lead to inequitable opportunities for students”; “I can identify racist
and/or biased practices in schools”; and “I can identify unfair policies that discriminate against students from culturally diverse backgrounds.”

These results suggested that school counselors’ self-efficacy in identifying discriminatory and racist practices in school, particularly as it relates to testing, plays a significant role in their overall leadership capacities. Further, this study’s findings implied that school counselors’ awareness to multicultural issues (factor 4) and ability to integrate awareness of racial concepts into practice (factor 6) and utilize data as an advocacy tool (factor 2), were also significantly related to their leadership practices in schools. Although the relationship between school counselor’s multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices have not been studied previously, this study’s results are similar to the findings of McLendon’s (2015) mixed-methods study exploring the multicultural leadership behavior of school counselors where multicultural competence was found to be significantly related to school counselors’ leadership behavior.

Hierarchal Multiple Regression Analyses

To address the secondary research question in this study examining if school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy predicted school counselors’ leadership practices, hierarchal multiple regression was utilized to estimate how much variance in leadership (measured by the LPI total score) was accounted for by multicultural self-efficacy (measured by the SCMES subscales). The null hypothesis was that multicultural self-efficacy would not predict school counselors’ leadership practices. Preliminary analysis was conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. The null hypothesis was rejected as each Model
was significant at the .01 alpha level, all of the SCMES subscales (combined) accounted for 36% of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices (indicated by Model 6), and factor 5 (multicultural assessment) uniquely explained 34% of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices (as indicated by Model 1) (See Table 9).

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchal Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Leadership ($N = 212$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig F Change</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1: Factor 5</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>108.83***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.58***</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2: Factor 5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>55.07***</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3: Factor 5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>37.75***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4: Factor 5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28.66***</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5: Factor 5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.82***</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6: Factor 5</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>19.36***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.039***</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Factor 1 = SCMES subscale “knowledge of multicultural concepts”; Factor 2 = SCMES subscale “using data and understanding systemic change”; Factor 3 = SCMES subscale “developing cross-cultural relationships”; Factor 4 = SCMES subscale “multicultural counseling awareness”; Factor 5 = SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment”; Factor 6 = SCMES subscale “application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice”

SCMES subscales were entered into the model based on the strength of their correlations to leadership. The subscale with the strongest correlation to leadership (factor 5, multicultural assessment) was entered first as the control variable in Model 1. The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that Model 1, multicultural assessment was statistically significant to the regression model, \( r^2 = .34, F(1, 210) = 108.83, p < .001 \), uniquely explaining 34% of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices.

Factor 2 (using data and understanding systemic change) was added at Model 2. The total variance explained by Model 2 as a whole was 35% \( (r^2 = .35), F(1, 210) = 55.07, p < .001 \). The addition of factor 2 did not generate a statistically significant change in the variance in school counselors’ leadership, as indicated by the \( r^2 \) value \( (r^2 = .00) \). Further, the Beta value for factor 2 (beta = .11, \( p > .05 \)) was lower than the beta value for factor 5 (beta = .50, \( p < .001 \)) suggesting that school counselors’ self-efficacy related to using data makes much less of a unique contribution to school counselors’ leadership practices than multicultural assessment (which made the strongest, unique contribution in this model).

Factor 4 (multicultural counseling awareness) was added at Model 3. The total variance explained by Model 3 as a whole was 35% \( (r^2 = .35), F(1, 210) = 37.75, p < \)
.001. The addition of factor 4 did not generate a statistically significant change in the variance in school counselors’ leadership, as indicated by the r squared value ($r^2 = .01$). The Beta value for factor 5 (beta = .43, $p < .001$) was higher than the beta values for factor 2 (beta = .06, $p > .05$) and factor 4 (beta = .14, $p > .05$) suggesting that school counselors’ self-efficacy related to using data and multicultural awareness made much less of a unique contribution to school counselors’ leadership practices than multicultural assessment (which made the strongest, unique contribution in this model).

Factor 6 (application of racial and cultural knowledge) was added at Model 4. The total variance explained by Model 4 as a whole was 36% ($r^2 = .36$), $F(1, 210) = 28.66$, $p < .001$. The addition of factor 6 did not generate a statistically significant change in the variance in school counselors’ leadership, as indicated by the r squared value ($r^2 = .00$). The Beta value for factor 5 (beta = .39, $p < .001$) was higher than the beta values for factor 2 (beta = .07, $p > .05$), factor 4 (beta = .09, $p > .05$), and factor 6 (beta = .10, $p > .05$) suggesting that school counselors’ self-efficacy related to using data, multicultural awareness, and applying racial and cultural knowledge; made much less of a unique contribution to school counselors’ leadership practices than multicultural assessment (which made the strongest, unique contribution in this model).

Factor 1 (multicultural knowledge) was added at Model 5. The total variance explained by Model 5 as a whole was the same as Model 4, 36% ($r^2 = .36$), $F(1, 210) = 22.82$, $p < .001$. The addition of factor 1 did not generate a statistically significant change in the variance in school counselors’ leadership, as indicated by the r squared value ($r^2 = .00$). The Beta value for factor 5 (beta = .39, $p < .001$) was higher than the beta values for
factor 2 (beta = .07, p > .05), factor 4 (beta = .09, p > .05), factor 6 (beta = .10, p > .05), and factor 1 (beta = 0, p > .05) suggesting that school counselors’ self-efficacy related to using data, multicultural awareness, applying racial and cultural knowledge, and multicultural knowledge; make much less of a unique contribution to school counselors’ leadership practices than multicultural assessment (which made the strongest, unique contribution in this model).

In the final Model; factor 3, developing cross-cultural relationships was added. This model included all of the SCMES subscales. The total variance explained by Model 6 as a whole was 36% ($r^2 = .36$), $F(1, 210) = 19.36, p < .001$. The addition of factor 3 did not generate a statistically significant change in the variance in school counselors’ leadership, as indicated by the $r$ squared value ($r^2 = .01$). The Beta value for factor 5 was highest (beta = .39, $p < .001$) followed by factor 3 (beta = .09, $p > .05$), factor 2 (beta = .06, $p > .05$), factor 4 (beta = .05, $p > .05$), factor 6 (beta = .10 $p > .05$), and factor 1 (beta = .10 $p > .05$). These results suggested that, combined, dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy accounted for over a third (36%) of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices with self-efficacy related to multicultural assessment making the strongest, unique contribution to school counselors’ leadership practices.

**Summary**

The results from the descriptive statistics, one way ANOVAs, correlational analysis, and regression analysis generated some useful insights regarding school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. Overall, the data indicated that school counselors felt “pretty well” regarding their ability to perform tasks
related to multicultural school counseling. However, participants’ reported being most confident in developing cross-cultural relationships and least confident in using data and multicultural assessment. Similarly, participants self-reported their engagement in leadership practices relatively high. However, participants self-reported more frequent engagement in leadership practices related to fostering collaborative partnerships and less frequent engagement in leadership practices related to motivating others towards organizational goals and generating systemic change.

One-way ANOVAs found significant differences on the SCMES based on the demographic characteristics race/ethnicity, years of experience, and school urbanicity. Although results should be interpreted with caution given the small number of racial/ethnic minority school counselors that participated in this study, findings indicated that Black/African-American school counselors self-reported higher self-efficacy in multicultural knowledge; using data and understanding systemic change; multicultural assessment; and applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice, compared to White school counselors. For the demographic variable, years of experience, there was a statistically significant difference found on factor 3 (developing cross-cultural relationships) such that school counselors with the most experience (over 19 years) self-reported higher self-efficacy in developing cross-cultural relationships than school counselors with moderate experience (4-7 years). For the demographic variable school urbanicity there was a statistically significant difference found on factor 1 (multicultural knowledge) and factor 6 (applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice) such that school counselors working in urban schools self-reported higher self-efficacy in
multicultural knowledge and applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice than school counselors working in suburban and rural schools. For school counselors’ leadership practices, there were no statistically significant differences found based on race/ethnicity, years of experience, or school urbanicity.

This study found positive, significant \( p < .01 \) correlations between school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. Overall; the correlation matrix suggested that the dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy that correlated strongest with school counselors’ leadership were multicultural assessment and using data. Building upon these findings, results from the hierarchal multiple regression analysis indicated that all of the SCMES subscales combined (i.e., multicultural knowledge, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice) accounted for 36% of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices \( p < .001 \). However, the SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment” uniquely explained 34% of the variance in school counselors’ leadership practices \( p < .001 \). A more detailed discussion of the results, the implications for school counselors and counselor educators, and recommendations for future research will be described in Chapter Five.
Chapter Five

Discussion

School counselors are in a unique position to advocate for social change by challenging the institutions that have created and maintained the injustices that impact students (Adelman & Taylor, 2002; Lee, 2007; Arredondo, 2008). School counselor educators have written extensively on the critical role of advocacy and leadership by school counselors to promote college and career readiness and increase academic achievement, particularly for historically marginalized, racial/ethnic minority students (e.g., Bemak & Chung, 2008; Carey & Dimmitt, 2012; Chen-Hayes, Ockerman, & Mason, 2013; Janson, 2009). However, limited empirical research exists to support the link between school counselors’ leadership practices and their multicultural capabilities. This is a serious issue.

With racial/ethnic minority students projected to become the “majority” within the U.S. student population by fall 2024; it is critical for all school leaders to have the multicultural capacities needed to effectively lead culturally diverse communities and advocate for policies and practices that can close achievement gaps in schools and districts (Horsford, Grosland, & Gunn, 2010). In order to ensure that school counselors are equipped with the skills needed to effectively address the needs of diverse populations and close achievement gaps in schools, research is needed to examine school counselors’ leadership practices in relation to their multicultural capabilities.
To address the significant lack of research in this area; the primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy and leadership practices. Specifically, this study aimed to understand if school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy predicted their leadership practices. There has not been a study, to date, that has examined the relationship among the constructs in this study. A total of 212 school counselors from across the United States participated in this study. Participants were recruited from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA).

Data were collected from participants utilizing an online survey consisting of instruments designed to measure school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy, leadership practices, and demographic characteristics. This chapter focuses on providing an interpretation of the results found in this study connecting this study’s findings to previous research, providing implications and recommendations for school counseling practice and counselor education, and describing this study’s limitations.

Recommendations for future research are also suggested.

**Multicultural Self-Efficacy**

The results of this study, consistent with previous research (e.g., Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008), found that, overall, school counselors felt relatively confident regarding their ability to perform tasks related to multicultural school counseling. This finding could be explained by the fact that multicultural perspectives have become embedded into many aspects of the counseling profession (ASCA, 2010, 2012; Ratts et al., 2016; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). For instance, counselor
education programs seeking CACREP accreditation must include issues of social and cultural diversity in their curriculum of study (CACREP 2016). Although not all university programs seek CACREP, its standards reflect the profession’s expectations of entry-level counselors (Evans et al., 2011). Thus, it can be assumed that (to some degree) all of the participants in the study have engaged in some level of training to develop their multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills which may have resulted in the participants feeling relatively confident in their multicultural capabilities.

Although the participants in this study self-reported relatively high levels of multicultural self-efficacy, there is concern that many school counselors continue to lack sufficient multicultural skills (Bemak & Chung, 2008; Evans et al., 2011; Goodman & West-Olatunji, 2010). For instance, Holcomb-McCoy (2001) found that academic training did not significantly increase multicultural competencies among school counselors. Thus, the challenge remains in ensuring that the content of required multicultural courses in all counselor education programs prepares school counselor trainees to work effectively with diverse student populations (Bemak, 2005; Bemak & Chung, 2008; Evans et al., 2011; Ratts, De-Kruf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007).

Given the lack of multicultural counseling skills acquisition among some school counselors, many culturally diverse students continue to experience underachievement and achievement gaps (Education Trust, 2014; Kena et al., 2015). To ensure school counselors are equipped (and being adequately trained) to meet the needs of culturally diverse students, additional research is needed to examine any potential discrepancies.
between school counselors’ self-reported multicultural capabilities and actual multicultural practices.

Consistent with previous studies (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008); school counselors in this study were most confident in developing cross-cultural relationships and least confident in multicultural skills related to leadership and advocacy. Results from this study suggest that school counselors might potentially feel more equipped to develop relationships with culturally diverse populations and less equipped to identify inequities and injustices in school policies and practices that impact culturally diverse students.

A potential explanation for this finding could be attributed to the fact that school counselors typically receive minimal education and training in leadership and advocacy (Evans et al., 2011). For instance; Bruce and Bridgeland (2012), utilizing a nationally representative sample of school counselors (N = 5,308), found that only 51% of practicing school counselors reported receiving training in leadership. In order for school counselors to employ the skills needed to ensure that the needs of culturally diverse student populations are being addressed, they must have access to leadership and advocacy training to support their engagement in this critical work.

This study also found significant differences in school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy based on certain demographic characteristics. Findings indicated that Black/African-American school counselors self-reported higher self-efficacy in multiple dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy compared to White school counselors. Although these findings should be interpreted with caution given the small number of school
counselors of color that participated in this study, these findings are consistent with previous research utilizing the SCMES (Crook, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Na, 2012) and studies exploring multicultural competency (e.g., Constantine, 2001; Constantine & Gushue, 2003).

As noted by Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) and supported conceptually by scholars in the counseling field (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1992; Sodowsky et al., 1991; Sue & Sue, 1990; Sue & Sue, 2008) school counselors of color may have life experiences that contribute to more heightened sensitivity, awareness, and willingness to address issues related to cultural and racial differences. What remains unclear from the results of this study is additional factors that might have impacted the multicultural self-efficacy of the school counselors of color in this study.

For instance, scholars have noted racial identity development as a “significant underlying construct” of multicultural competence (Chao, 2013; Sodowsky, Taffe, & Gutkin, 1991; Sue & Sue, 1990). That is, counselors may be able to better understand other racial and cultural groups when they are aware of their own racial attitudes and feelings (Constantine, Juby, & Liang, 2001; Parker, Moore, & Neimeyer, 1998). Although never directly studied, the racial identity of the school counselors of color in this study could have impacted their self-efficacy regarding meeting the needs, and promoting equity, for ethnically and culturally diverse students. That is, the Black counselors in this study may have been operating from a high level of racial identity development, thereby increasing their understanding of and ability to advocate for students of color. Additional research in this area could provide researchers and
practitioners with a more comprehensive understanding of multicultural competence as it relates to school counselors’ racial identity, leadership, and advocacy skills and practices.

This study also found that school counselors working in urban schools self-reported higher self-efficacy in multicultural knowledge and applying racial and cultural knowledge to practice than school counselors working in suburban and rural schools. These results are consistent with previous researchers (Crook, 2010; Gordillo, 2015; Na, 2012) and suggest that school counselors that work in geographical settings where there are greater concentrations of minority students might feel more confident with their general multicultural knowledge and ability to apply awareness of multicultural considerations and issues to their work with students, teachers, parents, and other key educational partners.

The greater number of minority students in urban schools may provide school counselors more exposure and/or immersion experiences with culturally diverse students that can foster more rapid development of multicultural awareness and skills, compared to school counselors working in rural and suburban settings. Given that the nation’s schools are growing increasingly diverse; areas that are not accustomed to ethnically, culturally, and linguistically diverse students will undoubtedly be impacted by the changing demographics within the United States (Colby & Ortman, 2015). It is critical that all school counselors (working in all settings) have the multicultural capabilities to effectively work with diverse populations and employ the leadership needed to ensure that all students have the opportunity to reach their utmost potential.
Results of this study also found that veteran school counselors (with over 19 years of experience) were more confident in their abilities to develop cross-cultural relationships than school counselors with moderate experience. In counseling literature, results have been somewhat mixed regarding the impact of school counselors’ years of experience on multicultural self-efficacy. Even with more recent graduates of school counseling training programs coming from programs that promote and emphasize standards set forth by CACREP and ASCA that incorporate multiculturalism, veteran school counselors might feel more self-efficacious in working with diverse populations based on their professional experiences over the course of their careers. Additional research is warranted to examine this further, particularly to determine potential discrepancies between veteran school counselors self-reported multicultural capabilities and actual multicultural practices and to generate insight regarding the multicultural skills counselors-in-training are gaining from counselor education programs. Nonetheless, all school counselors (regardless of experience level) need to be equipped with the multicultural skills needed to serve as effective leaders within the diverse contexts of today’s schools.

**Leadership Practices**

Overall, the participants in this study self-reported frequent engagement in leadership practices in schools. A potential reason for this finding could be attributed to the fact that all participants were recruited from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) which endorses school counselors serving as leaders in schools and utilizes leadership as one of the four foundational themes of the ASCA National Model
(ASCA, 2003, 2005, 2012). Given that participants were recruited through the ASCA database, and the study was advertised as being focused on school counselor leadership, participants may have also felt more inclined to provide socially desirable responses that positioned themselves as leaders within schools.

Consistent with previous research (Mason, 2008; Mason & McMahon, 2009; Sebera, 2005) this study’s findings indicated that school counselors self-reported lowest on the LPI subscales “inspiring a shared vision” and “challenging the process.” As noted by Young and Bryan (2015); the capacity to lead in schools requires the courage to challenge the status quo (Singleton & Lipton, 2006) and the ability to develop a common vision (Curry & DeVoss, 2009) that can promote positive outcomes for all students. The results of this study suggest that, although the school counselors in this study self-reported frequent engagement in leadership behavior, their leadership practices might be lacking in areas that have been deemed most essential to school counselors creating systemic change in schools. These findings highlight additional potential areas of counselor education training (i.e., inspiring stakeholders to create systemic change and challenging unjust processes in schools) that could benefit school counselors’ development as effective leaders.

This study’s findings that school counselors self-reported lowest on the LPI subscales “inspiring a shared vision” and “challenging the process” could also be related to what Bemak and Chung (2008) described as the “Nice Counselor Syndrome (NCS)” where school counselors are more reluctant to assume the roles as multicultural leaders or change agents in schools given the desire to maintain a “nice” persona and minimize any
potential interpersonal disagreements and conflicts with other school personnel. School counselors experiencing NCS may experience significant internal barriers to challenging injustices they see in schools, potentially overwhelmed with anxiety and fear regarding how they might be negatively perceived by school personnel for challenging the status quo. Findings from this study suggest that additional training and support for school counselors regarding advocacy and challenging processes in schools is needed.

Additional findings in this study indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in school counselors’ self-reported leadership practices based on demographic variables. The current literature on school counselor leadership has been dominated by a focus on the impact of demographic characteristics (e.g., Mason & McMahon, 2009; Shillingford & Lambie, 2010). However, the results from this study suggest that other variables that impact school counselors’ leadership practices might be more salient to explore. As such, in the current study, school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy was examined in relation to leadership.

Additional studies could explore other multicultural or race-related constructs, such as racial identity, that might also provide insight regarding school counselor leadership relevant to the diverse contexts in today’s schools. As a psychological construct, racial identity reflects the extent to which identification with one’s own socially designated racial group influences thinking, perceptions, emotions, and behaviors toward persons from other groups (Carter, 1995). Racial identity theory provides a framework to understand how people manage racial stimuli within oneself as well as within one’s environment (Helms, 1995).
As diversity in the United States’ student population increases and the demographic divide between students and teachers and administrators remains, it might be useful to examine the construct of racial identity (i.e., how individuals understand and internalize their socially ascribe racial group membership) and how it might impact school counselors’ capacities to address the needs of diverse populations of students and implement culturally responsive leadership practices in schools. Researchers have found that counselors’ racial/ethnic identity have been related to their self-reported multicultural competence (Chao, 2013; Constantine, 2002; Miklitsch 2005; Mueller & Pope, 2001; Weigand 2005) which could also have implications for school counselors employing the leadership needed to promote equity for historically underserved populations of students. Research to explore this potential connection between school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy, racial/ethnic identity, and leadership practices could be useful.

Counseling literature asserts that when professional school counselors develop and maintain a school counseling program based on leadership, they empower all stakeholders to challenge unjust institutional and systemic practices that deny the best career and college readiness opportunities to all students (ASCA, 2012; Chen-Hayes & Getch, 2015). Without the courage and willingness to challenge the status quo, tackle challenging multicultural issues and schools, and inspire stakeholders to be active partners in this critical work; it seems logical to assume that school counselors’ leadership efforts will be significantly stifled.
Multicultural Self-Efficacy and Leadership Practices

This study’s findings related to multicultural self-efficacy suggested that school counselors in this study were most confident in building cross-cultural relationships and least confident in employing advocacy skills to challenge systemic issues in schools. Similarly, this study’s findings related to leadership practices suggested that school counselors’ were least likely to engage in leadership practices related to challenging the status quo and most likely to engage in leadership practices related to building collaborative relationships and partnerships. Overall, these findings suggest that, as it relates to multicultural counseling and leadership, the school counselors in this study were more confident in their interpersonal skills and least confident in their advocacy skills. To better understand the relationship among the constructs in this study, correlation and multiple regression analyses were utilized to examine this study’s hypothesis.

**Hypothesis one.** This study hypothesized that there would be a positive, statistically significant relationship among the dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., knowledge of multicultural concepts, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice) and school counselors’ leadership practices. This hypothesis was supported as participants with higher multicultural self-efficacy (across all SCMES subscales) also reported more frequent engagement in leadership practices.
These findings suggest that, in general, school counselors in this study who were more confident in their multicultural capabilities also more frequently engaged in leadership practices. A potential explanation for this finding could be attributed to the fact that the SCMES measure incorporates school counselor advocacy for culturally diverse student populations and literature supports that being an advocate requires strong leadership skills, especially when advocating for systemic change in K-12 schools and policies (Chen-Hayes & Getch, 2015; Evans et al., 2011).

In particular, this study’s results found strong relationships between certain dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (i.e., using data and understanding systemic change, multicultural counseling awareness, multicultural assessment, and application of racial and cultural knowledge to practice) and school counselors’ leadership practices. The findings suggest that the leadership practices of the school counselors’ in this study were strongly related to their multicultural self-efficacy regarding: (a) promoting equity in schools and utilizing data as an advocacy and equity tool; (b) understanding how one’s culture and biases may affect interactions and interventions with students; (c) identifying culturally appropriate and fair testing practices in schools which includes identifying discriminatory policies and practices that impact culturally diverse students; and (d) integrating and applying awareness of racial concepts (e.g., racism and discrimination) into actual practice.

School counselors that are more self-aware of their own racial/ethnic biases and the systemic issues impacting culturally diverse students might be more likely to engage in leadership practices (such as utilizing data to identify inequities) in schools due to
heightened sensitivity to the various challenges and barriers that culturally diverse students might face within schools and the larger society. The results of this study are consistent with the description of school counselor leadership in the ASCA Model (2012) where school counselors are advocates for socially just outcomes when they actively seek to expand their cultural competence and develop their cultural proficiency as educational leaders who can acknowledge how various forms of oppression impact students.

Consistent with previous literature, the results of this study suggest that school counselors’ multicultural self-awareness and awareness to systemic issues impacting culturally diverse students are essential to their development as multicultural leaders (Chung, Bemak, & Grabosky, 2011; Evans et al., 2011).

Hypothesis two. This study also hypothesized that school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy would predict their leadership practices. This hypothesis was supported as all of the dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy (combined) accounted for significant variance in school counselors’ self-reported engagement in leadership practices. This was an important finding that implies that in order for school counselors to enhance their leadership in schools, they must develop and enhance their multicultural capabilities to be effective. As counselors become more culturally competent; they can utilize the multicultural knowledge, beliefs, and skills to serve students more effectively and serve as leaders within their school communities (Evans et al., 2011).

Although there has not been previous research examining the relationship among school counselors’ leadership practices and multicultural self-efficacy, this study’s findings could be related to a growing body of research in educational leadership that
highlights the importance of school leaders being culturally responsive to positively influence the academic achievement and engagement of traditionally underserved student populations (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2004; Klingner et al., 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Riehl, 2000; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2006). Given that multicultural considerations are understudied in relation to educational leadership (Brooks, 2008; Horsford, 2010; Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009; Normore, 2008) additional research is needed to further build upon this body of literature and the findings of this study.

An unanticipated finding in this study was that the SCMES subscale “multicultural assessment” uniquely explained over a third of the variance in school counselor leadership. Results suggested that out of all the dimensions of multicultural self-efficacy, school counselors’ self-efficacy in multicultural assessment was most predicative of their leadership practices. The multicultural assessment subscale assessed school counselors’ perceived capabilities related to identifying how assessments can lead to inequitable opportunities for students, advocating for the appropriate use of testing for culturally diverse students, identifying racist and/or biased practices in schools, and identifying unfair policies that discriminate against students of culturally diverse backgrounds.

These results suggest that, particularly as it relates to testing, school counselors who are more aware of systemic issues impacting culturally diverse students and have the tools to advocate for better policies and practices, are more likely to employ leadership practices. Given that the use of culturally inappropriate assessments for diverse
populations of students has led to widespread issues such as the over-identification of minority students in special education and the under-identification of minority students in gifted and advanced coursework (Hernandez et al., 2014; Huber, Hynds, Skelton, Papacek, Gonzalez, & Lacy, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1998); school counselors that have the capacity to identify such issues and advocate for better policies and practices might consequently be engaged in more leadership practices in their schools to effect systemic change.

This study’s findings should also be interpreted within the high accountability context of the U.S. educational system that has put an overwhelming amount of focus on testing and the use of test results (Miller, 2010). Given the emphasis and relative importance placed on assessments in schools; school counselors that are able to challenge such “high-stakes” policies related to topics such as assessments may possess more of the leadership skills needed to tackle issues that have such significant implications for the school community (Lindsey et al., 2013; Noguera, 2001).

Researchers have noted that leadership on behalf of multicultural issues can be very challenging and counselors often encounter systemic resistance (Arredondo, 2008; Evans et al., 2011; Wines, 2013). The results of this study suggest that leadership development training for school counselors should prioritize assisting school counselors with identifying systemic issues (such as the inappropriate use of assessments) that impact culturally diverse students and should ensure that counselors-in-training are equipped with the advocacy skills to effect systemic change. Additional implications and recommendations are provided in the next sections.
Implications and Recommendations

Counseling practice. The findings from this study suggest that in order for school counselors to employ more leadership practices in schools, they must also build their multicultural competencies in order to be more effective advocates for culturally diverse students. Bridgeland and Bruce (2011) found that since beginning their careers, only 44% of school counselors received training in cultural competence. School counselors must actively and continuously seek to expand their multicultural knowledge, awareness, and skills to meet the needs of students and serve as effective leaders in schools. If schools and districts are not providing multicultural and/or leadership training, school counselors should self-advocate to ensure they have the skills needed to effectively address the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. School counselors should join organizations such as the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) or American Counseling Association (ACA) to gain access to resources and trainings to continuously enhance their multicultural skills.

Despite national initiatives for school counselor leadership that emphasize the use of data for advocacy, this study’s findings suggested that school counselors are still not as confident in their ability to utilize data, compared to other skills. In order to position themselves as leaders in schools, school counselors must be equipped with the skills and confidence to utilize data for advocacy (ASCA, 2012; Young & Kaffenberger, 2013). As noted by Young and Kaffenberger (2013), it is critical for school counselors to review school data often found on the school, district, and state websites to determine if there are achievement or opportunity barriers that are impeding the success of students. Then,
school counselors should utilize this data to collaborate with other stakeholders to develop strategies and interventions to close achievement gaps.

For example, a school counselor should have the skills to disaggregate student course enrollment data to identify the potential underrepresentation of culturally diverse students in advanced coursework. If disproportionality is identified, the school counselor should have the confidence to present the data, highlighting these inequities, to school administrators and other key stakeholders to develop a plan of action. By doing this, a school counselor would be able to position him or herself as a student advocate and leader in the school community. Once programs and interventions are implemented to address the identified disproportionality, the school counselor should have the skills to utilize data to demonstrate the impact of the school counseling program on students (e.g., analyzing changes in grades or course enrollment trends for minority students) further building his or her leadership credibility.

As suggested through this study’s findings, it is particularly important that school counselors have the confidence to not only utilize data to identify educational inequities but can also utilize data to demonstrate the positive impact of their programs on students (Bemak, Williams, & Chung, 2014). School leader effectiveness has traditionally been equated with the ability to demonstrate leadership characteristics and practices that result in positive student outcomes (Marzano, 2010). Thus, for school counselors to assume the role as leaders amongst other stakeholders they must have the skills to utilize data to connect their programs and interventions to student outcomes.
Bemak, Williams, and Chung (2014) noted that school counselors often use perception data (often in the form of pre/post student perception surveys) that doesn’t effectively demonstrate the impact of their programs. Bemak and colleagues (2014) emphasized school counselors should utilize outcome data related to student achievement, attendance, and discipline to more effectively engage with stakeholders around the impact of their services and programs. By utilizing outcome data measures that are highly regarded by educational stakeholders (e.g., grades, attendance, suspension, and disciplinary referrals) school counselors can position themselves as school leaders and demonstrate the unique contributions they bring to identifying and closing achievement and opportunity gaps (Bemak, Williams, & Chung, 2014).

In addition to utilizing student outcome data; school counselors should implement other data gathering techniques to increase their awareness of issues serving as barriers to racial/ethnic minority students. For instance, school counselors can utilize focus groups to get marginalized students’ perspectives on the school climate and their experiences interacting with teachers, administrators, and other students (Smith & Geroski, & Tyler, 2014). School counselors can also hold focus groups with the parents of these students to determine how welcome they feel in the school environment and how informed they are about their child’s education, given that the parents of culturally diverse students frequently experience alienation from school communities (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007). Through utilizing focus groups to better understand the experiences of diverse populations of students and parents; school counselors can further situate themselves as
leaders within their communities that can identify systemic issues perpetuating the academic underachievement of culturally diverse students.

The results from this study suggest that through increasing school counselors’ awareness of multicultural issues, they might be more motivated to engage in leadership practices. To increase awareness, school counselors can utilize culture and equity audits which involves collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data (e.g., advanced coursework enrollment, test score trends, observations, climate surveys, focus group interviews) to identify any inequities impacting culturally diverse students and assess organizational cultural competence (Bustamante, Nelson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Nelson, Bustamante, Sawyer, & Sloan, 2015). Through utilizing multiple approaches (e.g., focus groups, school climate surveys, community partnerships, culture and equity audits), school counselors can develop a more holistic understanding of the systemic issues impacting the success of culturally diverse students and foster the internal motivation to lead change efforts. After building their own multicultural awareness, school counselors can better educate other stakeholders on unjust institutional and systemic practices impacting students (ASCA, 2012; Chen-Hayes & Getch, 2015) and develop the collaborative processes and partnerships needed to promote sustained learning outcomes for all students (Bryan, 2005; Bryan & Henry, 2012).

**Counselor education training.** Findings from this study highlight the need for enhanced training in school counselor leadership that incorporates multicultural considerations. Counselor education programs should provide leadership development training that incorporates multiculturalism such that students will be equipped with the
multicultural skills needed to serve as effective leaders in schools that can advocate for equity and lead initiatives to close achievement gaps. For example, counselor education programs can expose students to school counselor leaders engaged in social justice and advocacy work for diverse populations. Through providing interactive experiences with school counselor leaders within and beyond the classroom, counselor educators can support the development of counselors-in-training leadership identities and multicultural awareness in a manner that will better prepare students to meet the challenges inherent in the diverse contexts of today’s schools.

Further, this study’s findings suggest that it might be helpful to integrate the following multicultural topics (in particular) into counselor education curricula: (a) promoting equity in schools and utilizing data as an advocacy tool; (b) understanding one’s own culture and biases; (c) identifying unfair and discriminatory policies and practices; and (d) integrating and applying knowledge of racial and cultural concepts (e.g., the effects of racism and discrimination) into actual practice. This study’s findings are consistent with counseling literature that emphasizes that counselor education programs should cultivate students’ multicultural self-awareness, abilities to identify inequities that impact culturally diverse populations, and social justice advocacy skills (Bemak et al., 2011; Bemak & Chung, 2011; Bemak & Chung, 2007; Chung, Bemak, & Grabosky, 2011; Collins, Arthur, & Wong-Wylie, 2010; Ockerman & Mason, 2012; Talleyrand, Chung, & Bemak, 2006).

Despite increasing diversity within schools and the larger society, and literature that highlights the importance of integrating multiculturalism and social justice training...
throughout counselor education programs; most counselor education programs continue
to use traditional counselor training models that are based on European American norms
(Zalaquett et al., 2008) that might not be effective for equipping counselors to meet the
needs of diverse populations. Researchers have argued that because of the inherently
privileged and often monocultural nature of most universities, multicultural classrooms
typically fail to reflect the range of multicultural diversity represented in society
(Keengwe, 2010; Lee et al., 2014). Further, researchers have argued that didactic
methods of presenting multicultural content only reach trainees at the cognitive level,
with limited ability to produce changes in affect or behavior related to multicultural
differences (Lee et al., 2014; Sperling, 2007). More innovative approaches to training
counselors in multiculturalism are needed so that counselors-in-training will actually be
inspired and motivated to utilize their enhanced multicultural knowledge, awareness, and
skills to employ the leadership needed to effectively advocate for historically
marginalized populations.

Service learning is one pedagogical approach that counselor education programs
can utilize for multicultural training that addresses many of the critiques directed at
conventional models by exposing trainees to the experiential realities of diverse
populations (Lee et al., 2014; Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010). Service learning takes
place outside the classroom and involves counselors-in-training collaborating with school
and/or community agencies to gain experience interacting and working with marginalized
populations such as the homeless, foster children, and immigrant families (Bemak et al.,
2011). As highlighted by Bemak et al. (2011), one of the strategies to more effectively
infuse multiculturalism within counselor education programs is to incorporate service learning opportunities with underserved and underrepresented populations.

Through facilitating fieldwork opportunities with diverse populations, counselor educators can support students with reflecting on their own (and others) leadership and advocacy practices and encourage students to further enhance these skills to bring about social change for populations who remain marginalized (Bemak, et al., 2011; Chung, Bemak & Grabosky, 2011). Further; through more direct experience with traditionally underserved populations, school counselors-in-training can gain more in-depth awareness of systemic issues impacting ethnically and culturally diverse students, have opportunities to examine their own biases related to marginalized populations, practice utilizing data for advocacy, and learn how to navigate through barriers and challenges to their leadership or advocacy efforts. In fact, results from this study showed that school counselors who worked in urban environments tended to be more confident with their multicultural knowledge and skills related to advocacy for culturally diverse students suggesting that exposure to diverse populations is critical.

In order to ensure that school counselors are equipped to be leaders that can effectively respond to the issues of diversity in today’s schools; multiculturalism, social justice, advocacy, and leadership should be meaningfully infused throughout the design and implementation of counselor education programs (e.g., curriculum, field-based experiences, assignments, course offerings, diversification of the faculty and student body) (Bemak et al., 2011; Bemak & Chung, 2011; Bemak & Chung, 2007; Ockerman & Mason, 2012). In this study; participants more frequently engaged in leadership practices
focused on interpersonal skills, compared to leadership practices that involved challenging the status quo and generating systemic change suggesting the important role of counselor education programs in providing additional training and support in this area.

This study’s findings highlight the need for counselor education programs to provide leadership development training that addresses how school counselors can challenge inequitable school policies and practices in schools and inspire other stakeholders to engage in collaborative partnerships to ensure better educational outcomes for historically underserved populations. School counselors must be equipped to have difficult conversations with students, teachers, administrators, parents, community members, and other key stakeholders regarding racism, discrimination, and all other forms of discrimination and oppression that undermine the academic achievement of students. Counselor education programs should provide explicit training in leadership and advocacy that prepares counselors to engage in this work and cope with potential resistance to their leadership efforts (Arredondo, 2008; Bemak & Chung, 2008; Evans et.al, 2011; Wines, 2013). By providing more direct training in leadership and advocacy that acknowledges the challenges and resistance that school counselors may face, counselor education programs could potentially prevent the burnout of school counselors committed to challenging social justice and multicultural issues.

**Future research.** Future research should generate insight regarding how to support school counselor leadership in the diverse contexts of today’s schools. A leadership measure specific to school counseling that adequately captures multicultural considerations, and school counselors’ actual multicultural leadership practices, is
needed. With more appropriate measures, the school counseling profession can utilize leadership assessment tools to more adequately equip counselors to address the complex issues of diversity inherent in today’s schools.

Future studies examining school counselor leadership and multicultural self-efficacy should also extend the analysis to include other multicultural or race-related constructs. For instance, future studies could explore the potential impact of counselors’ racial identity. That is, future studies could explore if school counselors with more sophisticated levels of racial identity and higher multicultural self-efficacy self-report more engagement in leadership practices. This type of information could be useful in understanding how school counselors’ racial identity might relate to their confidence in multicultural tasks as well as their leadership behavior in schools, which could further inform and enhance school counselor leadership development training.

Given that school counselors of color are typically underrepresented in counseling studies; future research should purposively ensure that school counselors of color are more adequately represented. Although the participants in this study were primarily White, and the percentage was relatively consistent with the current demographics of the counseling profession, additional qualitative methods could be useful to better understand the unique challenges that school counselors of color may face when attempting to serve as leaders and advocate for multicultural issues. Research suggests that school counselors of color may experience significant challenges to their leadership and advocacy efforts (Arredondo, 2008; Wines, 2013). Additional research is warranted to enhance training for school counselors of color in leadership and advocacy.
Limitations

There were several limitations of this study. The first limitation is the use of self-report measures. All of the measures in this study relied on school counselors’ self-assessments. Thus, the scores on the multicultural self-efficacy measure indicate school counselors’ perceived multicultural counseling capabilities and do not refer to actual multicultural counseling practice. Similarly, the scores on the leadership measure provide information on school counselors’ self-reported engagement in leadership practices versus actual engagement in leadership practices. Participants may have reported information in a more socially desirable manner given that they were aware that the study was focused on understanding school counselors’ leadership practices in relation to multiculturalism.

Another limitation of this study is related to the leadership measure. Although the leadership measure used in this study has been utilized in previous research exploring school counselors’ leadership practices, the measure is not specific to school counseling practices. Thus, the leadership practices measured in this study are general leadership practices applicable to multiple contexts and do not necessarily assess leadership practices that encompass counselor-specific tasks.

A third limitation of this study can be attributed to the sample. Due to the fact that this study included a limited (N = 212) sample of school counselors recruited from the ASCA directory; the results may not be generalizable to the entire population of school counselors. For instance; few study participants were school counselors of color or first year counselors, limiting the implications of this study for these particular populations of
counselors. Although participants were recruited nationally; the demographic questionnaire did not capture regional information so it is unknown if the sample is regionally representative. Further, as members of ASCA, the school counselors that participated may be more active and informed of topics and issues impacting the school counseling profession (such as multiculturalism, leadership, and advocacy) which may have resulted in school counselors self-reporting higher on the study’s measures.

Conclusion

Fifteen years of new programs, testing, standards, and accountability have not ended racial achievement gaps in the United States (Sparks, 2016). Racial achievement gaps exist in nearly every district in the country and the districts with the most resources in place to serve all students frequently have the worst inequities (Reardon, 2015; Sparks 2016). Given that schools with the most resources are experiencing some of the largest achievement gaps, it is clear that school counselor leadership could be enacted to uncover systemic issues contributing to the academic underachievement of students of color.

Results from this study suggest that school counselors’ multicultural capabilities and, in particular their awareness to systemic issues (such as assessment policies) impacting culturally diverse students, are critical to their engagement in leadership in schools. With the student population in the U.S. growing increasingly diverse and achievement gaps persisting; future research in school counselor leadership, grounded in multiculturalism and advocacy, would be useful to the school counseling profession in regards to equipping all school counselors to be systemic change agents in schools.
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Recruitment Emails

B1. Recruitment Invitation Email
B2. Recruitment Follow-Up #1 Email
B3. Recruitment Follow-Up #2 Email
B.1. Recruitment Invitation Email

Recruitment (Invitation) Email

Greetings,

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Tracey Albert, a student from George Mason University. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are listed as an elementary, middle, or high school counselor. This student wishes to gather information about your leadership practices and multicultural self-perceptions and the survey will take roughly 20 minutes to complete. If you agree to participate in the study, you can elect to receive electronically (via email) an $5 Starbucks or Amazon.com gift card for participation in this study. In order to participate in this study, you must be a practicing elementary, middle, or high school counselor. Please click on the following link for additional information if you are interested in participating: surveymonkeyURL. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tracey R. Albert
George Mason University

IRB: For Official Use Only
Project Number: 544810-2
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Follow-Up #1

Recruitment (Invitation) Email

Greetings,

This email serves as a follow-up to a previous email sent on (INSERT DATE). You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Tracey Albert, a student from George Mason University. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are listed as an elementary, middle, or high school counselor. This student wants to gather information about your leadership practices and multicultural self-perceptions and the survey will take roughly 20 minutes to complete. If you agree to participate in the study, you can elect to receive electronically (via email) an $5 Starbucks or Amazon.com gift card for participation in this study. In order to participate in this study, you must be a practicing elementary, middle, or high school counselor. Please click on the following link for additional information if you are interested in participating: surveymonkeyURL. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tracey R. Albert
George Mason University
IRB number 844810-2
Revised 12/23/13
Follow-Up #2 (Final)

Recruitment (Invitation) Email

Greetings,

Just in case you were still interested in participating, this email serves as a final follow-up to previous emails. You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Tracey Albert a student from George Mason University. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are listed as an elementary, middle, or high school counselor. This student wants to gather information about your leadership practices and multicultural self-perceptions and the survey will take roughly 20 minutes to complete. If you agree to participate in the study, you can elect to receive electronically (via email) an $5 Starbucks or Amazon.com gift card for participation in this study. In order to participate in this study, you must be a practicing elementary, middle, or high school counselor. Please click on the following link for additional information if you are interested in participating: surveymonkeyURL. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tracey R. Albert
George Mason University
IRBNet number 544810-1
Revised 12/23/15

IRB: For Official Use Only

Project Number: 544810-2
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Informed Consent

School Counselors’ Leadership Practices & Multiculturalism

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

RESEARCH PROCEDURES
This is a national research study being conducted concerning school counselors’ leadership practices and multiculturalism. The researcher in this study wishes to gather information about your leadership practices and multicultural self-perceptions. Gathering this type of information has the potential to enhance the future education and training of school counselors. There are three surveys on this website that you are being asked to complete, including a demographic questionnaire. These surveys should take roughly 20 minutes to complete.

If you agree to participate, please click the “Start Survey” button found below and complete the surveys. By doing so, you are providing and documenting your consent to participate. When you have completed all three surveys you will need to click the “Submit” button for your responses to be recorded as valid. Then, you will be directed to a web-based form where you can optionally enter your name and email address to receive electronically (via email) an $5 Amazon.com or Starbucks gift card for participation in this study. If you do not wish to enter your name and email to receive the $5 gift card, simply do not complete the web-based form and your survey responses will still be recorded as valid.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks if you participate in this study.

BENEFITS
There are no benefits to you as a participant other than to further research to develop an in-depth understanding of factors that impact school counselors’ leadership practices in order to gain insight that can be useful for the future education and training of school counselors, and serve as the basis for further research.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The data in this study will be confidential. All survey responses will be used only for group analyses purposes. In fact, your name will not appear on any of the surveys and your responses will be identified only as a study code number. Information collected on the gift card giveaway page will be stored in a secure database separate from the database containing responses to the survey. If you elect to enter your information to receive the gift card, your personal information will be destroyed after you have received the gift card.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time and for any reason. If you do not wish to participate, simply do not complete the surveys.
If you agree to participate and complete the survey, you can optionally enter your name and email address to receive electronically (via email) an $5 Amazon.com or Starbucks gift card for participation in this study. If you do not wish to enter your name and email to receive the $5 gift card, simply do not complete the web-based form and your survey responses will still be recorded as valid.

CONTACT
This research is being conducted by Tracey Albert, College of Education and Human Development at George Mason University. She may be reached at 703-993-2087 for questions or to report a research-related problem. The student’s faculty advisor is Dr. Regina M. Talleyman and she can be reached at 703-993-4419. You may contact the George Mason University Office of Research Integrity & Assurance at 703-993-4121 if you have questions or comments regarding your rights as a participant in the research.

This research has been reviewed according to George Mason University procedures governing your participation in this research.

CONSENT
By clicking the START SURVEY button below, it indicates that I have read this form and agree to participate in this study.
Appendix D

Sociodemographic Questionnaire

Instructions: Please select the response that best describes you

1. What is your sex?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your age?
   - 20-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-60
   - 61 or over

3. What best describes your race/ethnicity?
   - Black/African-American
   - Latino(a)/Hispanic
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - White/Caucasian
   - Native American
   - Bi-racial/Multi-racial

4. How many (total) years of experience do you have as a school counselor?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1-3 years
   - 4-7 years
   - 11-14 years
   - 15-19 years
   - Over 19 years

5. How many years have you worked as a school counselor at the school where you are currently employed?
   - Less than 1 year
   - 1-3 years
6. What is the school level where you are currently employed?
   - Primary/elementary
   - Middle/junior high
   - High
   - Alternative
   - Multi-level
   - Other, please specify _______

7. How would you classify the school where you are currently employed?
   - Suburban
   - Urban
   - Rural
Appendix E

Leadership Practices Inventory

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is a copyrighted instrument and is not reproduced in this study. Instructions for obtaining the LPI instrument can be obtained at www.leadershipchallenge.com/research
Appendix F

School Counseling Multicultural Efficacy Scale

**Directions:** The following scale is 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 circling the appropriate number.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not well at all</td>
<td>Not too well</td>
<td>Pretty well</td>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I can challenge others’ racist and/or prejudiced beliefs and behaviors.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I can discuss the relationship between student resistance and racism.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I can assess my own racial/ethnic identity development in order to enhance my counseling.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I can discuss how interaction patterns (student-to-student, student-to-faculty) might influence ethnic minority students’ perceptions of the school community.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I can discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I can use data to advocate for students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I can discuss the influence of self-efficacy on ethnic minority students’ achievement.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. When counseling, I can address societal issues that affect the development of ethnic minority students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I can work with community leaders and other community members to assist with student (and family) concerns.
10. I can use culturally appropriate counseling interventions.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I can discuss the influence of racism on the counseling process.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I can discuss how school-family-community partnerships are linked to student achievement.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I can assess how my speech and tone influence my relationship with culturally different students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I can discuss how school-family-community partnerships influence minority student achievement.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I can develop culturally sensitive interventions that promote post-secondary planning for minority students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I can identify when a counseling approach is culturally inappropriate for a specific student.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I can develop a close, personal relationship with someone of another race.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I can verbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I can discuss how culture influences parents’ discipline and parenting practices.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I can evaluate assessment instruments for bias against culturally diverse students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I can identify when my helping style is inappropriate for a culturally different student.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. I can give examples of how stereotypical beliefs about culturally different persons impact the counseling process.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I can nonverbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I can analyze and present data that highlights inequities in course enrollment patterns and post-secondary decisions among student groups.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I can identify when the race and/or culture of a student is a problem for a teacher.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I can recognize when my beliefs and values are interfering with providing the best services to my students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. I can identify when specific cultural beliefs influence students’ response to counseling.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I can identify whether or not the assessment process is culturally sensitive.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. I can live comfortably with culturally diverse people.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. I can explain test information with culturally diverse parents.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. I can discuss how environmental factors such as poverty can influence the academic achievement of students.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. I can help students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. I can identify when my helping style is appropriate for a culturally different student.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. I can discuss what it means to take an “activist” approach to counseling.
35. I can develop friendships with people from other ethnic groups.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. I can challenge my colleagues when they discriminate against students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. When implementing small group counseling, I can challenge students’ biased and prejudiced beliefs.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. I can develop interventions that are focused on ‘systemic change’ rather than ‘individual student change.’
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. I can identify racist and/or biased practices in schools.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. I can integrate family and religious issues in the career counseling process.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. I can identify when my own biases negatively influence my services to students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. I can identify when my helping style is inappropriate for a culturally different parent or guardian.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. I can define and discuss racism.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. I can advocate for fair testing and the appropriate use of testing of children from diverse backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. I can discuss how assessment can lead to inequitable opportunities for students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. I can identify when a teacher’s cultural background is influencing his/her perceptions of students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47. I can identify unfair policies that discriminate against students of culturally different backgrounds.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

48. I can adjust my helping style when it is inappropriate for a culturally different student.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

49. I can utilize career assessment instruments that are sensitive to student’s cultural differences.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50. I can develop positive relationships with parents who are culturally different.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51. I can identify when to use data as an advocacy tool.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52. I can use culturally appropriate instruments when I assess students.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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